

From: [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)
To: [Janet Wood](#)
Subject: FW: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)
Date: Monday, December 12, 2016 4:08:04 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: sundrupal@capitol.local [<mailto:sundrupal@capitol.local>]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2016 4:02 PM
To: Sunset Advisory Commission
Subject: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)

Agency: TEXAS STATE BOARD EXAMINERS PROFESSIONAL COUNSELORS

First Name: Christy

Last Name: Graham

Title: Therapist, LPC Supervisor

Organization you are affiliated with:

Email: Christy@acorncounseling.services

City: corinth

State: Texas

Your Comments About the Staff Report, Including Recommendations Supported or Opposed:

I've listened to only about 5 hours of the testimony regarding Consolidation and the review Sunset Commission has done for the LPC Board. I have read the recommendations and have a few thoughts to add.

+Respondents must respond to the investigator in a public forum about things that should be private. One such thing is whether a report to CPS was made. The Board should be supervising whether this occurs, but the respondent should not be made to state whether and when a CPS complaint was made in front of the person/persons whom they reported. This has occurred and put the reporter of the abuse in a dangerous situation.

+Being able to see the entire complaint seems like it would be self evident. Under current rules, respondents do not have access to the entire complaint.

+As a supervisor, I have had cause to look at how LPC Interns are employed in north Dallas. Many times they graduate with 45,000\$ of loans and discover they are still unemployable for at least 3 months until they receive their LPC Intern License. Their professors do not adequately prepare them for this reality. Also, once they have their LPC Intern License, their work options are severely limited and their compensation is very low. This seems like an untenable situation when we are so desperately in need of more practitioners.

+Contrary to the report by Sunset, complaints have been thrown out as nonjurisdictional by the board.

+ Having the board as simply an advisory board sounds really scary to me.

If

the people who adjudicate these claims do not understand our training, our employment, and the other regulatory agencies involved in our profession, this is unjust. Professionals should be judged by a group of peers and those who have received services. If a person loses their license, it should be done by someone who knows what it took to get

that license.

+Our CEU process should be updated to include review of at least the goals and objectives of each of the CEUs offered.

That being said, I am deeply concerned that the processes we have used for years have been flawed. Watching the testimony, I saw some people who were very concerned and scared about things remaining the same on both sides of the table.

I have found that learning more about the board processes and undergoing review can be instructive and a growth opportunity. Rigorous oversight is definitely needed in our profession. Thank you for working to improve our licensure board.

Any Alternative or New Recommendations on This Agency:

I prefer that we be continued to be governed by an independent board, one where the training tells them their responsibilities, and where they have a say in the staff that implements their rules.

Standardizing the penalty matrix makes a lot of sense.

Standardizing the application process makes sense.

Having our own line items in the budget makes sense.

Training our board in their rights, responsibilities and having them connected to similar boards that have working processes or whom they can network and problem solve, seems very natural to our profession.

Having us in a corner of a larger organization does not.

Thank you.

My Comment Will Be Made Public: I agree