BOARD OF LICENSED SOCIAL WORKERS
Minutes of Meeting
May 23, 2008

The Board of Licensed Social Workers met on May 23, 2008, at the office of the Board of Medical Licensure and Supervision, 5104 North Francis Avenue, Suite C, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. The meeting was held in accordance with the Administrative Procedures Act and Open Meeting Act of Oklahoma.

Members Present:

Antoinette Lempicki, LSW, Board Chair
Eunice McDowell, LSW
Jeff Chace, LCSW
Elaine Eddens, LMSW
Larry G. Cassil, Jr.

Members Absent:

Gwendolyn Gibson, LCSW, Sec.
Joy Leuthard, LSWA, Vice Chair

Also Present:

Debra Schwartz, AAG
Kandi Hoehner, Administrator
Laura Maguire, Administrative Assistant

After roll call and noting that a quorum was present, Ms. Lempicki, Chair called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m..

The meeting began with Ms. Lempicki swearing in the new board member, Larry Cassil and welcoming him to the Board.

The Minutes from the March 14, 2008 meeting were reviewed. Mr. Chace moved to accept the Minutes. Ms. McDowell seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

A correction to the January 18, 2008 Minutes was addressed regarding Tausha Mayberry and Carla Parnacher. The initial draft Minutes did not correlate with the Consent Decree approved by the Board. The Minutes have been corrected to accurately reflect the terms of the Consent Decrees. Ms. McDowell moved to accept the corrected Minutes. Ms. Eddens seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

John O'Connor, attorney for **Denise Baker** submitted correspondence requesting the complaint against Ms. Baker, LSW be dismissed. Mr. O'Connor was not present at the meeting. Ms. Baker was in attendance along with her husband. Ms. Schwartz asked Ms. Baker if she would like to address the Board before discussion commenced. Ms. Baker

declined. Ms. Schwartz reminded the Board that Ms. Baker had appeared before the Board at a previous meeting to discuss private independent practice.

The complaint against Ms. Baker alleges that she was practicing independently by performing adoption home studies without being employed by an agency. Mr. O'Connor stated in his correspondence that other state's Attorney Generals have determined it is not truly private independent practice if the adoption home study is Court ordered. In such an instance, the Court itself is the body supervising the home study. He also points out that performing adoption home studies is not the practice of social work. If the Board chooses not to dismiss the complaint, Mr. O'Connor will seek a declaratory ruling by the District Court for clarification and interpretation of the Board's Rules.

Ms. McDowell pointed out that Ms. Baker does not hold the LCSW or LSW-Adm, therefore she should not be engaged in the private practice of social work. Ms. McDowell inquired of Ms. Baker if the adoption home studies she performed were Court ordered. Mr. Cassil inquired if her home studies were supervised in any way. Ms. Baker stated that all under the law all home studies are supervised by the Court as the Judge is the ultimate person who approves or disapproves the home study and adoption. She advised the Judge approves all studies upon completion however, he is not involved in the home study process. Mr. Cassil stated that in his opinion this does not constitute appropriate supervision.

Ms. Baker stated that she is a licensed private investigator. Ms. Schwartz reminded the Board that if a person uses the LSW designation, they are representing themselves as a licensee and will be held to the standards of the Board. After further discussion Mr. Chace moved not to dismiss the complaint against Ms. Baker. Ms. McDowell seconded the motion and the vote is recorded as follows:

Toni Lempicki, LSW	Yes
Jeff Chace, LCSW	Yes
Eunice McDowell, LSW	Yes
Elaine Eddens, LMSW	Abstain
Larrry Cassil	Yes

Watt Osage appeared before the Board with his attorney, Corrine O'Day. Ms. Schwartz initiated the discussion by stating the Board requested outside investigators to review allegations of a complaint lodged against Mr. Osage. The Complaint Committee evaluated the report as well as documents submitted by Mr. Osage at an informal interview. The Complaint Committee wanted the Board to be aware of the outcome of the investigation in order to make a decision regarding whether or not Mr. Osage should be granted a license. Mr. Osage has fulfilled all of the requirements, but has not been approved by the Board for a provisional license which allows Mr. Osage to take the ASWB exam.

