

MINUTES
UTAH SOCIAL WORKER LICENSING BOARD
ELECTRONIC MEETING
February 4, 2021 | 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

CONVENED: 9:06 A.M.

ADJOURNED: 2:36 P.M.

DOPL STAFF PRESENT ELECTRONICALLY:

Jennifer Falkenrath, Bureau Manager
Jennifer Johnson, Board Secretary
Carolyn Dennis, Management Analyst

Neena Bowen, Compliance Specialist
Tracy Naff, Compliance Manager
Jenna Mayne, Testing/Outreach Manager

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT ELECTRONICALLY:

Marette Monson, LCSW
Emily Aikins, LCSW, Vice Chair

Alan Misbach, LCSW
Jamie Navarrete, SSW

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

Rachel Stoddard, SSW, Chair

GUESTS:

Arianne Buck
DeAynne Baker
Dwight Hymans, ASWB
Jennifer Larson, DCFS
Nan Mendenhall, DCFS

Sarah Welliver, DCFS
Tanner Hone
Shaelene Virrueta
Katie Mansell, Executive Director with
Utah Chapter of NASW

Note: Others may have been in attendance but were not identified.

ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS:

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Ms. Monson called the meeting to order at 09:06 A.M.

REVIEW AND APPROVE December 3, 2020, MEETING MINUTES

Refer to audio for specifics. (Audio 01)(00:00:44 – 00:01:30)

The Board reviewed the minutes.

Mr. Misbach made a motion to approve the minutes as written.

Ms. Navarrete seconded the motion.

The Board motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Refer to audio for specifics. (Audio 01) (00:01:30 – 00:56:25)

DCFS – SSW ROLE DISCUSSION

SSW EDUCATION

Ms. Monson stated the Board has asked to discuss the Social Service Worker (SSW) role and the education and exam requirements for the SSW license. Ms. Monson stated the Board has had prior discussions regarding the different pathways towards licensure and the concern with allowing individuals without a Bachelors of Social Work (BSW) degree to be able to obtain an SSW License. The Board has asked to have additional discussion and have additional information provided before considering or recommending changes to the SSW license requirements.

Ms. Falkenrath stated individuals from the Department of Child and Family Services (DCFS) have been invited to discuss the non BSW pathway to SSW licensure.

The Board welcomed Tanya Myrup, Assistant Director, and Jennifer Larsen, Director Training and Professional Development, from DCFS to the meeting.

Ms. Myrup thanked the Board for allowing DCFS the opportunity to meet with them to discuss the non BSW pathway. Ms. Myrup stated currently DCFS has roughly 700 employees who have been licensed as a SSW through the non BSW pathway.

Ms. Myrup stated this pathway offers a really great opportunity for a number of individuals seeking to serve their communities. Ms. Myrup stated they would argue the effectiveness of a non BSW pathway in a number of ways within DCFS. Ms. Myrup stated Utah, compared to the national average, have many great performance indicators and discussed the areas most impacted.

Ms. Myrup stated DCFS is very concerned with the potential changes being proposed. Ms. Myrup stated it would affect about 89% of the DCFS workforce and would negatively and detrimentally will impact social work in the state of Utah. Ms. Myrup stated DCFS is a Social Work institution and they have oversight and commitment in this important field and there is an incredible amount of Government oversight in their fieldwork.

Ms. Monson thanked Ms. Myrup for her time and the information she provided. Ms. Monson stated the information will help the Board moving forward when making decisions or changes to areas that may be needed, however, the goal of the Board is to not solve one problem by creating another. Ms. Monson stated the purpose of the meeting was to gather information and she anticipates future

discussions before any kind of decision or proposal to make changes would take place.

SSW EXAM

Refer to audio for specifics. (Audio 01) (00:12:21 – 00:56:35)

Ms. Falkenrath stated Utah is currently on an exam waiver with ASWB that expires in June 30, 2021. Ms. Falkenrath stated a decision needs to be made to determine how Utah will move forward with the ASWB Bachelors exam.

