



# Oregon

John A. Kitzhaber, MD, Governor

## Board of Massage Therapists

748 Hawthorne Ave NE

Salem, OR 97301

Phone: (503) 365-8657

Fax: (503) 385-4465

[www.oregon.gov/OBMT](http://www.oregon.gov/OBMT)

## EDUCATION/SCOPE OF PRACTICE COMMITTEE MEETING

April 8, 2011

OBMT Office

### Attendance

#### Committee Members:

Lisa Barck Garofalo, LMT, **Chair**

Nick Chrones, LMT

John Combe, LMT

#### Board Members & Staff:

David Fredrickson, LMT, Board Liaison

Kate Coffey, Executive Director

Diana Nott, Compliance Coordinator

**Public:** Pam Pennington, LMT

**Call to Order** - Garofalo called the meeting to order at 10:05am.

**Introductions** – Present today are Lisa Barck Garofalo, LMT, Nick Chrones, LMT and Kathy Calise, Board Chair; and staff members Kate Coffey, Executive Director and Diana Nott, Compliance Coordinator. Board Member David Fredrickson, LMT and Board Liaison and John Combe, LMT, were in attendance by telephone. Jen Brady, LMT was excused

1. **Public Coment** – At this time, **Pennington** was not an official member of the committee, though she submitted an application for consideration by the committee. **Garogalo** indicated that the committee received an application for consideration from Janet Weiser.
2. **SB 454: Coffey** reported that SB 454 was moving through the legislative process and is now an A-Engrossed bill. It has been amended to include a credentialing portfolio, removal of hydrotherapy as a core curriculum requirement for licensure and includes some exemption language. It is requested that should the bill be passed, the committee be involved in assisting with writing subsequent Oregon Administrative Rules to clarify and define the statutes affected by SB 454. If the bill passes, the effective date will be January 1, 2012. This will require committees to move swiftly to address any needed rules or processes that will need to be put in place after passage.

Areas to address include identification and definition of credentialing agency and professional association, minimum level of training, demonstration of competence and ethical standards.

**Calise** indicated that the Board would look at these matters more closely at the May meeting in Bend.

**Chrones** stated that the MDTF participants are willing to be a resource for the Board when there is need to know more information about a particular modality or field of practice.

It is unclear how any changes may impact individuals that are currently enrolled in massage programs.

There was discussion on what constitutes a professional organization. It is unclear at this time. **Garofalo** shared that the Oregon School of Massage wrote a letter in protest of the change, as they feel that the language is too vague.

**Combe** voiced his concern over the potential removal of hydrotherapy as a core curriculum requirement. He indicated that a significant number of liability complaints involve hydrotherapy and he is concerned that removal of the requirements may increase those liability complaints.

**Calise** agreed with Combe and stated that there would be a need to specify hydrotherapy requirements separately in rule. She feels that there is an advantage to removing it from the core curriculum requirements and addressing it more specifically in rule and hopes that such a change would decrease liability claims with a well-defined set of standards.

**Coffey** reported that the reason hydrotherapy was removed from the bill was to address concerns put forth by Rolfers and Structural Integrators. They feel that they do not need to have hydrotherapy training and it is not part of their education. However, current Oregon requirements dictate that they obtain education in hydrotherapy in order to obtain licensure. As such, they were previously seeking exemption with SB 454. With the removal of hydrotherapy as a compromise, they have agreed to cease their quest for exemption.

**Garofalo** agrees that she does not want to see hydrotherapy used without training. She is trusting that the process will define appropriate requirements.

**Combe** voiced concern that the Board is making exceptions for a few hundred people, which causes concern for public safety.

**Coffey** agreed, but suggested that a larger concern for public safety might be if the group succeeded in obtaining exemption. As a result of this compromise, the group has pulled out of seeking exemption.

**Combe** suggested that practitioners become licensed bodyworkers instead of license massage therapists.

**Chrones** indicated that the use of the term massage therapist is a sticking point for many on the MDTF. They do not consider their practices to be massage and do not want to be known as massage therapists. He agrees that a name change may be the direction that the Board is headed in. He is still concerned about how the agency would cast a wider net and protect the public interest appropriately. He suggested that perhaps the Board would move to tiered licensing.

