



Counselor, Social Worker & Marriage and Family Therapist Board

50 West Broad Street, Suite 1075
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5919
614-466-0912 & Fax 614-728-7790
www.cswmft.ohio.gov

Social Worker Professional Standards Committee (SWPSC) Minutes **Thursday, January 17, 2013**

Members Present: Mr. Tim Brady, Ms. Jennifer Brunner, Mr. Bob Nelson, Mr. Steve Polovick

Staff Present: Mr. William Hegarty, Ms. Tracey Hosom, Mr. Andy Miller, Ms. Patty Miller, Mr. Jim Rough, Ms. Tamara Tingle, Mr. Doug Warne

Guests Present: Ms. Antwanette Brown, NASW-OH intern; Ms. Danielle Smith, NASW-OH Executive Director; Ms. Becky Corbitt, NASW National

1) **Meeting Called to Order**

Mr. Polovick called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

2) **Discussion/Approval of the January 17 & 18 Agenda**

Mr. Polovick asked if any changes or discussion were needed for the January 17 & 18 Agenda. Mr. Warne stated that Investigations had been moved from 9:30 to 10:30, and that there would be no hearing officer report or consent agreements. Mr. Brady motioned to approve the agenda. Mr. Nelson seconded the motion. Motion carried.

3) **NASW**

a) Discussion of rule change to 4757-9-05: Recently, the SWPSC had decided to no longer accept third-party CEU program and provider approvals from NASW, requiring that the providers must seek approval through either the CSWMFT Board or the ASWB. Ms. Miller explained that the NASW National Chapter approved programs which should not have been approved, and which the CSWMFT Board had declined. She did not believe that NASW Ohio should be allowed to offer third-party approval either, since it would cause confusion for licensees who wouldn't be able to easily tell which NASW chapters are accepted and which are not. NASW National had also stated they would not stand by Ohio's proposed requirement of 10,000 words per credit hour for text-based CEUs. If the CSWMFT Board is charging for CEU approval, Ms. Miller said, what was the point of letting other organizations approve programs, thereby losing revenue for the state. Mr. Rough explained that a previous

rule change for this had been approved, but Ms. Miller took issue with the wording, and that both Mr. Polovick and Jennifer Hadden had agreed the new rule change didn't meet their understanding of the SWPSC's intention either, and so the rule change needs to be reviewed again. He also pointed out that recent staff changes at NASW National may have helped resolve the issue.

Mr. Brady asked whether NASW's third-party approval benefitted the Board. Ms. Miller answered no. Mr. Brady asked if she had experienced similar issues with ASWB. Ms. Miller answered that she had not. Mr. Brady asked how this would affect the Board's intention to promote uniformity among licensing standards for counselors, social workers, and MFTs. Ms. Miller stated that NASW only approves courses for social workers, and that providers already must come solely to the Board for counselor and MFT approval. Mr. Polovick asked whether overturning NASW's approval fulfills the Board's mission to protect the public. Ms. Miller stated that if NASW approves content the Board would not, then NASW approval acts as a backdoor for bad programs.

Ms. Smith responded to these concerns, stating that NASW National has made changes, and that National could make efforts to accommodate Ohio rules. Mr. Rough stated that any changes would mainly affect nationwide CEU providers, as it's simpler for them to seek approval from a single organization than from every single state. Ms. Smith presented a packet with NASW National and NASW Ohio's CEU approval processes, and standards. She stated she was not worried about NASW's revenue, but about social workers' ability to find CEUs. NASW helps provide quality control and guidance for providers, and most states accept NASW approval. NASW can and does work to conform to state standards, and their approval is rigorous because they approve each CEU program a provider offers, rather than giving blanket approval to a provider. Ms. Smith pointed out that both ASWB and the CSWMFT Board have approved providers who went on to offer inferior programs. Ms. Corbitt explained that NASW can make a program's approval in a state contingent on whether it meets that state's specific standards, and that NASW will work with providers to make their content and CEU credits more appropriate. Ms. Smith stated that they had heard from social workers who still want NASW to be approved in Ohio. Ms. Corbitt stated that NASW National has approved programs for around 80-100 providers, and process 2-20 program approvals per week. Each provider is first approved by NASW, and then their programs are evaluated individually for approval. Ms. Miller clarified that the Board also evaluates individual programs at the time of the provider's renewal. Ms. Smith responded that NASW reviews provider evaluations on the front end, and takes them into account when considering a program for approval.