Ms. Falkenrath stated she spoke with the Utah Chapter of NASW and stated they have not pursued anything with the legislature to changes to education requirements or licensure pathway.

Ms. Falkenrath stated this means the Board needs to move forward with the way the statute is currently written. Ms. Falkenrath stated there the Board can recommend changes to amend the Rule or discuss options with the exam.

Ms. Falkenrath stated there are two options with the exam. Option one is to request another waiver with ASWB to allow non BSW's to take the AWSB Bachelor's Exam. Option two is to have non BSW applicants take the AWSB Associates Exam. Option two would require an amendment to the Rule.

Ms. Falkenrath stated regardless of the option the Board choses this is something that will need to be decided as soon as possible since either will take time to implement.

The Board welcome Dwight Hymans, ASWB Chief Executive Officer, to the meeting.

The Board asked Mr. Hymans how long a waiver lasts, the June 30, 2021 deadline, and what options the Board has.

Mr. Hymans stated if a waiver is approved with ASWB it is indefinite unless ASWB or the Board requests to change it.

Mr. Hymans stated the June 30, 2021, deadline is for members to come into compliance with ASWB exam use policy. Mr. Hymans stated there has been an increase in the number of individuals taking an exam outside of the validated use of each of the exams. Mr. Hymans stated when someone sits for an exam that does not fit the criteria for the exam use policy there is the potential for it to create an issue where the exam is no longer measuring what it was intended to and can make the exam invalid.

Mr. Hymans stated ASWB has been working with the members for the last five years to bring everyone into compliance with the exam use policy in order to protect the exam and make it valid and defensible. Mr. Hymans stated ASWB has been working with those

who fall outside of the policy to bring them into compliance with allowing alternatives and providing waivers.

Mr. Hymans stated exam waivers have not been granted for those whose degree does not meet requirements. Where the ASWB Bachelor's exam requires a BSW, those who have a non BSW degree should not be taking this exam. Instead ASWB recommends the Associates exam since that exam was designed for those without a BSW.

Questions and comments were discussed.

Ms. Monson asked if the ASWB Associates exam was provided as an option how would it affect DCFS.

Ms. Larsen stated adjusting the exam requirements would not be an issue for DCFS as long as the Rule allows for a non BSW to still be able to obtain a SSW license with the Associates exam.

Ms. Dennis provided information to the Board regarding SSW licensing and those that licensed through the alternate pathways. Ms. Dennis stated currently there are 1700 active SSW licenses. A majority received licensure through the alternate pathway and 568 held a BSW degree. In 2020, DOPL issued 100 SSW licenses and 80 of those held a BSW degree. Ms. Dennis stated when reviewing complaints there is not a safety issue for the public with those licensed through alternate pathways within DOPL's jurisdiction.

Mr. Misbach stated he wanted to thank everyone for the information provided and wanted to thank Ms. Myrup and Ms. Larsen from DCFS. Mr. Misbach stated there has been an active partnership with DCFS to review and address some of the issues that have been brought up. Mr. Misbach stated he respects DCFS and the important work they do.

Mr. Misbach stated he believes DCFS and the Boards intentions are inline and both want to provide the best services to the citizens of Utah and want to do it safely and effectively. Mr. Misbach stated he is on record regarding his concerns and stated that still stands and he would like to see data and hard facts to determine where is concern lies and if its warranted. Mr. Misbach stated he would like to review and discuss potential changes and unintended consequences.

Additional questions and comments were discussed.

Katie Mansell, Utah Chapter of NASW Executive Director, stated the Utah Chapter of NASW stated there are plans to pursue changes with licensure with the next legislative session and are in support of a waiver at this time during the interim.

Mr. Hymans stated a waiver would not be required if Utah would like to use the Bachelors exam and the Associates exam as they were intended. A waiver would be required to continue to allow everyone, including non BSW degrees, to take the

Bachelor's exam. Mr. Hymans even stated ASWB will work with those who are trying to come in to compliance with the exam policy.

