



Counselor, Social Worker & Marriage and Family Therapist Board

50 West Broad Street, Suite 1425
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5919
614-466-0912 & Fax 614-728-7790
<http://cswmft.ohio.gov> & cswmft.info@cswb.state.oh.us

Social Worker Professional Standards Committee (SWPSC) Mohican Retreat Minutes

Thursday, April 20, 2006

Members Present: Mr. Glenn Abraham
Mr. Rocky Black
Dr. Theresa Cluse-Tolar
Ms. Molly Michelbrink
Ms. Jennifer Riesbeck-Lee.

Staff Present: Ms. Paula Broome
Ms. Rhonda Franklin
Mr. Bill Hegarty
Ms. Marcia Holleman
Mr. Jim Rough
Ms. Tammy Tingle

Guest Present: Mr. P.R. Casey, Assistant Attorney General, Ms. Elaine Stepp, Executive Director, Ohio Chapter National Association of Social Workers (NASW)

The SWPSC meeting was called to order by Mr. Abraham at 11:11 a.m.

Mr. Abraham asked if there were any particular issues that the SWPSC wished to address first. Ms. Michelbrink suggested that the SWPSC go through the list in the order of the memo that everyone received in their packet. All members agreed and the meeting proceeded.

1. Strategic Plan Items – Working Plan For Executive Director of 7/7/05

Dr. Cluse-Tolar responded that this was related to what Dr. Susan Huss had discussed in the full Board meeting this morning. Mr. Abraham wondered if the SWPSC should look at this within their own committee in terms of what issues we feel should be considered and then meet with the other committees or delegate someone to work with the other committees. After further discussion, it was determined that the Strategic Plan Items tie in with the Executive Director's focus and responsibilities and should be dealt with at a later date with the Personnel Committee.

2. Criminal Record Checks For Licensure

Mr. Rough reviewed the proposed language to add criminal record checks to the CSWMFT Laws & Rules Section 4757.16 Application for license or registration. The proposed addition is as follows:

(C) An applicant under this section shall submit a request to the bureau for criminal identification and investigation for a criminal records check of the applicant. The request shall be on the form prescribed pursuant to division (C)(1) of section 109.572 (109.57.2) of the Revised Code, accompanied by a standard impression sheet to obtain fingerprints prescribed pursuant to division (C)(2) of that section, and accompanied by the fee prescribed pursuant to division Code, accompanied by a standard impression sheet to obtain fingerprints prescribed pursuant to division (C)(3) of that section. Upon receipt of the completed form, the completed impression sheet, and the fee, the bureau shall conduct a criminal records check of the applicant. Upon completion of the criminal records check, the bureau shall send the results of the check to the board. An applicant requesting a criminal records check under this division shall ask

the superintendent of the bureau of criminal identification and investigation to also request the federal bureau of investigation to provide the superintendent with any information it has with respect to the applicant.

(1) The results of any criminal records check conducted pursuant to a request made under this section, and any report containing those results are not public records for purposes of section 149.36 of the Revised Code and shall not be made available to any person or for any purpose other than the following:

(a) The results may be made available to any person for use in determining under this section and section 4757.36 of the Revised Code whether the individual who is the subject of the check should be granted a license to practice counseling, social work or marriage and family therapy or whether any temporary permit granted to the individual under this section has terminated automatically.

The SWPSC discussed the pros and cons of requiring applicants for licensure to obtain a criminal check prior to licensure. Mr. Abraham felt that it could be problematic for the applicant because they would have to pay for a criminal check for the board and then possibly pay for another one for their employer. The check would not be a “one-time deal”. Ms. Riesbeck-Lee commented that in her experience as an administrator in the child care field, is that checks are required each time a person starts a new job. Mr. Abraham asked her about the time frame involved for obtaining the results and what was the cost? Ms. Riesbeck-Lee stated some that the agency she has dealt with has their own machine and that the results come back very quickly and that the fee at that time was \$15. Mr. Black stated that Columbus Public Schools has a machine in their administrative office and that it may be worth the expense for the board to invest in a machine or going in with another board that is considering criminal checks. Mr. Abraham said that if this is something that potentially every board is looking at doing then it may make sense putting terminals in at a central location. Ms. Tingle stated that she had to have a check to renew her notary license and that she went to the Sheriffs Department and had it completed for \$25. Dr. Cluse-Tolar stated that whenever she has had a check for a job that the employer has paid for it.