3. MDTF Report – **Chrones** reported that much of the MDTF report was covered in previous discussion. The task force has adjourned for a month and will return in June. During their sabbatical, they will be looking at the structures of their guilds or organizations. They will return and provide information on continuing education requirements and disciplinary processes. In addition, they believe that the model curriculum needs to be reworked. The focus is no longer on Swedish massage, even in the eye of the general public.

The next meeting for the task force is scheduled for June 3, 2011 from 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm at the Portland Campus of Oregon School of Massage.

The task force would like to be a true Board committee and act as a resource for the Board.

- Oregon Department of Education Curriculum Design Details** – The Oregon Department of Education has amended some rules affecting many schools in Oregon. **Calise** felt that it was something that the committee should be aware of as they consider revising the Model Curriculum.

**Fredrickson** indicated that it was his understanding that the changes impact only private vocational career schools. This encompasses 200+ schools that train a variety of professions and have a range of minimum standards. He noted that the massage profession has an independent agency in place with a model curriculum and external review and testing process. He is concerned that the requirements of instructional design are expensive and not equally applied to public and private institutions.

**Garofalo** reported that she provided a draft curriculum review. She analyzed 60 hours of education on one single subject and it took her about 10 hours to complete the draft.

**Fredrickson** asked if it would be advantageous to have the OBMT involved in the regulatory oversight of massage schools, as opposed to the Oregon Department of Education. He does not believe that the Department of Education is prepared to assess standards of classroom requirements in this profession. He is concerned that with the current budget woes and limited time frame, there will not be enough staff expertise in the Oregon Department of Education to oversee the new requirements.

**Coffey** will reach out to the Department of Education to discuss the concerns and suggestions of the committee. She is aware that the Oregon Board of Nursing has control over the CNA program and will attempt to learn how that was accomplished. She will report her findings to the Board in May.

**Calise** provided the committee members with a letter from the University of Western States regarding a request to consider changing the verbiage in rules and law from clock hours to credit hours. The committee will consider this when reviewing the model curriculum.

- Model Curriculum Review** – The committee is charged with reviewing and possibly amending the model curriculum. **Garofalo** suggested that the Body of Knowledge would be a good resource. She inquired as to the desire of the Board.

**Calise** stated that the Board hasn't had discussion at this point, but it was believed that with the potential passage of SB 454 and the changes from the Department of Education, the committee should review the model curriculum for possible updates. The last revision was done in 2006. She believes that some things may need to be added to reflect more accurately what schools need to teach.

The committee should learn what schools are truly teaching and review the statutory requirements. They can then determine where schools have flexibility in their programs and what items are mandatory. With the Department of Education shifts, the committee may need to consider implementing parameters around assessment.

It was discussed that it was difficult to speculate on the ramifications of SB 454. At this time, the work on the model curriculum is a brain storming session. After lengthy discussion which included potential impacts of SB 454, a noted need to address distance learning and consideration of a credentialing review process, the committee determined that they would begin to revise Section A, Professional Behaviors, for the next meeting. The committee will also review format and jargon, to be certain that matters are up-to-date with industry standards.

Staff will assist **Garofalo** in putting together a resource binder which will include items such as the rules and laws

for the OBMT as well as for the Department of Education, the Massage Therapy Body of Knowledge, the NCBTMB Needs Assessment and the AMTA and ABMP professional standards.

6. **Other Business as Directed by the Board** – The committee was charged with reviewing a draft Best Practices document. They provided feedback and made amendments which are to be presented to the Board at the April 11, 2011 Board meeting.
7. **Public Input** - There was no public input at this time.

The committee reviewed **Pennington's** application and it was determined that she is an official member of the Education/Scope of Practice Committee.

The next two meetings are scheduled for Friday, May 6, 2011 from 10:00 am – 12:00 pm and Friday, June 3, 2011 from 9:30 am – 11:30 am. Both meetings will be held at the Board office in Salem. **Fredrickson** is expected to attend by telephone.

8. **Adjournment** – The meeting as adjourned at 12:05 pm.