

**MINUTES OF THE MASSAGE THERAPY  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Call to Order:** Ms. Rieve called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. on Thursday, July 21, 2005.

**Committee members present:** Rick Phillips, Mark Melecki, Rick Greely and Dennis Gibbons.

**Guests present:** Patti West, NWAM, Inc.; Len Montavon, Spirit Creek Healing Arts School; Doug Shodd, Jr., Youngstown College of Massage; Karl Meyer, IOTM & Council of Schools; Ramona Chance, AMTA-Ohio; Chris Colburn, Capitol Consulting Group (AMTA); and Bruce Doolin, OAH.

**Staff Members present:** Diann Thompson, Joan Wehrle, Kay Rieve, Beth Wismar, Ginny Wemmerus and Jean Gillman.

**I. Minutes Review and Approval – January 20, 2004**

Mr. Greely said that on page 6, second paragraph, the name Melecki is spelled incorrectly.

Mr. Gibbons said that on page 2, fourth paragraph, his name was spelled incorrectly.

Mr. Phillips said that on the bottom of page 2, Ms. Baldwin's name was referred to as Ms. Shannon. He also advised that Mr. Kuntzman's name was spelled incorrectly on page 4.

Mr. Gibbons made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected and Mr. Greely seconded the motion. All committee members voted aye.

**2. Report from the Council of Schools – Rick Greely**

Mr. Greely turned his portion of the meeting over to Ms. West and Ms. Montavon who are from the Council of Schools.

**3. Discussion of Curriculum**

Ms. Montavon stated that she, Ms. West, Mr. Meyer and Dr. Alan Woodson have been on a committee for 2 ½ years reviewing textbooks and also on curriculum development. They presented their information to the Council who approved the work they had done. The next step was to present their information to the Medical Board.

Ms. West presented a list of textbooks that she said the Council has recommended. The books are as follows:

**The Art of Massage**

Dr. J.H. Kellogg

**Pathology for Massage Therapists**

Susan G. Salvo  
and Sandra K Anderson

**Theory and Practice of Therapeutic Massage**

Mark Beck

**Principles of Anatomy and Physiology (11<sup>th</sup> Ed.)** Dr. G.J. Tortora

Ms. West stated that 22 out of 40 schools were represented at the Council meeting when the vote was taken, and the other schools had been given the information concerning the textbooks. She further explained some of the nice features of the newer textbooks but also noted that only part of each textbook was relevant to Ohio requirements. Some of the textbooks work well along with the Dr. Kellogg's textbook; the techniques in the newer book, "dovetail" with the Kellogg method.

Other information contained in a packet Ms. West distributed included a list of Medical Board Administrative Rules for Massage Therapy, core curriculum outlines for Anatomy and Physiology as well as for the Limited Branch. She suggested a minimum school curriculum for all schools to follow then the students would all have a minimum of materials taught to them. She said that the schools could go beyond the stated requirements but that these would be the basis of their school curriculum. The textbooks would not be limited to the ones presented but that the core curriculum would need to be covered. All the requirements are based on the new Board educational requirements of the 750 hour program. .

Ms. West also had a listing of where the Council thought the focus of the State test should be for both A & P and Limited Branch.

Ms. Rieve introduced Dr. Beth Wismar who would present a response for the Medical Board to the report from Council of Schools.

Dr. Wismar congratulated the Council of Schools on all the work they have done and advised them they have taken some big steps toward forming objectives. However, she said they aren't there yet and the Medical Board cannot yet endorse their proposed curriculum. She referred the committee members to a handout that she had drafted on Writing Behavioral Objectives. She said that if you look at the whole practice of massage therapy, what the therapist does becomes a task analysis. From that point it is a matter of cyclically asking questions in a top-down approach. They must relate the behaviors directly to what the therapist is

doing and, then, ask what knowledge is needed to ACCOMPLISH each of those behaviors. The attainment of that knowledge becomes the objective. That level becomes the next task analysis level. The final analysis is the basis of what is needed to perform the tasks at the beginning of your analysis. Objectives are independent of any specific book. They are also independent of an specific test. The student may use any text that reaches the objectives that have already been defined. The behaviors must be expressed (or written) in a way that can be tested.

