

Faulk, Camilla

From: Michele Penberthy [Michele@seniorguardianship.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 15, 2008 8:33 AM
To: Faulk, Camilla
Cc: CQC2bmm@richpoor.net; sgssarah@comcast.net; Carol DeMers
Subject: Guardians/Agencies

Dear Ms. Faulk:

I write to express my support and concern for changes in the guardianship training requirements and Board limitations. I've been in the Senior market since 1982 providing fiduciary services along with Case Management and began my guardianship service in 1993. I was in the first Certification training.

However, I do not have a college degree, but I have supporting education from a Community College, I have years of Medical Office Management, medical assisting and am very bright. I have compassion, common sense, and after all these years am very respected individually and as an agency. I have two Certified Professional Guardians on my staff in addition to myself, but only one having a formal college degree. If the rules are changed will I have to close my guardianship business and at age 60 begin looking for another career. You must consider grandfathering those of us who are in the trenches, who have learned by doing, take continuing education seriously, and who prudently and effectively take care of our clients.

The new training makes it impossible for me to afford to educate my long time employees and myself. The rules require that I have a certain number of CPG's on staff to maintain my agency, but at the proposed cost of training, it will be impossible for me to meet that standard unless I hire only trained CPG's. With the training, the salaries I would like to afford are not possible as our reimbursement for what we do does not match the amount required to be trained. A large percentage of my client base are Medicaid clients and I am limited to \$175 per month, this does not even allow for more than paying for office overhead. Many clients who have funds out live them and eventually go on Medicaid and I then am limited in my reimbursement and forced to provide the same quality of service (which I insist on) for free. It seems like the only reimbursement I can expect is the personal knowledge that I provided loving, supportive care to my clients. After these many years in business, I've earned my gold star, but it doesn't pay my payroll.

Limiting CPG's on the Board of Directors feels somewhat like a dictatorship in that we are limited in our input into these changes, but forced to accept and abide by them. I would ask that requirement be given a bit more clarification I agree there should be better screening of applicants who are entering this career. I do not necessarily agree that a college degree makes a person more educationally prepared for this type of work unless the degree is in Social Work or Accounting. I am an example of a person without a degree, but with the drive and innate ability to be proficient in this type of work.

I believe a credit check is very good as it will allow the Board to potentially weed out possible financially unstable individuals. I support the disclosure of crimes! I believe further clarification is needed for bankruptcy as I assume there maybe flood victim families or medical catastrophies that may have caused some bankruptcy occurances. Many of the clients I work with specifically have been exploited and I am diligent in protecting them. I abhor the thought that a CPG may exploit a vulnerable person, but as in any field that possibility exists and I, for one, support all efforts to weed those individuals out, but I don't know if that is possible.

In closing I ask you consider all of input from the CPG's in the outlying areas who do a very good job for their clients, but do not enjoy the income of the larger urban areas. The cost of training and continued education would limit our ability to maintain our certification and perhaps even our businesses. Thank you.

Senior Guardianship Services, LLC
Michele Penberthy, CPG and Manager
PO Box 2670
Olympia, WA 98507-2670
360-943-7413