



STATE BOARD of LICENSED SOCIAL WORKERS
Board Planning Meeting
Saturday, April 13th, 2013
3218 Pringle Road SE, Salem, OR 97302

Board Members Present: Carol Copley Zancanella, *Chair*
Donna Henderson, *Vice Chair*
Kathy Outland
Mark Oldham
Kittee Custer
Martha Lopez
Rachel Jensen

Board Counsel Present: Kyle Martin, *AIC, Oregon Dept. of Justice*

Staff Members Present: Martin Pittioni, *Interim Executive Director*
Mindy Tucker, *Senior Compliance Specialist*
Jesse Milich, *Investigator*
Kimberly Sommer, *Licensing Specialist*

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Zancanella called the Board Planning Meeting to order at 9:40 a.m., and provided brief opening remarks.

2. REPORT FROM COMMITTEES ON PLANNING GOALS:

Chair Zancanella asked for planning reports from the committees.

Oldham reported for the Continuing Education Committee, and stated that the committee would like to develop a system that would allow specific allocation of CE hours to ethics if a portion of the event covered ethical topics, even if the event is not advertised as training dedicated exclusively to ethics. **Oldham** added that the CE committee had also discussed a goal to develop clarity around what CE is considered clinical, supervisory, or non-clinical, to provide better guidance to licensees now licensed at different levels. **Pittioni** advised that any rule changes that may happen related to this should be integrated with the other rule changes the Board has to work on in 2014, a project which would need to be ideally completed by the October 2014 Planning Meeting, given that at least some planned rule changes would benefit from an effective date of January 1, 2015, such as fee changes and implementation of House Bill 2082, if approved in its current form.

Chair Zancanella discussed the Consumer Protection Committee planning, and reported that CPC is working on delegated authority issues, primarily with respect to criminal background checks. **Zancanella** advised that the CPC would like to broaden item 10 of the delegated authority to CPC by allowing further delegation of criminal background check reviews by CPC to staff, to lessen the burden on CPC to review what often are routine criminal background matters. **Zancanella** reported **Tucker** is working a delegation structure proposal to CPC, should the Board approve amending the delegated authority document to allow CPC to delegate this power further. **Pittioni** also discussed an additional amendment sought by CPC and staff, under Board delegation to staff item 19(g), which would permit the Executive Director to delegate issuance of subpoenas to a staff member, a power currently

delegated only to the Executive Director with no possibility of further delegation. **Tucker** advised that further flexibility would be helpful and would be consistent with the powers she has had in previous comparable positions. **Pittioni** advised he would, if this is approved by the Board, look for a specific proposal from **Tucker** that would ensure that a two-eyes principle or sign-off is maintained prior to any subpoena being issued, even if the Director does not sign, given the sensitive nature of subpoenas. Board members discussed both issues and reviewed a draft updated delegated authority document documenting the proposed changes.

- i. Custer moved to adopt and approve the proposed amendments to the Board's delegated authority document, specifically with respect to item 10 on page 1 covering delegated authority to CPC, allowing further delegation to Board staff for criminal background check reviews, and with respect to item 19g on page 5, delegated authority to the Board's Director, allowing further delegation by the Director of the power to sign subpoenas.*
- ii. Henderson seconded.*
- iii. Motion passed unanimously.*

Chair Zancanella then discussed the Consumer Protection Committee plan to move back to a system of CPC meeting every other month, with adding CPC meeting time under this structure the afternoons prior to the Board meeting.

3. STRATEGIC PLANNING

Pittioni presented to Board members future growth projections based on the emergence of new MSW programs being implemented by in-state universities currently offering BSW-level education. Board members discussed the numbers and implications, which depend heavily on how fast the MSW programs get accredited by CSWE. **Pittioni** advised that while the Board's growth will slow significantly the next 2-3 years, the Board may well experience strong growth again thereafter. **Pittioni** predicted that this could mean growing pressures for the Board to consider specialist forms of licensure, and would no longer be considered a small Board, and may well be large enough to trigger special consideration if it makes operational sense to consolidate this Board with others administratively.

