



## *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](http://www.cswmft.ohio.gov)

### **Social Worker Professional Standards Committee (SWPSC) Minutes** **Thursday, November 15, 2012**

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

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

#### **1) Meeting Called to Order**

Mr. Polovick called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

#### **2) Discussion/Approval of the November 15 & 16 Agenda**

Mr. Polovick asked if any changes or discussion were needed for the November 15 & 16 Agenda. Mr. Warne asked to add an item to old business, a rule change review for 4757-9-5. Mr. Brady motioned to approve the agenda. Ms. Hadden seconded the motion. Motion carried.

#### **3) Approval of the September 20 & 21 Minutes**

Mr. Polovick asked if any changes or discussion were needed for the September 20 & 21 minutes. Ms. Hadden requested a change to page 2 of the minutes: changing the sentence "...while the disciplinary action should be displayed, it should also be clear that it has been completed" to "...while the disciplinary action should be displayed, it should also be clear that the requirements of the consent agreement have been completed." Mr. Miller noted the change. Mr. Brady made a motion to approve the revised minutes. Ms. Hadden seconded the motion. Motion carried.

#### **4) Approval of Applications for Licensure**

A motion was made by Mr. Brady to approve the 253 LSW applicants and 99 LISW applicants approved by the staff, and the 8 SWA applicants registered by the staff, from September 19, 2012 through November 15, 2012. Seconded by Ms. Hadden. Motion carried.

## 5) Investigations

Mr. Hegarty discussed the investigations process for the benefit of the SWPSC's new member, Ms. Brunner. He explained that his department would be reviewing all consent agreements posted on the Board's website, and making a notation on the records of those licensees who had met all requirements and completed their consent agreements; this will also be standard practice from this point forward.

### a) Closed Cases

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

2012-161	Confidentiality. Close with no violation.
2012-162	Improper billing. Close with caution.
2012-168	Non-sexual boundaries. No violation found.
2012-179	Non-sexual boundaries. Cannot substantiate allegation.
2012-181	Record keeping. Close with caution.
2012-182	Confidentiality. Close with caution.
2012-195	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. Ms. Hadden seconded the motion. Motion carried.

2012-160	Billing issues. Close with caution.
2012-163	Competency. Close with no violation.
2012-166	Competency. Close with no violation.
2012-175	Confidentiality. Close with no violation.
2012-183	Improper termination. Close with caution.

### b) Consent Agreements

**1) Mr. Eddie D. Brundidge:** Mr. Brundidge renewed his social work license through June 10, 2012. In May 2012, he was audited for compliance with continuing education requirements. Mr. Brundidge was not able to provide proof of the 30 hours needed to have renewed his license, a violation of Ohio Revised Code 4757.36(C)(1) and Ohio Administrative Code 4757-11-01(C)(20)(b). Mr. Brundidge admits to these allegations. In a letter dated July 8, 2012, he offered to surrender his license rather than complete the audit. The Board is allowing Mr. Brundidge to surrender his social work license in lieu of potential disciplinary action. This surrender is permanent and precludes Mr. Brundidge from applying for any license through the CSWMFT Board in the future.

Ms. Hadden made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Mr. Brundidge based on the evidence in the document. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.

**2) Mr. Adam J. Ratliff:** On August 8, 2012, Mr. Ratliff was convicted on two counts of voyeurism, a third degree misdemeanor, in the Hamilton County Clerk of Courts. This action constitutes a violation of Ohio Revised Code 4757.36(C)(7). Mr. Ratliff admits to these allegations. The Board is allowing Mr. Ratliff to surrender his social work license in lieu of potential disciplinary action. This surrender is permanent and precludes Mr. Ratliff from applying for any license through the CSWMFT Board in the future.

Ms. Hadden made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Mr. Ratliff based on the evidence in the document. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.

