



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, November 21, 2013**

Members Present: Mr. Tim Brady, Ms. Jennifer Brunner, Ms. Erin Michel, Mr. Steve Polovick

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

1) Meeting Called to Order

The SWPSC began the day by attending the keynote presentation at the NASW-Ohio Chapter Annual Conference. They returned, and Mr. Polovick called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

2) Working Meeting

While Mr. Brady attended an Investigative Liaison meeting, and Ms. Michel attended the CEU Committee 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.

3) Discussion/Approval of the November 21 & 22 Agenda

Mr. Polovick asked if any changes or discussion were needed to the November 21 & 22 Agenda. Mr. Brady motioned to approve the agenda. Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.

4) Approval of the September 19 & 20 Minutes

Mr. Polovick asked if any changes or discussion were needed for the September 19 & 20 minutes. Mr. Brady made a motion to approve the minutes as written. Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.

5) Approval of Applications for Licensure

The SWPSC reviewed the 264 LSW applicants and 113 LISW applicants approved by the

staff, and the 9 SWA applicants registered by the staff, from September 19, 2013 through November 20, 2013. Ms. Brunner made a motion to approve the applicants. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.

6) **Executive Committee report**

Mr. Polovick provided details of the Executive Committee's meeting. Five-year rule reviews are coming up and will need to be looked over by March. Ms. Michel was encouraged to attend the ASWB's spring education training for new Board members, and Mr. Polovick discussed the usefulness of written reports being submitted by Board members who attend conferences; the reports are helpful to other Board members, and the practice should be encouraged. The CPSC is considering making rules regarding relationships between supervisors and supervisees, in order to avoid conflicts of interest with regard to billing. The Board will be asked to consider crafting a system to encourage peer consultation, either requiring it or awarding CEUs to licensees who practice it. Mr. Brady asked Ms. Brunner if attorneys are encouraged to engage in consultation. Ms. Brunner replied that there are mentoring programs available, but they are not required. She suggested offering credit to both those who seek consultation and to those who provide it. Mr. Warne stated that he personally uses LinkedIn as a source of consultation. Mr. Polovick suggested that for now, a piece on consultation could be run in the newsletter. He then provided copies of a new Board member training prepared by Margaret-Ann Adorjan, and asked the committee members to look it over.

7) **Investigations**

a) **Closed cases**

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

2013-78	Competency. Close with caution.
2013-161	Custody issues. Close with no violation.
2013-166	Competency. Close with no violation.
2013-188	Custody issues. Close with strong caution.
2013-199	Confidentiality. Close with no violation.

b) **Consent Agreements**

- a) **Ms. Andrea F. Stuck:** Ms. Stuck is a licensed independent social worker. In 2012, Ms. Stuck blurred boundaries with a client by engaging in a financial transaction with him. This action constitutes a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1) and OAC 4757-5-03(A)(4)(d). Ms. Stuck admits to these statements. Ms. Stuck's LISW license is hereby reprimanded. Mr. Polovick made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Ms. Stuck based on the evidence in the document. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.

- b) **Ms. Alice E. Dawson:** Ms. Dawson is a licensed independent social worker. From about May 20, 2009, through about March 28, 2013, Ms. Dawson treated a client, from whom the Board later received a complaint. The Board obtained a copy of the client file. The notes maintained in the file were illegible, and could compromise the continuity of services provided to the client in the future. The client file also did not contain the required individual service plan, nor did it contain the required release document from the client required to allow the client's husband to participate in her sessions, and the case notes did not reflect that Ms. Dawson informed the husband of his role in the therapy. Ms. Dawson's actions constitute a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1), OAC 4757-5-02(B)(7), and OAC 4757-5-09(B) and (C). Ms. Dawson admits these allegations. The Board will allow Ms. Dawson to retire from the profession and mark her license as Expired in lieu of discipline. This is an amendment to the consent agreement approved on September 19. Mr. Brady made a motion to accept the amended consent agreement between the Board and Ms. Dawson based on the evidence in the document. Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.
- c) **Ms. Kaitlyn Pecherkiewicz:** Pecherkiewicz is a licensed social worker. In April 2013, Ms. Pecherkiewicz inaccurately documented client records. This constitutes a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1) and OAC 4757-5-01(I)(1). Ms. Pecherkiewicz admits these allegations. Her license is hereby reprimanded, and she will be required to take six CEUs in ethics and proper documentation. Ms. Brunner made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Ms. Pecherkiewicz based on the evidence in the document. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.
- d) **Ms. Jill M. McClellan:** Ms. McClellan is a licensed social worker. In June 2013, she was audited for compliance with continuing education requirements. Ms. McClellan was unable to provide proof of the 30 hours needed to have renewed her license. Failure to comply with an audit constitutes a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1) and OAC 4757-11-01(C)(20)(b). Ms. McClellan admits these allegations. The Board will allow her to surrender her social work license in lieu of other potential discipline. Mr. Brady made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Ms. McClellan based on the evidence in the document. Mr. Polovick seconded the motion. Motion carried.

