

AGENDA ITEM 5

REVIEW AND VOTE ON APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 14, 2024, COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES.



**** DRAFT ****

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON SUPERVISION STANDARDS MEETING MINUTES

August 14, 2024

Committee Members Present

Denise Miller, Chair/Board Member
 Beata Morcos, Board Vice President
 Sharon Pavlovich, Board Member
 Cesar Arada
 Candace Chatman
 Joyce Fries
 July Mclaughlin Gray
 Domenique Hendershot-Embrey
 Ada Boone Hoerl
 Heather Kitching
 Kersten Laughlin
 Terry Peralta-Catipon
 Liz Phelps
 Penny Stack

Board Staff Present

Heather Martin, Executive Officer
 Rachael Hutchison, Manager
 Jeanine Orona, Analyst

Committee Members Absent

Samia Rafeedie
 Erin Schwier

Wednesday, August 14, 2024

8:00 am – Committee Meeting

1. Call to order, roll call, establishment of a quorum.

The meeting was called to order at 8:02 a.m., roll was called, and a quorum was established.

2. Committee Chair’s Opening Remarks.

Chair Denise Miller welcomed all in attendance. Ms. Miller summarized the committee’s discussion items at the April 12, 2024, meeting as follows:

- Concern regarding the term “services” in Section 4181(e) prompted the suggested language: “prior to when providing occupational therapy services, education, supervision, and practice.”
- Some programs have students fulfill their capstone experience during the pre-accreditation phase; therefore, using the phrase, “Accreditation Council of Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE)-accredited and pre-accredited doctoral degree program” was recommended.

- ACOTE defines “pre-accreditation” as the point in time at which the education program submitted its self-study or was close to doing so.
- The next steps for the committee included:
 - Reviewing literature and statistics to see if the proposed supervision ratios were justified;
 - Inviting an ACOTE representative to the next meeting;
 - Researching other states “supervision limitations” and “ratios” and
 - Clarifying the phrase “at any one time.”

Chair Miller summarized the committee’s discussion at the June 26, 2024, meeting as follows:

- ACOTE’s Director reported that the standards were written to be general and not prescriptive.
- Moving “at any one time” to the beginning of the proposed language was suggested.
- Removing OTAs from the proposed supervision limitation language and creating a new section for them was suggested. and
- Defining “faculty-led fieldwork” and “faculty-led site visits.”

3. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda.

There were no public comments for items not on the agenda and the public attendees chose not to introduce themselves.

4. Review and vote on approval of the April 12, 2024, committee meeting minutes.

- Penny Stack moved to approve the April 12, 2024, committee meeting minutes.
- Beata Morcos seconded the motion.

There were no additional committee member remarks.

There were no public comments.

Committee Member Vote

Beata Morcos	Yes
Sharon Pavlovich	Yes
Cesar Arada	Yes
Candace Chatman	Yes
Joyce Fries	Yes
July Mclaughlin Gray	Yes
Domenique Hendershot-Embrey	Yes
Ada Boone Hoerl	Yes
Heather Kitching	Yes
Kersten Laughlin	Yes
Terry Peralta-Catipon	Yes
Liz Phelps	Yes
Penny Stack	Yes
Denise Miller	Yes

The motion carried.

5. Review and vote on approval of the June 26, 2024, committee meeting minutes.

- Heather Kitching moved to approve the June 26, 2024, committee meeting minutes.
- Julie McLaughlin Gray seconded the motion.

There were no additional committee member remarks.

There were no public comments.

Committee Member Vote

Beata Morcos	<i>Abstained</i>
Sharon Pavlovich	Yes
Cesar Arada	Yes
Candace Chatman	Yes
Joyce Fries	Yes
July McLaughlin Gray	Yes
Domenique Hendershot-Embrey	Yes
Ada Boone Hoerl	Yes
Heather Kitching	Yes
Kersten Laughlin	Yes
Terry Peralta-Catipon	Yes
Liz Phelps	Yes
Penny Stack	Yes
Denise Miller	Yes

The motion carried.

6. Consideration and possible recommendation to the Board on amending the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 16, Division 39, Article 9, Section 4180, Definitions, and Section 4181, Supervision Parameters.