## **6) Correspondence**

- a) The Board received an e-mail from a licensee inquiring whether a social worker is allowed to sign a “pink slip,” which is an informal term for the legal document used for the involuntary hospitalization of a patient for 72 hours in cases of psychiatric emergencies under ORC 5122. Mr. Warne had contacted a colleague, Dave Wilhelm, who verified that health officers who are approved by an ADAMHS Board have the authority to sign this document, and that social workers can be appointed as health officers in this capacity. Social workers who have not been appointed as a health officer by an ADAMHS Board, however, cannot sign a “pink slip.”

Mr. Brady inquired whether the actions of a social worker acting as a health officer fell under the jurisdiction of the CSWMFT Board or the ADAMH Board. The other members of the SWPSC were uncertain. Ms. Brunner asked if social work licensure and training was a requirement for the health officer status. Mr. Warne responded that, according to the e-mail from Dave Wilhelm, a psychiatrist, a licensed clinical psychologist, a licensed physician, health officer, police officer, sheriff or sheriff’s deputies can legally sign the pink slip, but the policy of the state hospitals is to only accept a pink slip from an individual, or agency, who has been designated by the ADAMHS Board to be a health officer. The reason for this is connected with state funding mechanisms.

## **7) Old Business**

The Board received an e-mail from a licensee inquiring whether a social worker could take a verbal order from a physician, and then relay that order to another member of the medical staff. Mr. Warne asked to clarify the Board’s position on this issue. In their September meeting the SWPSC had determined that a social worker can document communication with a doctor in the patient medical record and relay communications from the physician to other medical staff, but that the social worker cannot practice medicine and should not write orders on a medical order sheet. The SWPSC agreed that this was correct.

## 8) Working Meeting

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, until Mr. Nelson could arrive.

Mr. Nelson arrived, and asked to add a new item to the agenda. In November 2011, Dwight Hymans visited the SWPSC to discuss ASWB exams offered in Ohio. It was the ASWB's concern that an applicant could complete an MSW education in macro-level social work, take the Advanced Generalist Exam, and eventually become an LISW in Ohio, an LISW being able to practice clinical social work in Ohio without supervision; a person with no clinical education or background could then conceivably be licensed to practice clinical work without impediment. At the time, the Board's position was that laws requiring social workers to practice within their competencies would prevent this situation and legally protect the Board. However, it was Mr. Nelson's opinion that it would be better to completely follow through on the ASWB's recommendation, and to have an LCSW license specifically for clinical social workers in addition to an LISW for non-clinical social workers.

The SWPSC briefly discussed this issue. Mr. Hegarty stated that a change of this magnitude would require a statute change, which would require a law to be passed. To demonstrate the need for the law, the SWPSC would be best served to produce data showing definite harm to clients if the current licensure model is allowed to continue, and that data does not exist. Mr. Nelson stated that his goal was to be proactive and to prevent any such problems from happening at all. Mr. Warne stated that there are fifteen of fifty-one licensing jurisdictions in the U.S. that have both macro and micro level licenses and this thinking is in line with the current trend. Mr. Nelson asked to add this issue to the agenda and discuss it in full later. The Committee agreed, and adjourned for lunch at 11:50 a.m.

The SWPSC re-convened at 12:45 p.m.

## 9) Investigations – continued from Item 5) b)

Mr. Hegarty returned with an additional consent agreement for the SWPSC's consideration.

**3) Lauri C. Pierce:** Ms. Pierce was employed with Family Price of Northeast Ohio from approximately September 2004 to June 18, 2012. While employed there, Ms. Pierce failed to maintain appropriate boundaries by entering into a sexual relationship with an ex-client within five years after terminating the therapeutic relationship, a violation of Ohio Revised Code 4757.36(C)(1) and Ohio Administrative Code 4757-5-04(C). She was then terminated from her position at Family Price of Northeast Ohio. Ms. Pierce admits to the above allegation. Her license to practice social work is suspended for three years, effective November 16, 2012, and she will be responsible for renewing it when appropriate if she intends to return to practice. After the mandated suspension and upon employment, Ms. Pierce must be monitored in all aspects of her social work practice and receive face-to-face monitoring (one hour per every two weeks) for two years.

Mr. Brady made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Ms. Pierce based on the evidence in the document. Ms. Hadden seconded the motion. Motion carried.