c) **Goldman Reviews**

- a) **Mr. William McKenzie:** Ms. Brunner moved to revoke Mr. McKenzie's social work license because Ms. McKenzie did not comply with a Board audit for continuing education as required by Ohio Revised Code 4757.36(C)(1) and Ohio Administrative Code 4757-11-01(C)(20)(b). Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.
- b) **Ms. Amy S. Cowgill:** Ms. Michel moved to revoke Ms. Cowgill's social work license because Ms. Cowgill did not comply with a Board audit for continuing education as required by Ohio Revised Code 4757.36(C)(1) and Ohio Administrative

Code 4757-11-01(C)(20)(b). Mr. Polovick seconded the motion. Motion carried.

- c) **Ms. Gail A. Bell:** Ms. Brunner moved to indefinitely suspend Ms. Bell's social work license because Ms. Bell did not fully comply with a Board audit for continuing education as required by Ohio Revised Code 4757.36(C)(1) and Ohio Administrative Code 4757-11-01(C)(20)(b). Ms. Bell had initially submitted her audit material, but was found to have completed 22 unapproved hours. Ms. Paula Broome had notified Ms. Bell of the deficiency on July 12, 2013. She was given an extension until August 1. On August 8, another request for compliance was sent, but there has been no communication since then. Mr. Hegarty stated that under a suspension, Ms. Bell's license will lapse in two years if she does nothing, but this does give her the opportunity to resume communication. Mr. Polovick moved to revoke the license. Mr. Brady seconded the motion to suspend. The SWPSC voted on whether to indefinitely suspend Ms. Bell's license: Ms. Michel—aye; Mr. Brady—aye; Ms. Brunner—aye; Mr. Polovick—nay. Motion carried.
- d) **Ms. Gale Kistemaker:** Mr. Brady moved to revoke Ms. Kistemakers's social work license because Ms. Kistemaker did not comply with a Board audit for continuing education as required by Ohio Revised Code 4757.36(C)(1) and Ohio Administrative Code 4757-11-01(C)(20)(b). Mr. Polovick seconded the motion. Motion carried.
- e) **Mr. Timothy A. Dycus:** Ms. Brunner moved to revoke Mr. Dycus' social work license because Mr. Dycus was convicted of two felony counts of Attempt to Commit Aggravated Arson in Lucas County, a violation of ORC 2923.02, 2909.02(A)(1), and 4757.36(C)(5). Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.

d) Impairment order

- a) **Case 2013-167:** The LISW involved in this case is suspected of impairment due to substance abuse and/or mental health issues. Mr. Hegarty requested that the SWPSC order him into an impairment evaluation. Ms. Brunner moved to order the evaluation. Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried, with Mr. Brady abstaining due to his prior knowledge of the case.
- b) On a related topic, Ms. Hosom wished to present a new disciplinary process. Lately, the Board has seen a rise in impaired practitioners. There have been a couple of recent cases where the licensee was impaired, but had not violated any of the Board's ethical laws. Under the Board's rules, it was found that licensees could be ordered into a diversion program in lieu of other discipline. Their licenses can be set on inactive status while they complete the program, and upon completion the diversion would not show on the licensee's record as discipline, since no clients were harmed. The result should be that licensees are more willing to report impaired coworkers, or seek treatment themselves, if they know their licenses are safe. Mr. Polovick asked if this could also be used for licensees with dementia or Alzheimer's. Mr. Hegarty stated that the Board could ask a physician to determine whether the licensee would be likely to ever improve; in cases where the impairment will never likely end, it may

