



Certified Professional Guardianship Board Annual Planning Meeting

Monday, April 11, 2016 (9:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m.)
SeaTac Office Center, 18000 International Blvd., Suite 1106,
SeaTac, WA

Members Present

Judge James Lawler, Chair
Commissioner Rachelle Anderson
Ms. Rosslyn Bethmann
Dr. Barbara Cochrane
Mr. Jerald Fireman
Judge Gayle Harthcock
Mr. Bill Jaback
Ms. Victoria Kesala
Commissioner Diana Kiesel
Dr. K. Penney Sanders
Ms. Carol Sloan

Members Absent

Ms. Barbara West
Ms. Amanda Witthauer

UW Guardianship Certificate Program

Ms. Kate Lorenzen

Staff

Ms. Shirley Bondon
Ms. Kathy Bowman
Mr. Christopher Fournier
Ms. Carla Montejo
Ms. Kim Rood

1. Welcome, Introductions and Public Comments

Judge James Lawler welcomed all present for the public comment and dialog portion of the meeting in Lower Plaza (LP) 16 at 9:00 a.m. Board Members each took a moment to introduce themselves.

Following the discussion of a number of topics introduced by members of the public, Judge Lawler called a break at 11:00 a.m. and informed everyone that the regular Board Meeting would convene at 11:15 a.m. in Suite 1106.

Written comments provided by the public are located at the end of these minutes.

2. Meeting Called to Order

Judge Lawler called the regular Certified Professional Guardianship Board meeting to order at 11:15 am.

3. Chair's Report

Judge Lawler entertained a motion to approve the minutes of the March 13, 2017 meeting. A motion to approve the minutes was made and seconded. There were no corrections or additions. The minutes were approved. Ms. Bethmann abstained as she was not present at the March 13, 2017 meeting.

Motion: *A motion was made and seconded to approve the March 13, 2017 meeting minutes. The motion passed. Ms. Bethmann abstained.*

4. UW Guardianship Certificate Program Update

Kate Lorenzen, program manager for the UW Guardianship Certificate Program was present to report updates made to improve the three courses, including new articles and a review and revision of online course information. She reported that there continues to be a consistent pool of qualified applicants for Certificate Program. The Board inquired how applicants are informed about board requirements for certification. Ms. Lorenzen noted that the UW informs applicants during informational sessions that the UW Guardianship Certificate Program is independent of guardianship certification and applicants are encouraged to apply to the Board for guardianship certification before taking the UW Guardianship Certificate Program. Staff explained that the Board had recently approved guidelines about the credit score needed for certification. Staff agreed to share that guidance with Ms. Lorenzen.

A board member encouraged UW to give applicants a realistic outlook of the actual business of being a CPG, both timewise and financially. Staff recalled developing a list of tips that should help to provide a realistic outlook and agreed to send the tips to Ms. Lorenzen who was encouraged to give this information to applicants before they begin the Guardianship Certificate Program.

Ms. Lorenzen asked board members if they thought that too many applicants were completing the guardianship certificate program or if more guardians were needed. Board members indicated that more qualified guardians were needed. A board member inquired if UW would consider revising the program to include electronic delivery of the in-person portion of the Certificate Program in eastern Washington. Ms. Lorenzen recalled having both quality and connectivity issues when UW attempted distance training in the past and stated that UW wasn't optimistic that they could address the technology challenges at this time.

Judge Lawler asked and Ms. Lorenzen confirmed that the program covers "after death" issues such as probate, final reports and closing the guardianship. Ms. Lorenzen announced that Roxanne Ray will now be the new program manager.

Staff explained that a bill had been dropped and then not pursued during the Legislative Session that would have made the curriculum for the Guardianship Certificate Program public information. Apparently some members of the public wanted full access to the curriculum, which UW did not provide because the training materials were considered proprietary and thus exempt from release.

5. Executive Session (Closed to Public)

6. Reconvene and Vote on Executive Session Discussion (Open to Public)

Applications Committee

On behalf of the Applications Committee, Mr. Jaback presented the following applications for Board approval. Members of the Applications Committee abstained.