Some objectives are capable of being objectively measured. Some can be machine scored. Other behavior can be observed in a clinical practical exam.

Dr. Wismar said that the practical could be done in the classroom. Some of the behaviors may be written so that they are only done in the classroom and the student will know that that behavior will then not be on the state exam.

Dr. Wismar said that if the Council of Schools decide, that as a group, you want to recommend that the schools write objectives, you will find a commonality. If you want to continue to try to polish these, she would be willing to work with a small group any time schedules permit. She said that she was there to help the schools.

Ms. Montavon said that she appreciated and agrees with what Dr. Wismar was saying. She said the work they have already done was drafted in broad categories to simplify them for the report they presented to the Board. Ms. West said that they have a larger document that is more detailed. Dr. Wismar said that she would be willing to work with a group anytime. Ms. Rieve suggested having a follow-up meeting to review the entire document that the Council of Schools had prepared to determine the curriculum/student objectives.

Mr. Greely said that he hoped that textbooks could be approved at this meeting to help the schools prepare their new 750 hour curriculums. He said that he understood that the objectives are more important than particular textbooks, however, some determination needs to be made on textbooks. Refining the curriculum is going to be an ongoing process. Ms. Montavon said the schools need a starting point so that all the schools are teaching a set of material.

Mr. Greely submitted a chart titled DACUM Research Chart for Massage Therapist (Designing A Curriculum) which was done in March through Columbus State Community College and was a panel of career (field) experts at Ohio State University. It is an analysis of the duties and the tasks required to perform that duty.

Dr. Wemmerus said she found the information exceedingly helpful. She said that the initial three areas on the chart show a content map of the field. She said the content map makes it easy to write a test. Mr. Gibbons said that a lot of that was taken into consideration, and is how you would test from these tasks. Dr.

Wemmerus said that as long as you have a content map, it does not matter what textbook you use, as long as the students can do the behavior that is on the map. Dr. Wemmerus said that she would like to back off being the idea of being wedded to a particular textbook, and that should be the ultimate goal. Mr. Greely said that long term that is where they are trying to get, however, for the short term, because of vocabulary, you have to identify a source so that all the schools are on the same page or it will create more confusion. If you can identify the source of where the information comes from, it will be easier for the schools to incorporate that rather than having different terminology. The reason for trying to match things to a text was for commonality of terms. Dr. Wemmerus said that terminology issues is a stumbling block. Mr. Greely added that some terms can mean two different techniques.

Ms. West said that she compared four textbooks for hydrotherapy techniques that will now be on the exam, and no two had the same water temperature. She said in certain issues, you can use any textbook, however, when you come to specific region or area that is not true. However, if the question did not ask a specific water temperature, the techniques were about the same. Ms. Montavon said that that was the reason the committee recommended the Beck book supplementing the Kellogg text.

Ms. Rieve said that the schools want to know what books to purchase for their students.

Dr. Wismar said that changing of terminology is a problem and at times on the exam they have put a second term in parentheses. She requested that anyone let her know if there are other incidences where they need to use parentheses.

Mr. Melecki said that his review of the materials presented at this meeting contains some really good information and he wanted to thank those who did the work. He said he felt that massage therapy has potential that hasn't been tapped yet and part of the reason is our way of educating has not taken us there. One of things he saw that was really excellent was the beginning of an actual discussion of how does a massage therapist evaluate, do an assessment. He felt that standardizing a list of specific conditions that every massage therapist who passes the Boards should be conversant in is a minimal starting point.