be necessary to revoke the license. The rules can be amended to provide specific guidance for these cases. Mr. Polovick asked if the diversion would require a consent agreement. Ms. Hosom responded that the diversion would not be public record, so long as it was successfully completed. Another advantage of these programs is that they are accessible to low-income individuals. Mr. Polovick asked whether diseases (cancer treatment, recovery from surgery, etc.) could also be covered. Mr. Hegarty stated that diseases are not covered in the statute, only mental health issues.

8) New Business

- a) Following up on the Executive Committee report, Mr. Rough informed the SWPSC that the CPSC was leaning toward the idea of awarding three CEUs for licensees who engage in peer consultation. The Board could also insert an item into the newsletter acknowledging these licensees for superior practice. This process would only apply to independent practitioners who are no longer under supervision. The committee liked the idea, but Mr. Polovick also pointed out that one major source of peer consultation are professional organizations; it may be enough to award CEUs to licensees who are members of these groups. Mr. Rough agreed that this may be a workable idea. As a suggestion, he also pointed out that in Saskatchewan, licensees are able to complete peer consultation or supervision to meet their ethics CEU requirement.

9) Correspondence

- a) Mr. Warne received an email from a licensee who was licensed as an LISW from 1986 to 1988. She now wishes to re-apply for licensure. Her supervision is now around 30 years old, and although nothing in the Board's rules states that experience needs to have been completed within a certain timeframe, Mr. Warne inquired whether the Board wanted former licensees to be able to resume independent licensure so many years after letting it expire without completing more supervision. The committee agreed that social work practice evolves drastically over time, and the knowledge gained 30 years ago would certainly be out of date. However, Ms. Michel debated that the issue is rare, and likely did not warrant a rule change stating that a person who has not been licensed for X number of years would have to re-do supervision. Mr. Warne responded that he's seen three similar cases within the last couple of months. Ms. Michel suggested that any rule should be left vague, so that the committee could evaluate applicants on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Miller suggested that the rule could require any licensee whose independent license expired more than 10 years ago to be evaluated by the Board. Mr. Brady stated that the supervision process enhances a person's educational background and field practice, and that in his opinion that knowledge doesn't go away. Requiring licensees to pass the current Clinical or Advanced Generalist exam already addresses this issue, and CEUs work to catch the licensee up to speed. Mr. Warne suggested that a rule change could be drafted for the committee's review and further discussion.

10) New Business

At its previous meeting, the SWPSC had discussed making a rule change to OAC 4757-19-

01 and 19-02 regarding the exam. The SWPSC discussed the following changes:

4757-19-01 (LSW)

5) Applicants shall have passed the required examination within seven years of application date, unless they are currently licensed in an equivalent capacity in another state and passed the prescribed examination as part of the licensure requirements in that state; and

4757-19-02 (LISW)

4) Applicants shall have passed the required examination within seven years of application date, unless they are currently licensed in an equivalent capacity in another state and passed the prescribed examination as part of the licensure requirements in that state.

Mr. Miller explained that this would mean that only applicants who took the exam within the past seven years would be able to re-apply for new licensure without having to re-test (except for endorsement applicants); this would mean that applicants LICENSED within the last seven years would still be required to re-test if their licensure expired. Mr. Brady made a motion to adopt the rule change as written. Ms. Brunner seconded. Motion carried.