Motion: *A motion was made and seconded to approve Ilie Burcheci's application for certification, conditional upon completion of the UW Guardianship Program. The motion passed.*

Motion: *A motion was made and seconded to approve Kathrine Cooley's application for certification, conditional upon completion of the UW Guardianship Program. The motion passed.*

Motion: *A motion was made and seconded to deny Charles Hall's application for certification, due to lack of demonstrated financial responsibility and for failure to disclose information. The motion passed.*

Motion: *A motion was made and seconded to approve Julie Johnson's application for certification. The motion passed.*

Motion: *A motion was made and seconded to approve Nicole Jordan's application for certification, conditional upon completion of the UW Guardianship Program. The motion passed.*

Motion: *A motion was made and seconded to approve Michael Parrott's application for certification, conditional upon completion of the UW Guardianship Program. The motion passed.*

7. CPGs with Multiple Grievances

Staff explained that several CPGs had four or more pending grievances. Staff was becoming concerned and was trying to determine if a different investigative process should be developed for these circumstances. To address their concerns, staff requested guidance from the Board. Following discussion, the Board decided that CPGs with multiple grievances should follow the regular investigation process.

8. Ethics Advisory Opinions

Staff reported that board members had agreed to discuss reconvening the Ethics Advisory Committee. Staff provided a brief history of Ethic Advisory Opinions. Generally, Ethics Advisory Opinions should be case specific, fact-based and apply to a single person. Standards of Practice are written more broadly.

Ethics Advisory Opinions are usually not binding, but if followed, can provide evidence of an individual's intent to follow a recognized process. The opinion and name of the requestor for an advisory opinion cannot be withheld per administrative public records

regulation GR 31.1. A board member indicated that they were not sure that the Board should be involved in writing ethics advisory opinions. This seemed inconsistent with the Board's regulatory mission. Staff referred the Board to Attachment E of the meeting materials. There is a conflict between Regulation 301.3 and GR 31.1, regarding whether the name of the requestor could be withheld. This conflict and others have not been corrected because the Board is reluctant to make changes to the SOPs; however, GR 31.1 supersedes Regulation 301.3.

9. Proposed Standard of Practice Posted for Public Comment

WINGS submitted a proposed standard of practice that would prohibit a CPG from serving as the court-appointed guardian in a case he or she investigated as a Title 11 GAL. The Board published this proposed SOP for comment. Comments were all over the board. Most respondents believed CPGs should not serve as the court-appointed guardian in a case he or she investigated as a Title 11 GAL. However, some recognized that many courts feel they have no other options due to the shortage of individuals qualified and willing to serve as a guardian in rural counties. Judge Lawler stated that it is incumbent on the courts to assure that the reason for assigning guardianship to a GAL is well documented in the record. The Board took no action on the proposed standard of practice.

10. Grievances

Staff presented the annual 2016 Grievance Report to the Board. Judge Lawler confirmed that while the number of grievances closed in 2016 is higher than usual, the number of grievances received in 2016 was also higher. The new Diversion process was discussed, with the Board asking about the timing, and status of agreements with mediators and auditors. Staff reported that the program was on track and would begin with court reporting audits, which can be done in house. Approximately 35 grievances have been determined as appropriate for diversion or dismissal.

11. Disciplinary Regulation 500

After spending approximately five years revising Regulation 500, the Board is now ready to post it for public comment. Because the changes are significant, using tracked changes was not possible. The regulation would not be readable if tracked changes was used, so a clean copy and a side-by-side comparison of the existing regulation and the proposed regulation will be posted for public comment. Comments will be accepted at any time on sections, although discussion will focus on specific sections that are identified in the schedule provided.

12. Wrap Up and Adjourn

Judge Lawler thanked AOC Extern Christopher Fournier for his work with the Board. Mr. Fournier's externship will come to an end on May 4. As there was no other

business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:25 pm. The next Certified Professional Guardianship Meeting will take place via teleconference on May 8, 2017 at 8:00 am.

Recap of Motions from April 10, 2017 Meeting

Motion Summary	Status
Motion: <i>A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the March 13, 2017 teleconference. The motion passed.</i>	<i>Passed</i>
Motion: <i>A motion was made and seconded to approve Ilie Burcheci's application for certification, conditional upon completion of the UW Guardianship Program. The motion passed.</i>	<i>Passed</i>
Motion: <i>A motion was made and seconded to approve Kathrine Cooley's application for certification, conditional upon completion of the UW Guardianship Program. The motion passed.</i>	<i>Passed</i>
Motion: <i>A motion was made and seconded to deny Charles Hall's application for certification due to lack of demonstrated financial responsibility; and due to failure to disclose information. The motion passed.</i>	<i>Passed</i>
Motion: <i>A motion was made and seconded to approve Julie Johnson's application for certification. The motion passed.</i>	<i>Passed</i>
Motion: <i>A motion was made and seconded to approve Nicole Jordan's application for certification, conditional upon completion of the UW Guardianship Program. The motion passed.</i>	<i>Passed</i>
Motion: <i>A motion was made and seconded to approve Michael Parrott's application for certification, conditional upon completion of the UW Guardianship Program. The motion passed.</i>	<i>Passed</i>