Ms. Mayne asked Mr. Hymans if ASWB has granted any waivers to any other states to allow for non BSW degrees to be allowed to take the ASWB Bachelors exam.

Mr. Hymans stated there have been requests but they have been denied. ASWB has denied all requests for waivers to allow for non BSW degree holders to take the ASWB Bachelors exam.

The Board stated at this time the best option would be to request an exam waiver while decisions are being made with the license and education requirements. Especially if changes will require amendments to the statute and rule.

Mr. Misbach made a motion to request a two year waiver to allow Utah to continue with the exam as they have been. Utah would review in two years to determine if changes need to be made.

Ms. Aikens seconded the motion.

The Board motion passed.

Ms. Monson stated the Board is committed to working with the everyone on this issue and will continue to have discussions regarding this before the two year deadline for the waiver were to expire if granted by ASWB.

Mr. Hymans stated once the waiver is submitted it will reviewed by ASWB at their next Board meeting following the submission. Mr. Hymans stated ASWB will meet again on April 29, 2021.

UTAH ADMIN. CODE R156-60a-302d

Refer to audio for specifics. (Audio_01) (00:56:43 -00:57:05)

Ms. Falkenrath stated since the Board has decided to go with the exam waiver option this discussion is no longer needed. In the event the Board had chosen to utilize the ASWB Associates exam, draft Rules had been created for Board review.

SB 23

Refer to audio for specifics. (Audio_01) (00:57:05 – 1:00:39) & (Audio_02) (00:00 – 00:17:05)

Ms. Dennis stated this is continued discussion regarding the amendments made to licensure by Endorsement. SB 23 requires the review of all 55 jurisdictions for licensure similarity with Utah. If an individual is licensed within a jurisdiction that has been deemed similar to Utah, with one year of experience at the independent license level, they are able to obtain a license with Utah.

Ms. Dennis reviewed information and draft map for the SSW license. Ms. Dennis stated all of the stated identified in green have the CSWE requirement for education, require the ASWB Bachelor's exam, and the scope of practice is in line

with Utah which is what the main focus is. Ms. Dennis stated the states identified in yellow do not require an exam or do not require the ASWB Bachelor's exam. These states would be one where we ask for verification of passing the ASWB Bachelor's exam. Outlier states were discussed.

Questions and Comments were discussed.

Ms. Dennis reviewed information and the draft map for CSW license. Ms. Dennis stated the states in green have the CSWE requirement for education, meet the exam requirement, and the scope of practice is similar. The states in yellow would need to provide evidence of meeting Utah's exam requirements. Outlier states were discussed.

Questions and Comments were discussed.

Ms. Dennis stated for the states that have been identified as similar, the states will be identified in green on the map, Utah will take the license at face value and issue the Utah equivalent license. States that have questions additional information will be requested and then a license will be issued. Ms. Dennis stated this is the process for all of the professions DOPL licenses.

Ms. Dennis reviewed additional information with the Board regarding the draft map for the LCSW license.

Questions and Comments were discussed.

Ms. Dennis stated she will take the information discussed and prepare a formalized map for the Board to review and approve at the next Board meeting.

The Board thanked Ms. Dennis for all her work throughout this process.

Ms. Falkenrath requested the role be taken for those in attendance for the meeting since that information was not captured at the beginning of the meeting.

BREAK

The Board took a break at 10:30 A.M.

The meeting resumed at 11:10 A.M.

APPOINTMENTS:

COMPLIANCE REPORT

Refer to audio for specifics. (Audio_02) (00:30:00 - 00:32:25)

Ms. Bowen presented the compliance report as provided.

Questions and comments were discussed with the Board regarding the information provided for the upcoming interviews.

CHET LUDLOW, PROBATION REVIEW:

Refer to audio for specifics. (Audio_02) (00:33:00 -00:53:00)

The Board welcomed Mr. Ludlow to the meeting.