Ms. Corbitt stated that inferior programs had indeed been approved in the past, due to conflicting standards. NASW National could require programs offered in Ohio to meet CSWMFT Board standards, and take into account whether programs had been denied by the Board in the past. Ms. Corbitt also asked for information on which provider's denial initially caused this issue. Ms. Miller promised to provide this information, and asked to see a list of programs that NASW National had denied. Mr. Polovick clarified that this would help ensure that NASW and the Board have similar standards for denial. Ms. Corbitt promised to provide those details, and asked input from the Board on programs they had denied as well.

Mr. Brady asked the cost of NASW program approval; Ms. Corbitt gave the cost of \$100-300, depending on the program, and Ms. Smith added that NASW helps with advertising for the provider, explaining the higher cost. Ms. Smith reiterated that NASW National could write a rule stipulating that programs denied by the Board could not seek NASW approval, and that staff changes at NASW National have increased the overall quality of programs. Mr. Polovick conceded that the Board did not want to punish competent providers for past mistakes.

Mr. Rough explained the current proposed rule change as it was written, which would only allow NASW Ohio and ASWB to award third-party approval, and presented the options to leave the rule change as written or modify it. Ms. Brunner stated that it would be wrong to ask licensees to submit post-program approval for all NASW programs, and that they should have assurance of whether a program is acceptable up front. Mr. Polovick stated that the SWPSC would discuss the issue again on Friday and make a full decision. Ms. Brunner asked how this issue had come up, and Mr. Miller explained how a provider denied by the CSWMFT Board had then sought and received NASW approval, with the full knowledge that this was a workaround. The SWPSC discussed the validity of creating CEU content restrictions, and tabled the issue for the day.

4) Approval of the November 15 & 16 Minutes

Mr. Polovick asked if any changes or discussion were needed for the November 15 & 16 minutes. Mr. Nelson made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Polovick seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Mr. Brady made a motion to appoint Mr. Nelson to the Board's CEU Committee, as Jennifer Hadden had resigned from the Board. Ms. Brunner seconded the motion. Motion carried.

5) Approval of Applications for Licensure

A motion was made by Mr. Brady to approve the 155 LSW applicants and 92 LISW applicants approved by the staff, and the 10 SWA applicants registered by the staff, from November 15, 2012 through January 16, 2013. Seconded by Mr. Nelson. Motion carried.

6) NASW

Mr. Warne presented his article on supervision written for the NASW Ohio newsletter, for the committee's information.

7) Investigations

Mr. Nelson made a motion to close the following cases, as he had determined that no actionable offenses had been found. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.

2012-154	Impairment. Allegation unsubstantiated.
2012-155	Billing. Close with no violation.

2012-190	Non-sexual boundaries. Close with caution.
2012-201	Competency. Close due to lack of jurisdiction.
2012-202	Record keeping. Close with caution.
2012-224	Misrepresentation of credentials. Close with caution.

Mr. Brady made a motion to close the following cases, as he had determined that no actionable offenses had been found. Mr. Nelson seconded the motion. Motion carried.

2012-164	Records issue. Close with no violation.
2012-171	Record keeping. Licensee now in compliance.
2012-173	Custody. Close with no violation.
2012-184	Competency. Close with caution.
2012-199	Billing issues. Close with strong caution.
2012-203	Practice on a lapsed license. Close with caution.
2012-204	Competency. Close with no violation.
2012-218	Improper supervision. Close with caution.