Ms. Michelbrink stated that employers require checks to protect the agency and that perhaps the Board should look at it as protecting the consumers of the state of Ohio by requiring checks as an extra security measure. She further stated that although it would be an additional cost to the applicant, especially to graduating students, then the Board in conjunction with the academic institutions could make students aware that this will be a cost involved with obtained your social work license. Ms. Michelbrink also stated that the responsibility of a check should be on the Board for the protection to the consumer because not all employers require checks. Mr. Abraham stressed that even if the Board did start requiring checks, it is still imperative that we review all applicants with criminal backgrounds on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Black asked Mr. Casey if the Board had statutory authority to require checks. Mr. Casey responded that the Board could argue that they do have the statutory authority because the ultimate goal of Board is to protect the public. Ms. Tingle also responded that this could be tied into the good moral character requirement that the Board has with regard to licensure.

The SWPSC further discussed the level of the check, whether or not it would be a BCI and a FBI check, and at what point would the Board start requiring a check. Ms. Stepp suggested that the board use the check that an applicant may have received previously if the check had been received within the past 60 or 90 days. Dr. Cluse-Tolar wondered however, if the check would be like a transcript, which we require to come directly from the academic institution. Mr. Abraham suggested that perhaps there is an electronic repository which the board would have access to. Mr. Black suggested that we look into what the other regulatory boards are doing, and not “re-invent the wheel”. The SWPSC agreed to empower Mr. Rough to move forward with further investigating the possibility of the Board requiring applicants for licensure to obtain a criminal records check prior to licensure.

3. CEU Discussion

Ms. Franklin is concerned about the number of telephone calls she receives from licensees about whether or not the programs they attend are approved by the board. She stated that she informs licensees that they need to check the approval number before they attend the program to determine if it is approved by the board. She further stated that the typical response she receives is that they do not know what an approval

number is. Ms. Broom also stated that in her position as a receptionist she also receives a large number of phone calls inquiring if a program is approved or not. Ms. Michelbrink commented that before she attends a program she always checks the approval number to see if it is approved. Mr. Abram commented that he understands that it is possible that a person is not aware of what an approved number Ms. Holleman remarked that it is the job of the staff of the board to answer the questions of the licensees regardless of how trivial we may perceive the question to be. Ms. Franklin said that the licensees receive the information about approval numbers when they first receive their license and that they just do not read the information that they receive. Mr. Abraham said that the unfortunate reality is that when a person gets licensed, they may be thinking that two years is a long way off and that their concern may not be with the renewal information that is in the packet they initially receive. He wondered if it may be more appropriate to send them additional information to reiterate the initial information at some point closer to their renewal.

4. Marriage & Family Therapist (MFT) Legislation Issue

Ms. Stepp asked the plans of the board with regard to how the pending legislation of the MFT's will affect social workers in the state of Ohio. Dr. Cluse-Tolar explained to the committee that one piece of the MFT legislation that is being considered has the potential of pulling the scope of practice away from Counselors and Social Workers so that MFT's can take a baby step forward. She further stated that when the Board initially charged Mr. Rough with the task of working with the MFT's and the legislature to allow them to have the ability to diagnose and treat, they did not realize what a damaging impact it could possibly have to the other professions. Dr. Cluse-Tolar stated that the SWPSC needed to come together as a group and make a statement about where the committee stands. It was determined that there are less than 200 licensed MFT's in the state of Ohio. Ms. Franklin and Ms. Tingle stated that they have spoken with several MFT's who are not willing to renew their license because of the restrictions they have with regard to their scope of practice. Dr. Cluse-Tolar stated that there has only been 1 MFT licensed this year and that she is of the opinion that people are questioning why they should obtain a MFT license that they cannot do anything with, so they choose to keep their Counselor or Social Worker license.

Ms. Stepp said that Mr. Rough asked her to attend a meeting with him last week. At this meeting, Clyde Evans and Shawn Webster were on a telephone call and there were approximately 15 other people in attendance including Carolyn Towner who is the lobbyist for the Counselors and Dr. Thorwood, Psychiatrist. Ms. Stepp said that she was asked by Clyde Evans to explain the difference between MFT's and Social Workers. Ms. Stepp replied to him that she has not researched the issue and did not know exactly how to respond.