The Committee felt Mr. Osage was appropriate in reporting what he suspected was abuse of residents at the Tenkiller Adventure Program. The Committee's focus was on the

interaction Mr. Osage had with one particular resident that will hereinafter be referred to as "MN". A letter signed by MN stated that Mr. Osage was the only counselor that cared about the residents and other counselors were named alleging they had treated the residents poorly. MN was 17 at the time the letter was written according to Mr. Osage.

When MN was interviewed by investigators he stated he only wrote the initial letter at the urging of Mr. Osage's son-in-law who requested the letter on behalf of Mr. Osage. MN was directed by investigators to write what transpired in his own words. When the Complaint Committee reviewed both letters it was very apparent to them that the letters most probably did not originate through the same author. Mr. Osage expressed his belief that the original letter had been written by MN.

Ms. Schwartz said MN told the investigators during the interview that he is unable to write in complete sentences and that he copied the first letter from a prewritten statement given to him by Mr. Osage's son-in-law. If this is true, it raises an issue of exploitation. It is also a breach of confidentiality due to the fact that when Mr. Osage submitted the first letter it had MN's full name and two other resident's names and was distributed to many people. Mr. Osage said it was not his intention to exploit the residents or breach confidentiality. He included the residents' names with the belief the Complaint Committee would need to have that information if they wanted to contact them. He assumed that confidentiality would extend to the people who received the letter.

Corrinne O'Day said that in the summary there were no direct allegations that Mr. Osage conspired with his son-in-law regarding obtaining the letters. She advised the Board that Mr. Osage's son-in-law was present at the meeting to answer any questions they may have regarding this issue. She stated that Mr. Osage did not request anyone to extract a letter from a minor. He does maintain contact with some of the residents.

Mr. Osage explained that when each resident entered the program they were assigned a buddy. There are levels that each resident could advance through and MN was in an upper level. Mr. Osage believes MN could not have reached the level at which he was assigned without knowing how to read and write. Ms. Schwartz responded by saying that the letter MN wrote for the investigators was incoherent and the first letter written has good vocabulary, spelling and sentence structure. Mr. Osage reported the residents help one another with the writing of letters. Ms. Schwartz advised MN wrote the second letter in the presence of investigators however, they don't know the origination of the first letter except from MN telling the investigators how the first letter came to fruition in his second letter.

Mr. Osage said he was dismissed from his employment abruptly and there was no closure with his clients. He was told that one resident wished to speak with him and Mr. Osage told the resident he could write him a letter. This was his explanation of why the first letter was in existence.

Ms. McDowell questioned whether Mr. Osage has the concept of confidentiality of clients and not allowing himself to be in a position of exploiting a client for his own gain.

She believed there is still a need for him to explore these areas in a supervised setting. Ms. Lempicki expressed her concern regarding Mr. Osage breaching confidentiality again.

Ms. O'Day said that she did feel the children were in danger at the time, but directed Mr. Osage to inform the Board what he has learned from this experience. Mr. Osage said he has always maintained confidentiality with clients. He has had sexual abuse cases arise and has had the need to contact child welfare and has maintained confidentiality in those instances.

The Board questioned Mr. Osage's son-in-law. He said MN approached him and asked to speak with Mr. Osage and he informed MN to write a letter to Mr. Osage. He stated MN took two days to write the letter.

Historically the staff at the Tenkiller Adventure Program has helped the residents write letters. The son-in-law denied giving MN telephone numbers for both himself and Mr. Osages. He denied helping MN write the first letter and advised it was his understanding that MN was coerced to write the second letter. Ms. Schwartz responded by saying the first letter also appears to have been coerced. Ms. Lempicki inquired of the son-in-law if the letter indeed was being written to Mr. Osage why it would be addressed "To Whom It May Concern". Ms. Schwartz questioned MN's motivation for authoring the first letter unless it was at Mr. Osage's son-in-law's request.

Mr. Osage said he was never given anything in regards to the allegations. He was fired abruptly and not given an opportunity to speak with the residents. He said he was told by his supervisors at Tenkiller Adventure Program they felt he had exploited the children. Mr. Osage's son-in-law stated he resigned his position and was not given the chance to speak.

Ms. O'Day stated that when Mr. Osage originally met with her he was very concerned about the children and it was his wish to help them. He was at a loss as to what to do from that point. He alleged his concern was for the children, not himself. Mr. Osage first contacted her in March. She said that initially Mr. Osage reported to the agency supervisor, then to the agency head, and then to the program head.