8) Correspondence

- a) Mr. Miller received an email from a licensee, Debra Farley, who was working with the medical director of Ohio's Medicare Part B contractor. The contractor had an issue with LISWs being able to provide and bill for tobacco counseling services; in other states, LCSWs are able to provide this service, but the contractor was unclear as to the difference between an LCSW and Ohio's LISW. Mr. Miller had explained to the contractor and to Ms. Farley that Ohio's LISW is equivalent to an LCSW. Ms. Farley later emailed back to inform Mr. Miller that the contractor had officially opened up tobacco counseling services to LISWs on 10/19/12, and LISWs in Ohio can now bill for that service. A copy of the email threads were presented to the SWPSC. Mr. Polovick asked that Mr. Miller and Mr. Warne include this item in a future Listserv, as social workers in Ohio may not be aware they can now provide this service.
- b) The SWPSC had previously received an email from a licensee asking to receive her training supervision through Skype or other video chat. The committee had decided to allow video chat, since OAC 4757-23-01 stipulates that the supervision must be "face-to-face," but decided not to allow telephone. The licensee wrote to the SWPSC again in December 2012, asking to also be allowed to complete her training supervision through telephone and confidential email due to the unique nature of her work. Mr. Brady stated that this would blatantly contradict the rule, and he felt the rule to be reasonable. Mr. Polovick agreed that a decision based on the rule had already been made, and he asked Mr. Warne to write a response to the applicant stating that the committee would not accommodate her request for telephone and email supervision, as this would very clearly violate OAC 4757-23-01(A)(2).
- c) The Texas State Board of Social Work Examiners was recently required to come up with a clear definition of clinical social work. Due to budget cutbacks in their state, clinical work was being completed by unqualified workers; a federal lawsuit resulted, requiring

the state to write the clinical definition. The Executive Director, Carol Miller, sent an email to Mr. Rough describing her experience in framing and defining the issue, and her difficulty gathering data through public discussion and debate. The SWPSC reviewed her e-mail, as the creation of an LCSW license is one of the Board's goals. Ms. Brunner suggested that the best practice would be to form an advisory committee of organizations that have a history of working well with the Board, and these organizations can help promote the idea to others. Mr. Rough agreed with the idea, and suggested it as a next logical step in the process. Mr. Warne suggested that the issue be briefly set aside until the committee had the chance to review all the New Business scheduled for Friday's meeting. The committee agreed.

- d) At a previous meeting, the SWPSC had approved supervised work experience that an LISW applicant received prior to earning his ACSW designation. Another applicant recently applied who also had received supervised work experience under the same circumstances, the only difference being that she had not been working continuously in the social work field since that time. Ms. Brunner motioned to accept the supervised work experience under endorsement. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.
- e) The SWPSC received a letter from an applicant requesting that he be allowed to substitute a portion of his 20 years' social work experience for part of the 2 years and 3000 hours of supervised work experience required for LISW licensure. Ms. Brunner motioned to deny the request, as the Board has absolutely no statutory authority to waive the supervision requirement. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.

9) New Business

a) Mr. Warne described the process of auditing supervision logs; since he started auditing them in the fall, he has completed roughly 30 audits. In November 2012, the Board examined an applicant who was not able to provide any copies of her supervision logs. The case was referred to Investigations, and Mr. Brady had reviewed the case and closed it with a caution letter. Mr. Warne and Mr. Hegarty personally visited the agency, verified that the applicant was continuing her supervision, and found her and her supervisor to be conscientious practitioners.

Mr. Warne recently audited one applicant who had lost some of her supervision logs but was able to provide the majority of them, and the ones she was able to provide clearly reflected Master's-level work. Ms. Brunner motioned to accept the submitted logs as sufficient evidence of completed supervision. Mr. Polovick seconded the motion. Motion carried.

b) Mr. Warne presented another supervision log audit. In this case the applicant reported her supervisor did not instruct her to keep logs, which the supervisor contradicted. During this audit the applicant's work supervision logs were reviewed and indicated problems with boundaries, time management, and keeping pace with her paperwork documentation. However, the supervisor recommended the applicant for independent practice on her PER form. The applicant was able to provide a number of supervision logs from another supervisor, showing a number of similar professional concerns, though this supervisor also

