

**MINUTES**  
**UTAH SOCIAL WORKER LICENSING BOARD**  
**ELECTRONIC MEETING**  
**JUNE 4, 2020 9:00 A.M.**  
**Heber M. Wells Building**  
**160 E. 300 S. Salt Lake City, Utah**

**DUE TO COVID-19, NO PUBLIC ANCHOR LOCATION WAS PROVIDED.**  
**Public attended electronically**

**MEETING OPEN:** 8:59 A.M.

**MEETING CLOSED:** 12:57 P.M.

**DOPL STAFF PRESENT ELECTRONICALLY:**

Bureau Manager: Jennifer Falkenrath  
Board Secretary: Jennifer Johnson  
Compliance Specialist: Mark Smith

Compliance Specialist: Neena Bowan  
Management Analyst: Carolyn Dennis

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT ELECTRONICALLY:**

Chair: Rachel Stoddard, SSW  
Vice Chair: Emily Aikins, LCSW  
Jamie Navarrete, SSW  
Marette Monson, LCSW

Alan Misbach, LCSW  
Jenafer Newman, CSW  
Kathleen Anderson, Public Member

**BOARD NOT MEMBERS PRESENT:** N/A

**ASWB MEMBERS PRESENT ELECTRONICALLY:**

Dwight J. Hymans, MSW, LCSW, ACSW, Chief Executive Officer  
Jennifer Henkel, LCSW, CAE, Senior Director of Member Services & Strategic Initiatives  
Lavina Harless, MSW, LCSW, Director of Examination Development

**GUESTS:**

Joanne Yaffe, UNASW  
Madison Norris  
Jared Ferguson

**ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS:**

**CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

Ms. Stoddard called the meeting to order at 8:59 A.M.

**REVIEW AND APPROVE FEBRUARY 6, 2020 MEETING MINUTES (00:04)**

The Board reviewed the minutes.

Ms. Aikins made a motion to approve the minutes with corrections.

Ms. Newman seconded the motion.

The Board motion passed.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

### **ASWB - DWIGHT HYMANS & JENNIFER HENKEL (00:08)**

Introductions were made.

Mr. Hymans stated ASWB is the Association of Social Work Boards and is a Member Organization. The Utah Division and the Social Work Board are Members of ASWB.

Mr. Hymans stated he wanted to meet with the Board to review ASWB's Exam Use Policy and how Utah's current exam practices that are in conflict and out of compliance with ASWB's Exam Use Policy. The hope is that ASWB and Utah can determine reasonable ways to move forward with the exam practices that are satisfactory to both. Mr. Hymans stated ASWB exams must be legally defensible on behalf of Utah and all the other Member Boards.

Mr. Hymans stated there are five categories for exams. Each category of the exam is validated for specific candidate populations through a practice analysis process. If there are too many people taking exams outside of the specified candidate population groups, it creates the potential of ASWB's inability to be able to defend the exam. In order for ASWB to verify the exam measured what it was intended to measure, those taking the exam need to be who the exam was intended for. Too many candidates taking an exam not intended for them, makes it so that ASWB may not be able to defend the exam.

Ms. Harless stated exams are created through research and subject matter expertise. A process that takes two to three years from start to finish and is performed every five to seven years to make sure current practice is being measured. The last one was performed in 2015 and the exams were released in 2018. Ms. Harless stated the exams determine the competencies for safe practice on the first day of the job, giving Member Boards a valid, reliable, and legally defensible tool to assist in the mission of protecting the public.

Mr. Hymans reviewed ASWB's Exam Use Policy and a letter sent to the Board regarding that policy that outlines the specific target populations for each exam.

The Bachelors exam is designed for use as a licensure requirement for Baccalaureate Social Work (BSW) licenses. This exam requires a candidate hold a BSW. In order for ASWB to ensure exam reliability and validity, they need to ensure only those sitting for the Bachelors exam hold a Bachelors in Social Work degree.

The Advanced Generalist exam is designed for use as a licensure requirement to individuals with an MSW and two years of experience in non-clinical settings. The exam is intended to measure competencies in a more generalist perspective in social work practice and in non-clinical settings.

The Clinical exam is designed for use as a licensure requirement for Clinical Social Work licenses to individuals who have an MSW and two years of experience in clinical settings. Mr. Hymans stated the key area to focus on is the two years of experience in clinical settings.