Guests Present: Mr. Tom Goldsmith
 Mr. Mike Parrott
 Ms. Mindi Blanchard
 Ms. Claudia Donnelly

Public Comments

Materials submitted by Claudia Donnelly

1 individual needs and wishes. The legislature also recognizes that
2 these services are less expensive than guardianship for the state,
3 the courts, and for individuals with limited capacity and their
4 families.

5 Sec. 2. RCW 2.72.010 and 2007 c 364 s 2 are each amended to read
6 as follows:

7 The definitions in this section apply throughout this chapter
8 unless the context clearly requires otherwise.

9 (1) "Office" means the office of public guardianship.

10 (2) "Public guardian" means an individual or entity providing
11 public guardianship services.

12 (3) "Public guardianship services" means the services provided by
13 a guardian or limited guardian appointed under chapters 11.88 and
14 11.92 RCW, who is compensated under a contract with the office of
15 public guardianship.

16 (4) "Long-term care services" means services provided through the
17 department of social and health services either in a hospital or
18 skilled nursing facility, or in another setting under a home and
19 community-based waiver authorized under 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1396n.

20 (5) "Supported decision-making assistance" means support for an
21 individual with diminished decision-making ability in making
22 decisions affecting health or safety or to manage financial affairs.
23 Assistance includes, without limitation, acting as a representative
24 payee, an attorney-in-fact, a trustee, and a public guardian.

25 (6) "Representative payee" means the designated agent for a
26 recipient of government benefits whom a government agency has
27 determined to be incapable of managing his or her benefits.

28 (7) "Attorney-in-fact" means an agent authorized by an individual
29 to act on his or her behalf pursuant to a power of attorney.

30 (8) "Trustee" means a person or organization named in a trust
31 agreement to handle trust property for the benefit of one or more
32 beneficiaries in accordance with the terms of the agreement.

33 Sec. 3. RCW 2.72.020 and 2007 c 364 s 3 are each amended to read
34 as follows:

35 (1) There is created an office of public guardianship within the
36 administrative office of the courts.

37 (2) The supreme court shall appoint a public guardianship
38 administrator to establish and administer a public guardianship.

RCW 11.92.190

Detention of person in residential placement facility against will prohibited —
Effect of court order — Service of notice of residential placement.

No residential treatment facility which provides nursing or other care may detain a person within such facility against their will. Any court order, other than an order issued in accordance with the involuntary treatment provisions of chapters 10.77, 71.05, and 72.23 RCW, which purports to authorize such involuntary detention or purports to authorize a guardian or limited guardian to consent to such involuntary detention on behalf of an incapacitated person shall be void and of no force or effect. This section does not apply to the detention of a minor as provided in chapter 70.96A or 71.34 RCW.

Nothing in this section shall be construed to require a court order authorizing placement of an incapacitated person in a residential treatment facility if such order is not otherwise required by law: PROVIDED, That notice of any residential placement of an incapacitated person shall be served, either before or after placement, by the guardian or limited guardian on such person, the guardian ad litem of record, and any attorney of record.

[1996 c 249 § 11; 1977 ex.s. c 309 § 14.]

RCW 71.05.040

Detention or judicial commitment of persons with developmental disabilities, impaired by chronic alcoholism or drug abuse, or suffering from dementia.

Persons who are developmentally disabled, impaired by chronic alcoholism or drug abuse, or suffering from dementia shall not be detained for evaluation and treatment or judicially committed solely by reason of that condition unless such condition causes a person to be gravely disabled or as a result of a mental disorder such condition exists that constitutes a likelihood of serious harm: Provided however, That persons who are developmentally disabled, impaired by chronic alcoholism or drug abuse, or suffering from dementia and who otherwise meet the criteria for detention or judicial commitment are not ineligible for detention or commitment based on this condition alone.

[2004 c 166 § 2; 1997 c 112 § 4; 1987 c 439 § 1; 1977 ex.s. c 80 § 41; 1975 1st ex.s. c 199 § 1; 1974 ex.s. c 145 § 5; 1973 1st ex.s. c 142 § 9.]