Dr. Wemmerus presented the Medical Board's side of the discussion. She said that they have been working on what is the content domain of massage therapy and what an entry level massage therapist should be able to practice safely and effectively. For example, she said they went through the list of skin conditions that the Council of Schools felt an entry level massage therapist should know. She would like to have a larger set of conditions that an entry level massage therapist should know. Even the list of skin conditions in Tortora which she passed out does not cover all the relevant conditions which she presented as a third list of skin conditions. Mr. Greely said their concern was to have "a set" and

that they would gladly take more but they would like to know specifically what they would be. Dr. Wemmerus said her wish list would include additional skin conditions. Similarly, Dr. Wemmerus provided a wish list of drugs a massage therapist should know and a much shorter list of drugs covered in Tortora. Mr. Greely said that he felt pharmacology was not to be taught. Dr. Wemmerus said that drugs are now part of the assessment process. Mr. Melecki ask if it was necessary for entry level and Dr. Wemmerus said that some drugs are. Mr. Phillips reminded the group that “entry level” is the only time we have the opportunity to test.

Ms. West ask if classification of drugs could be taught rather than specific drugs. Dr. Wemmerus said that the drug situation needs to be looked at in just that way for some drugs you do not need to know the specific name but you need to know what that class of drugs does. Ms. West said a class of drugs would be easier to test on. Dr. Wemmerus said that the problem is that clients don’t always know what class of drugs they are taking, only the name of the medication. She said that both the conditions and drugs listed in the sheets titled “Conditions in Tortora by System” and the “Drugs & Terminology in T & G 11<sup>th</sup> Ed.” are used in current exams.

Mr. Melecki said that the Council of School reviewed a number of texts but it decided that Tortora & Grabowski was the best choice at this time. Dr Wemmerus said that teaching should not be limited to one text, that others texts can be used to supplement the basic text. Ms. West said the problem with that is that students cannot afford to purchase multiple books. Dr. Wemmerus said that she would rather work from a list of conditions and not be concerned what book was being used to teach them. Mr. Gibbons stated that some textbooks totally contradict each other about contraindications. Ms. West said that there are different view points between authors for each of these conditions. Mr. Gibbons said there is no research to document the extent of the contraindications.

Ms. West said that she thought students were to be taught pathology in their training but not tested specifically on pathology; meaning signs and symptoms of a condition. The student needs to learn, if a client has a condition, can they or can they not perform massage on them. Ms. Rieve said that the law does not allow the Board to test on pathology. Ms. West said that on a testing level, the student is not allowed to be asked the symptoms or signs of a condition. She felt there needed to be a distinction in the way the question is asked. Mr. Melecki said that the student is not to try to diagnose a condition, but to look for “red flags” as to the type massage to do for a client. Mr. Gibbons said that by studying pathology the students find they understand the conditions which is very helpful when answering questions on the test.

Dr. Wemmerus reviewed pending exam content and process changes. She said that one of the things they would like to add to the exam is a scenario question where multiple questions would be asked based on one same scenario. She asked

for a small group of volunteers to sit with them to determine if answers should be weighed as to which would be the best answer, giving lesser credit for other answers, which may be correct but not the best answer.

Mr. Melecki asked if Dr. Wemmerus had considered making this a third branch of the exam; i.e., Anatomy, Limited Branch and then Limited Branch Clinical. Dr. Wemmerus said that her immediate goal is to use one question, and grow the domain of that type of question for the future. Mr. Greely said that it is important to get the information to the schools so they can prepare the students. She agreed, but said the first question would probably be published on the website rather than the exam. Mr. Melecki said that this is the difference between training technicians and training therapists; being able to do clinical reasoning. He also suggested certifying instructors to show they have shown a certain level of proficiency in the state of Ohio. They could then give a hands-on clinical exam prior to sitting for the state exam. Ms. West and Mr. Greely volunteered to work with Dr. Wemmerus on the sample scenario question. It was determined that it could not be added as an exam question until the June 2006 exam. The sample question and information would be published on the website well in advance of the exam. It would be one scenario with five questions.

Dr. Wemmerus said that they would also like to add pictures to the exam. They would probably be line drawings of muscles. Again, it would be one picture and five questions. Dr. Wismar said that she would like to have a panel review which visual presentation would be preferred. This would be on the Basic Science portion of the exam. Dr. Wemmerus said that the first illustrations would be of a joint and muscle that crosses it. She would like input from professionals working in the field if they have differing opinions than what is being presented. Any proposed changes to the exam would be posted on the website.