#### **10) Discussion of LCSW licensure**

Mr. Nelson re-stated his concerns: there are students who complete a clinical MSW program, there are students who complete a macro/administrative program, and there are students who complete an advanced generalist program. The issue is that regardless of which track the student follows, they can eventually become an LISW able to practice clinical social work independently. The ASWB had warned in November that if Ohio became involved in a legal issue because an LISW not trained in clinical work was practicing those modalities and got in trouble through lack of competency, the ASWB would not be able to assist the state of Ohio with legal defense. Mr. Nelson's proposal is to create an LCSW license specifically for clinical independent social workers.

The Committee discussed the issues that could be involved in implementing this policy. Mr. Nelson stated that obviously a number of LISWs would need to be converted to LCSWs, probably through demonstrating a certain amount of clinical experience. Ms. Hosom asked if LCSWs would be able to do macro social work, and if not then the Board would need to write clear definitions of both kinds of social work. Mr. Polovick pointed out that some jobs, like clinical directors, do have the characteristics and skills of both. It was asked whether all grandfathered LCSWs would be required to have passed the Clinical exam, but Mr. Miller pointed out that the Advanced Generalist Exam used to contain some clinical content, and it was only this year that the exams were completely separated in terms of content, so the exam policy should not be retroactive. Mr. Rough stated that Florida would be a good model to review, as they only license clinical social workers and require specific clinical content above and beyond an MSW.

Ms. Brunner suggested holding discussions with schools and other stakeholders, provide them with some models of licensure and get their input before any firm decisions are made, allowing them to become part of the process. Mr. Nelson suggested insurance panels be part of this process as well. Mr. Miller suggested the regional MSW/MSSA programs be contacted to see how they define clinical vs. macro work, and what they consider when developing their educational programs. Mr. Polovick suggested the SWPSC form an ad-hoc committee to work with Mr. Warne in developing the suggested licensure models, since the full SWPSC does not frequently meet. Mr. Nelson and Ms. Brunner volunteered for this ad hoc committee, and Mr. Nelson thanked the Committee for their time and for being so open to new ideas.

#### **11) Meeting Adjourned**

Mr. Polovick adjourned the meeting at 2:45 p.m.

**Social Worker Professional Standards Committee (SWPSC) Minutes**  
**Friday, November 16, 2012**

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

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

**Guests Present:** Ms. Amanda Borders, NASW-OH intern; Ms. Adrienne Gavula, NASW-OH Relationship Manager; Mr. Glenn Karr, LLC; Ms. Danielle Schmersal, NASW-OH intern

**1) Meeting Called to Order**

Mr. Polovick called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

**2) Old Business**

**a) Draft change review of 4757-19-04:** This rule change would add the following language to 4757-19-04, the social work examination policy:

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 presented several options to the SWPSC: to approve the rule change as written, to require only 18 completed months of supervision prior to taking the exam instead of the full 24, or to allow licensees to complete a brief 6-month extension of their LSW licenses prior to registering for the exam. He also questioned whether Ohio should begin offering the Master's Exam.

Mr. Nelson stated that there is no need for the Master's exam since there is only the LSW license in Ohio and not a separate LMSW and LBSW; all LSW applicants should take the Bachelor Exam. He also clarified that he still supports the full 24 months of supervision being completed. Ms. Hadden disagreed, and supported an early 3-month window. Mr. Rough pointed out that it would be illegal to write into the rule a temporary extension of 6 months for the LSW, since this would contradict the Board's statutes. Similarly, LSW renewal cannot simply be waived for a temporary period pending completion of supervision and the exam. He stated the next step would be to send out a proposed rule change to licensees for input.