Notes:

From: Michael/Claudia Donnelly <thedonnelys@oo.net>
Subject: **Fwd: [nngp] Raven Versus DSHS opinion**
Date: October 20, 2013 9:57:36 AM PDT

Begin forwarded message:

The Seattle Times

Local News

[Low-graphic news index](#) | [Mobile site](#)

Friday, July 19, 2013 - Page updated at 09:00 p.m.

Court: Not forcing nursing care isn't neglect

By **DONNA GORDON BLANKINSHIP**
The Associated Press

The Washington Supreme Court on Thursday ruled that the guardian of an elderly Pierce County woman was not negligent when she didn't force her into a nursing home against her wishes. The court explained in the unanimous ruling that even if the bed-bound woman could have gotten better care in such an institution, she should not have been forced to move into one. Following her wishes was not neglect.

In a unanimous ruling, the Supreme Court reversed a decision by the Washington Court of Appeals, citing the Legislature's mandate against placing incapacitated persons against their will.

The court did not agree with the guardian, however, that she was entitled to be reimbursed for her attorney's fees. The justices said the Department of Social and Health Services was justified in its investigation, but incorrect in its findings.

The guardian's attorney, Jeff Crollard, said he thought the Supreme Court decision will be a good guide for guardians in the future.

"I think, in a very sensitive and comprehensive way, the court affirmed the difficulty of the circumstances," he said. "I don't think she (Resa Raven, the plaintiff) acted perfectly, but I think she did a

pretty darn good job.”

The Department of Social and Health Services said the case highlights the challenges of caring for the elderly.

“The justices indicated that everyone concerned was sincerely acting with the best interests of this elderly woman at heart,” DSHS spokesman Thomas Shapley said. “It’s an opportunity for all of us to think about and plan for how we will care for our family elders and how we will want to be cared for ourselves.”

The elderly woman, whom the court calls Ida in its ruling, is described as a retired nurse with a long history of independence and reliance on naturopathic and alternative medicine. Since a fall that fractured a bone in her knee, she had suffered from chronic pain as well as several serious and debilitating ailments.

“Ida was resistant to medical care and was combative, violent, hostile and uncooperative with her caregivers,” Justice Debra L. Stephens wrote in the court’s opinion on *Resa Raven v.*

Department of Social and Health Services. Her medical history shows ups and downs, including medical crises and episodes of neglect.

She was assigned a guardian, Resa Raven, in 2004, at the age of 83. After reviewing her medical history and talking with Ida and her family, the guardian identified in the ruling as Raven determined that when Ida was competent, she consistently refused to be placed in a nursing home or other long-term-care facility.

Ida’s health and health care continued to be inconsistent and her behavior continued to be combative, which made keeping caregivers more challenging.

“One of the difficulties of this case from the perspective of Ida’s care team is that Ida often required more care than could be delivered in a home setting,” Stephens wrote.

“But in matters of consent, though a ward may choose a course of action that would strike many as unreasonable, if the guardian can determine that the ward would choose such an action if competent, the guardian is bound to advocate for that position.”

Raven sued the state after DSHS determined she had failed as a guardian and neglected Ida.

The Supreme Court ruling cites previous cases that endorsed a similar ruling, including a decision from 1984 in which a guardian sought a court ruling to force a woman to have a laryngectomy for

cancer treatment instead of her preference for radiation. The court ruled that even though the guardian's preference was more likely to be a successful treatment, it would also likely cause her to lose her vocal chords. The goal was to do what the individual would want if she were competent and understand her options, not what most people would do or what the court believes is the wise thing to do.

nngp mailing list
nngp@argate.net
<http://www.argate.net/mailman/listinfo/nngp>

WHAT IS A GUARDIAN PROHIBITED FROM DOING?

A Guardian May Not Force an Incapacitated Person to Stay in a Particular Residential Setting

A guardian of the person is responsible for selecting, and if necessary advocating for, a safe and appropriate residence for the IP. In order to carry out this duty the guardian must do some research and learn what residential options are available in the local community. There will normally be a continuum of choices ranging from independent living in a private home to supported living in an assisted living facility, group home or even a skilled nursing facility. The guardian must be familiar with the IP's level of functioning in order to determine the appropriate residential setting. It will be important to know whether the IP will need assistance with preparing meals, personal hygiene or managing medications.