Ms. Stepp also stated that Dr. Thorwood wants the wording in the scope of practice of MFT's to be changed from diagnosis to assessment. It is her understanding that the ultimate goal is to have psychiatrists sign off on the work that every Counselor, Social Workers and MFT's in the state performs. Supposedly, Shawn Webster is in the process of drafting this change. If that is the case, Ms. Stepp believes that the SWPSC need to come together and act as one for the Social Workers in the state of Ohio and protect their scope of practice. Dr. Cluse-Tolar stated that she was under the impression that this issue had been dropped. Ms. Stepp stated that the people who were in this meeting are not dropping anything and that they it is very assertive from all sides.

Mr. Abraham suggested that this topic be tabled and that the meeting be reconvened in the afternoon.

Meeting adjourned for lunch at 11:56 a.m.

Meeting reconvened at 12:03 p.m.

5. Statutory Changes For Exempt Setting Law

Mr. Hegarty stated that any changes with regard to exempt settings would require a statutory change. He posed the question as to whether or not the SWPSC would make the change or would the professional associations initiate the change. Ms. Riesbeck-Lee asked Mr. Hegarty for the history behind exempt

settings. He explained that in 1984 and 1985 when the law was being created there were a large number of people who were civil servants who would not be eligible for licensure based on having a degree in social work. Mr. Abraham remarked that he is aware that a lot of exempt setting agencies are now requiring licensure as a basis for getting hired or promoted. He brought up what the Board is now doing to work with the Department of Youth Services (DYS) to license the employees who now have the union job title of Social Worker. The SWPSC said that they applaud the efforts of DHS to protect the public through requiring licensure and the provisions they are giving their employees to obtain the license.

Mr. Hegarty stated that according to the opinion of the previous AAG, Julie Barone and her supervisor, if a person is licensed and they violate the code of ethics, or get in any sort of trouble, the Board does not have jurisdiction over that person if they work in an exempt setting. Mr. Abraham commented that this is not what the interpretation used to be and that he is not pleased with it. He asked Mr. Hegarty how that part of the statute could be changed. Mr. Hegarty said that it could be changed and he further explained the lengthy process of changing the statute. He stressed that when you open up the statute you want to make sure that you have a focused list of changes you want to make and that all of the professional organizations are on board with the proposed changes. The risk is that when you open up the statute that other changes can happen that you do not want to happen. If section 4757 of the Ohio Revised Code is opened anyone can make an amendment to the proposed bill.

Dr. Cluse-Tolar made the statement that based on earlier discussions about the MFT issues that the Board may want to hold off on opening the statute until this issue is resolved. Based on this, Dr. Cluse-Tolar suggested that we may want to put the statutory change with regard to exempt settings in the hands of a professional association such as the Ohio National Association of Social Workers (NASW). Ms. Stepp stated that the Ohio NASW has always wanted to make a move against the exempt setting ruling but they do not have the financial means to hire a lobbyist and move forward. Also, in light of what is going on now with the MFT's, they are also hesitant to open up the statute.

Mr. Black and Ms. Stepp discussed the cost of hiring a lobbyist to represent the Ohio NASW. Ms. Stepp emphasized that their membership is such that they cannot afford a lobbyist at this time. She said that Ms. Sarah Hamilton who is the Government Relations Associate for the Ohio NASW and does an extremely good job at monitoring what is going on. Furthermore, they have never had such a major issue that they have wanted to put so much emphasis on lobbying. However, now that the issue of the MFT's has come about, they are extremely worried about the impact it will have on the future scope of practice of social workers and they will have to take drastic measures to not allow this to happen

The census of the SWPSC is that changing the exempt setting statute is something that they are in favor of doing but it would be better coming from the professional associations as opposed as coming directly from the Board.

5. Multiple Lapsed Licenses

Mr. Abraham explained how this issue came about with related degree applicants who become licensed and then do not take the necessary college coursework to renew their license. Their licenses lapse and they gain employment in an exempt setting and wait out the mandatory two year period that they are not licensed. They then take the exam again and re-apply for licensure. He reminded the SWPSC of a recent applicant who did this and is now licensed for the third time with a related degree. He stated that perceivably this person could do this the entire time of her career.