recommended her on the PER. Mr. Warne sought guidance on how to deal with not only the missing supervision logs but the fact that the audited logs contradict the supervisor's recommendation on the PER. One option suggested by Mr. Rough was to instruct her to deal with the professional issues detailed in the logs, and enter her into a consent agreement for one year while she did so. Ms. Hosom objected, arguing that the Board has no basis to issue a consent agreement on these grounds. Her LISW can be denied, but she cannot be forced into counseling for this. Mr. Brady stated that this action would encourage licensees to not be as open with their supervisors about their problems, which would be harmful to the profession. Mr. Hegarty stated that the Board's statutory authority to deny a license based on supervision log content is unclear, though she could possibly be licensed as an LISW under a consent agreement requiring her to complete the supervision. Mr. Warne clarified that while supervision log content may not be clear grounds for denial, a lack of supervision logs would be a clearer justification, to which Mr. Hegarty agreed but did add that the justification was still fairly weak. The rules allow the SWPSC to establish criteria for licensure, but are vague on the criteria for this particular issue. Mr. Hegarty added that in the past, licensees had been brought in to meet with a board member for evaluation on similar issues.

Ms. Hosom suggested that the real issue of concern seemed to be the licensee's competency, as opposed to the missing logs. Ms. Brunner agreed, and suggested that the committee require the licensee to complete more supervision focusing on her boundary issues and issues with documentation, based on the fact that she has no logs showing her effort to resolve these issues. Mr. Brady asked that they committee establish a specific timeframe, and Mr. Nelson suggested that the licensee be given 90 days to demonstrate improvement, at the end of which time the committee could decide to issue approval or denial. Ms. Brunner moved to hold the licensee's LISW application in abeyance for 90 days, during which time the licensee will be expected to complete further supervision focusing on resolving boundary issues and keeping documentation, with the committee retaining the right to make contact with the supervisor for progress reports throughout, in order to make a full evaluation and decision at the end of the 90 days. Mr. Polovick seconded the motion. Motion carried.

c) The SWPSC discussed the need to modify OAC 4757-19-02 to include more specific criteria on the expected quality and outcomes of social work training supervision. Ms. Brunner suggested a webinar or other formal presentation for licensees. Mr. Polovick suggested a more formal and specific documentation form or standardized log, which licensees could possibly submit online. Ms. Brunner reiterated the importance of presenting any standards to supervisees BEFORE supervision begins. She agreed with the idea of standardized logs, which would also allow the Board to collect data for trend analysis; Mr. Polovick also suggested this could help in determining whether the work was clinical or not. Mr. Warne asked what the committee might expect these forms or webinars to specifically contain, but Ms. Brunner responded that the best solution might be to begin the process, present the information to licensees, and see where they had questions or confusion. Mr. Miller summarized the SWPSC's points as follows, with the understanding that they will be drafted into a rule change for review: 1. Establish a webinar or training for supervisees and also supervisors to take detailing the training supervision process and expectations; 2.

Create a standardized supervision log; 3. Institute an online method for supervisees to submit their logs on a regular basis, allowing the Board staff to monitor them. The SWPSC agreed with this summary.

10) Working Meeting

The SWPSC broke for lunch at 12:18 p.m. At 1:00 p.m. the SWPSC began its working meeting to review pending applications for licensure, files to be audited, CEU Programs & Providers, Related Degree course worksheets, and Licensure Renewal Issues, while Mr. Nelson and Mr. Brady attended an Investigative Liaison meeting.

Upon his return, Mr. Brady examined and denied a supervision hardship request. The committee also reviewed a “self care” CEU program to determine whether it would meet the requirement for a three-credit supervision course needed by LISW-S licensees to renew. They determined that this course could not be considered supervision-focused and would not count, but that they would continue to look at these courses on a case-by-case basis.

11) New Business

Mr. Warne presented information from Laura W. Groshong’s book, Clinical Social Work Practice and Regulation: An Overview. He first reminded the committee that this book was not endorsed by the ASWB, who had expressed concerns over Groshong’s data. Groshong concludes that there are four basic licensure levels for social workers (Clinical, Macro Practice, Master’s, and Bachelor), and that the 38 separate licensure titles used by states all fall into these categories. Ohio is one of four states that combine both the Masters and Bachelor level within the LSW license.

The SWPSC then examined other states’ licensure models. Florida has an LCSW license, requiring those licensees to take an advanced course in psychotherapy. Minnesota has both an LICSW for clinical licensees and an LISW for generalist independent social workers. Michigan has an LMSW-C and an LMSW-M, the LMSW-M having been added two years ago after five years of work and discussion. Texas has an LMSW-AP for macro social workers. The committee again reviewed the email provided by the Texas executive director, and information she had written for her staff to aid in answering questions from licensees.