Dr. Wemmerus proceeded to discuss the content domains that they would like to see covered on the exam. She said they would like to have students know more about muscles as the body moves rather than origin and attachments. She would also like to see more pharmacology taught to students so they can safely practice massage therapy.

Dr. Wismar would like the teaching emphasis to be structure and function as opposed to anatomy and physiology. Dr. Wemmerus said that they would like the curriculum to be focused on things that are necessary for a massage therapist to know to practice safely and effectively. **The printed material presented at this meeting is a long term wish list for the direction of development as the exam evolves.**

Dr. Wemmerus said they are trying to focus questions toward the thinking that will be expected of a clinician. Mr. Melecki said there is an entire domain that is missing from the list which is the interpersonal domain. He felt that as massage therapy is raised to a more professional level, social science and counseling

domains need to be considered. Dr. Wemmerus said she agreed but did not know how to ask that on a test. Other categories are listed on the printout. Dr. Wismar added that she would welcome input from others also.

Ms. Rieve stated she thought the two plans need to come together as one objective as the schools need to know how to proceed. Dr. Wemmerus said that Mr. Meyer, Ms. West and herself would meet and resolve the differences in the two plans. Mr. Meyer said that the direction sounds great but today the schools need to have specific issues decided. Dr. Wemmerus said that she would be comfortable referencing questions to two pathology books.

Mr. Melecki said that a joint taskforce is needed to develop a five year plan to reshape the exam in Ohio. What is done on the Board exam is what drives what happens in the classroom. Ms. West said that the schools had never had a core curriculum before and felt that was what is needed now, and enlarge it later.

Mr. Greely said that the new questions on the exam are not what the schools are anticipating so it is not what they are teaching. Dr. Wemmerus said that is why the Board is trying to give advance notification through the website of changes that will appear on future exams. Ms. West said the schools are putting together their curriculum for 2006 to meet the new Rules and their present students will be taking their Board exam in 2006 under the old system. Ms. Rieve said that is an issue that will have to be reviewed at a joint meeting.

As far as textbooks, Dr. Wemmerus said that she is fine with adding the pathology book to the textbook list. On the five year plan there may additional textbooks. Mr. Melecki suggested stating that the questions for the 2006 exam will be referenced both to Fritz and Beck. Ms. West asked if it would be the entire text or only a chapter of the text. Mr. Melecki said that what is listed on the website at the moment are content areas. The same chapters in Beck would be applicable. Dr. Wemmerus said that for hygiene the exam will reference Fritz, Beck and the CDC Fact Sheet on Hygiene; for hydrotherapy Fritz and Beck will be used; condition and symptomatic applications (pathology) will be from the supplemental list from Tortora. Mr. Melecki suggested posting the portion of the CDC Fact Sheet used for the exam on the Medical Board Website. Other texts will be added for later exams.

Mr. Melecki made a motion, for immediate implementation, Beck, Salvo and Anderson and supplemental information that will be posted on the website will now be referenced for the areas which were previously referenced to Fritz. Mr. Greely seconded the motion. All committee members voted aye.

Mr. Melecki made another motion that a joint conference committee between Medical Board testing staff, Council of Schools and MTAC members to formulate a five year plan for evolution of the Board exam in the face of the curriculum changes. Mr. Greely seconded the motion and all committee members voted aye.

Dr. Wemmerus noted that on the June 6, 2006 exam the basic science questions will be cross referenced to some other anatomy and physiology textbooks as well as Tortora.

