

Board of Counseling
Regulatory Committee Minutes - Final
December 2, 2005

TIME & PLACE: The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. on December 2, 2005 in Board Room 1 at the Department of Health Professions, 6603 West Broad Street, 5th Floor, Richmond, Virginia.

PRESIDING: Kevin S. Doyle, Ed.D, Chair

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kevin S. Doyle, Ed.D.
Jack Knapp, D.D.
Charles "Rip" McAdams, Ed.D.
Karen Rosen, Ed.D.
Linda Seeman, Ph.D.

STAFF PRESENT: Ben Foster, Deputy Executive Director
Diana Pollick, Administrative Assistant

TOPICS OF DISCUSSION:

Clarification of language of 18 VAC 115-20-45 – Endorsement:
After some discussion it was decided to table this topic until member(s) of the Credentials Committee were present to support the language changes.

Ben Foster: Time frame for regulatory changes regarding Residency:

Mr. Foster shared with the committee that any necessary changes should not be delayed since the contract with NBCC/CCE has ended and the LPC, LSATP, CSAC and CSAC-A applications would be coming back in house for processing. Therefore, with the need for forms to be developed prompt attention to language would be beneficial.

18 VAC 115-20-52-B-2: Kevin Doyle presented the issue of residents now being required to have one hour of supervision for every 20 hours worked. Some concerns resulting from discussion were 1) residents who work 40 hours lose 20 of those hours when they are only able to obtain one hour of supervision, 2) there are a limited number of supervisors even in some metropolitan areas, 3) supervisors sign off on registration of supervision forms that they will accept responsibility for all activity of residents, not just 20 hours. 4) rationale for the 1/20 ratio was unknown.

It was suggested that by letting residents count all 40 hours of experience. However, they would still need the 200 hours of supervision which could take up to four years. Concerns were shared regarding the developmental process that takes place during the supervision experience would be jeopardized. Consideration was given to the fact they are masters level residents, the cost of supervision and the four year time period residents would have to be supervised in order to get their required 200 hours.

It was discussed that limits should be set on how much supervision a resident can accrue in a given time period. It was suggested that a minimum of 1/40 be set and a maximum of 2/40 be set, with a week meaning a clearly established seven day period. Jack Knapp made a motion to accept the changes stated above. Linda Seeman seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

It was also discussed that with these changes the need for all residents to register their supervisor would be necessary, not just those in a exempt (non-profit) setting. It was suggested that 18 VAC 115-20-52-A-1 should read: "Applicants who render counseling services shall" , (removing in a nonexempt setting), and that 18 VAC 115-20-52-A-2 should be removed from the regulations. Jack Knapp made a motion to accept the changes in the regulations as stated above. Linda Seeman seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Kevin Doyle: Discussion of Face-to-Face Supervision:

After discussion it was determined that "face-to-face" had meaning only when it was used when it involved residents and their work with clients. It was decided to remove face-to-face from 18 VAC 115-20-52-B-2 in all instances, and from 18 VAC 115-20-52-C. "Face-to-face" will remain in 18 VAC 115-20-52-B-4. Jack Knapp made a motion to accept the regulatory changes as stated above. Karen Rosen seconded the motion which carried unanimously. Ben Foster will search the regulations making sure all inappropriate uses of face-to-face have been identified and removed. Mr. Foster also told the committee that this action will require bringing the changes to the full Board and that such change will require a NOIRA which will require a motion to be made by the Board and a passing vote.

Kevin Doyle: Discussion of 18 VAC 115-20-52-C.

This discussion focused on “at least one half of the individual face-to-face supervision shall be rendered by a licensed professional counselor.” It is believed that the intent of this statement was to ensure professional identity. The question arose as to whether group supervision would offer any less professional identity, with the maximum number of the group being six. Discussion resulted in committee members feeling that the new interpretation would not indicate harm to the public and that it offered the most flexibility possible. There was a consensus in theory so regulatory language would have to be developed to fast track this change. Linda Seeman made a motion to accept the change it read “At least 100 hours of the supervision shall be rendered by a licensed professional counselor.” Rip McAdams seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Technology and Supervision: An informal discussion took place which resulted in the committee deciding that research needs to be done before this can be discussed productively. Topics such as what others are doing and whether we are in step with them or not and the different types of technology being used and in what instances. Issues like confidentiality and whether or not good, effective supervision can take place without the supervisor and resident sitting down face to face in person. Credentials for supervisors is another factor to be considered with several options being discussed. Karen Rosen made a motion to research what other Boards’ supervisory requirements are currently in place. Linda Seeman seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

NEXT MEETING DATE: February 16, 2006. 12:30 Lunch – 1:00 PM Meeting Begins
Topics for Discussion: Technology & Supervision
Qualifications of “Approved Supervisor”

ADJOURNMENT:

Dr. Kevin S. Doyle, Ph.D., Chair

Benjamin Foster, Deputy Executive Director