Chair Miller invited Ms. Kitching to discuss her comment that she emailed to the Executive Officer regarding proposed amendments to Section 4181(e)(2).

Ms. Kitching summarized her concern that the distinction between entry-level capstone students versus post-professional remained unclear. In her opinion, post-professional students should not be included in the list of whom “no more than a total of three” shall be supervised at any one time. There are also doctoral capstone students who are post-professional students; meaning they are already in practice and licensed and those individuals would not require the same level of supervision.

Ms. Miller thanked Ms. Kitching for her comment. Ms. Miller reminded the committee that at the last meeting, the committee had a robust discussion in terms of what “at any one time” meant. The committee also discussed the phrase, “no more than” and identified that more occupational therapy assistants could be supervised than students at any one time or the number should be equal. However, Ms. Miller suggested that the committee begin with wrapping up their discussion regarding the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 16, Division 39, Article 9, Section 4180. Ms. Miller asked the committee to think about Section 4180 in terms of licensed versus unlicensed practitioners in future discussions.

Ms. McLaughlin Gray agreed with Ms. Kitching in terms of distinguishing between entry-level and post-professional student capstone experiences. She also suggested the committee add “doctoral capstone student” to 4180(c). She noted that although it was inferred, the committee could provide more clarity by using consistent language in 4180(a),(b), and (c).

Ms. Boone Hoerl added that she agreed with Ms. Kitching’s comments. Ms. Kitching’s letter inspired Ms. Boone Hoerl to research the American Occupational Therapy Association’s (OTA) language regarding capstone mentorship versus capstone supervision.

Ms. Hendershot Embrey stated that Section 4180 includes “entry-level” language and that repeating it in Section 4181 would be clearer.

Ms. Kitching expressed her appreciation for Ms. Miller’s comment regarding the need to focus on licensed versus unlicensed student supervision parameters.

Mr. Arada suggested that the Committee propose inserting “entry-level doctoral capstone student” in Section 4180(c) to distinguish entry-level versus post-professional doctoral capstone students. However, he did feel that it was clear that the language was for the supervision standards for the unlicensed students.

Ms. Miller suggested adding “entry-level” to language referencing doctoral capstone students.

Ms. McLaughlin Gray suggested keeping the language consistent across Section 4180(a), (b), and (c). She added that the suggested language “with the goal of developing competent, entry-level practitioners” would be clearer if it was “with the goal of developing entry-level competence” was used instead.

Ms. Boone Hoerl suggested language for 4180(b) read as “Level II Student means an occupational therapist or occupational therapy assistant student participating in delivering occupational therapy services to clients.”

Ms. Miller proposed defining an entry-level student as an occupational therapist or occupational therapy assistant student participating in delivering occupational therapy services to clients.

Ms. McLaughlin Gray liked Ms. Miller’s proposed definition of entry-level students.

Ms. Stack agreed that the term “Level II” implies that it is entry-level, ACOTE-accredited, or in candidacy status, and focused on developing competency.

Ms. Pavlovich that those criteria need to remain as a large range of stakeholders need to be able to interpret the definition of Level II students.

Ms. McLaughlin Gray suggested placing the term “entry-level” before “occupational therapist” resulting in, “entry-level occupational therapist or entry-level occupational therapy assistant...”

Ms. Miller agreed that adding “entry-level” at the beginning of the definition provided clarity.

Ms. McLaughlin Gray agreed and suggested the definition be, “doctoral capstone student means an entry-level occupational therapy doctoral student completing a capstone project and experience” and removing, “while enrolled in an ACOTE-accredited doctoral degree program or doctoral program with ACOTE pre-accreditation or candidacy status.”

Chair Miller asked if it made sense to reference “ACOTE-accredited” and ACOTE pre-accredited somewhere else in the section and make a note that the terms “ACOTE-accredited” and ACOTE pre-accredited” pertain to all of the definitions.

Ms. Pavlovich stated that at Loma Linda University, to qualify for a post-professional program to earn a doctoral degree, it is required to pass the NBCOT exam and obtain licensure first, however, some programs do not have that requirement. She noted that as Ms. Martin mentioned earlier, some programs allow students to finish their program and enroll directly into an entry-level doctoral program without pursuing licensure.

