



Certified Professional Guardian Board Meeting

Monday, May 14, 2012 (8:00 am – 9:00 am)

Conference Call

Meeting Minutes

Chair

Judge James Lawler

Members Absent

Judge Robert Swisher

Judge Sally Olsen

Nancy Dapper

Members Present

Robin Balsam

Gary Beagle

Dr. Barbara Cochran

William Jaback

Chris Neil

Emily Rogers

Prof. Winsor Schmidt

Carol Sloan

Comm. Joseph Valente

Emily Rogers

Staff

Shirley Bondon

Katrin Johnson

Kim Rood

Carol Smith

Public

Tom Goldsmith

1. Call to Order

Judge Lawler called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

2. Board Business

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Chris Neil commented that on page six, #5 Standards and Practice Committee should be Regulations Committee.

Motion: *A motion was made and seconded to approve the April meeting minutes with the correction referenced above. The motion passed.*

Chair Report: Judge Lawler reported that there will two vacancies on the Board soon and a nominating committee was needed to review letters of persons interested in replacing outgoing members. The Board also received an appeal of a denied application and an Appeals Panel was needed. Judge Lawler appointed Commissioner Valente, Judge Windsor and Gary Beagle to serve on the nominating committee. Nancy Dapper, Judge Swisher and Chris Neil were appointed to the Appeals Panel.

Judge Lawler reported that he, Commissioner Valente and Commissioner Grovdahl gave a presentation on Guardianship at the Superior Court Judges' Association Spring Conference that was well attended and well received. The presentation was developed to help judges understand a little more about certified professional guardians and the grievance procedures

and they talked to them about monitoring.

3. Applications Committee Report

The applications committee was charged to visit Regulation 100. Bill Jaback said that at the last meeting they had gone over the significant changes to applications regulations and the committee had recommended breaking out the recertification regulations from the application regulations. Most of those changes were generally approved, although not approved for implementation. The committee met a few weeks ago to review the proposed edits by the Board. Recommended revisions are as follows:

102. Definitions

The first of the minor edits, is paragraph 102.3 citing a new definition for “conditional approval”. Commissioner Valente asked if are there any other circumstance where the board would provide conditional approval other than attending and completing the UW program. Mr. Jaback said that was discussed at the committee level and there was one scenario that hadn’t yet occurred, but was possible. An applicant who completed the UW program and submitted an application might have filed bankruptcy and the board might elect to provide conditional approval upon documentation of bondability. That was one example; other than that they were coming up a little short.

A board member asked the intent of conditional approval. Mr. Jaback said he thought the intent was to codify a term the board was already using.

A board member suggested adding a statement clarifying that conditional approval does not allow an applicant to indicate they are certified or conditionally certified. It gives the wrong impression.

Ms. Bondon indicated that without the conditional approval they can accept two cases without being certified.

A board member stated that applicants shouldn’t be marketing themselves as being conditionally approved.

Mr. Jaback suggested adding language to the conditional approval definition to not allow any applicant to identify him/herself as a certified professional guardian or conditionally approved certified professional guardian.

Revising 102.3. Substitute does not “authorize” (in place of “allow”), and after the word guardian add, “or conditionally approved certified professional guardian”.

103. Qualifications

Proposed Changes to 103.2: Provide additional clarity as to where applicants can find information about the approved CPG training course by cross referencing this with section 108.

104-5. Application “for Certification”

Adding the words: “For certification” to (1) the title of section 104, “Filing Application for Certification” and (2) to the title of section 105, “Initial Review and Verification of Applications for Certification.”

105. Initial Review and Verification of Applications

Revision to 105.1. The purpose of the edits in this section is to streamline the review process. If an application is submitted and it isn't complete, AOC staff may reject the application, but may not deny. If rejected by staff for being incomplete, the application isn't reviewed or contemplated by the applications committee or the Board.

Revision to 105.2. Verification of Application replaces the word rejection deletes “denial of rejection of that application”.

106. Processing of Application

Adding the words “for Certification” to the title.