12) Old Business

Mr. Brady presented information on a new health care model being enacted by Medicaid, a “health home.” This model will see four levels of employees: a director, team leaders, care managers, and health home specialists, all of whom would have some clients. The consensus seems to be that LSWs would act as care managers in this model, which will create an increased need for LSWs in every state, and the most government funding will go to these health homes and other organized care systems. Ms. Brunner stated that another related concern is the upcoming health care exchanges, and how social work licensees will fit in to that model. In looking at the issue of creating a new LCSW, it’s paramount to ensure that licensees are organized in such a way that they’ll be able and prepared to fit

into these new models, and perform the work expected of them. Ms. Brunner suggested the Board take care to create a flexible, simple model that could be adapted with small rule changes as shifts and nuances arise. She offered to contact the Office of Health Transformation for input and clarification on the impending health care structures. The SWPSC agreed that this would be worthwhile.

13) Meeting Adjourned

Mr. Polovick adjourned the meeting at 3:40 p.m.

Social Worker Professional Standards Committee (SWPSC) Minutes
Friday, January 18, 2013

Members Present: Mr. Tim Brady, Ms. Jennifer Brunner, Mr. Bob Nelson, Mr. Steve Polovick

Staff Present: Mr. William Hegarty, Mr. Andy Miller, Mr. Jim Rough, Mr. Doug Warne

Guests Present: Ms. Antwanette Brown, NASW-OH intern; Mr. Jose Camerino, LISW-S, former Board member; Ms. Adrienne Gavula, NASW-OH Relationship Manager; Mr. Glenn Karr, LLC; Ms. Danielle Smith, NASW-OH Executive Director; Ms. Danielle Schmersal, NASW-OH intern

1) Meeting Called to Order

Mr. Polovick called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

2) Old Business

Mr. Rough presented details on three significant rule changes for social workers, effective 1/1/2013:

- a) **4757-5-02(G)(2):** The Board requires every licensee to complete three CEUs in the topic of ethics each renewal period, and that rule has been modified slightly. Social work licensees may now complete three CEUs in the topic of cultural competency to meet the ethics requirement.
- b) **4757-9-03:** SWAs are now only required to complete fifteen CEUs per renewal period instead of thirty.
- c) **4757-21-01:** The scope of practice for SWAs was modified due to a grammatical error. The rule previously stated that “intake, assessment and referral” were within an SWA’s scope of practice. The rule now reads “intake assessment and referral.”

3) Executive Director’s Report

Mr. Rough discussed recently expired Board appointments. The Board’s bill did not pass in the last legislative session, and will be reintroduced. The budget for the 2014-15 fiscal year has been submitted. Rule changes have been filed and are effective 1/1/2012, except for two rules which had not been filed at that time: rule 4757-9-04, requiring 10,000 words per credit hour for text-based CEUs, and rule 4757-9-05, removing automatic acceptance of NASW’s third-party approval. The National Center for Health Workforce Analysis will be creating surveys for mental health licensees, in order to create a uniform data set to aid in national policy decisions. They are working with licensing boards now on how best to administer and implement their surveys.

4) Old Business

a) Mr. Brady had raised the issue of recent changes to confidentiality laws in Ohio, which are now more relaxed than some HIPAA rules. Mr. Brady wanted to check whether a conflict existed due to the differing severity of the rules. Mr. Hegarty stated, after researching the differences, he'd determined that CSWMFT rules do not conflict with HIPAA confidentiality. When it comes to third party access, the more stringent law is allowed to take precedence. On the other hand, Mr. Karr pointed out, when accessing your own records, the more liberal law takes precedence. In fact, CSWMFT rules do have more restrictions on self-access than HIPAA rules do, and there is work being done to reconcile the two. The Board also has rules on breaching confidentiality that differ somewhat from state law.

b) In the Board's previous meeting, the SWPSC reviewed an applicant who was unable to provide supervision logs. Mr. Warne and Mr. Hegarty met with the applicant and her supervisor and confirmed that logs are now being kept. The investigation aspect was closed with caution by Mr. Brady, and the new logs will be reviewed at the Board's March meeting.

c) The SWPSC reviewed a draft rule change for OAC 4757-19-04, which would add the following two lines:

(4) All applicants for the social worker license shall take the bachelor's exam.

