Vignette #1 - Ethics related to representation of professional credentials

A substance abuse counselor intern has been working under the direction of a licensed substance abuse counselor at a local agency. After getting his signature verifying her internship and work experience hours, she was confidentially advised by a co-worker that there may be a "problem" with the LSAC supervisor's license. Upon checking the professional licensing website she found that his license has been suspended for many months. She went to the clinical director, who re-signed for her hours, but advised her to "let it go" and that the situation with the LSAC supervisor was 'being handled". In the meantime, the LSAC employee appears to be continuing to practice and signing client and intern documents using the LSAC letters after his name. Apparently the person in question is fairly well known and respected in the treatment community.

Vignette #2 - Responsibility to terminate or refer

A therapist was informed by a female client that the program had just accepted a man who she previously reported to the therapist had raped her 5 years prior. The therapist told the woman to not come on Mondays and had the man come only on Mondays even though he was assessed at a much higher level of care. On the first Monday, the therapist had the man process with the group the rape allegation, the man used the woman's name and denied it completely. On that Tuesday the woman came to group the next three days but the therapist did not inform the woman she had had the man process her and her allegations until after the group on Tuesday at which time she told the woman that it was a good thing she was not in group as the man had been quite derogatory about her. This situation continued on until the woman client could not function within the group and went on an individualized plan. At no time was the woman told there were any alternatives to this situation although there were many.

Vignette #3 - Respect for proprietary products, iatrogenic effects of services

Prevention program "A", an intervention approved for indicated and selective populations, has undergone several evaluations and is now listed on SAMHSA's NREPP as an effective prevention program. An advocate, not a prevention specialist or practitioner, in her zeal to get parenting resources to more families, decided to take program "A" and put it on DVD so parents and their kids could watch it in their homes... as opposed to having families receive the program in vivo with trained facilitators, as the program was designed to be delivered (universal direct). The DVD delivery of the program has no opportunity for questions and answers and has no one there to address conflicts between the parents and youth when they arise. The advocate did not re-label the program as program "B", but continued to use the trademarked name.