#### **IV. Discussion of NCTMB examination.**

Ms. Rieve said that the National Certification for Therapeutic Massage and Bodywork (NCTMB) did a presentation for the Council of Schools. She said that the Medical Board, however, still plans to continue with the Board exam for Ohio. She said that acceptance of their certification for massage therapists could possibly be a future discussion for a MTAC meeting. Mr. Melecki said that the NCTMB exam was a weaker exam than the Ohio Board exam and would cause a shift in curriculum for the schools. Another issue is that acceptance of their exam would cause even more challenges of unlicensed persons practicing as massage technicians. Dr. Wemmerus said that even if the certification exam is for licensing purposes, it does not license anyone who has passed the exam. She said that the public cannot distinguish between the two types of licenses.

Ms. Chance said that she received an invitation to the Federation of State Massage Boards who want regulatory bodies, not boards to regulate the practice of massage therapy. They want to have a national exam and to have reciprocity between states. Ms. Rieve suggested Ms. Chance do a report at the next MTAC meeting.

#### **V. Communications**

Mr. Melecki said that all the MTAC members had received an email from an out-of-state massage therapist wanting licensure in Ohio. Mr. Greely said that after the new curriculum rules go into effect at the end of the year, she can sit for an Ohio exam as early as June 2006. Mr. Melecki said that he and Mr. Greely had talked about how hard it is for an out-of-state therapist to come into Ohio and become licensed.

Mr. Greely felt that if Ohio is so hostile to them, they will join the ranks of the unlicensed practicing in Ohio which undermines the strength of licensing in Ohio. He said there are two ways to try to cope with unlicensed persons; 1) to increase the professionalism of massage therapy, 2) and look at rule changes that will make it easier for out-of-state therapists to certify their training and allow them to sit for the Ohio exam. He said that it would be a good topic for discussion at the next MTAC meeting. Ms. Rieve said they could discuss setting up criteria for them to sit for the exam. Dr. Wemmerus said that monitoring how the out-of-state therapists do on the exam would give guidance in how well prepared therapists are from other states. Ms. Rieve said that it is a topic that needs to be discussed.

Mr. Melecki said that the other issue is that the MTAC members are “out front” for these questions. He needs a contact on the Board to answer questions for them. He suggested having a massage therapy ombudsman in the Board office whose job it is to answer the questions. Ms. Thompson said that would have to be considered, but that the Board is short staffed at the moment. She and Ms. Rieve do try to get the answers to inquiries but they realize the need for one person to answer questions.

Mr. Greely brought up the issue of CPT codes that massage therapists can use. Ms. Wehrle said they are working on the problem.

Mr. Greely asked how many days prior to the exam is the cutoff time for submitting applications. Ms. Rieve advised applications must be received at least 30 days prior to the exam in order to allow enough time to mail out admission packets.

#### **VI. Results from June 2005 LMT exam**

Ms. Rieve said they had just received the scores from the June 2005 exam and they are as follows:

833 Took the Basic Science  
765 Took the Limited Branch  
443 Total passed  
431 Total failed  
425 were licensed and names were added to the website

The median score was 75 and the mean was 73 for Basic Science. On the Limited Branch, the mean was 78.6 and the median was 79. Dr.. Wemmerus said that they did not have the information broken down by subject matter, etc., as yet, and it does not include information on those taking the exam for the first time or those retaking the exam.

Ms. Rieve said that the application has been revised. Students no longer have to put in their entire work history, only the last five years.

#### **VI. Miscellaneous**

Mr. Melecki asked about the process of choosing a new MTAC member since Ms. Jewett is no longer on the committee. Mr. Greely advised that in the past applications were reviewed without names and they prioritized a list. Ms. Rieve said a call for MTAC members needed to be put on the website and applicants should forward their resumes to the Board.

Mr. Greely wanted it noted that MTAC wished to thank Ms. Jewett for her hard work, and to let her know how much she added to the group, and how much she will be missed.

Ms. Chance advised the committee that she had seen a news story on channel 6 by Carol Luper. Ms. Thompson advised that she had spoken to the reporter. Ms. Lubow said she would check the information in the report and possibly draft a letter to station. Mr. Greely said that he felt there should be follow up on the misinformation reported in the story.

Ms. Rieve advised the next meeting will be October 20, 2005.

Mr. Greely moved to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Gibbons seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jean Gillman