Revising 106.2.2. Adding the words “or conditional approval”. The board shall approve the application for certification or conditional approval.

Addition to 106.3. Approval of an agency application. This regulation would allow AOC staff to approve agency applications that meet Regulation requirements. If staff recommends denial of an agency application, the denial must be decided on by the Applications committee or CPG Board.

107. Right to Appeal of Denial of Certification

Adding “or Conditional Approval” to the title.

Revising 107.3. Adding “or conditional approval.”

Revising 107.4.10. Application Committee proposed striking the language “and no further evidence may be submitted to the board”, as this was believed to be limit the scope of material that staff and Board members may contribute in the appeal process.

108. Training

Remove the reference to the specific name of the U of WA Guardianship certificate program. To keep more general, change to a program that has been approved by the Board.

Motion – *A motion was made and properly seconded to approve all changes on regulation 100 and post for comment. The motion passed.*

Ms. Katrin Johnson said the certified **Certification Maintenance Regulations** needed to be posted for comment. She said, based on the discussion during the April board meeting, the Applications Regulations had divided into two regulations – Applications Regulations for those applying for certification and the Certification Maintenance Regulations specifying the ongoing obligations of certified guardians and agencies. There were no suggested edits at the face to face meeting.

Motion: *A motion was made and properly seconded to approve all changes on Regulation 700 and post for comment. The motion passed.*

The Board paused for a brief break.

4. Regulations Committee Report

Mr. Chris Neil presented the proposal for modification to SOP 410.2. He said they received public comments and the comments were supportive.

Motion: *A motion was made and properly seconded to approve modification to 410.2. The motion passed.*

5. Executive Session – Board members only

6. Applications Committee

Committee recommended denying the application for certification of Rubin Lester Carter for failure to provide a complete application.

Motion: *A motion was made and properly seconded to deny application for certification. The motion passed.*

Committee recommended approving the application for certification of Sam Maleski.

Motion: *A motion was made and properly seconded to approve application for certification. The motion passed.*

Committee recommended denying the application for certification of Richard Georgescu for failure to provide a complete application.

Motion: *A motion was made and properly second to deny application for certification. The motion passed.*

Committee recommended denying application for certification of Renee Roberson for failure to provide a complete application and respond to requests for information from Katrin Johnson.

Motion: *A motion was made and properly seconded to deny application for certification. The motion passed.*

7. Standard of Practice Committee

Commissioner Valente reported:

The Standards and Practice Committee recommended acceptance of an Agreement Regarding Discipline in grievance 2011-014, Steve Groom.

Motion: *A motion was made and properly seconded to approve the Agreement Regarding Discipline. The motion passed.*

The Standard of Practice Committee recommended approval of the Memorandum of

Agreement for monitoring in grievance 2011-012, James Christnacht.

Motion: A motion was made and properly seconded to approve Memorandum of Agreement for the monitoring contract in grievance 2011-012.
The motion passed.

8. Adjourn

Judge Lawler noted the next meeting will be an in person meeting on Monday, June 11, 2012. Judge Lawler adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:00 a.m.

Recap of Motions from May 14, 2012 Meeting

Motion Summary	Status
Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the meeting minutes from the April meeting.	Passed
Motion: A motion was made and seconded to post Regulation 100 for public comment.	Passed
Motion: A motion was made and seconded to post Regulation 701 for public comment.	Passed
Motion: A motion was made and seconded to post SOP 410.1 for public comment.	Passed
Motion: A motion was made and seconded to deny application for certification from Rubin Lester Carter.	Passed
Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve application for certification from Sam Maleski.	Passed
Motion: A motion was made and seconded to deny application for certification from Richard Georgescu.	Passed
Motion: A motion was made and seconded to deny application for certification from Renee Roberson.	Passed
Motion: A motion was made and seconded to accept the agreement regarding discipline with the admonishment of Steve Groom	Passed
Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the Memorandum of Agreement for monitoring in grievance 2011 012.	Passed

Action Items for Next Meeting

Action Item	Who	Status
Follow-up with Nancy regarding nominating Committee.	Ms. Bondon	Complete