

Nancy Toner Weinberger

From: Laura Allen <therassage@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2014 8:59 AM
To: 'Nancy Toner Weinberger'
Subject: RE: Final attendance for Wednesday's meeting and final agenda

Frankly, I wasn't that crazy about it, and I think it stands to put a lot of us out of business. However, if we are discussing only requiring what's necessary for public protection for CE, which it looked to me like we were, then it's a solution. I'm open to others.

I have it on good authority that the ELAP is going to recommend 750 hours as the entry-level requirement for practice. That will put a lot of schools in an uncomfortable position. It is currently at the stage of being passed around to all the Boards of the national organization for approval or disapproval, and then it will be released to the public for another comment round, if I'm not mistaken.

LA

From: Nancy Toner Weinberger [mailto:weinberger@mindspring.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2014 8:46 AM
To: 'Laura Allen'
Subject: RE: Final attendance for Wednesday's meeting and final agenda

Wow! You have really drunk the Kool-Aid, Laura. It appears you now think the MOCC was a good idea! Forgive me for my surprise!

I will send your comments around to everyone, Laura. I believe in everyone having a say, and I do agree with some of the points you make.

I am neither in favor or not in favor of the NCBTMB. I keep a certain respect in mind due to the appreciation they deserve for enabling licensing to be established in so many states. Most state practice standards were based on the NCBTMB standards, NCB's psychometrically valid standardized entry level testing was available (something that states needed to even consider licensure), and indeed, even customized for state's needs. In taking on a fairly successful model for establishing standards for our profession, states also adopted the requirements for ongoing CE. The NCB has literally been the mother of regulation for massage and bodywork in the states. I recall an original NC Board member telling me that whenever they were unclear on a decision, they looked to the NCB's standards for guidance and found it there.

Problems with the running of the NCBTMB organization itself have cast a big shadow over the NCB and it is uncertain whether they will recover. And they do seem to be casting kerosene on the fire by lowering standards while saying they are raising the standards- certainly in regard to their CE Approved Provider Program.

The thing is with a 500 hour educational entry level requirement, I really do believe we need to require CE. Not the free-for-all take-anything way that we are doing it, but in-class hands-on and/or biological and medical sciences classes, possibly some business

classes. While Ethics classes can have value, they don't have value when you can complete them on-line in 20 minutes for 3 CEs.

My personal recommendations are that we require a minimum 24 CEs per renewal and top it off at 500 hours. That would encourage people to take more classes as they build towards something more useful in their practice than they can achieve with only 24 hours of education in 2 years.

And we need a way to make a license inactive- there are 3 reasons we get those "do you have anything for 4 hours?" calls.

- 1) LMBTs have other priorities in life- aren't even practicing, but need to keep up their license because there is no way to re-instate it (grandfathering in situation, or the cumbersome re-application from scratch process). This happens when a family member is sick and must be cared for, children come and must be raised, injuries preventing the therapist from practicing occur and require a long rehabilitation, people go back to school for more degrees, etc. If we had an inactive status, it would work out MUCH better for all.
- 2) LMBT does not have the money. Hard times, loss of spouse's job, unexpected expenses, etc. Also the LMBT may not be skilled enough to keep clients. Thus the lack of income.
- 3) LMBTs develop a mindset that 24 hours is what they must have, so that is what they will have. I have run into this myself after 38 years of being a therapist- I would like to take a John Barnes series, but that is 3 classes of 72 hours. I would like to do this all at once so I can retain the learning, but a part of my mind is saying, maybe I should spread them out instead so that I don't have to come up with another 24 hours so soon after taking. That would also help with the expense..... So if we had a cap of 500 hours, the thinking would be more like "Well if I get 72 hours of training, that is like money in the bank, and so what if I have to find something else to take next year.."

We say we want to be "medical professionals". Yet when LMBTs come to my classes it is clear that more training is imperative for that to ever happen. If you look around in our profession, who is it that we recognize as working at that level. Name one LMBT working at a high level of competence that does not have significant hours of extra education under their belt- with CE hours and degrees. Don't we owe it to the public to ensure confidence that they will be treated professionally?