It will be important to confer with the IP to determine his or her current preferences. The IP's current preferences should be honored if doing so will not put him or her at risk of harm. If possible, the guardian should try to determine what choice the IP would make if he or she knew all the present facts and circumstances and still had the capacity to make sound decisions. This might be the case when the IP had capacity through most of his or her life and voiced clear opinions on the subject. However, it is not always possible to obtain this information, such as when the IP has lacked capacity since birth.

A guiding principle is that the guardian must always select the least restrictive residential arrangement that will be safe and appropriate to meet the IP's needs. This may mean leaving the IP where they are, moving them to a more restrictive environment or perhaps even to a less restrictive environment. The goal is to preserve the maximum amount of freedom and independence for the IP while still keeping him or her safe from harm.

There are resources that can assist you in supporting the person in the least restrictive setting. See "Stay Right Where You Are: Resources for Seniors and Adults with Disabilities Living at Home in Washington State".

A guardian must understand that he or she can only go so far in securing a safe and appropriate residence for the IP. A guardian cannot force the IP to stay in a particular residential setting. The IP is free to leave and may not be locked in or physically restrained from leaving. A special statute (RCW 11.92.190) gives the IP a right not to be detained against his or her will in a residential care facility.

In certain limited situations the guardian may pursue other remedies in order to keep the IP safe. If an IP, as a result of a mental disorder, is acting in a way that presents a danger to him or herself or others or they are gravely disabled from effective self-care, the IP may be detained in a psychiatric facility for evaluation and treatment. Under the Involuntary Treatment Act, the guardian may initiate this process by requesting an evaluation by a county Designated Mental Health professional. There are strict due process protections for the IP in this proceeding, such as the right to be represented by an attorney and to have a jury trial before any extended detention is imposed. Additionally, if the IP is choosing to live with a predatory individual who is exploiting or abusing him or her, the guardian may petition for a Vulnerable Adult Protection Order on behalf of the IP. If successful, this may resolve the residential conflict by ordering the predator to not have any further contact with the IP.

Clearly, things can get complicated if the guardian and the IP don't agree on a safe and appropriate residential setting. If, as guardian, you are not sure how to carry out your duty to select a safe and appropriate residence for the IP, it might be wise for you to consult with an attorney and/or seek guidance from the court by filing a Petition for Instructions. [A form is available on the court website] In light of the rights and freedoms retained by a person subject to guardianship, the guardian cannot be expected to guarantee a safe and appropriate residence for the IP. The guardian must simply use his or her best efforts within the limits of the law.

A Guardian May Not Consent to Some Medical Procedures without a Court Order

While the guardian of the person may consent to most types of medical treatment, there are four medical procedures that require special attention:

1. electro-convulsive therapy;
2. psychosurgery, such as a lobotomy
3. psychotropic medication or mental health procedures that restrict physical freedom of movement; and
4. reproductive surgery, such as sterilization.

In any of these cases, the guardian must seek instructions from the court. The court will want to know the:

1. prognosis if no treatment is provided;
2. prognosis if one treatment is chosen over another;
3. risk of adverse side effects from the proposed treatments;
4. intrusiveness or severity of the proposed treatments;
5. incapacitated person's ability to cooperate and assist with post-treatment therapy;

6. incapacitated person's religious or moral views regarding medical care or the dying process; and
7. wishes of family or friends, if those wishes would influence the incapacitated person's decision.

The Court may consider what most people would do in similar circumstances, but this should not be regarded as controlling.

Grievance Status Reports

CERTIFIED PROFESSIONAL GUARDIAN GRIEVANCES
April 30, 2017

Investigations	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	Total
Grievances Needing Investigation: 3/31/2017	16	69	20	12	1	118
Resolved w/o ARD or Hearing		[8]				
Resolved w/ARD						
Resolved w/Hearing						
New Grievances (Opened Since Last Report)	6					
Grievances Needing Investigation: 4/30/2017	22	61	20	12	1	116

Resolutions	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	Total
Dismissal – No Jurisdiction						
Dismissal – No Actionable Conduct						
Dismissal – Administrative						
Voluntary Surrender		8				
Admonishment						
Reprimand						
Suspension						
Administrative Decertification						
Decertification						
Closed Since Last Report	0	8	0	0	0	8