Mr. Hymans stated ASWB has concerns regarding Utah's current use of the exams and would like to suggest more appropriate exams, in certain areas, and would comply with ASWB's Exam Use Policy.

Mr. Hymans stated for Utah's Social Service Worker license the Bachelors exam is required. Currently, Utah allows the Bachelor exam to be administered to candidates who do not hold a BSW degree. ASWB is concerned with this practice since the exam is only intended for those with a BSW degree and recommends using the Associate exam for candidates without a BSW. .

Mr. Hymans stated ASWB understands Utah allows the Clinical exam to be administered to candidates in their last semester or immediately upon graduation. This is outside of ASWB's Exam Use Policy and ASWB recommends using the Master's exam.

Mr. Hyman's stated Utah allows for the Advanced Generalist exam. Based on current license statute and rules, that exam does not support any of Utah's licensing categories and ASWB recommends Utah no longer use this exam.

Mr. Hymans stated going back to the Clinical exam, ASWB is aware this exam has been administered to individuals who do not have the two years of clinical experience required for licensure. Members have requested a waiver for this exam that allows an applicant to sit for the exam, prior to completing the supervised experience, but after they have completed no less than 18 months of supervised experience. This waiver is generally granted to individuals by ASWB's Board of Directors for individuals. Mr. Hymans stated this may be a way for Utah to come into compliance ASWB's Exam Use Policy and still be able to administer the exam prior to the completion of supervised experience.

Mr. Hymans stated ASWB would like to work with Utah to come into compliance. Based on ASWB observation, with the exception of Clinical exam use, Utah is administering the exams in line with ASWB policy. With regards to statutes and regulations there are inconsistencies with ASWB's Exam Use Policy.

For the areas that were identified as being outside of ASWB's Exam Use Policy, Utah has options to come in to compliance. The first, is to make changes in the statute, law or administrative procedure. The second, request a waiver or an exemption of ASWB's Exam Use Policy, some of the waivers have been granted and some have not. Mr. Hymans reviewed the waivers available.

Mr. Hymans and Ms. Henkel stated there is confusion on ASWB's end regarding Utah's licensure CSW and CSW Intern license categories.

**Ms. Falkenrath stated the CSW Intern license is for individuals who have graduated with their MSW and have not taken an exam or have not been able to pass an exam. The CSW Intern license is issued for six month license that allows an individual to practice with a license until they are able to take and pass an exam and apply for the CSW license.**

Mr. Hymans as if the CSW license was a license that individuals could hold forever and not be required to get the LCSW license.

**Ms. Falkenrath stated that is correct. The CSW license is a maintainable license. Utah does not require CSW's to obtain the LCSW license if it's not wanted.**

Mr. Hymans stated from ASWB's Exam Use Policy perspective, Utah using the clinical exam for the CSW license is not appropriate since the competencies being measured are not for someone to practice at a CSW license level. The exam measurement is for someone who intends to practice clinically at the LCSW level, which is what the Clinical exam is designed for.

Mr. Hyman stated for those taking an exam prior to graduation, they need to take the Master's exam. It's not only industry standard but also in compliance with ASWB's Exam Use Policy.

**Ms. Falkenrath stated the Board Division and the Board will need to determine how to move forward and if Utah can and will be able to comply with current requirements or will need to request a waiver. Ms. Falkenrath stated a current waiver is in place.**

Mr. Hymans stated that waiver will expire June 2021.

Mr. Hymans stated the goal of ASWB is not to create barriers, but to make sure an exam is defensible on how it's used.

**Ms. Aikins stated she understands not wanting to create barriers. However, it does not make sense that Utah would require an exam for licensure and then use the exam outside of the way it is intended. Ms. Aikins stated when looking at all sides of the issues, the legal defensibility overrides everything else.**

Ms. Yaffe stated Utah does not have licensure for individuals not involved in clinical activities. The two licenses are LCSW and CSW. The CSW licensed is required to obtain the training required for LCSW licensure. This is the Universities understanding as well and they train their students to the exam. Those individuals who do not plan to practice in a clinical setting typically never take an exam at all. Ms. Yaffe asked what the differences were in the Master's and Clinical exam.