Mr. Hegarty stated that he had discussed this particular issue with Mr. Casey because Mr. Abraham had suggested that the SWPSC deny this person a license. Mr. Casey said that unfortunately this is a loophole that this person has found and that based on the statute we cannot deny her a license. Ms. Holleman stated that this has always been an issue with related degree applicants. Mr. Abraham stated that he can understand this happening with some licensees who stop working in the field and have career changes or relocate to another state, or for those who choose to stay at home for a period of time to raise children. However, in this particular case, there was the appearance of the intent to get out of the college coursework and continuing education on a continual basis. Dr. Cluse-Tolar suggested that a statute change could be made to the effect that if you obtain licensure based on having a related degree and then

you allow your license to lapse, you would have to prove that you had received the required coursework before you could apply for licensure again.

Ms. Holleman said that contrary to popular belief, the number of related degree applicants is not phasing out. Dr. Cluse-Tolar stated that at the University of Toledo, they always thought that the numbers would go down as well. Mr. Hegarty stated that in terms of investigations, related degree licensees tend to be more problematic than licensees who have social work degrees because they lack the basic social work education and field placement. Ms. Michelbrink brought up the fact that the last several SWPSC hearings have been due to denial of related degree applicants because they do not meet the coursework requirement. Mr. Hegarty agreed that these hearing are time consuming and the last few applicants have tended to be very argumentative. Ms. Riesbeck-Lee asked what type of a statute change could be made to resolve this issue. Mr. Hegarty suggested that if the statue is going to be opened, then perhaps it is time to remove the related degree licensure from the statute. He stated that a possible solution would be to make a statutory change that would say as of a certain date (to be determined by the SWPSC), related degree applicants will no longer be accepted. The SWPSC commented that they had not thought of this as a possibility, and decided to further discuss the possibility of no longer licensing related degree applicants.

6. Clinical Scope Of Practice For A Social Worker

Mr. Hegarty said that he had a question to ask the SWPSC. He said that if he was a LPC seeking to become a LPCC, that 50% of his 3,000 hours of supervision had to be direct client contact in diagnosing and treating mental and emotional disorders. For example, for a LSW seeking to become a LISW, this is not the case. A person could obtain the LISW, open their own practice and have no direct client contact in diagnosing and treating mental and emotional disorders. He stated that he is seeing an increasing number of cases in investigations where LISW's are leaving an agency and opening a private practice although they do not have the background, education and experience in clinical practice. He said that he does not understand how we are licensing a group of people to diagnose and treat mental and emotional disorders and they are not verifying that they have the experience to do so.

Mr. Abraham said that this could be problematic for licensees who live in rural areas where the percentage of time that they spend doing clinical work is so small compared to everything else they are doing, that it could take years for them to obtain the 50%. Mr. Hegarty suggested that we could have LISW's with a specialty in clinical social work and require them to have a certain amount of CEU's or coursework that makes them competent to practice clinical social work. Ms. Michelbrink stated that some academic institutions offer either the clinical or the administrative track. Ms. Stepp stated that it usually has to do with the person and the she is confident that the LSW who wants to become a LISW and do clinical work makes sure that they obtain supervision in the clinical field.

Dr. Cluse-Tolar stated that social work is a very broad field and that not every social worker does clinical social work. She believes that it would be problematic to say that a certain percentage of a LSW's supervision would have to be diagnosing and treating mental and emotional disorders if they wanted to obtain the LISW. Ms. Michelbrink suggested that perhaps we could add another level of licensure to what we currently have

The committee spent time reviewing the experience and supervision requirements for other states and discussed them at length. Mr. Hegarty reminded the SWPSC that they are only discussing future goals of the board that will provide the greatest amount of protection to the citizens of the state of Ohio. The committee agreed to further discuss the possibility of adding a clinical social worker designation.

7. Proposed Rule Change From the Ohio National Association of Social Workers

Ms. Stepp said that the Ohio Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers urges a change to 4757-23-01(C)(2) by striking from the rule the provision that does not allow the supervisee to pay a fee or making any other form of remuneration to the supervisor. Mr. Abraham adamantly stated that he has seen such horrible abuse from this practice. Ms. Stepp said that the Counselors allow the supervisee to pay for