Pending Grievances Involving Guardians with Multiple Grievances
April 30, 2017

CPG ID	Year Certified	Grievances	Year(s) Grievances Received	Status
A	2015	4	2016 (3), 2017 (1)	
B	2011	5	2014 (1), 2016 (3), 2017 (1)	
C	2002	2	2014 (1), 2016 (1)	
D	2010	2	2016 (1), 2017 (1)	
E	2011	2	2015 (1), 2016 (1)	
F	2005	4	2014 (2), 2015 (1), 2016 (1)	
G	2004	2	2015 (1), 2017 (1)	
H	2014	3	2015 (1), 2016 (1), 2017 (1)	
I	2012	4	2016 (3), 2017 (1)	
J	2004	2	2016 (2)	
K	2010	8	2015 (1), 2016 (5), 2017 (2)	
L	2001	3	2014 (1), 2015 (1), 2016 (1)	
M	2011	2	2015 (1), 2016 (1)	
N	2003	2	2015 (2)	
O	2003	3	2015 (1), 2016 (2)	
P	2007	4	2015 (1), 2016 (2), 2017 (1)	
Q	2010	3	2014 (1), 2015 (1), 2017 (1)	
R	2003	2	2016 (2)	
S	2001	2	2016 (2)	
T	2001	9	2015 (1) 2016 (8)	
U	2001	2	2014 (1), 2016 (1)	
V	2007	2	2016 (2)	
W	2007	2	2016 (1), 2017 (1)	
X	2014	3	2015 (1), 2016 (1), 2017 (1)	
Y	2001	2	2016 (2)	
Z	2015	2	2016 (1), 2017 (1)	
AA	2013	2	2016 (1), 2017 (1)	
AB	2010	2	2015 (1), 2016 (1)	

Total 85

Pending Grievances Involving Guardians with Multiple Grievances
 April 30, 2017

	Year Certified	# of Guardians
Before UW Certificate Program 122	2001	5
	2002	1
	2003	3
	2004	2
	2005	1
	2006	
	2007	3
	2008	
	Total	15
UW Certificate Program 147		
	2009	
	2010	4
	2011	3
	2012	1
	2013	1
	2014	2
	2015	2
	2016	
	Total	13

Year	Grievance by Year
2013	
2014	7
2015	15
2016	49
2017	14

UW Guardianship Certificate Program
Contract Renewal



Certified Professional Guardianship Board

Date: May 1, 2017

To: Certified Professional Guardianship Board

From: Education Committee

Re: University of Washington Certificate Program and Continuing Education –
Contract Renewal

The following is a report with recommendations to the Certified Professional Guardianship Board (Board) on the UW Guardianship Certification program based on materials received from the University of Washington Continuum College. The Board's contract with the UW ends in August 2017. The Education Committee has evaluated the program offered during the period covered in this contract, October 2014 to May 31, 2017.

Kate Lorenzen, Assistant Director of Academic Programs at the UW Continuum College provided the following attached documentation:

- **2016 UW Guardianship Certificate Revision**
- **CPG Board Handout April 2017**
- **UW Guardianship Certificate Course Summary Reports**

Guardian 101	Autumn Term 2014	Leesa Arthur
Guardian 101	Autumn Term 2014	Jamie Shirley
Guardian 102	Winter Term 2015	Kathryn Sanders
Guardian 103	Spring Term 2015	Kathryn Sanders
Guardian 101A	Autumn Term 2015	Jamie Shirley
Guardian 101A	Autumn Term 2015	Kathryn Sanders
Guardian 102A	Winter Term 2016	Jamie Shirley
Guardian 103A	Spring Term 2016	Jamie Shirley
Guardian 103A	Spring Term 2016	Kathryn Sanders
Guardian 101A	Autumn Term 2016	Jamie Shirley
- **Exit Survey Open Ended Questions Prog 4623 Spring 2015**
(Part I and II)
- **Exit Survey Statistics for Prog 4623 Spring 2015**
- **Guardian 101A Jamie Shirley Comment Package Autumn 2015**

Discussion of UW Materials:

2016 UW Guardianship Certificate Revision

This document summarizes the scope of work that was needed to revise the UW Guardianship Certificate program for 2016 to 2017.

CPG Board Handout April 2017

The program provided information on Enrollment Statistics, Student Demographics, Course Evaluations, Travel Stipend, Curriculum Review, Instructors, and addressed Information about the CPG Profession.

The Curriculum Review explains that for the 2016-2017 year the school has implemented a full program revision of the curriculum and course flow to ensure that everything is “up-to-date”, accurate and consistent. An increased use of video recordings and online tools have also been added.

