

WRITTEN TESTIMONY

House Committee on Behavioral Health

House Bill 8043 – Section 8

Position: Oppose

Submitted by: Kathy Outland, LCSW

City: Salem, Oregon

I am submitting written testimony in opposition to the proposed language in House Bill 8043, Section 8, regarding the supervision of behavioral health providers.

My opposition is not to interdisciplinary supervision itself, but rather to the fact that this provision is duplicative and unnecessary, and bypasses a well-established regulatory process that is already actively addressing this issue.

I can speak specifically on behalf of social work, as I am a Licensed Clinical Social Worker. The Oregon Board of Licensed Social Workers (BLSW) has approved several alternative mental health professionals as supervisors for licensure purposes for a number of years. This authority has been exercised through the Board's existing rulemaking process, which is designed to ensure public protection, professional competence, and appropriate stakeholder input.

More recently, the BLSW initiated a formal rules review and revision process to consider the inclusion of Licensed Professional Counselors (LPCs) and Licensed Marriage and Family Therapists (LMFTs) as approved supervisors for clinical social work associates. As part of this process, the Board convened its Rules Advisory Committee (RAC)—a body composed of licensed social workers, professionals, and other relevant stakeholders. The RAC was asked to review feedback from licensees and evaluate proposed rule amendments initiated by the Board.

Following this review, the Rules Advisory Committee concurred with the Board's recommendation to approve LPCs as eligible supervisors for licensure. These and other proposed rule revisions are currently awaiting the public hearing process, after which they may be formally adopted as administrative rule.

Given this context, the supervision provision contained in HB 8043 Section 8 duplicates work that is already underway through an established, transparent, and efficient regulatory mechanism. The existing administrative process allows for careful consideration, public input, and profession-specific expertise—without the need for statutory intervention.

For these reasons, I respectfully recommend that the Committee remove or amend Section 8 of HB 8043 and allow the relevant licensing boards to complete their rulemaking processes. Doing so will more effectively accomplish the intended goals of this provision while preserving regulatory integrity and avoiding unnecessary duplication.

Respectfully submitted,
Kathy Outland, LCSW
Salem, Oregon