11) Correspondence

- a) The Board had previously discussed and approved a rule change to OAC 4757-21-03(B) back in 2009, but the rule change was never filed. As a result, there have been no rules regarding the supervision of Social Work Trainees. The rule is now being filed, with this issue addressed as well as two other errors in paragraph C. Since this issue had already been discussed and approved by the Board, no further discussion is needed, and the rule change will be filed as follows:

4757-21-03 Scope of practice for an independent social worker

(B) The scope of practice for an independent social worker may include those duties as described in the subparagraphs that follow.

(1) Psychosocial assessment: intervention planning, psychosocial psychosocial intervention, and social psychotherapy, which includes the diagnosis and treatment of mental and emotional disorders and counseling.

(2) Program assessment, planning, and development, program implementation and evaluation.

(3) Organizational assessment, planning and development, intervention, accountability, and supervision.

(4) Specialized problem-oriented assessment, specialized project or case-oriented planning, specialized intervention, evaluation of consultation activities, provide training supervision for social workers seeking licensure as independent social workers.

(5) Provide clinical supervision of social worker assistants, social workers except for their training supervision, professional counselors, and marriage and family therapists; training supervision of registered social worker trainees unless they are diagnosing and treating mental and emotional disorders; and supervision of chemical dependency counselors and prevention specialists and as specified in Chapter 4758. of the Revised Code.

(C) The scope of practice for an independent social worker with supervision designation may include those duties as described as follows:

(1) Psychosocial assessment: intervention planning, psychosocial ~~psychosocial~~ intervention, and social psychotherapy, which includes the diagnosis and treatment of mental and emotional disorders and counseling.

(2) Program assessment, planning, and development, program implementation and evaluation.

(3) Organizational assessment, planning and development, intervention, accountability, and supervision.

(4) Specialized problem-oriented assessment, specialized project or case-oriented planning, specialized intervention, evaluation of consultation activities, provide training supervision for social workers seeking licensure as independent social workers.

(5) Provide clinical and/or training supervision of registered social worker trainees, social worker assistants, social workers, professional counselors, and marriage and family therapists; and supervision of chemical dependency counselors and prevention specialists as specified in chapter 4758. of the Revised Code. Provide training supervision for social workers gaining supervised hours to meet the requirements of paragraph (C)(2) of rule 4757-19-02 of the Administrative Code to become licensed as independent social workers per rule 4757-23-01 of the Administrative Code.

- b) The SWPSC reviewed a hardship request they had examined in September, and for which they had requested more information. The hardship request came from an LSW working in a setting dealing with autism spectrum disorder, and who wanted to receive additional training supervision from a psychologist trained in that setting. Her regular supervisor, an LISW-S, plans to take maternity leave in the near future, and in order to provide consistent supervision as well as to take advantage of the psychologist's expertise, the LSW requested that she be allowed to receive 75 hours of supervision from the psychologist. Ms. Michel stated that there would be many other supervisors available at the LSW's large agency, so it shouldn't be necessary to go outside of the profession. Mr. Polovick replied that the LSW had written to them with a plan, and made a very convincing argument, which is what they had asked for. The practice is also very specialized. Ms. Michel agreed with that, but was worried about setting precedent. Ms. Brunner replied that autism is a growing concern, and the profession needs to ensure that it is growing and gaining tools to address it. Mr. Brady stated that he was comfortable due to the limited number of hours being requested, and Mr. Polovick suggested that the supervision could still be audited at the end of the process to ensure quality. Ms. Brunner suggested that the hours be accepted "for review;" the hardship can be accepted, and supervision evaluated via the logs. Mr. Miller clarified that, yes, even though the supervisor is from another profession, logs would be required. The SWPSC approved the request with Mr. Polovick's and Ms. Brunner's stipulations.

12) Meeting Adjourned

The meeting was adjourned at 4:06 p.m.

Social Worker Professional Standards Committee (SWPSC) Minutes
Friday, November 22, 2013

Members Present: Mr. Tim Brady, Ms. Erin Michel, Mr. Steve Polovick

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

1) **Meeting Called to Order**

Mr. Polovick called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.