supervision and that it is very difficult for LSW's to obtain supervision for free. Mr. Abraham said that he does not believe that the person who is getting paid by the person they are supervising is going to honestly tell us if that person is not any good. Ms. Stepp said that then it would be an ethical issue if the person is going to say yes if they should have said no, and we would hope that an unethical person would not be providing supervision. Also, as it is now, some agencies say that they will provide a LSW with supervision, but they end up deducting it from the salary of the LSW. Ms. Michelbrink asked if would help to persuade more LISW's to provide supervision if they were paid for the service. Mr. Abraham stated that the SWPSC has allowed LSW's to pay for supervision when they have demonstrated the absence of other alternatives. Dr. Cluse-Tolar stated the committee does not receive a lot of requests and that individuals can request an exemption. Furthermore, the rule specifically stated that "Individuals who are unable to secure unpaid supervision may request an exception to this rule from the social work professional standards committee." She urged Ms. Stepp to refer people to Ms. Holleman when she receives calls from LSW's who say that they cannot find unpaid supervision. Based on further discussion of cases of paid supervision that was thought to be unethical, fees for supervision, and numerous other issues, the SWPSC said that they were not willing to change the rule to allow for paid supervision. However, they are very open to reviewing cases for exemptions.

8 Registration Of LISW Supervisors To Provide Supervision To LSW's

Mr. Abraham asked the SWPSC if they wanted to explore the idea of certifying supervisors to provide training supervision to LSW's or requiring a LISW to have additional training to provide training supervision to a LSW. Ms. Holleman discussed what the procedure is for Counselors to obtain the Supervising Counselor Designation status. Mr. Abraham said that he had talked with a lady in Florida who told him about an online exam that social workers can take to obtain the LISW Supervision Designation. Dr. Cluse-Tolar said that she is not aware of any academic institutions that offer supervision courses in the social work programs.

9. Pre-Approval of ASWB Exam

Ms. Michelbrink stated that at the last ASWB meeting she attended, it was stressed that the validity of the exam is jeopardized due to having people that are not social worker candidates taking the exam and memorizing several of the questions. Then people who offer licensure preparation courses have the exact questions that are on the exam to allow actual social worker candidates to study from. Mr. Abraham said that his main concern with pre-approving applicants to take the exam is that it will hold people up from obtaining their licensure. Ms. Michelbrink asked what exactly it would take for an applicant to obtain pre-approval from the Board to take the exam. Mr. Rough said that when a person is in their last quarter of semester, they can get a letter from the academic institution stating that they are in good standing and with that letter we would approve the applicant to take the exam. The Board would issue an approval letter to you allowing you to register to take the exam and would send a letter to the applicant. For those applicants who are not in school, they could send their transcript to the Board with a letter requesting approval to take the exam.

Dr. Cluse-Tolar stated that what she likes about pre-approval to take the exam is that it will eliminate those people who are under the impression that if they pass the exam, then they are able to practice social work. She said that hopefully, this will cut down on the number of people who practice with out a license because it will be explained beforehand that they have to apply for a license after they take the exam. She also feels that another positive by-product of this process is that it allows for the academic institutions to become more involved in the licensing process of the students. Ms. Michelbrink asked if Ohio was the only state that did not require pre-approval to take the exam. Mr. Rough said that Ohio is one of nine entities which include the 50 states, 9 provinces, Washington DC, Guam, Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico that does not require pre-approval of the exam.

Ms. Holleman discussed that this could be problematic with regard to related degree applicants the right to due process. Her question was what would happen if she allowed a related degree applicant to take the exam, and the SWPSC denied the person a license? It was determined that related degree applicants would have to be pre-approved by the SWPSC before they could receive a pre-approval letter to take the exam. Dr. Cluse-Tolar referred that this would no longer become a problem after the Board no longer

accepts related degree applicants. Mr. Black stated that in his opinion, we do not have to re-invent the wheel. If we go to pre-approval, we need to look at what the process is for other jurisdictions that pre-approve to take the exam.

Dr. Cluse-Tolar asked if there had to be a motion to go ahead with pre-approving applicants to take the exam. Mr. Rough said that he would draft the language for the May Board meeting.

Dr. Cluse-Tolar asked if we would also need draft language on the changes the SWPSC discussed with regard to related degree applicants as well. Mr. Rough stated that he would draft that language as well or that if it became a part of a statute change and that the rule could be could adjusted.