Mr. Misbach conducted the interview with Mr. Ludlow and reminded Mr. Ludlow the meeting is public and being recorded and will be uploaded to the Public Notice Website.

Mr. Misbach stated the Board has received all of the information Mr. Ludlow has provided. Mr. Misbach stated he understands Mr. Ludlow has put in a request for an amendment to his Order to allow him so see female clients that the Board will need to address.

Mr. Misbach reviewed Mr. Ludlow's supervisor reports and provided feedback on what he would like to see reflected in the report, the length of the report, and would like to see it type written. Mr. Misbach stated he does not have any concerns with Mr. Ludlow at this time and is in compliance.

Mr. Ludlow provided an update to the Board regarding his written request allowance to see female clients in a group setting and under supervision. Mr. Ludlow discussed what he has learned through the process and why he feels he is ready to start seeing female clients. Mr. Ludlow stated he is willing to do whatever the Board requires of him.

Mr. Misbach stated both Mr. Ludlow's therapist and supervisor have stated it would be in Mr. Ludlow's best interest to be able to see female clients in a setting where he is not alone and support this request at this time.

Mr. Misbach asked the other Board members if they had any questions, comments, or concerns with Mr. Ludlow's request.

Ms. Aikins stated she commended Mr. Ludlow on his dedication to the probation process and working with the Board even when the Board was tough on him and he has come along way. Ms. Aikins stated she would support the opportunity to allow him to start working with female clients as long as there were safeguards in place.

Ms. Monson stated she supported the request as well. Ms. Monson stated she would like to see information documented in Mr. Ludlow's therapy reports on how he is addressing his personal issues with transference and counter transference. Ms. Monson stated she hopes Mr. Ludlow will use the opportunity to grow.

Ms. Navarrete stated she agreed with the other Board members and supported Mr. Ludlow's request. Ms. Navarrete stated she was impressed with the plan Mr. Ludlow provided.

Ms. Falkenrath stated the Board would need to make a motion for an amendment to be made to Mr. Ludlow's Order and the Division Director would need to approve the Board's recommendation.

Mr. Misbach made a motion to modify the Order to allow Mr. Ludlow to see female clients under the conditions recommended by his therapist and supervisor.

Mr. Ludlow is only allowed to see female clients under direct supervision, by another clinical person, and in a group setting.

Ms. Monson seconded the motion.

The Board motion passed.

Mr. Misbach stated at any time the Board could make a recommendation to amend the order for a change or to reverse the decision if there was cause for concern.

Mr. Misbach he would like to see more detailed documentation with Mr. Ludlow's supervisor reports on how the change in the Order is to benefit him and the public.

The Board found Mr. Ludlow COMPLIANT.

Mr. Ludlow thanked the Board for their time and consideration with his request.

JERRY BUIE, PROBATION REVIEW:

Refer to audio for specifics. (Audio_02) (00:53:00 – 1:00:11) & (Audio_03) (00:00 – 00:06:45)

The Board welcomed Mr. Buie to the meeting.

Ms. Aikins conducted the interview with Mr. Buie and asked him to provide an update to the Board since last meeting with them in December.

Mr. Buie provided an update to the Board and stated he meets with his supervisor every week and attends therapy twice a month. Mr. Buie stated he makes sure he is compliant with the terms of his Order and including having his reports are submitted on time.

Questions and comments were discussed.

The Board reviewed the CE course Mr. Buie submitted for review and determined it was an acceptable course.

Ms. Monson stated she would like Mr. Buie's feedback on the course the next time he meets with the Board.

Ms. Navarrete stated she has appreciated Mr. Buie's openness and willingness to work with the Board.

Ms. Aikins stated Mr. Buie is doing well and the Board does not have concerns at this time.

The Board found Mr. Buie COMPLIANT.

Mr. Buie thanked the Board for their time.

The Board will plan to meet with Mr. Buie on Thursday, April 1, 2021.