2) **Correspondence**

- a) Mr. Warne had received an email from an LISW who wanted to know if IQ testing is within the LISW scope of practice. Mr. Warne had verified with Investigations staff that OAC 4757-5-06 speaks to assessment instruments, and IQ testing is one of them. Mr. Polovick expressed a concern that, as far as he was aware, IQ testing fell under the sole provenance of the Psychology Board. He asked that verification from the AAG be sought. Mr. Brady agreed, stating that most schools don't teach MMPI, and he couldn't think of any that taught IQ testing. Mr. Warne stated that the SWPSC had ruled that AIMS testing (Assessment of Involuntary Movements Scale) is outside of social work scope of practice, so there is some debate on testing.
- b) The SWPSC had recently approved a draft rule change to OAC 4757-19-04 which would require LSWs to complete eighteen months of post-MSW, post-LSW supervision before taking the Clinical or Advanced Generalist exam. Feedback was received from licensees, and in light of this Mr. Rough proposed moving the effective date of the rule change to 7/1/2015 to allow licensees time to prepare. Ms. Michel related that, as a student, she had planned to take the Advanced Generalist exam because it seemed a more efficient path through licensure. But when her classmates had trouble with the advanced tests, she changed to the Bachelor exam and passed it. This would be a helpful rule change for students, because many aren't familiar with their options. Mr. Hegarty stated that this would improve the supervision process, which fulfills the Board's mission. The SWPSC agreed to move the effective date of the rule change to 7/1/2015.
- c) A licensee wrote in, requesting her discipline record be removed from the website. It was a brief suspension, and she claimed that the discipline record has kept her from getting jobs, being on insurance panels, and practicing independently. Mr. Hegarty stated that discipline records have never been removed before, and are left up for public protection. Mr. Brady asked if it was true that she was barred from private practice due to past discipline; Mr. Hegarty said he had already informed her that this was incorrect. Many licensees with even more serious past discipline have been able to work in the field. The SWPSC agreed not to remove the disciplinary record.

3) CEU Committee

Ms. Michel reported that she had met with Danielle Smith, and that the two of them began working to strengthen the relationship between NASW and the Board. The goal is to be on the same page with regard to CEU approval decisions. NASW National has been asked how they want to receive communication from the Board. Input was received on their processes, and their sometimes turbulent relationships with other state boards. Ms. Michel was now waiting for NASW National to reply to a request for information. Ms. Miller expressed her concern over not hearing back from National yet. She had asked them before to hold off on approving trainings on yoga, essential oils, and Reiki therapy, because the Board always denies these trainings. The Board's stance needs to be clear to NASW. Mr. Polovick confirmed that these topics should not be approved. CEU providers have made a slim case for incorporating these techniques into Social Work practice. Mr. Brady suggested checking with the National Institute of Mental Health to see if yoga is part of best practice for social workers. Mr. Rough states that while yoga cannot be approved as a topic or a part of practice, the Board can approve trainings on integrating mindfulness into evidence-based practice. Ms. Michel pointed out that CEU approval is ultimately subjective, and even though the Board and NASW agree on some topics, there will always be differences. Her intention is to work as a liaison with NASW National so the Board can communicate with them directly rather than going through the Ohio Chapter. There's a lack of trust between the organizations that needs to be improved. Mr. Polovick responded that the issue is not trust, but regulation. Ms. Michel responded that state boards have always been hostile toward NASW, and they respond in a guarded fashion. Conversation is needed to fix the issue. Ms. Miller stated that in her opinion, NASW's responsibility to the Board is greater, because the Board gave them approval. Ms. Michel replied that she would contact them as a Board member and express everyone's concerns. Mr. Polovick suggested setting a deadline for these issues to be resolved in order to keep NASW's approval. Mr. Rough suggested that in general, the Board needs to ensure an understanding of the wholeness of social work practice before denying any CEU topic.