Here is something else to be considered. Clients get hurt a lot more than anyone acknowledges in our profession. I hear story after story after story. But it all goes unreported. Because of the very nature of the client/therapist relationship. The number one reason people don't say anything when they are hurt is because "they don't want to hurt the therapist's feelings." Done without malice, the public will put up with a lot. But should they? I think not.

That's all I have time for right now. I will check out your blog later, Laura.

Nancy Toner Weinberger

Dynamic Equilibrium
309 Oakwood Court
Youngsville, NC 27596
919-562-1548
weinberger@mindspring.com
www.dynamicequilibrium.com

From: Laura Allen [<mailto:therassage@bellsouth.net>]
Sent: Monday, January 20, 2014 7:01 PM
To: Nancy Toner Weinberger
Subject: Re: Final attendance for Wednesday's meeting and final agenda

I'm throwing in my two cents worth, in line, in color. Thanks for keeping me in the loop. I saw Dr. Preston today. He is going to be at your meeting. I didn't send this to the whole crowd, just to you. You may share any of my comments or not as you see fit.
LA

THERA-SSAGE
431 S. Main St., Ste. 2
Rutherfordton, NC 28139
828-288-3727
www.thera-ssage.com
www.LauraAllenMT.com

From: Nancy Toner Weinberger <weinberger@mindspring.com>
To: alanorleslie@att.net; anita@massagecupping.com; catmatlock@gmail.com; deborahsmith@massagetherapy.com; equestriantouch@gmail.com; fannrobin@gmail.com; gloria@reikiheartandsoul.com; healingscents@gmail.com; linwsw@charter.net; massage@sallyraspberry.com; Massageproce@gmail.com; mckeeverbrian@att.net; mokshakolman@gmail.com; msscottmassage@gmail.com; nanmacd@gmail.com; pattiodell@bellsouth.net; Rlawsonh@aol.com; sandysbassline@hotmail.com; sbeam@ec.rr.com; sbross2000@msn.com; Shirley@shirleyknapp.com; terri@jackiewoods.org; therassage@bellsouth.net; winecoff@skybest.com; michaelsitzer@gmail.com; magnolia_day_spa@yahoo.com; cindy.rankinamta@gmail.com; mkestin@ensomabodyworks.com; lorraine@peacefulconnection.com
Sent: Monday, January 20, 2014 6:15 PM
Subject: FW: Final attendance for Wednesday's meeting and final agenda

This is to keep those not attending informed.

Nancy Toner Weinberger
Dynamic Equilibrium
309 Oakwood Court
Youngsville, NC 27596
919-562-1548
weinberger@mindspring.com
www.dynamicequilibrium.com

From: Nancy Toner Weinberger [<mailto:weinberger@mindspring.com>]
Sent: Monday, January 20, 2014 10:53 AM
Subject: Final attendance for Wednesday's meeting and final agenda

Please print out this email and bring it with you to the meeting. Please also READ it! ☺
 Know that the 3 questions we are going to try to answer are HUGE. Some background reading from the website I created for us will prove to be very helpful in regard to our productivity in the short time we will have together.

Coalition of Massage & Bodywork CE Educators

www.coalitionofmbceeducators.com

Meeting Wednesday, January 22nd at 9:30AM at the Courtyard Raleigh Midtown, 1041 Wake Towne Drive, Raleigh, NC 27609

| | |
|---|--|
| 9:30-9:50am | Reasons for gathering and plan for the day |
| 9:50-10:20am | Background (Summary of recent events and pertinent information) |
| 10:20-11:45 general discussion & break out groups | Address the 3 critical questions that have not yet been answered. |
| 11:45-12:30 | Purpose & Structure of this organization Communication between ourselves and with other organizations |
| Lunch 12:30-2:00PM | |
| 2:00-2:30PM | 1. Address by the NC Board |
| 2:30-3:00 | 2. Q&A for the Board |
| 3:00-3:50 | 3. Address by NCB; Q&A |
| 3:50-4:00 | 4. Conclusion |

The 3 critical questions:

1. Why CE is essential to the ongoing protection of the public?

It isn't, unless the classes are directly related to public protection.

