

DRAFT  
Board of Counseling  
Regulatory Committee Minutes  
June 8, 2006

TIME & PLACE: The meeting was called to order at 1:12 p.m. on June 8, 2006 in Alcoa Classroom B at the Department of Health Professions, 6603 West Broad Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Richmond, Virginia.

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

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Charles R. McAdams, Ph.D

STAFF PRESENT: Evelyn B. Brown, Executive Director  
Ben Foster, Deputy Executive Director  
Robert Nebiker, Director, DHP  
Sandra Ryals, Chief Deputy Director, DHP  
Elaine Yeatts, Agency Regulatory Coordinator  
Diana Pollick, Administrative Assistant

PUBLIC COMMENT: NONE

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Dr. Karen Rosen moved to accept the agenda.  
Dr. Linda Seeman seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Dr. Knapp made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 16, 2006 meeting. Dr. Seeman seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

TOPICS OF DISCUSSION:

- O **BOARD MEMBER HANDBOOK UPDATES: BEN FOSTER**  
Mr. Foster issued new regulations for the Board members' handbooks.
- O **CRITERIA FOR SUPERVISORS: ROBERT NEBIKER, DIRECTOR**  
Mr. Nebiker began by stating that any increase in the requirements for licensure, even indirect, would be heavily scrutinized. If the Board wants to regulate "supervisors" this would result in another category of licensure and, therefore, would require a statutory amendment rather than simply a regulatory change.

June 8, 2006

-2-

Mr. Nebiker stated that a survey had been done by Kirsten Barrett several years ago because the Board felt the need to increase the requirements of supervisors and the survey resulted in approximately 80% of supervisors and residents indicating that the system at that time was working very well. Mr. Nebiker summarized by stating that any significant regulatory change should begin by stating what the problem is and then develop the means to alleviate the problem.

Dr. Doyle discussed the current regulations specifying training and experience of a supervisor. He noted that current and past Board members believe the regulations are too vague and do not ensure quality supervision. Dr. Rosen suggested that the Board look into what is already in place for qualifications of supervisors in professional organizations, and added that AAMFT has requirements for those approved as supervisors. Evelyn Brown stated that NASW also has criteria in place for qualified supervisors.

Discussion followed regarding whether the the purpose of the “residency” Is to adequately prepare residents for licensure, or whether it is a public protection issue. Dr. Seeman stated that the main concern is that residents must be trained to be competent at what they are doing and that this is a major safety issue. It was suggested that a competency level assessment might need to be put in place. Dr. Knapp questioned what kind of latitude this gives the Board and if the Board could develop a protocol for direct supervision. Further discussion noted that there is insufficient data to demonstrate a lack of quality supervision.

Elaine Yeatts stated that the current regulations state that the supervisor must have “training in supervision” but suggested that the Board develop precise language as to what that means.

Dr. Doyle reported that Dr. McAdams researched what other states require as qualifications of approved supervisors and those materials were disseminated to Committee members for their review. A wide range of criteria existed, ranging from no requirements, to CE’s, to formal training. This led to a discussion which resulted in the necessity for the Board to obtain a job analysis of duties of a supervisor and based on the results, determine the qualifications of a supervisor. It was suggested that AAMFT, NBCC, ACS and the Pastoral Counselors Association may have job analyses that the Board could access and review.

June 8, 2006

-3-

It was also suggested that a survey of current supervisors may yield helpful information regarding the development of qualifications for approved supervisors. This led to a discussion of what impact this proposed change would have on applicants, and would there be enough approved supervisors to absorb the number of residents. It was decided that by the next meeting the Committee would contact AAMFT, ACS, NBCC, and the Pastoral Counselors Association to see which Virginia licensees were currently on their approved supervisors lists.

Dr. Doyle stated that the Committee has three options. One, to do nothing; 2. to develop a proposal; or 3. present this issue to the full Board at the June 9, 2006 meeting for their review and input. It was determined that the Committee would present this information to the full Board on June 9, 2006.

OLD BUSINESS:     O     **SUPERVISION & TECHNOLOGY: ALAN FORREST**  
No Report Given

NEW BUSINESS:    O     **SUPERVISION, ENDORSEMENT, PORTABILITY NOIRA:  
BEN FOSTER**  
Mr. Foster shared with the Committee that no action needs to be taken at this time. The letter from AASCB indicates that they are not at a point where the Board needs to make a final determination and, endorsement and portability issues still need to be resolved.

O     **RESPONSE FROM THE BOARD OF SOCIAL WORK: DR. DOYLE**  
Dr. Doyle shared the letter the Board received from the Board of Social Work regarding their rejection of the Board of Counseling's request to have LPC's being approved to supervise social work trainees.

SCHEDULE NEXT  
MEETING:                     August 17, 2006 at 1:00 P.M.

ADJOURN:                     Jack Knapp made a motion to adjourn at 3:35 P.M. The motion was seconded by Linda Seeman and passed unanimously.