4) Old Business

a) Mr. Warne presented a new Professional Employment reference form for consideration. The SWPSC has routinely been looking at issues on how to differentiate between Bachelor-level and Master's-level practice. To aid in this, CSWE competency areas have been incorporated into the PER form. In October, Mr. Warne had given a supervision presentation in Summit County, and during the presentation he asked the licensees to discuss the differences between the two levels; they had trouble differentiating which practices fit which level. Many people working there frequently crossed between levels in their work, so the issue is complicated. Mr. Rough suggested that the best method would be to compare licensees who recently graduated from school, and find examples of how exactly these competencies are exhibited in the real world. Ms. Michel stated that people working in the field all have different competencies, based on their own skills and knowledge, sometimes regardless of the education they've received. Mr. Warne responded that it was a complicated issue, but in a recent survey most licensees responded that they would like more guidance on this issue. Mr. Brady stated that he was

in favor of the idea, but questioned the logistics of the form. If an applicant gets too many bad scores on the checklist, for example, is their license denied? Mr. Rough replied that licensees could be asked to complete more supervision on certain topics based on the evaluation. Ms. Michel asked for a literature review on performance evaluation and competency evaluation, to look at how they're used elsewhere in social work practice. Mr. Warne agreed to perform this literature review.

- b) Mr. Warne presented his outline of a supervision CEU that will be presented to NASW Ohio Chapter. The SWPSC reviewed the content and approved.

5) **Executive Director's Report**

Mr. Rough reported that more site visits are planned for March. HB232 passed in the House, and is now awaiting motion in the Senate. The SWPSC read over Mr. Rough's written report and discussed.

6) **Old Business**

- a) Following up on an item from September's meeting, Mr. Miller reported that the September minutes did indeed include an error. Mr. Rough had confirmed that the "Navigators" being set up by the Affordable Care Act do not need to be licensed insurance brokers. They simply need to be trained, registered individuals, and refer clients to insurance agents and brokers for specific products.
- b) Mr. Warne had asked Danielle Smith to find out if the NASW had put out any policy updates or practice guidance regarding competency evaluations. Ms. Smith was not able to find anything issued by NASW on this topic. Mr. Warne asked the committee if they had any other ideas. Mr. Polovick suggested running it through ASWB to find out if other states have input on the issue.

7) **New Business**

- a) Mr. Warne suggested a possible rule change for OAC 4757-23-01. Previously, the rule used to state that a training supervisor was responsible for the professional growth and development of their supervisees. That part of the rule was removed because the Board thought it sounded like it was entirely the supervisor's fault if the supervisee failed to grow as a practitioner. Mr. Warne read the original language, and thought that a rule change that stressed a *shared* responsibility would be beneficial to the supervision process. He and Mr. Rough drafted some basic language for a proposed change:

(A) Definitions of social work supervision:

(2) "Training supervision" means supervision for the purposes of obtaining a license and/or development of new areas of proficiency while providing services to clients. The training supervisor is responsible for providing direction to the supervisee, who applies social work theory, standardized knowledge, skills, competency, and applicable ethical content in the practice setting. The supervisor and the supervisee both share

responsibility for carrying out their role in this collaborative process of professional growth and development. Training supervision may be individual supervision or group supervision.

The SWPSC discussed, and approved of the general idea. They requested that Mr. Warne and Mr. Rough formally draft a rule change for review at a later meeting.

- b) With time running short, the committee decided to table the remainder of the New Business items until the next meeting, and resumed their working meeting.

8) Meeting Adjourned

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Mr. Steve Polovick, Chairperson

ACTION ITEMS

November 2013 meeting

1. Draft rule change requiring LISWs who have not been licensed for 10 years to have their supervision/work experience evaluated by the SWPSC, to see if they still are eligible for LISW licensure (Correspondence).
2. SWPSC approved drafted rule change for 4757-19-01 and 19-02, need to move forward on those as appropriate (New Business).
3. Check with AAG to make sure our licensees are able to conduct IQ testing. Steve thinks the Psych Board might have ownership of this. (Correspondence)
4. Need literature review on performance evaluation and competency evaluation, to look at how they're used elsewhere in social work practice, for the new PER form. (Old Business)
5. Check with ASWB/other states on whether social workers can do competency evaluations. (Old business)
6. Draft rule change for 4757-23-01. (New Business)

Tabled for now

1. Discussion of LCSW
2. Discuss counseling definition in May 2014