

## Faulk, Camilla

---

**From:** Dianne Klem [diannek@pugetsoundguardians.org]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 23, 2008 2:29 PM  
**To:** Faulk, Camilla  
**Cc:** youradvocates@comcast.net  
**Subject:** Proposed changes to: GR 23  
**Attachments:** Proposed Changes 4.21.08.doc

TO: Washington State Supreme Court  
RE: Proposed Changes to GR 23  
FROM: Puget Sound Guardians

Dear Camilla:

Attached please find Puget Sound Guardians comments to the proposed changes to GR 23. Please contact our office with any questions.

Sincerely,

Dianne Klem  
Executive Director  
CPG  
Puget Sound Guardians  
425 952 2600

**Proposed Changes**

**Puget Sound Guardian's Position**

<p>1. Limiting the Percentage of CPG's on CPG Board to 1/3 max.</p>	<p>Oppose: Since guardianship is such a specialized profession CPG's should make up the majority of the board with the following requirements: CPG's on the board should be practicing professional guardians with 5 years minimum experience with their primary work focus as a practicing guardian; It also seems reasonable that non-CPG board members should also have 5 years minimum experience in their own area of professional practice in association with guardianship matters so that they may have a better appreciation of the challenges that face practicing guardians on a daily basis.</p>
<p>2. Increasing the Formal Education Requirements for CPGs.</p>	<p>Support: The standard should be raised. Guardianship is a complex process requiring a vast base of knowledge and complex decision making experience. Future CPG improved requirements should include at a minimum an associates degree (preferably a bachelors degree) and 4 year work experience in the related field in addition to the certification program.</p>
<p>3. Requiring CPG applicants to submit personal credit reports to the Board;</p>	<p>Support: Only provide the credit score but not the private information included in a detailed credit report one time only at time of application.</p>
<p>4. Expanding Bankruptcy Disclosures by CPGs;</p>	<p>Support.</p>
<p>5. Expanding Disclosure for Crimes;</p>	<p>Clarification needed.</p>
<p>6. Allowing Longer Terms for Board Members;</p>	<p>Oppose.</p>
<p>7. Requiring New Sanction Disclosures for non-professional licenses;</p>	<p>Oppose—What is a non-professional license?</p>
<p>8. Reworking Public Disclosure of Board Records;</p>	<p>Support.</p>
<p>9. Setting Criteria for Board Member Conflicts of Interest; and</p>	<p>Support.</p>
<p>10. Narrowing the Definition of Experience Required for Certification.</p>	<p>Clarification needed. Oppose on the basis that the level of "decision making" or "independent judgment" is not described in the proposed change. This would provide more information as to the individuals level of responsibility to their client. (i.e. medical receptionist level of decision making vs. Nursing supervisor level.)</p>