Ms. Harless stated the content outline of the exams shows the differences. The Clinical has more diagnosis and treatment as well as DSM information. The Master's is more generalist but still covers some clinical material but not all. Both exams are distinct exams.

**Ms. Monson stated there are a lot of CSW's that have no plans to work in a clinical setting nor plan to obtain a LCSW license and would prefer to take the Master's exam and were pushed to take the Clinical Exam.**

Ms. Yaffe stated if this is the case then Utah should look at having a certification or license available for general practice. This would make it easier to come into compliance with ASWB exam practices.

Mr. Hymans stated ASWB has information available if Utah wanted to consider an option for a general practice license.

**Mr. Misbach thanked Ms. Yaffe and Ms. Monson for their comments and stated the CSW license requirement is to take either the Master's or Clinical exam. Most CSW's are working towards clinical licensure and doing clinical work under supervised practice. Asking them to take a lower level exam now and then take another exam in 18 months to two years to measure what they are already doing does not make sense.**

**Mr. Misbach asked what the options were and stated the decisions made now will have a huge impact later. Mr. Misbach also stated he does not see how individuals taking two exams protects the public.**

Mr. Hymans thanked Mr. Misbach for his comments and stated he understand the concern about revenue and stated ASWB does not try to increase the number of exams administered. ASWB's mission is to focus on protecting the public and supporting their Members.

Mr. Hymans stated with regards to moving forward there are two things happening right now. The first is coming into compliance with ASWB's Exam Use Policy and Utah deciding if there is a need for a category of license for those doing clinical practice. The second is in regards to the exams for licensure.

For the SSW License, the individuals that do not have a BSW need to take the Associate exam. Those with a BSW need to take the bachelors exam. For the CSW or LCSW license, the focus should be on the clinical exam and Utah looking at eliminating the other categories. Individuals cannot take the Clinical exam until they have practiced for at least 18 months. If Utah requires an exam for the CSW license then the Master's exam is what needs to be taken.

Mr. Hymans stated making adjustments in those areas will bring Utah in to compliance with ASWB's Exam Use Policy.

**Ms. Falkenrath stated in order to apply for the Clinical exam after 18 months of supervised practice, Utah would have to apply for a waiver.**

**Ms. Stoddard stated Utah would need to consider extending the CSW Intern license to meet the 18 months.**

Ms. Henkel stated when compared to other jurisdictions that would be Utah's path of least resistance. Also, this would mean two exams would no longer be required. Utah would need to see if statutes and regulations have the flexibility that would allow those changes.

**Ms. Stoddard stated Utah has a pathway for SSW licensure for those that do not have a BSW degree and asked if Utah would be able to apply that to a waiver that would allow those individual to still take the Bachelors exam.**

Mr. Hymans stated similar waiver requests are currently being denied.

Mr. Hymans stated the Associate exam does not imply an individual has an associate degree it's just a term ASWB uses to describe the exam. The exam is similar to the Bachelors exam it's just scored differently.

**Ms. Stoddard stated this is something the Board needs to consider. Utah requires the Bachelors exam for SSW license and does not allow for another exam. For those that don't have a BSW, and can't take the Bachelors exam, they will be disqualified from some employment opportunities, like the Federal Government, that require SSW licensure.**

**Ms. Monson stated the Board needs to take into consideration the exceptions Utah has made with degrees and exams and how it is going to affect license portability. Portability coming into Utah may not be an issue but Utah's portability going into another state may be and Utah needs to consider coming into compliance with few exceptions.**

**Mr. Misbach stated he agrees with Ms. Stoddard and Ms. Monson's concerns. Mr. Misbach stated the SSW issue should be addressed and we need to look into bringing it in line with national standards and if needed make Utah's license more consistent so that Ms. Stoddard's concern is address.**

**Mr. Misbach stated he is concerned with Utah doing what he calls a "back door" licensing practice allowing licensure of individuals who can call themselves social workers, but they do not have a degree in Social Work or related field. Mr. Misbach stated he supports recognizing a different type of licensure for those that fall into that category that does not necessarily have to restrict their scope of practice.**