HEATHER DRAUGHAN, PROBATION REVIEW:

Refer to audio for specifics. (Audio_03) (00:06:50 – 00:14:56)

The Board welcomed Ms. Draughan to the meeting.

Mr. Misbach conducted the interview with Ms. Draughan and reminded Ms. Draughan the meeting is public and being recorded and will be uploaded to the Public Notice Website.

Ms. Draughan provided an update since last meeting with the Board. Ms. Draughan stated she has learned a lot through the process and feels she is a much better therapist.

Mr. Misbach asked Ms. Draughan if she had any questions for the Board at this time.

Ms. Draughan stated her Order is due to end at the end on March 9th and wanted to know what the requirements of her as she finishes the process.

Ms. Bowen stated because Ms. Draughan is on a quarterly submission her supervisor can submit a report for March if they would like but it's not required. Ms. Bowen stated unless something changes Ms. Draughan will hear from Ms. Falkenrath once her probation has been terminated.

Ms. Falkenrath stated unless the Board recommends something different the recommend to release Ms. Draughan from probation will be forward to the Division Director for review and approval.

Mr. Misbach stated since this is most likely Ms. Draughan's last meeting with the Board he wanted to know when she last reviewed her Order and if she feels she is compliance with it.

Ms. Draughan stated she recently reviewed it feels she had done everything required of her. Ms. Draughan stated she has appreciated the opportunity she has had with this process. She is thankful for the people that have helped her and feels it has made her a much better therapist and she is a much stronger person.

The Board stated they did not have any concerns with Ms. Draughan at this time. The Board congratulated Ms. Draughan in completing her probation and wished her the best of luck moving forward.

The Board found Ms. Draughan IN COMPLIANCE.

Ms. Draughan thanked the Board for their time and their support.

LUNCH

The Board adjourned for lunch at 12:07 P.M.

The meeting resumed at 12:35 P.M.

RICHARD GARCIA, PROBATION REVIEW:

Refer to audio for specifics. (Audio_03) (00:19:54 – 00:43:00)

The Board welcomed Mr. Garcia to the meeting.

Ms. Navarrete conducted the interview with Mr. Garcia.

Mr. Garcia provided an update to the Board. Mr. Garcia has submitted a request to have an amendment made to his Order to remove the monthly requirement of two supervised client sessions due to a change in position with his employer. Mr. Garcia stated he is in contact with his supervisor on a daily basis.

Ms. Navarrete stated she wanted to make sure Mr. Garcia is setting appropriate boundaries for what he is capable of with his new position and not getting overwhelmed. Ms. Navarrete stated she wanted to make sure he does not end up in the same situation that placed him on probation.

Mr. Garcia stated he is aware and understands his limits and stated his employer and program director are working with him to make sure he does not get overwhelmed. Mr. Garcia stated he appreciates the Board's observation and concern for his wellbeing and stated he learned a lot from the previous situation and has put parameters in place to help him.

Ms. Navarrete stated Mr. Garcia's Order requires he complete two supervised sessions per month and that is what he is asking to amend.

Mr. Garcia stated that was correct.

Ms. Navarrete stated with the new position Mr. Garcia is doing is group treatment and occasional crisis intervention and asked if he is discussing this on a weekly basis with his supervisor.

Mr. Garcia stated he does and it's part of his routine duties. He is required to touch base with his supervisor and the facility director regarding each client. Mr. Garcia stated there is constant communication.

Ms. Navarrete asked the other Board members if they had any questions or concerns with Mr. Garcia's request to amend his Order.

Ms. Navarrete stated she does not have any issues with Mr. Garcia's request and feels the information is being captured elsewhere.

Ms. Monson stated Mr. Garcia's clinical skills were never in question. Mr. Garcia came before the Board due to being overwhelmed and made some billing errors as a result. Ms. Monson stated she is fine making an amendment to the supervision requirement of his clinical skills but would like to see supervision of his billing work.

Mr. Garcia stated his clinical director monitors his billing work on a weekly and monthly basis and he has been at 100%.

