

copy for
NOK

May 27, 1965

H. Alvan Jones, M.D.
Chairman, Maryland State Board of Physical Therapy Examiners
301 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Dear Doctor Jones:

The letter of May 10 and excerpts from minutes of the meeting of March 4 have been received from Mr. Clemens Gaines. Because it is apparent that there is misunderstanding about the points of agreement, the representatives of the Maryland Chapter of the American Physical Therapy Association, who attended that meeting, have not to discuss the letter. The following notes are based on the recollections of the three representatives.

Section 605 The representative agrees that there was consensus that the Board's proposal be accepted, as stated in Mr. Pine's letter of March 30.

Section 609a (See discussion relating to Section 612 below.)

Section 610b (2)(a) The phrase, "be of good moral character", is already in the law 610b 1(a) and was carried forward to the new sub-section because this sub-section is intended to supersede the previous sub-section. For this reason, it seems there should be no objection to this clause, nor should there be any new problem of administration.

610b 3(b) At the time of the March 4 meeting, a question was raised (by a member of the Society) why it was necessary to use the services of a National organization rather than those of the State Board for evaluation of educational institutions from which the foreign-trained have graduated. It was pointed out by the Secretary to the Board that the State does not have the facilities for this evaluation.

H. Alvan Jones, M.D.
May 27, 1965
Page Two

Following this explanation, it is our recollection that there were no further objections raised to the proposal, leading us to the assumption that there was consensus in favor of the amendment.

It is gratifying to know that the Board has made the proposals, as listed in 610b 3(b), a part of their administrative procedure, to be effective as of July 1, 1965. Since the policy, as stated in the minutes, will be in effect, it seems there should be no objection to making it a part of the law.

Section 612 At the meeting, a representative of the Society raised some questions, and a Board member made the comment that the proposed amendment regarding advertising was rather precise. When it was shown that the wording was essentially as it appears in the Maryland State Medical Practice Act there were, to our recollection, no further objections, leading us to the assumption that there was consensus in favor of this amendment.

(609a (7) is necessary if 612 is included.)

Section 613 There was no intention to deprive the Board of the right to approve of the letters or symbols used. Rather, it was felt that the phrasing limits the jurisdiction of the Board to those symbols or letters of which they approve, to the exclusion of other symbols or letters, which also might imply physical therapy licensure.

Section 614 There was consensus that the proposed amendment regarding gratuitous services be deleted, and that the proposal regarding physical therapy students be included.

The excerpts of the minutes state there had been a meeting of the representatives of the Maryland State Physical Therapy Society, Inc. and the Maryland Chapter of the American Physical Therapy Association prior to the March 4 meeting with the Board. There had been no such meeting.

H. Alvan Jones, M.D.
May 27, 1965
Page Three

In the letter there was a proposal to amend Section 612 to permit the employment of assistants " who may or may not be licensed."

In effect, this could constitute licensure of assistants without any stipulations regarding their qualifications or training. It would tend to defeat the very purpose of the Physical Therapy Practice Act and would make a mockery of the ~~purpose~~ of the law which is to limit the practice to qualified physical therapists. Therefore, we find this proposal unacceptable.

Sincerely,

Ernest Burch
Chairman, Legislative Committee

cc: Mr. Clemens Gaines

EB/jb