4. CSWA PROGRAM – POLICY REVIEW AND RULE PLANNING

Pittioni advised Board members that Interim Approvals including all approvals impacting the CSWA program had been temporarily suspended, to complete implementation of a dual-sign-off process to ensure all CSWA certifications were properly issued. Board members directed **Pittioni** that given implementation of clear dual sign-off the Interim Approval system could be re-instated. **Pittioni** reviewed with Board members his current work with staff to ensure CSWA candidates remain in compliance with Board laws and rules for supervision, and his work with staff to ensure that CSWA renewals and CSWA exam extension requests would be used as opportunities to work with CSWAs to submit an plan updates or missing six-month reports. **Pittioni** then reviewed with the Board potential use of and changes to the Board's rules on inactive status CSWA's, for use by staff in cases of out-of-state applicants for LCSW who do not qualify for LCSW because they first must pass the ASWB clinical exam.

Chair Zancanella then led a policy-level discussion of the CSWA program in the context of the changing nature of the profession, and suggested this should mean the Board re-evaluate the specifics of the CSWA program, and be more open to integrating private practice experience as

a valuable component of CSWA education and training that should qualify as experience accepted by the Board. **Zancanella** added that at this point only agency settings are permitted, and the Board may need to consider making changes to that rule. Board members discussed the matter. **Chair Zancanella** then discussed the matter of **McNulty**, deferred from the previous day. **Henderson** reported on approaches in Texas and New York to the issue of what qualifies as agency. **Oldham** stated he thought that agency settings were really helpful with large numbers of licensees around to consult with and help new CSWAs stay out of trouble. **Zancanella** then advised she would start working toward having the Legislative and Rules Committee of the Board look at the issue of definition of agency. Counsel **Martin** recommended the Board not respond to **McNulty** specifically until there is a specific plan of supervision in place for the Board to consider, given the limits to the Board's authority he had laid out the previous day. **Pittioni** was directed to so respond to **McNulty**, including an explanation of the Board's lack of authority to approve agency settings.

Chair Zancanella recessed the Board at 12:07 p.m. for a brief break to grab lunch, and asked that Board members return at 12:20 p.m. so the Board could continue working over lunch.

Chair Zancanella reconvened the Board at 12:25 p.m.

5. **DIRECTOR RECRUITMENT**

Chair Zancanella and **Pittioni** briefed Board members on the status of the recruitment, and discussed with Board members an option floated by DAS to work with the Board of Psychologist Examiners on a pilot project of a joint recruitment for a single Director to serve both boards, with an additional manager also split between the two boards two support the Director and maintain the current management FTE level of both agencies. **Zancanella** added that the Board of Psychologist Examiners is also being consulted on their willingness to enter into such an arrangement not just with this Board, but also alternatively with the Board of Counselors and Therapists, whose Director is currently also serving as Interim Director for the Board of Psychologist Examiners. Board members discussed the matter detail, emphasizing the need to be open to innovative solutions, the need to send a clear signal this Board was willing to work across agency lines and with the office of the DAS COO to find operational efficiencies; Board members further appreciated the potential of being potentially able to recruit a Director under the pilot at a higher level of classification, a goal long sought by the Board. **Chair Zancanella** was directed to respond to **Sarah Miller**, the Deputy COO, to express the Board's willingness to participate in development of such a pilot.

6. **TASK FORCE UPDATES**

Board members briefly discussed the task forces on electronic supervision and on child custody guidelines.

7. **ANNOUNCEMENT AND ADJOURNMENT:**

Chair Zancanella reminded Board members about the May 10, 2013 conference call 4:00 p.m. adjourned the Board meeting at 1:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Martin Pittioni
Interim Executive Director