Ms. Monson stated that was great to hear and recommended receiving a supervisor report addressing productivity instead of clinical skills and information being provided that he is at 95-100% compliance.

Ms. Aikins made a motion to amend Mr. Garcia's Order, which currently requires supervision reports, to allow for his supervisor to submit productivity reports verifying his documentation of billing and request for funding are accurate.

Ms. Monson seconded the motion.

The Board motion passed.

Ms. Falkenrath stated she will draft the amendment to the Order and submit to the Division Director for review and approval.

The Board found Mr. Garcia IN COMPLIANCE.

Mr. Garcia thanked the Board for their time and consideration.

An appointment was made for Mr. Garcia to meet with the Board on June 3, 2021.

Ms. Navarrete left the meeting.

KELLY THOMAS, PROBATION REVIEW

Refer to audio for specifics. (Audio_03) (00:43:30 -00:54:13)

The Board welcomed Mr. Thomas to the meeting.

Introductions were made.

Ms. Monson conducted the interview with Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Thomas stated it had been a year since he last met with the Board and provided an update to the Board. Mr. Thomas stated he started clinical work in October 2020 and meets with his supervisor. Mr. Thomas stated he has been maintaining compliance with his Order.

Ms. Monson thanked Mr. Thomas for the update. Ms. Monson asked Mr. Thomas to remind the Board on what brought him before the Board.

Mr. Thomas stated he was placed on probation due to a dual relationship.

Ms. Monson stated the Board has reviewed the information Mr. Thomas has provided and there are no concerns at this time. Ms. Monson asked Mr. Thomas to make sure he is providing detailed supervisor reports and show that the issues that brought him before the Board are being addressed and he is maintaining compliance with his Order.

Mr. Thomas stated he has seen the information the supervisor is providing to the Board.

Ms. Monson stated she recommends Mr. Thomas work with his supervisor and provide the feedback from the Board on what information they would like to see provided in his supervisor reports.

Ms. Monson stated because the Board does not have a quorum at this time they are unable to make an official vote on anything but can indicate Mr. Thomas has provided what has been required.

The Board found Mr. Thomas IN COMPLIANCE.

Mr. Thomas thanked the Board for their time.

An appointment was made for Mr. Thomas to meet with the Board on April 1, 2021.

KYLE PETERSON, PROBATION REVIEW

Refer to audio for specifics. (Audio_03) (00:54:13 – 00:59:43) & (Audio_04) (00:00 – 00:17:40)

The Board welcomed Mr. Peterson to the meeting.

Ms. Monson advised Mr. Peterson the meeting is public and being recorded and will be uploaded to the Public Notice Website. At any time during the meeting if the character, professional competence or physical or mental health will be discussed the meeting can be closed at the request of Mr. Peterson or the Board.

Mr. Misbach conducted the interview with Mr. Peterson.

Mr. Peterson provided an updated to the Board. Mr. Peterson discussed what brought him before the Board. Mr. Peterson stated he reviews his Order on a regular basis to ensure he is staying in compliance. Mr. Peterson stated he attends therapy on a regular basis.

Mr. Misbach stated he has reviewed the supervisor reports that have been provided and he appreciates that the reports are type written. Mr. Misbach stated he has concerns regarding Mr. Peterson's supervision. Mr. Misbach stated the reports are very brief and do not provide adequate information.

Mr. Misbach stated the purpose of the reports need to identify how Mr. Peterson is doing and how he is maintaining compliance with the requirements of his Order.

Mr. Misbach stated the last supervision report received was only two sentences and that is not acceptable.

Mr. Misbach asked Mr. Peterson if he meets weekly with his supervisor.

Mr. Peterson stated he is and his supervisor also sits in on two sessions per month as requested. Mr. Peterson stated he reported the feedback of the Board from the last meeting and will relay the information again.

Mr. Misbach stated the Board does not know if Mr. Peterson's supervisor is sitting in on the sessions as required if he is not identifying it in his report.