**Mr. Misbach stated he does not agree with allowing a person to practice longer after graduation without having taken any kind of exam. Mr. Misbach stated he does not see how this is a safer practice. Extending the CSW Intern license from six months to 18 months does not verify protection to the public, but does bring us into compliance with ASWB. Mr. Misbach stated he supports this if it brings us in compliance with ASWB and prevents an individual from having to take another exam.**

**Ms. Monson stated she is not comfortable with individuals out there practicing without having passed an exam. The exam was put in place to measure competency to practice and she is not opposed to requiring two exams.**

**Ms. Falkenrath stated with regards to other professions, the associate clinical mental health counselors and the associate marriage and family therapists are not required to take an exam prior to receiving licensure. Their associate license is good for three years and during that time is when they need to pass their licensing exam. This means they are practicing mental health therapy for up to three years without passing an exam.**

**Ms. Falkenrath thanked Mr. Hyman and his team for attending and presenting at the meeting. Ms. Falkenrath stated she would reach out to ASWB if Utah needs to request a waiver.**

Mr. Hyman thanked the Division and the Board for allowing ASWB to attend and present their information.

**USU COURSE SYLLABUS REVIEW FOR DOPL, SOC 1020 (1:13)**

**Ms. Falkenrath stated there is an applicant that wants to apply for an SSW license. They have a bachelors in another field so they are required to take additional coursework. The applicant has taken a SOC 1020 course from a program that is not on the list of approved courses, but feels the course meets requirements.**

**Ms. Falkenrath stated the Division wanted to bring this before the Board to determine if the course meets requirements.**

**Mr. Misbach stated he is opposed stating if we grant an exception to one person then we need to grant an exception to all and that is essentially changing licensure.**

**Ms. Monson based on the conversation with ASWB, the Board needs to have additional discussions regarding education. At this time Ms. Monson stated she is not opposed to reviewing on a case by case basis but does not want this to become a standard where the Board is continuing to review on a case by case basis. Ms. Monson stated for this situation since the same course appears to be accepted from other programs with the same title she would accept it for this person.**

**Ms. Newman stated since the Board has been reviewing and allowing on a case by case basis she is willing to make a motion to accept this course.**

**Ms. Newman made a motion to accept this course for this individual.**

**Ms. Aikins seconded the motion.**

**Mr. Misbach abstained.**

**The Board motion passed.**

**LEGISLATIVE UPDATE - S.B. 23 (1:26)**

**Ms. Falkenrath reviewed S.B. 23 with the Board. S.B. 23 provides a provision to allow someone who has been licensed for at least one year in another state, and that state has a similar scope of a practice, the individual may receive a license by endorsement without having passed an exam. Ms. Falkenrath stated this applies to any state, district, or territory of the United States.**

**Ms. Falkenrath asked the Board if they want to allow the applications coming in for endorsement determine how the Division looks at it or do they want to review the different requirements for every state before determining.**

**Ms. Falkenrath asked if the Board feels the Social Work scope of practice is the same across all states or are there areas of significant difference that would be an issue if someone were allowed to license by endorsement under the new provisions established by S.B. 23.**

**Ms. Aikins stated in working with the VA, where you are allowed to work as long as you hold a Social Work license with any State, she has found that license requirements vary with other states. For example, Puerto Rico has less stringent requirements for licensure that may not line up with other states.**

Ms. Dennis stated she is the management analyst tasked researching all 56 jurisdictions for all of the license to determine what the scope of practice is. If the scopes are similar then she reviews what the qualifications to get that license are.

Ms. Dennis stated Social Work falls under the Umbrella Rule 58-60 and how the Board feels about that the requirement. Currently the endorsement provision is an individual has to have practiced at least 4000 hours, which 1000 hours must be in mental health mental health therapy. This requirement is for two years rather than one. Ms. Dennis asked if the timeframe was an important distinction to the Board.

**The Board indicated hours of practice, years of practice and continuing education were important to them. The Board also stated they would like to see “equivalent” more defined. Also, clarification on the one year. Does it mean they only had to hold a license for one year or that they actually had to practice for one year.**

Ms. Dennis stated this gives her information regarding what she needs to look for. Ms. Dennis stated she will gather information that will be brought back for the Board to review at a future meeting.