UW Guardianship Certificate Course Summary Reports

Ms. Lorenzen explained that program management felt that there was an inconsistency with providing both numeric and narrative evaluations for both instructors for 2014-15. The program shifted away from doing any narrative in 2015-16. Ms. Lorenzen also explained that in 2016 the program tried to lessen the burden on students by having them evaluate Ms. Shirley only in the Autumn, and Ms. Arthur only in the Winter. The program did have the students evaluate both instructors in the Spring. She stated that in the future, the program will go back to evaluating both instructors each quarter. Ms. Lorenzen indicated that no narrative evaluations were returned for Ms. Shirley’s class in the Autumn of 2016. She also pointed out that the University of Washington Continuing Education program does not make instructor or program evaluation mandatory, so often only a small percentage of student’s complete evaluations.

Ms. Lorenzen did not provide copies of numeric evaluations for all instructors for each quarter in which these instructors were purportedly evaluated. AOC requested the evaluations and Ms. Lorenzen said that staff would look for them, but nothing further was provided. The school only provided narrative evaluations for two classes. These were given in 2015.

Generally, most student scores for the courses were in the higher ratings of Excellent, Very Good and Good. The UW reported the median rating of the four global summative items on each course summary report. AOC took the median of those ratings, which was 3.9. “Very Good” was a 4, so this rating was between “Good” and “Very Good”, very close to the higher rating. The UW also addressed the median ratings for the courses in the hand-out provided to the Board at its April meeting, where the average scores were also quite high, ranging from 3.4 and 4.9.

AOC prepared rating summaries of all of the UW course summaries, focusing on the areas needing improvement. It has set out the ratings in the “Fair”, “Poor”, and “Very Poor” areas. Factors that received two or more ratings have been highlighted. AOC

also added comments regarding the ratings at the end of each form, which are included in the materials.

The following received multiple lower ratings in multiple class evaluations:

- Availability of extra help when needed.
- Use of class time.
- Reasonableness of assigned work.
- Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements.
- Evaluative and grading techniques.
- Amount you learned.

Exit Survey Open Ended Questions Prog 4623 Spring 2015

Instructor 1

Ten individuals out of twenty-four class members submitted narrative responses to ten open-ended questions. These questions were not identical to those in the exit questionnaire given at the end of the Spring class, although the information sought was similar.

Those students responding provided various comments, with little commonality. However, the comments were similar to responses given to other questions, or in the comments made to the questions posed at the end of the Autumn Term. These responses are set out in the discussion on the Autumn Term comments below.

The first question was “What do you wish had been included in the program but was not?” Students wished for more practice oriented material, such as cases that could be worked on together during live classes. One student said that he or she would like more field trips to the court house. A student requested set office hours for instructors, either by phone or online.

The second question was “For any program aspects that did not meet your expectations, please describe your most important concern”. One student commented that some guests spoke at excessive length. Some students wanted more class discussion, while others felt that it was more valuable to have instruction.

One student felt there were errors in the homework materials students were given, and faulted the program for not teaching more about the legal requirements imposed on guardians. One response indicated that some updating of course materials was needed. There was also one comment that the “website organization was difficult”. This concern was raised by only one student. It should be noted that these comments were made prior to the course revision of 2016-2017. It is unknown if these concerns are now addressed.

The next question that solicited information about the course was “Which of the instructors in this program, if any, exhibited truly outstanding performance and would you recommend that they be recognized for a teaching excellence award? “This

question did not appear in the Autumn questionnaire, nor was there any question which solicited similar information. Students indicated that both Instructors 2 and 3 were excellent instructors.

The last question soliciting comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the course was “[W]e welcome additional comments that will assist us in future offerings of the program.” One student commented that CPGs she contacted for help during the course mentioned that the course materials failed to provide enough information about the client for decisions to be made on their behalf, and as a consequence that there was a lot of “spinning of wheels” in trying to complete an assignment. This student also commented on the guest speakers, indicating that they “did not add value to the program”. Finally, she said that for anyone asking about the program it was her opinion it would not be worth the time and investment to start up a business as a sole proprietor given the little that could be earned as a CPG.

Comment Cover Sheet Guardian 101A Instructor 2 Autumn 2015

There were thirty-five (35) students enrolled in this class; thirty (30) provided narrative responses to a four-question, open-ended questionnaire.