Dr. Cluse-Tolar added that the SWPSC had also discussed having a statute change with regard to exempt settings. Mr. Abraham said that they would like to strike certain pieces of the statute as opposed to striking the entire section. Specifically, the SWPSC discussed eliminating 4757.41 (5) with regard to any person employed in the civil service as defined in section 124.01 of the Revised Code while engaging in social work or professional counseling as a civil service employee. Mr. Rough suggested that instead of doing away with this exception would be to stipulate that it would only affect any person applied after a specific date. Mr. Abraham said that 4757.41(7) would need to be changed because we are coming upon the two year period that is referred to and we will no longer need to have it. He also stated that if it was phased in over a period of time then it would allow people to obtain a social work degree so that they could obtain their social worker license.

Dr. Cluse-Tolar said that the committee had also discussed a rule change with regard to requiring LISW's who want to supervise LSW's to have a Supervising Social Work Designation. Mr. Rough will review the language in the statute to see if we have the authority to authorize the rule.

Ms. Rough stated that with regard to the rule 4757-19-07 Endorsement of a social work license, he believes that it is very straight forward and relatively simple for someone coming in from another state and that he does not feel that there is a need to change it. The SWPSC agreed with this and also felt that no changes were necessary.

Mr. Abraham adjourned the meeting at 5:04 p.m.

Social Worker Professional Standards Committee (SWPSC) Mohican Retreat Minutes

Friday, April 21, 2006

Members Present: Mr. Glenn Abraham
Mr. Rocky Black
Dr. Theresa Cluse-Tolar
Ms. Molly Michelbrink
Ms. Jennifer Riesbeck-Lee.

Staff Present: Ms. Paula Broome
Ms. Rhonda Franklin
Mr. Bill Hegarty
Ms. Marcia Holleman
Mr. Jim Rough
Ms. Tammy Tingle

Guest Present: Mr. P.R. Casey, Assistant Attorney General,

The SWPSC meeting was called to order by Ms. Michelbrink at 9:11 a.m. due to the absence of Mr. Abraham and Dr. Cluse-Tolar being in and Executive Session meeting with the MFT's.

1. Student Interns

Ms. Holleman stated that Dr. Cluse-Tolar had recently contacted Mr. Rough with the issue of the inability to find internship opportunities for students. Mr. Rough had advised her that one suggestion would be to create a Social Work Trainee status to allow students to be registered and recognized by the board which could be verified via CAVU online. This designation would allow them to work in agencies and bill for their services. Dr. Cluse-Tolar believes that this would allow for an increase in better opportunities for field placement for students. Ms. Michelbrink stated that she did not think that there was enough of a need for students to bill for services. Mr. Black stated that he did not understand how a student could bill for services if the purpose of the internship was a learning opportunity. Ms. Tingle stated that a Social Worker Trainee would have to be put on the ODADAS matrix to be able to bill for their services. Someone would have to check into how this could be facilitated. The consensus of the committee members was that a Social Worker Trainee status should not be developed.

2. Renewal of Dual Licensees

Ms. Franklin explained that there have been numerous requests and discussion regarding allowing a licensee who holds more than one license to only obtain 30 CEU's to renew both licenses. She stated that the Counselor Professional Standards Committee had agreed that this would be okay if the CEU's were germane to that discipline. Ms. Michelbrink stated that she understood the hardship of obtaining 30 CEU's for each license. Mr. Abraham adamantly stated that if you have both licenses then a licensee has the responsibility to obtain 30 CEU's for each license they hold.

Dr. Cluse-Tolar made the motion to allow for a licensee holding more than one license to obtain only 30 CEU's to renew the licenses if the CEU is approved for both licenses. Ms. Michelbrink seconded the motion. Mr. Black, Dr. Cluse-Tolar, Ms. Michelbrink and Ms. Riesbeck-Lee approved the motion. Mr. Abraham opposed the motion. Motion carried.

3. Discussion Regarding Previous Meeting With MFT's

Dr. Cluse-Tolar reported that the chairs of the professional standards committees, the Chair of the Board, Mr. Rough and Mr. Casey had met with the MFT's at the request of Kenneth Trivison. The MFT's had requested that the committees not put any motion on the floor that would negatively impact the efforts of the MFT's to move forward with opposing the current proposed legislation. Mr. Casey had suggested at this meeting that the full Board would go into executive session to further discuss the role of the Executive Director and the board's direction to him in legislative matters.

Mr. Abraham adjourned the meeting at 12:40p.m.

Glenn Abraham, LISW
Chairperson of the Social Worker Professional Standards Committee (SWPSC)