Mr. Osage again stated to the Board that he never exploited the children. He never offered them anything in return for their support.

Ms. Lempicki stated the Board can't get a clear answer on how Mr. Osage would handle future situations and feels that he needs added supervision. The Board expressed concern that Mr. Osage may not be adequately prepared to be an independent social worker.

Mr. Osage is now employed at Oklahoma Family Services, Inc. in Muskogee, which is a private non-profit agency, as a contract employee. Mr. Osage advised the Board that he is currently under supervision with John Eckenberger. He also receives supervision from Michael Simmons, LPC, the director of Oklahoma Family Services, Inc., on a day-to-

day basis. He advised the office has staff meetings on a weekly basis and cases are discussed at said meetings.

The Board stated that working as a contract employee is a violation of the statute and brings up the issue of being a contract employee while under supervision which is not permitted under the Rules. Mr. Osage said that he would correct this problem.

Ms. McDowell moved that Mr. Osage continue under clinical supervision for one year. During that time monthly reports are to be submitted by his clinical supervisor in relationship to the issues discussed in supervision. The reports must include issues of client confidentiality, in-agency processing of complaints and client/social worker relationship. Mr. Cassil amended the motion by adding that the Board needs evidence that he is no longer working as an independent contractor. Mr. Cassil then seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative. A letter will be sent to Mr. Osage.

Lyle Kelsey and Regi Varghese appeared before the Board to present the Administrative Report. Mr. Kelsey reviewed the revision to the FY '07 Budget Work Program. The total revision amount is $8,800 which represents database modifications, website changes, and online renewal project cost that was underestimated.

Revisions to the FY '08 Budget Work Program were presented to the Board. The total revision amount is $20,959 that represents: $19,709 for the Attorney General Contract which was not originally budgeted; $11,250 for the Board's FY 2008 share of the Consultant Contract which was originally budgeted through Medical Board but not included in OSBLSW budget; and -$10,000 for moving expenses that were budgeted but not spent.

The Budget for FY '09 was then reviewed. By June 30, 2008, the estimated cash carryover will be $ 230,000 and the estimated revenue for the FY '09 is $196,000. Mr. Kelsey explained the estimated expenses to be paid out during FY '09. The amount of $10,000 was put back in the budget for moving expenses. The Medical Board is currently looking at property but they are not finding many buildings with the space that is needed, approximately 10,000 square feet. Mr. Kelsey is anticipating an increase in office space rent.

The estimated cash carryover for June 30, 2009 will be approximately $170,000. Mr. Kelsey suggested waiting on the online application set-up. There being no further discussion, Ms. McDowell moved to approve the financial statement. Mr. Chace seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative. Mr. Chace then moved to approve the 2009 budget. Ms. Eddens seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Patrick Elifritz was called before the Board on a complaint that he had excessive social contact with a client. Ms. Schwartz began the discussion by informing Mr. Elifritz this was an informal interview. She advised that if he and the Board can agree on a plan to address any deficiencies they may see or that he may admit to, those issues are not

considered a disciplinary action and are not reported to the national databank. It would simply be a plan of improvement.

Mr. Elifritz did not disagree with the complaint letter. He explained that he is from a very small town. While at a gas station near his home, a client approached him. She said she was going to an unsupervised visit with her children and wanted to take bicycles for them to ride and asked to borrow Mr. Elifritz's truck. He asked to see her driver's license and then loaned her his truck. He told the Board that he wasn't trying to benefit from it and thought it was an innocent thing to do. He also stated that the client was a client of the agency with which he was employed, however she was not his client. Ms. Lempicki stated in small communities it is very difficult not to have dual relationships. Once he loaned his vehicle, it started something in motion, which allowed further contact.

After the loaning of his truck, the client came to his home on two occasions for advice, bringing with her her children.

Mr. Elifritz is now employed full-time with an agency in Eufala and provides services in LeFlore County as a therapist. He confirmed that he was terminated two months ago from his previous job due to the alleged dual relationship. The Board discussed several options that Mr. Elifritz could have taken in dealing with the client and he agreed to the approaches offered by the Board.