Ms. Chatman suggested that “entry-level doctoral capstone students” and “post-professional doctoral capstone students” be defined separately. It would then be clear that the supervision parameter language only referred to entry-level doctoral capstone students. She noted that the current language in Section 4180(c) for a doctoral capstone student more accurately defined an entry-level doctoral capstone student.

Ms. Chatman also suggested a post-professional doctoral capstone student could be defined as “a licensed occupational therapist returning to an occupational therapy doctoral program.” She added that the post-professional doctoral capstone occupational therapy programs are not ACOTE-accredited.

Ms. Phelps said using the term “licensed” would be problematic because, for example, in her program, a short period exists when students are not licensed; meaning those students would not fit into either definition. She proposed the language, “a post-professional doctoral capstone student that has completed an entry-level degree.” Then it would be at the discretion of the fieldwork site to determine a student’s level of supervision based on whether or not they were licensed.

Chair Miller asked if for those programs that do not require licensure for enrollment, would it be problematic if California’s regulatory language pushed schools to require students to be licensed. Ms. Miller asked the Committee to consider where the programs are headed in terms of requirements in the future so they could recommend language to the Board that could potentially last many years.

Ms. Fries said that there used to be a requirement that the applicants had to have five years of clinical practice for admittance into a post-professional education program.

Ms. McLaughlin Gray asked if an unlicensed student is in a post-professional doctoral program, then the Committee wished to apply supervision standards, however, if the student is licensed then the Committee does not wish to apply supervision standards to

those individuals. In her opinion, the phrase, “doctoral capstone student” insinuates entry-level knowledge and abilities. In her program, doctoral capstone students are referred to as residents. She suggested adding “for the purpose of these regulations” to the definition of a doctoral capstone student. The definition would be, “A doctoral capstone student means either an entry-level occupational therapy doctoral capstone student completing a capstone project or capstone experience.” Alternatively, the definition could be, “an unlicensed post-professional occupational therapy doctoral capstone student.”

Ms. Chatman suggested defining the post-professional doctoral capstone student as, “a person who has received an entry-level occupational therapy degree and is either licensed or pursuing licensure while enrolled in a post-professional occupational therapy doctoral program.”

Ms. Martin noted that Business and Professions Code 2570.4(a) provides the Board authority over unlicensed students because they provide services to patients/clients. She suggested defining a student as “an individual enrolled in an ACOTE-accredited degree program or an educational program with ACOTE pre-accreditation or candidacy status.”

Chair Miller noted that the phrase, “with the goal of developing entry-level competence” distinguished the capstone from the Level I and the Level II students.

Ms. McLaughlin Gray pointed out that the terms “occupational therapist” and “occupational therapy student” are inconsistent among the definitions. In Section 4180(c) students are referred to as “occupational therapy students,” however, in Section 4180(a) and (b) the students are referred to as “occupational therapist” students. She recommended that the Committee use the same term throughout the section.

Ms. Peralta-Catipon said that regarding Section 4180(c) it was her understanding that the Committee was moving toward creating a distinction between Level I, Level II, and capstone students. According to ACOTE, Level I students gain an understanding of the needs of clients, Level II students prepare for entry-level competency, and for doctoral capstone students, the goal is to gain in-depth exposure to a specific area of practice.

Ms. Stack suggested that because the doctoral capstone project and experience occur together, the language could be, “completing a doctoral capstone project *and* experience.”

Chair Miller read the Committee’s proposed language thus far for Section 4180(c), “Doctoral capstone student means an occupational therapist student completing a doctoral capstone project and experience.”

Ms. McLaughlin Gray noted “with a goal of developing entry-level competence” only applied to Level II students. Ms. McLaughlin Gray suggested adding that phrase to Section 4180(b) and adding language to 4180(c) that described the goal of the doctoral capstone student, for example, “an in-depth experience and synthesis of knowledge.”

Ms. Martin suggested defining a Level II student as, “an occupational therapist or occupational therapy assistant student participating in delivering occupational therapy services to clients to develop entry-level competence” and removing “designed” from Section 4180(a).

Concern was noted that without the phrase, “participating in” in the Level II student definition, the fieldwork sites could potentially see a loophole; meaning the language could be interpreted as only the students are providing services.

Chair Miller announced that she felt the Committee had accomplished making the language in Section 4180(a), (b), and (c) consistent and the Committee had also identified new language to define a student.