**Ms. Aikins made a motion for a break.  
Ms. Stoddard seconded the motion.  
The Board motion passed.**

**BREAK**

## **APPOINTMENTS:**

### **JESSICA MEEKINS, ADDITIONAL SUPERVISEE REQUEST (1:43)**

Ms. Meekins met with the Board to request permission to supervise additional supervisees beyond the amount allowed by Statute.

**Ms. Stoddard conducted the interview with Ms. Meekins.**

**Ms. Monson stated she reviewed Ms. Meekins request and is concerned with the amount of responsibility Ms. Meekins would be taking on when supervising 10 supervisees. Ms. Meekins would not only be responsible for her supervisees, but their caseloads as well.**

**Ms. Monson stated with a large agency like First Step House it's difficult to understand that Ms. Meekins is the only available therapist to provide supervision**

**Mr. Misbach stated he is opposed to making these types of exceptions across the Board.**

**Ms. Newman stated she agrees with Ms. Monson and Mr. Misbach. Ms. Newman stated the law recently changed to allow supervision from three individuals to six.**

**Ms. Navarrete stated she agreed with the other members of the Board.**

**Ms. Aikins stated she is in agreement with the other members of the Board and stated the Board is just getting comfortable with the change from three to six and ten just too many.**

Ms. Meekins stated are other therapists at First Step House, but they are not required to provide supervision if they do not want to.

Mr. Ferguson, First Step House clinical director, stated it's at his request Ms. Meekins is appearing before the Board to request approval for additional supervisees. Mr. Ferguson stated while there are other supervisors available to provide supervision, Ms. Meekins carries the highest supervision work load. Ms. Meekins is well qualified and provides the highest level of care to her supervisees and clients.

Mr. Ferguson stated as First Step House continues to grow so does its demand for clinician supervision. First Step House takes supervision very seriously. Mr. Ferguson stated when it comes to providing quality supervision, he feels it's not based on the number of individuals supervised but the qualifications and quality of supervision provided by the supervisor.

Mr. Ferguson stated Due to the shortage of mental health professionals in Utah, and knowing Ms. Meekins capabilities as a therapist and supervisor, he is asking for Board consideration to allow Ms. Meekins to supervise up to ten supervisees.

**Ms. Monson thanked Mr. Ferguson for his attendance and his comments. Ms. Monson stated while she does agree with some of Mr. Ferguson's comments, the issue presented is an agency issue and not a Board matter. The agency needs to hire more clinicians that are willing to supervise instead of asking for exceptions to the requirements.**

**Ms. Monson stated this is the 2<sup>nd</sup> time Ms. Meekins has asked for an exception to take on additional supervisees. The agency needs to work within the bounds of the laws and rules.**

Mr. Ferguson stated he respectfully disagreed and stated the agency does not have a hiring issue but a quality of care issue. The agency does not have enough supervisors that can provide the quality of supervision and care that that Ms. Meekins provides

**Ms. Monson stated the Boards role is to ensure the Laws and Rules are followed as they are written. And issues regarding quality of care, hiring and supervision need to be addressed within the agency.**

**Ms. Stoddard called the Board back to order and stated the Board needs to make a decision regarding Ms. Meekins request.**

**Mr. Misbach made a motion to deny Ms. Meekins request to supervise more than six supervisees.**

**Ms. Navarrete seconded the motion.**

**The Board motion passed.**

**Ms. Stoddard stated although Ms. Meekins is a good therapist, the capacity to supervise beyond six supervisees is not something the Board is willing to approve at this time.**

#### **COMPLIANCE REPORT (2:02)**

Mr. Smith reviewed the compliance report as provided.

#### **JAYNE SUMNER, NEW PROBATION REVIEW (2:17)**

**Ms. Newman conducted the interview with Ms. Sumner.**

**Ms. Newman asked Ms. Sumner what brought her before the Board and if she understands the requirements of her Stipulation and Order.**

Ms. Sumner stated she understood the terms of her order and stated she is appearing before the Board due to a boundary violation with a client. Currently she focuses on telehealth in her practice and feels safe in her environment.

**The Board reviewed Ms. Sumner's Stipulation and Order and addressed the violations documented in the Order. Ms. Newman asked Ms. Sumner how she has addressed the violations identified and how she will prevent them from happening again in the future.**

Ms. Sumner stated she understands the mistakes made and has learned a lot regarding boundaries. Ms. Sumner stated with the issues that occurred she allowed herself to be manipulated by a client. Ms. Sumner stated she has learned how to say no and understands that clients are clients and there is always a professional boundary that has to be maintained.