2. What is appropriate CE for massage therapists in terms of ensuring ongoing protection of the public?

The classes that the FSMTB put out in their initial plan were all about that-- ethics, safety, pathology, sanitation, etc.

3. Is it possible for an approval process to provide quality assurance in CE and what would that approval process consist of- who should provide the regulation? I don't believe it is possible anymore. The classes that are science-based on the NCBTMB Approved Provider pages are outnumbered by all the energy work classes. You cannot have quality assurance when things that have no basis in reality are given equal status as science. Healing with the Flower Fairies and other such classes---wow, that makes us look really credible to the health care community. As long as people who believe that classes like that are acceptable for CE manage to serve on boards and CE committees, there will never be quality assurance. There is nothing wrong in people who want to spend there time and money attending such classes, but they should not be getting CE credit for it.

Notes from Rick Rosen

1. Should continuing education be mandatory for renewal of state licensure – and is it essential for the ongoing protection of the public? **Unless it is related to public protection, it's not protecting the public. So yes, those classes that are about public protection should be mandatory--to a point. I believe there should come a point in time, say after 20 years of practice, when you should be exempt from mandatory CE.**

2. Given the reported inconsistencies in the instructional design and delivery of CE courses, is it even possible for an approval process to provide quality assurance?

Answered above. **How can you provide quality assurance on a class that is based on a theory that violates the laws of physics and the known workings of the universe? How can you provide quality assurance on a class called "Reiki with the Angels?"**

3. Does the cost of compliance for CE providers (both in terms of time and money) bring an equal or greater benefit to the massage therapy field, and to the public at large? **The majority of CE instructors (the ones who are not "rock stars") are not getting rich, they're going in the hole for the love of teaching, most of the time. The cost of compliance and all the expenses that go along with teaching CE take a big chunk of money. Many times massage therapists are so complacent or even resentful about it, they're not getting any benefit. I get phone calls that say "I just need four hours. Do you have any classes that are four hours?" They don't even care what it is or whether they have any true interest in it or not. They are looking for the closest, cheapest thing.**

4. What kind of regulatory process – if any – is needed; and which organizational entity is best suited to perform this function?

Periodic renewal of public protection classes, FSMTB should own it and contract it out to the AFMTE, with the FSMTB maintaining oversight.

Notes from Nancy Toner Weinberger

Problem: CE Provider oversight/approval (National Approval is better for CE Providers, but is an issue for state regulatory Boards in terms of reliance on a third-party organization.) **It's okay to contract with a third-party, as long as you maintain oversight. We have never had that with the NCBTMB, so it's an improper delegation of authority.**

Problem: Evaluating and Maintaining quality in CE.

Course content

Sub-Problem: Ethics (the deteriorating worth of courses offered.)

Instructor

Problem: What is appropriate continuing education for LMBTs and why?

Sub-Problem- Self-Care category.

Sub-Problem- Distance learning vs. in class learning

Problem: When does CE become non-productive for 1) protecting the public 2) professional development ?

Hard to evaluate based on the number of years in practice when we don't allow inactive licensure. A good measure might be 500 total documented hours of massage/bodywork related CE, to include at least 50 hours in advanced (level 2 and higher) studies

Problem: Non-practicing LMBTs taking CE to renew their license. Thus looking for cheap credits, could care less- do we want these folks in our classes? Illness/injury, taking care of aging parents or family members, raising children, back to school full time for a degree or other.

Solution: Eliminate unnecessary CE requirements by allowing the license to be inactive. Charge a small fee, say \$25 and require current address and license every renewal period. Notice sent by email and postcard.

To reinstate: 24 CE live in class hands-on. OR 21 CE live in class hands-on plus 3 hours live class Ethics. And the Jurisprudence exam.