After more input, Mr. Polovick stated that the general consensus seemed to be to support the rule as written, but that the Board could create one or two alternative models allowing licensees to take the exam 18 or 21 months into their supervision, and send all options out to licensees for their input. Ms. Gavula pointed out that while these actions would improve

pass rates and the quality of supervision, the SWPSC needs to be aware that students are not going to respond well to the added cost of having to take two exams.

b) Mr. Warne received an email from an LSW who had been looking for supervision. The LSW contacted an LISW-S who felt that her job duties would not qualify her for the supervision needed to get the LISW since those job duties lacked clinical content. Mr. Warne clarified with the LSW that the work does not need to be clinical, but that it does need to be MSW-level work. This raised the question of how the Board perceives MSW-level work: does the job description itself need to say that the job requires an MSW? Can it be a Bachelor-level job, but the LSW is functioning and working at a considerably higher level than her Bachelor's-level cohorts? Or is it up to the supervisor's judgment?

Mr. Nelson stated his opinion that the rules needed to be as objective as possible, and to that effect the job should require an MSW. Ms. Gavula pointed out that most social work job descriptions say they require a Bachelor's *or* Master's degree since Ohio licensing doesn't differentiate between them at the LSW level; most jobs that require an MSW also require an LISW. Mr. Polovick questioned whether there should be a rule on this, since it's the job of a supervisor to enhance the work being done and help make it MSW-level. Ms. Gavula agreed, and stated that social workers generally have to take any job they can find, and it's not always what they want or need. Mr. Nelson responded that this was understandable, but while NASW's perspective is to help its members, the Board's perspective always needs to be focused on protecting the public and improving the quality of the profession. Mr. Warne suggested the Committee examine the rest of the supervision issues scheduled for this meeting before coming to a decision.

### 3) New Business

a) Mr. Rough and Mr. Warne recently updated the Board's Professional Employment Reference form. The supervisor is now required to attest that the supervisee was involved in masters level social work intervention for the two years/3,000 hrs of supervised experience required to upgrade to an LISW. Also added is a way the supervisor could state that they recommended the applicant for independent social work licensure "with reservations." The SWPSC agreed this form was an improvement. Ms. Hadden stated that due to these changes, the Board needs to ensure that LSWs are aware of what's on the form from the first day they begin their supervision, preferably as soon as they leave school, in order to ensure that their work is at the appropriate level. Mr. Warne stated that one of his goals is to create a web-based interactional supervision course for CEUs on the Boards web site. This course would explain the supervision requirements in detail and provide needed information for this and other issues.

b) Mr. Warne presented a PowerPoint presentation he had created for the upcoming NASW Ohio Chapter Annual conference on the topic of supervision. The presentation detailed how in 1986 the rules differentiated between "work supervision" and "training supervision." In 1997, the social work scope of practice was expanded to include social psychotherapy, and "work supervision" was changed to "clinical supervision" to reflect what the Board saw as an increasing focus on clinical work in the field. The presentation then covered the current

definitions of clinical and training supervision, the PER form, the role and licensure requirements of the LISW-S, and how many social workers it takes to change a light bulb. The SWPSC approved Mr. Warne's presentation for use at the conference. Mr. Warne also stated his intention to use this presentation as a template for his proposed CEU course.

c) Mr. Warne recently audited an LISW applicant whose supervisor had signed off on her PER form, but she was unable to provide her supervision logs upon request, as required by OAC 4757-23-01(D)(3). The applicant stated in a letter that her agency's standard practice is to complete and review all documentation electronically, and that the information is maintained within the context of the electronically stored case notes. She discussed her proximity to her supervisor at the agency, and they discussed issues "face-to-face several times daily" and that she was "very confident" she had completed all 150 required hours. She further stated that she had read the supervision law, and misunderstood how documentation should be kept. Mr. Warne suggested two options for the SWPSC to consider 1) to have the applicant complete all two years of supervision again, or 2) to have her complete another 60 days, and keep a detailed log so she would at least have something to show.