The first question was whether the participant found the class stimulating. Twenty-two (22) answered in the affirmative, five (5) gave a negative response, and three (3) did not respond either yes or no (two said “somewhat”). It appeared from the comments that those with more experience found the class less stimulating or challenging.

In response to the question as to what aspects of the class the participants had found most useful, four individuals found the “accounting” or other fiscal course content very valuable. One participant said that they would recommend more such material be taught in the course.

Two participants felt the field trip was very useful, and another two felt that the ethics discussions were particularly helpful. There were comments indicating that speaker discussions regarding their experiences with clients were helpful and that they would like more such information, but other participants felt that anecdotal information was a waste of their time. Some liked class discussions, but others commented that often discussions were too lengthy and not necessarily on point.

Some participants liked the “multi-modal” aspect of the instruction, with some “live” classroom time and some online learning. Some wanted more class time, and others less. Some commented on the geographic barrier presented by having classes held only in Seattle.

In response to an inquiry as to what aspects of the class detracted most, several participants (four) felt that the classroom was too noisy. Apparently the class was held near a child care early learning center.

One respondent said that the public program materials, including information on long term care, needed updating. Several wanted more information about the time

demands, of both of the course and of individual assignments. Several respondents commented on the fact that they were working and had multiple demands on their time.

Some respondents felt that there was too much “legalese”. The recommendation had been made by students at the time of the last program review in 2014 that advance instruction on terms used in the class (and field) be given to better equip class members to understand. See Recommendation below regarding a “glossary”.

Education Committee Recommendations and Requests

Evaluations

- Use consistent evaluation tools (both numerical and narrative) over time and in all classes. Provide these to the Board.
- Advise Board how evaluations are carried out, including steps taken to increase their return (e.g. last class day, online?). For example, exit evaluations could be given prior to the end of the last in-person class with time allowed to complete the forms.

Instruction

- Students continue to express concern that class time is not used well. Identify and prepare guest speakers to better meet the program goals. Instructors need to better guide and monitor the speakers and student discussion. As in the last Board recommendations, the program should establish and re-enforce student ground rules for in-class presentation.
- Students in the 2015 sessions continued to voice concern about errors in the materials and the need for updates. In addition, students felt that the homework assignments lacked information necessary to complete the assignments in a reasonable period of time. The numerical evaluations also reflect student concern about insufficient clarity as to student responsibilities. The program is to better prepare students for the time commitments involved and develop more in-depth factual background for case problems.
- The program apparently did not timely implement the CPGB’s May 2014 recommendations to review and revise materials, and instead initiated implementation for the 2016-2017 course year, such that it is not possible to determine the effectiveness of these changes. The program is to act promptly to implement Board’s recommendations.
- Students also said that the website organization was problematic. The UW Continuum program is to report to the Board its understanding of the concern and steps taken to address it.
- Both students and program management commented on the students’ desire to know more about the nuts and bolts of guardianship work and the economic feasibility of the career. More information about accounting, fiscal management and feasibility, and record keeping is to be provided. Describe what steps are being taken to emphasize practical aspects of guardianship work.
- The Board was unclear as to the nature and goals of group work assignments that students commented on. If this information is not included in the course

syllabus (requested in an April 25, 2017 email) provide an explanation about what group work assignments are required, their learning outcomes, rationale for group versus individual work, and steps taken to ensure that evaluations of group work also reflects individual performance.

- Students recommended that a glossary be developed and provided to students so they share a common vocabulary. Students continued to voice concern about “legalese”. Advise the Board on steps taken to develop a glossary, including timelines for its completion and steps for enhancing student awareness of and access to this resource.
- Identify procedures used to facilitate interactions with students needing assistance (e.g. office hours, in-person or phone based appointments). Students should be informed about these procedures at the beginning of each course. Each instructor will set procedures to facilitate individual student contact for assistance and will share these with students at the beginning of each course.
- Given that some students wanted more connection with other students, explain to the Board what systems are in place for students to communicate with one another, and what additional opportunities will be provided for students to connect, e.g. interested students sign up for lunch groups on live class days.

Proposal:

That the University of Washington Continuum College provide a response to the Board’s recommendations and requests within three months of receipt.

That the University of Washington Continuum College report on implementation within one year of receipt of the Board’s recommendations.

That the University of Washington Continuum College provide resumes for all instructors, syllabus for all courses, and student evaluations of all courses completed to that point six months in advance of the expiration of the contract.