Questions for the Board

Are there any plans for re-opening the Practice Act?

If so when and for what purpose?

How would we be able to know if this is going to happen, and how can we make recommendations for law changes in synch with this action?

Is the /Board considering changes to CE requirements and if so, why?

Have there been problems with CE from the Board's perspective and if so, what are they?

Have there been complaints? If so, what have been the nature of those complaints? Has any action already been taken in regard to the complaints?

Are committee meetings private or is the public allowed to attend?

Notes from Linda McCrea

What would NC state approval of CE providers address a/o add to the already rigorous process that has been maintained and updated for our required completion for nearly 20 years through our existing national approval through NCBTMB? What function and purpose would additional NC state approval serve, since we as nationally approved CE providers already conduct our approved CE classes in NC, as well as in other states? **The NCBTMB has made one major mistake after another for years. They are not in good financial condition, either. I have already provided Nancy with a huge list of classes that violate their own bylaws--not allowing classes based on religion and/or spirituality, for example. Their last election was conducted very unethically to say the least.**

What other states currently require additional individual state approval, and what are their documented outcomes of improved quality of instruction over that already achieved by nationally approved CE providers? **HI, IL, IA, LA, MS, NY, ND, TX have their own approvals. As far as I know there is no documentation of the sort.**

Questions for NCB

Could the NCB administer the Approved Provider Program while being responsible to the State Board, perhaps similar to the way they are doing it for NY?

How is the NY program set up?

Questions regarding our function as a group

Is there value in identifying ourselves as a group?
Who would comprise our group and why?
Does it serve us to meet in person like this?
Communication issues- Email; Forum; Website.
What level of organization is right for us? Could we align with another established organization, such as the Alliance?
Do we need agreement and if so, how can we know if we have it? How much agreement do we need?
Do we need funds?
What actions can we take that will make a difference?

We want a Continuing Education standard that *produces consistent results that are recognized by both the public and health professionals.* (Rick Rosen)

Who is attending the meeting:

CE Teachers:

Amber Keithley
Arlene & Larry Green
Claire Marie Miller
Cynthia J. Loving
Dawn Weeks
Deborah Peters
Dianna Lee
Elizabeth Kirkland
Janice Marie Durand
Juul Bruin
Kelly Holland Azzaro
Kimberly A Perry
Laura Landsiedel
Maryska Bigos
Nancy Toner Weinberger
Robert Wootton
Sheila Alexander
Marsha Presnell-Janette
Larry Koliha
Bethany Ward
John Zeller
Lindsay Neese
Carmen Lazenby
Carrie W. Bodane
Pat Donohue
Christina Hagan
Julie Marciniak
Melissa Mosher
Mike Seufer
Kay Warren

Dianne M. Willett

Guests:

Kim Moore from the NC AMTA

Charles Wilkins from the NC Board of Massage & Bodywork Therapy

Donna Sarvello from the National Certification Board for therapeutic Massage & Bodywork

Logistics notes: Amber Keithley and Pat Donohue will take minutes for us and my husband, Mike Weinberger, will video the proceedings (this will be an amateur video recording, but it will be recorded). Elizabeth Kirkland is bring a laptop projector for presentations as needed. The room comes with wifi, so we can look things up online if we need to. I will have a table out front with name tags- Please take a nametag, so that I can know who attended after the meeting. There will be a box for contributions towards the cost of the room.

Only 9 people signed up for the Coalition Forum I set up on www.massagetherapists.com and there have been no suggestions, questions, no additional input of any kind as of yet, so I hope you will all have your thinking caps on for the meeting! Rick Rosen has not sent me any further information on what he is proposing to the NC State Board and the Federation of State Massage Boards.

See you there on Wednesday!

Nancy Toner Weinberger

Dynamic Equilibrium

309 Oakwood Court

Youngsville, NC 27596

919-562-1548; cell 919-618-2232

weinberger@mindspring.com

www.dynamicequilibrium.com