Ms. Sumner reviewed CE courses with the Board and what she learned from them.

**Ms. Newman made a motion to approve the CE's Ms. Sumner has completed.**

**Ms. Anderson seconded the motion.**

**The Board motion passed unanimously.**

#### **HEATHER DRAUGHAN, PROBATION REVIEW (2:35)**

**Ms. Anderson conducted the interview with Ms. Draughan.**

**Ms. Anderson asked Ms. Draughan to provide an update on how things are going since she last met with the Board.**

Ms. Draughan stated she works with children, teens and adults. She sees about 30 clients per week. Most clients are seen electronically but there are a couple children that she still meets in person with. Ms. Draughan stated her supervisor is very knowledgeable and provides the support she needs.

**Ms. Anderson asked if there were any concerns Ms. Draughan has or needs anything from the Board at this time.**

Ms. Draughan stated she did not at this time

**Ms. Anderson stated Ms. Draughan has proposed Roselene Dalanhese as her supervisor asked if Board had any questions or concerns with the proposed supervisor.**

**Mr. Misbach made a motion to approve Roselene Dalanhese and Ms. Draughan's supervisor.**

**Ms. Anderson seconded the motion.**

**The Board motion passed.**

**The Board found Ms. Draughan in compliance.**

#### **CHET LUDLOW, APPLICATION REVIEW (2:44)**

Introductions were made.

**Mr. Misbach conducted the interview with Mr. Ludlow.**

**Mr. Misbach asked Mr. Ludlow to indicate what brought him before the Board and how things have been going since he last met with the Board.**

Mr. Ludlow stated a boundary violation with a client, two years ago, that brought him before the Board. Mr. Ludlow stated he made an egregious mistake and has spent the past two years trying to correct the mistake and learn from it. Mr. Ludlow stated there was a period of time where he was unemployed due to his situation and probation status. Mr. Ludlow stated he currently works one day a week at a residential treatment facility treating male clients. His full time job he is a compliance officer at a residential treatment facility but he does not have any clinical duties.

**Mr. Misbach asked Mr. Ludlow if he had any questions or concerns he would like to address with the Board.**

Mr. Ludlow stated he did not.

**Mr. Misbach stated he understands Mr. Ludlow has proposed a supervisor that is not a Social Worker. Mr. Misbach stated for those that are on probation he is opposed to having**

**a supervisor that is not in the same field. Mr. Misbach stated he apologizes that information was not previously provided to Mr. Ludlow.**

Mr. Ludlow stated where is located in a rural area it has been difficult to find a supervisor willing to supervise him. Mr. Ludlow stated his proposed supervisor, Heather Allred, has been a great supervisor and has provided him with the support he has needed.

**Mr. Misbach asked if the Board had any questions regarding Mr. Ludlow's proposed supervisor.**

**Ms. Navarrete asked for clarification regarding Mr. Ludlow's and Ms. Allred's previous work relationship since they worked at the same place of employment when Mr. Ludlow's violation occurred.**

Mr. Ludlow stated they were located and different locations and had very little interaction. There was not any supervising authority between the two at that time, they were colleagues.

**Ms. Monson stated she has concerned with the guidance of the Social Work Code of Ethics when a supervisor is licensed in another field and not familiar with the Social Work Ethical Guidelines. Ms. Monson stated she agrees with Mr. Misbach and would prefer Mr. Ludlow have a Licensed Clinical Social Worker as his supervisor.**

**Mr. Misbach made a motion to deny Heather Allred as Mr. Ludlow's recommendation for a supervisor.**

**Ms. Monson seconded the motion.**

**The Board motion passed.**

**Ms. Aikins stated she wanted to commend Mr. Ludlow on the efforts he has made and the Board wants to continue to support him.**

**Mr. Misbach stated the decision to deny is nothing against Mr. Ludlow or Ms. Allred. Mr. Misbach stated the Board would like Mr. Ludlow to propose a new supervisor that is an LCSW in good standing and has held that license for two years.**

Mr. Ludlow stated he would have to stop seeing clients if he does not have a supervisor.