(5) Applicants for the independent social worker exam shall have completed their supervised practice required in paragraph (B)(2) of rule 4757-19-02 prior to receiving pre-approval for taking the clinical or advanced generalist exam.

Mr. Warne stated that very few states allow applicants to take either the clinical or advanced generalist exam without completing their supervised experience. According to the ASWB, the validity and reliability of these exams is based on that experience. In Oregon, applicants are allowed to take the exam after completing 75% of their supervised experience, and they have received positive responses from their applicants. Mr. Brady expressed his concern over students' reaction to a change, and Ms. Smith confirmed they have heard from students who are concerned about the cost of a second exam. Mr. Camerino asked how the Board perceives this rule change as protecting the public. Mr. Nelson explained that if licensees must complete supervision in order to take the higher-level exams, they will take supervision more seriously knowing that they need this experience to prepare for an exam, and the overall quality of supervision and LISW applicants will improve. Ms. Smith agreed that this would provide clarity for the purpose of training supervision, and expressed that she would prefer applicants be allowed to complete 75% of their supervision as opposed to 100% to be allowed to test. Ms. Gavula stated that the 75% rule still won't help everyone, since most LSWs don't begin supervision until 3-6 months after becoming licensed, in which case they still have to renew their LSW licenses at least once regardless. Mr. Camerino responded that in terms of public protection that was better anyway, because it meant the licensees had to go through a renewal cycle and complete CEUs.

Mr. Nelson made a motion to approve the rule change with the following modification:

(4) All applicants for the social worker license shall take the bachelor's exam.

(5) Applicants for the independent social worker exam shall have completed seventy-five percent of their supervised practice required in paragraph (B)(2) of rule 4757-19-02 prior to receiving pre-approval for taking the clinical or advanced generalist exam.

Ms. Brunner seconded the motion. Motion carried.

d) Mr. Warne discussed his research findings, with regard to the issue of how to define “master’s-level social work.” The ASWB, NASW, and CSWE were all contacted. The ASWB Model Practice Act lists three practice types: Baccalaureate, Master’s, and Clinical. Baccalaureate and Master’s have essentially the same definition, with the exception that “Master’s... practice includes the application of specialized knowledge and advanced practice skills.” Clinical work is defined as including diagnosis and treatment. NASW-Ohio provided information on how the CSWE breaks down the differences: CSWE has ten competencies which are common to BSWs and MSWs, but again the degree of specialization and expertise are higher for an MSW, and MSWs have more competencies and practice behaviors. Mr. Warne had compiled a chart of the CSWE concentration areas for each MSW program in Ohio, and he and Mr. Miller contacted each school for information on the school’s advanced MSW competencies. Mr. Camerino cautioned that the degree earned by the student is still considered generalist, as specialization is not listed on the degree, so it may still be difficult to determine which “track” each student pursued. Mr. Warne presented a competency checklist that could be used to help supervisors determine if a supervisee is performing at the MSW level, possibly as a supplement for the PER form. Mr. Warne clarified that the purpose of this discussion was to help in determining the scope of practice for a potential LCSW license, and define the levels between BSW and MSW-level work. Rules do not yet require MSW-level work for an applicant’s training supervision to be considered valid, but that rule change is under review.

Mr. Camerino suggested that the Board also acquire the advanced competencies for out-of-state schools whose students may come to practice in Ohio. He also stated that supervisors should be promoting MSW-level work out of their supervisees, even if the job description is technically at the BSW-level. Mr. Warne agreed, and stated that if a licensee has a BSW-level job but is functioning at a higher level, then that would be accepted. Mr. Nelson expressed his concern that at an organizational level, LSW licensees all perform virtually the same job regardless of education. Ms. Smith agreed that workforce staffing might be impacted, but also argued that an MSW naturally functions at a higher level regardless of the position, bringing their advanced education and skills to any work they do. In defining MSW-level work, we also need to be sure that macro practitioners are not shut out. Mr. Camerino suggested requiring supervision CEUs to cover the difference between supervising BSW-level work and MSW-level work. Mr. Polovick suggested a practice analysis of work actually being done in the field. Mr. Hegarty suggested that social workers, like professional counselors, could be required to complete half their supervision in direct client practice; Mr. Miller argued that this would shut out all macro practitioners, who have no education in clinical work, but Mr. Brady added that all MSW students are required to complete some coursework on the DSM and diagnosis methods, but macro students receive far less instruction in it.