Next, Chair Miller asked the Committee to focus on Sections 4180(d), (e), and (f) and began by stating that she was fond of the language proposed in Section 4180(d).

Ms. Stack agreed with the language proposed in Section 4180(d) as well.

Ms. Boone Hoerl noted that regarding Section 4180(d), ACOTE defined supervision as the direct inspection of quality of work and a supervisor as one who ensures tasks assigned to others are performed correctly and efficiently. ACOTE defines mentorship as dedicated to the personal and professional growth of the mentee. She suggested the Committee include a definition of mentorship as the demands of mentorship are different than the demands of clinical supervision.

Ms. Boone Hoerl cautioned the Committee to be careful not to equate supervision and mentorship as the rationale for the supervision ratios of the students.

Ms. Stack recalled a prior discussion regarding supervision versus mentorship and it was determined that the Board could not use the term mentorship in regulation.

Ms. Martin confirmed Ms. Stack’s recollection and explained that mentorship could not be used in the Board’s regulations as it was deemed too ambiguous; thus, the term supervision is used in both the Board’s statutes and regulations.

Chair Miller asked Ms. Martin if any changes to the language resulted from that discussion.

Ms. Martin replied that there were many iterations of the language and the language provided in the meeting materials and reflects the Committee’s suggestions to date except for the more recent callouts regarding the phrases, “no more than” and “at one time.” She clarified that the Committee still needs to discuss those phrases.

Ms. Miller asked why the term “mentorship” was still in Section 4180(d).

Ms. Stack agreed that the Committee should not use the term “mentorship” in that context and expressed that she was open to alternate language.

Ms. McLaughlin Gray noted that regarding Section 4180(c) and (d), supervision would be necessary when the student was providing a direct patient/client care experience,

and the mentorship would apply when the student was doing a capstone project or experience.

Ms. Stack noted that mentorship could be throughout the education process, not just when the students are hands-on with a patient/client. Mentorship should also include guiding the student through their capstone project or providing feedback on a report they might be working on.

Ms. McLaughlin Gray asked if the term “mentorship” really belonged in Section 4180 at all. In her opinion, only patient/care belonged in the guidelines.

Ms. Stack agreed with Ms. McLaughlin Gray.

Chair Miller suggested using “guidance” instead of “mentoring.”

Ms. McLaughlin Gray proposed using the term “oversight.”

Ms. Stack proposed the language, “supervision of a doctoral capstone experience means the supervision of the doctoral capstone student completing a direct patient/client experience” to keep the language consistent.

Ms. Martin opined that using the term “oversight” might be better because the ACOTE guidelines refer to the mentorship of a doctoral student but not to the supervision of a doctoral student. She recommended leaving the term “mentorship” in the definition because both ACOTE and AOTA publicly commented on that previously. This was to incorporate verbiage used in the ACOTE Guidelines and recognize that only students providing direct patient/client care needed supervision under a licensee.

Chair Miller asked if mentorship would be a concern for a patient/client who received services from a doctoral capstone student.

Ms. McLaughlin Gray noted that she liked the link to the ACOTE language described by Ms. Martin. Ms. McLaughlin Gray proposed the language, “supervision of a doctoral capstone experience means the mentorship of the doctoral capstone student when completing a direct patient/client experience.” Leaving “mentorship” in the definition would align the language with the ACOTE Guidelines and emphasize that the language pertained to when a student was providing direct patient/client care.

Chair Miller announced that the Board’s quarterly meeting was scheduled for August 22-23, 2024. The meeting was in person at Stanbridge University for those who wished to attend.

Ms. Miller added that Board staff would prepare a draft of the language based on the discussion today and be presented at the next Committee meeting.

Ms. Miller invited Committee members to send their comments about Sections 4180 and 4181 to Executive Officer Heather Martin in the interim; any comments received would be a springboard for discussion the next meeting.

The Committee agreed to meet again in September and Ms. Miller instructed Board staff to send out a Doodle Poll.

7. Review CCR Title 16, Division 39, to identify other sections possibly affected by proposed amendments to CCR Sections 4180 and 4181 and recommend proposed regulatory amendment(s) to the Board to ensure consistency.

This item was tabled until the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:03 a.m.