**The Board stated they did not want to create a situation where Mr. Ludlow would lose his employment and suggested for the purposes of his probation he find another supervisor who is an LCSW. This would mean Mr. Ludlow would have two supervisors.**

**Ms. Falkenrath stated Mr. Ludlow would need to have a new proposed supervisor at the next Board meeting in order to remain in compliance.**

**Ms. Aikins made a motion to allow Mr. Ludlow to continue supervision under Ms. Allred and will need to provide a new LCSW supervisor, not one previously proposed, at the next Board meeting**

**Mr. Misbach seconded the motion.**  
**The Board motion passed unanimously.**

**The Board found Mr. Ludlow in compliance.**

An appointment was made for Mr. Ludlow to meet with the Board August 6, 2020

**KYLE PETERSON, PROBATION REVIEW (3:08)**

**Ms. Monson conducted the interview with Mr. Peterson and asked what brought him before the Board.**

Mr. Peterson stated he had an inappropriate relationship with a client and a complaint was made to the Division regarding the relationship.

**Ms. Monson asked if Mr. Peterson would provide an update to the Board on his employment and probation.**

Mr. Peterson stated he is currently employed with a treatment facility treating male clients. He attends meetings and is trying to stay compliant with the terms of his Order.

**Ms. Monson stated the Board has received Mr. Peterson's written plan. Ms. Monson stated the Board would like to see additional information and stated they would like to provide Mr. Peterson to provide an updated plan.**

Mr. Peterson stated he would provide a new written plan.

**Ms. Monson stated Mr. Peterson has proposed a supervisor that is not a licensed social worker. Ms. Monson stated the Board prefers and recommends having a supervisor, licensed in the social work profession, familiar with the Social Work code of ethics and will be able to ensure compliance with the Social Work Laws and Rules. Ms. Monson stated a new recommendation would need to be provided by the next Board meeting.**

Mr. Smith stated Mr. Peterson can submit recommendations to him and he will forward to Ms. Falkenrath prior to the next meeting with the Board.

**Ms. Falkenrath stated she appreciated Mr. Peterson's commitment to his probation and has appreciated the continued communications Mr. Peterson has had with Mr. Smith regarding any questions he has had.**

**Ms. Monson made a motion to deny Mr. Peterson's proposed supervisor and request a new supervisor be proposed that is a qualified LCSW.**

**Ms. Aikins seconded the motion.**  
**The Board motion passed.**

**Ms. Monson made a motion to deny Mr. Peterson's current written plan and requests a revised plan be submitted.**

**Ms. Newman seconded the motion.**

**The Board motion passed.**

Mr. Peterson stated he is required to complete eight hours in continuing education. Mr. Peterson asked the Board if they had suggestions in the areas needed and stated he has proposed a course that has been provided today.

**Ms. Monson stated the Board likes to see courses specific to what brought Mr. Peterson before the Board. Ms. Monson recommended looking for courses regarding clients and boundaries. Ms. Monson stated the course Mr. Peterson provided unfortunately had expired so he will need to look at new courses. Ms. Monson stated due to the Pandemic courses are being offered online and the Board would accept those at this time.**

**Ms. Monson made a motion to deny Mr. Peterson proposed continuing education course since the course is no longer available.**

**Ms. Aikins seconded the motion.**

**The Board motion passed.**

**The Board found Mr. Peterson in compliance.**

An appointment was made for Mr. Peterson to meet with the Board August 6, 2020.

**Ms. Newman stated this will most likely be her last Board meeting since she will be applying for her LCSW and no longer be able to be the CSW member. She thanked the Division and the Board for the time she has served on the Board.**

**Ms. Stoddard adjourned the meeting.**

**NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING: AUGUST 6, 2020**

**ADJOURN:**

**Meeting adjourned at 12:57 P.M.**

Note: These minutes are not intended to be a verbatim transcript but are intended to record the significant features of the business conducted in this meeting. Discussed items are not necessarily shown in the chronological order they occurred.

8/6/20

Date Approved

(ss) Marette Monson

Rachel Stoddard Chairperson, Social Work Licensing Board

08/06/2020

Date Approved

(ss) Jennifer Falkenrath

Jennifer (Zaelit) Falkenrath, Bureau Manager, DOPL