Mr. Polovick commented that neither of these solutions seemed to address the possibility that the applicant had simply lied about completing her supervision. Ms. Brunner questioned the inaccessibility of the agency's electronic records, and whether the applicant couldn't provide case notes (with client information redacted) co-signed by her supervisor to prove work was completed. Mr. Nelson questioned how structured the supervision really was, and, from the applicant's comments, whether she even tracked her hours. Ms. Brunner also stated that according to case law, whether the applicant understood her obligation to keep logs is irrelevant; when you are required to follow a law, you are legally presumed to know what that law is. Mr. Polovick stated that the option of having the applicant send her case notes was not acceptable to him, as he did not want client records to be treated as being interchangeable with supervision logs. He suggested that the Board's Investigation unit be asked to help in determining if supervision was really completed. Mr. Brady dissented; he questioned what Investigations could discover that would have a bearing on the issue. In his opinion, if she violated a rule needed to get her LISW, she should not be granted an LISW until she's completed the requirements.

Ms. Brunner proposed a compromise to accommodate as many of their concerns as possible, suggesting that if the applicant did complete a short additional amount of supervised work experience, she could be asked to sign an affidavit legally swearing that all of her previous supervision was completed in a similar fashion. Ms. Brunner made a motion to request that the applicant complete an additional 90 days of supervised work experience, keeping a strict log of those 90 days as required by OAC 4757-23-01(D)(3), that she and her supervisor also be interviewed by Investigations in the meantime, and that Investigations will then report back to the SWPSC so that upon completion of the 90 days the Committee can refer to the applicant's documentation and the Investigations report and determine if additional information or action is needed. Ms. Hadden seconded the motion. Motion carried. Mr. Brady voted in favor of the motion, but made clear that it was only for this one instance, and that he had concerns about the precedent. Mr. Nelson stated that he understood the concerns,

but that this was also a transition period in the revision of the supervision process, and that hopefully this should be a temporary issue. Ms. Hadden requested that a reminder of the supervision process be sent to licensees via the Board's Listserv.

#### 4) **Executive Director's Report**

Mr. Rough reported on Board appointments and the status of the Board's House Bill 567, which at the time was not expected to be passed in this Legislative session. Senate Bill 205 (the Art Therapy bill) was re-drafted and would be presented at the full Board meeting later that day, where the other professional standards committees were expected to vote against the Board supporting it. The ASWB spring education training will be coming in a few months, and Mr. Rough asked the SWPSC to decide who they wanted to send to it.

The five-year rule review has been completed with the Common Sense Initiative, and rules have been filed with the Legislative Service Commission. Mr. Rough did receive one objection to proposed changes to 4757-5-02, allowing social workers to complete 3 CEUs in either ethics *or* diversity, and responded back with an explanation that CEUs are part of the life-long learning process for licensees, and issues of dealing with diversity in practice are an important part of that learning process. The Board has also received opposition to changes to 4757-9-04, requiring 10,000 words per hour for all test-based CEUs, most notably from a CEU provider who came to the CEU Committee meeting on November 15. Ms. Hadden stated that she herself was growing uncomfortable with the requirement; she questioned whether the amount of content that would need to be added to existing CEUs would be quality content, or "filler" placed in just to meet the rule requirement. Mr. Rough described the organizations he'd contacted and the reading studies he'd reviewed to arrive at the 10,000-word standard. The SWPSC then reviewed a proposed Board policy change to Information Technology standards, and the addition of a new policy outlining customer service standards. Both policies were approved.

#### 5) **New Business**

a) The SWPSC reviewed a proposed change to rule 4757-19-02. Change to the rule is underlined below:

"Two years employment experience" means at least two complete years supervised experience with includes three thousand hours of work for a fee, salary, or other consideration, during which time the applicant was engaged in the practice of master's level social work and held licensure as a social worker.

The SWPSC approved this rule change.

#### 6) **Old Business**

a) The SWPSC reviewed a proposed rule change to rule 4757-9-05. The proposed rule would add the following language:

vi. Social worker supervision continuing education courses need to focus on training supervision as defined in rule 4757-23-01 of the Administrative Code, which is the sole reason for the independent social worker supervision designation. Ultimately, training supervision is focused on developing social worker trainees and the master's holding social workers into ethical and competent social worker and independent social workers respectively. Supervision trainings which have a strong component about the supervisee-client relationship or the clinical supervisor-supervisee relationship apply. Courses on work place supervision or employer-employee relationships do not apply.