Mr. Misbach stated Mr. Peterson's Order require Mr. Peterson's supervisor to review a percentage of the files as determined by the Board. Mr. Misbach stated he is not sure if the Board ever determined this percentage and if they did the supervisor is not providing the information in the reports.

Ms. Monson stated she does not believe the Board ever determined the percentage of the files they would like reviewed by Mr. Peterson's supervisor.

Mr. Peterson stated he has 12 clients at this time and then does group therapy sessions.

Mr. Misbach stated since Mr. Peterson only has 12 clients he would like to recommend Mr. Peterson's supervisor review 100% of the files at this time.

Mr. Peterson stated that would be fine.

Mr. Misbach addressed a few other areas of concern regarding Mr. Peterson's supervision, supervision reports, and the feedback being provided by Mr. Peterson's supervisor.

Mr. Peterson stated he has completed 7.5 hours of required CE's and has submitted a CE for Board review and approval regarding ethics and boundaries.

Mr. Misbach stated he did not have any issues with the course and asked the other Board members if they had any concerns.

Ms. Monson stated because the Board does not have a quorum they cannot make an official motion but can make a recommendation to allow the CE and formally approve at the next Board meeting when a quorum is available to make an official vote.

The Board found Mr. Peterson IN COMPLIANCE.

An appointment was made for Mr. Peterson to meet with the Board April 1, 2021

ZACH SNOW, INITIAL PROBATION REVIEW

Refer to audio for specifics. (Audio _04) (00:17:40 – 00:59:29)

The Board welcomed Mr. Peterson to the meeting.

Introductions were made.

Ms. Monson conducted the interview with Mr. Snow.

Ms. Monson asked Mr. Snow what has brought him before the Board. Ms. Monson advised Mr. Snow the meeting is public and being recorded and will be uploaded to the Public Notice Website. At any time during the meeting if the character, professional competence or physical or mental health will be discussed the meeting can be closed at the request of Mr. Snow or the Board.

Mr. Snow stated he understood and did not feel the meeting needed to be closed at this time. Mr. Snow stated on multiple occasions between January and October 2020, he submitted documentation stating he had completed in-home hospice visits when he had not. Mr. Snow stated his place of employment terminated him and he self-reported to the Division. Mr. Snow stated he has not been working in the field but does have a job offer upon approval from the Division and the Board.

Questions and comments were discussed.

The Board reviewed the requirements of Mr. Snow's Order.

Ms. Monson stated the Board can make a recommendation to move forward with employment and formally approve at the next Board meeting when a quorum is available to make an official vote.

Ms. Monson stated before the Board can approve a supervisor they would like to have the supervisor submit a CV or resume and a letter for why they feel they are acceptable to supervise Mr. Snow.

Mr. Snow stated he understands and will plan to move forward with employment and supervision.

Ms. Monson provided feedback regarding Mr. Snow's written plan and advised what information the Board would like to see addressed, including what steps are being taken to ensure the issues that led to the mistakes made are being addressed.

Ms. Bowen stated Mr. Snow's Order does allow for the Board to make a recommendation with a mental health evaluation.

The Board stated they would like to make a recommendation Mr. Snow obtain a mental health evaluation.

Ms. Monson stated the Board will make an official vote on this at the next meeting but recommends Mr. Snow look into scheduling a mental health evaluation now since this can take a while to receive an appointment.

The Board stated Mr. Snow's written plan was sufficient.

Additional questions, comments, and concerns were discussed.

The Board found Mr. Snow IN COMPLIANCE.

An appointment was made for Mr. Snow to meet with the Board on April 1, 2021

Meeting ADJOURN: 2:36 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 necessary shown in the chronological order they occurred.

4/1/21
Date Approved

(ss) Marette Monson, LCSW
Marette Monson, acting Chairperson
Social Work Licensing Board

April 1, 2021
Date Approved

(ss) Larry Marx
Larry Marx, Bureau Manager, DOPL