Mr. Polovick asked to table further discussion of this topic for the day, as the committee had other pressing topics to review. He also asked whether the legislature was still considering a law that would require all state licensees to register their competencies in a database. Mr. Hegarty stated that the bill did not pass. Ms. Brunner suggested the Board could still require LSWs and LISWs to list their specializations; Ms. Smith indicated that there are websites where licensees can advertise their specialties. Mr. Warne summed up the discussion, and stated that Mr. Rough would like the PER competency checklist to be revisited in autumn.

5) NASW Report

Ms. Smith reported that due to the NASW's change in liability insurance providers, they have lost members due to misinformation. They are trying to educate licensees about the need to carry their own liability insurance separate from their agency's policy. They are also continuing to educate the public on DSM changes.

The SWPSC continued their discussion of the proposed rule change to 4757-9-05. Ms. Smith presented information requested from NASW National on the previous day: the number of active programs currently approved by National (1,496), and a list of programs denied by National along with the rationale for each program's denial. Mr. Polovick asked whether the committee wanted NASW National to still be able to approve programs which the Ohio Board must accept. Mr. Nelson stated that they could now require NASW National to conform to the Board's rules. He expressed his comfort with that change, and stated his view that NASW approval improved service to licensees. Ms. Brunner stated her concern that the push for the proposed rule change was largely coming from one person, and not from the committee as a whole; she saw no need to remove NASW approval. Mr. Warne reiterated that NASW National has been re-staffed with more responsive employees. Ms. Smith stated that she was assured that NASW National would be required to follow Ohio standards, and that they would not approve programs already denied by the Board. Mr. Brady expressed his misgivings over allowing national organizations to approve CEUs in the first place; as he was uncertain about his own opinion, he chose to abstain from the discussion.

Ms. Brunner made a motion to scrap the previously proposed rule change, and to modify OAC 4757-9-05(E)(4) as follows:

(4) ~~Any~~ Courses accredited by NASW shall be accepted by this board for continuing social work education, provided they are in compliance with these rules.

Mr. Nelson seconded the motion. Motion carried, with Mr. Brady abstaining.

6) CEU Committee Report

Mr. Rough stated that the Board had received pushback on proposed changes to 4757-9-04, requiring 10,000 words per hour for text-based CEUs. Rather than final-file the rule, he set it as to-be-refiled so the Board could discuss again. At the full Board meeting, members would be asked to each vote individually. Most of the backlash coming from providers seems to come from concern over every board in the state creating a similar requirement. Mr. Polovick stated another concern was due to the many different learning styles people have, though there are enough CEU methods approved by the Board to address this. Mr. Brady

stated the Board had already thoroughly discussed this issue and defended this solution every time. Mr. Nelson asked if there was any reason to scrap the proposed rule change other than to protect the CEU providers' profit, to which Mr. Rough diplomatically answered that most providers had not argued with the new requirement. Mr. Polovick reiterated that the issue would be voted on at the full Board meeting.

7) **Executive Committee Report**

Mr. Polovick reported that Mr. Rough's Executive Directors Report highlighted issues discussed in the Executive Committee Meeting, and there were no further issues to discuss.

8) **ASWB**

Mr. Polovick pointed out that the ASWB's spring education meeting is coming up, and the committee had originally intended for Jennifer Hadden to attend. With Ms. Hadden having resigned, he asked if anyone else wanted to attend, and offered to go himself if no one else wanted to. Ms. Brunner made a motion to send Mr. Polovick as the Board's representative to the ASWB Spring Education meeting. Mr. Nelson seconded the motion. Motion carried.

9) **Meeting Adjourned**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:59 p.m.

Mr. Steve Polovick, Chairperson