Ms. Hadden suggested changes to the final two sentences, to read as follows:

Supervision trainings with ~~which have~~ a strong component regarding ~~about~~ the supervisee-client relationship or the clinical supervisor-supervisee relationship apply. Courses on workplace ~~work place~~ supervision or management ~~employer-employee relationships~~ do not apply.

The SWPSC approved of Ms. Hadden's changes, and requested a re-drafting of the rule change for their full review and approval.

7) **New Business**

The SWPSC reviewed revisions made to the Board's Consumer Brochure. Changes had been suggested and drafted by the NASW-OH, and they were thanked for their wonderful input. The SWPSC approved the new brochure.

8) **Old Business**

As the Board recently approved so much new language regarding "master's level" social work, a definition of master's-level work is needed in the rules. Mr. Warne presented a list of foundation competencies compiled by the University of Toledo for the BSW and MSW programs. Mr. Nelson requested that Mr. Warne contact the CSWE for their accreditation standards in what differentiates a bachelor's-level practicum from a master's-level practicum, and what specifically MSWs are learning that BSWs are not.

9) **New Business**

a) Mr. Brady discussed two concerns he recently discovered that he would like to be discussed at the next SWPSC meeting: 1) Due to at-will employment, when employers have disputes with their employees, the Board's rules tend to favor the employers. The Committee needs to review some of these rules and see if they can be improved. 2) Confidentiality rules with regard to reporting medical information have recently been changed in Ohio, and the Committee needs to review these rules to see if the Board's licensees are affected.

b) Mr. Miller raised an issue regarding criminal record review: when an applicant completes their SWT or SWA application, and their criminal record is reviewed and approved by the Board, does that same criminal record need to be reviewed again for their LSW and LISW if

there are no new offenses? The SWPSC agreed that if no new offenses have been committed, the criminal history does not need to be reviewed by a board member again, and the applicant can be approved by staff, unless the staff has reservations about issuing the license and would like the committee to review the applicant's history.

#### **10) CEU Committee Report**

Ms. Hadden reported that the CEU committee had discussed issues related to supervision training, and the problem of expired CEU providers still using the CEU approval numbers given to them by the Board. She then brought up the question of whether the SWPSC still wished to support the 10,000 word-per-hour requirement for text-based CEUs. Mr. Nelson questioned whether the rule was necessary for the Board's main mission of protecting the public. Mr. Polovick pointed out that if the Board believes CEUs are needed for professional growth and development, then standards for those CEUs must exist, but Ms. Hadden questioned whether requiring more words would really improve the quality of the CEUs. Mr. Nelson stated that to him, the issue did not seem to be about quality, but about making text-based CEUs more equivalent to live CEUs in terms of time spent; if fairness and uniformity are the main issue, then the rule works. Mr. Polovick questioned whether making rules on CEU content was even possible, and it may only be possible to affect an issue like word count. Ms. Brunner raised a concern that if word counts are increased, then publishing and printing costs will increase for the CEU providers, and they will pass those increases on to the consumer.

Ms. Hadden made a motion to accept the 10,000 word-per-hour requirement for text-based CEUs, with the understanding that this will not absolutely solve the issue of quality, and the Board still needs to look at substantive issues to make sure CEUs continue to improve. Mr. Nelson seconded the motion. The Committee voted on the motion: Mr. Brady—no; Ms. Brunner—no; Ms. Hadden—yes; Mr. Nelson—yes; Mr. Polovick—yes. Motion carried. Ms. Brunner stated that the Board should definitely seek to establish baselines of quality and content for CEUs in the future.

#### **11) 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.

#### **12) NASW Report**

Ms. Gavula reported on members' continued transition of liability insurance providers, and reminded the SWPSC that NASW-OH's Annual Conference is November 29 & 30. Mr. Brady asked whether NASW-OH offered any text-based CEUs, Ms. Gavula replied that they do not currently offer any.

**13) Meeting Adjourned**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

---

Mr. Steve Polovick, Chairperson