Ms. McDowell moved to have the complaint dismissed with a verbal caution to Mr. Elifritz. Mr. Cassil seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Ms. Dannie Valega appeared before the Board requesting a waiver of continuing education requirements for the 2007 calendar year and to allow her to renew for 2008 out of time. Due to extended illness and an accident during an ice storm, Ms. Valega lost her job, home and car. She stated that she did send in her renewal form with a money order before March 31st however the Renewal was never received at the OSBLSW office. Ms. Valega did not realize that her license had not been renewed until a new employer requested her current wallet card and she realized she did not have it. Ms. Valega commented several times that she did send in the renewal information, money order, and CEUs. She can't locate the copies due to the fact that she only had 48 hours to move out of her home and consequently many things were lost in the move.

After some further discussion and reviewing letters from Ms. Valega and her physician, Mr. Cassil moved to waive the required continuing education for 2007 and allow a late renewal. Ms. McDowell seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

The Board reviewed correspondence from **Dale Doty** wherein he asks the Board to make an exception to supervisor training requirement. Mr. Doty was required to attend a supervisor training course by July 2007 but did not attend until the April 2008 training. Mr. Doty did however, teach a six hour Supervisor Refresher Course, approved by the Department of Health. He also advised he has not supervised anyone in the last year, but

has been asked to supervise a license candidate. Mr. Chace moved to accept the April 2008 supervisor training as timely and to allow Mr. Doty to maintain his Board Approved Supervisor status. Ms. Eddens seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Bill Piatt, Vice-President of Southern Oklahoma Treatment Services, appeared before the Board regarding the issue of MSWs under supervision not being able to be contract employees. Mr. Piatt is a healthcare lobbyist and business owner. He began by stating all therapists working for his agency are contract employees. He expressed his concern that MSWs under supervision for clinical licensure weren't making the same pay as LCSWs under contract. Ms. Lempicki stated that the statute says licensees under supervision cannot do contract work. Mr. Piatt responded by saying that supervisees are working under contract in other agencies and he wanted to make the Board aware of the problem. There was some discussion on what supervisees can and cannot do while under supervision. Ms Schwartz said that under the current statute and Rules MSWs are not permitted to be contract employees. Mr. Piatt thanked the Board for their time.

Philip Griffith, Major in the USAF, sent in a written request for waiver of the continuing education requirements due to active military duty in the Middle East. He will not return home until late December 2008. Mr. Chace moved to waive the continuing education requirements for Mr. Griffith's 2009 renewal. Mr. Cassil seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

The Board reviewed a letter from **Gina Filkins** explaining the delay of her signing the Consent Decree, a copy of which was attached. No vote was necessary.

Alicia Atwell submitted a physician's report that had been requested by the Board at the March 14, 2008 meeting. She is requesting a waiver of the continuing education requirements for her 2008 Renewal. She had obtained six hours of continuing education before breaking her left shoulder, which required multiple surgeries. After reviewing the physician's report, Mr. Cassil moved to grant Ms. Atwell's request and send correspondence to her asking whether more continuing education hours had been obtained than she stated. Her renewal was dependent on receipt of money and Renewal form. Mr. Chace seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

The Board reviewed the requested medical documentation of **Lynda Cooper** and her daughter, Debra Owens. The documentation had been requested at the March 14, 2008 meeting. Ms. Cooper requested a waiver of continuing education requirements due to illness. In addition to her illness, she was the caretaker for her daughter after a major surgery. Before becoming ill, Ms. Cooper had completed 12 continuing education hours. After reviewing the documents, Ms. McDowell moved to grant the request in addition to Ms. Cooper taking the remaining four hours needed for renewal, along with the 16 hours required for this year. Mr. Chace seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

As a result of her Consent Decree, **Karla Kemph** submitted a report detailing her efforts to direct and focus her supervision on both self-care and proper relationships with clients. This more detailed correspondence was requested at the March 14, 2008 Board meeting. The Board felt what Ms. Kemph sent to the March meeting did not fufill the requirements of the Consent Decree. The updated report stated how she is applying theses principles. Ms. McDowell moved to accept the letter as fulfilling the requirements of the Consent Decree. Ms. Eddens seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Ms. Schwartz presented the complaint log. In the case # 200801, Ms. Schwartz recommended dismissal of the complaint against **Valery Gonzalez**. Ms. Eddens moved to dismiss the complaint. Ms. McDowell seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

In the case #200802, Ms. Schwartz recommended to dismiss the complaint against **Jacqueline Kluemper**. Ms. McDowell moved to dismiss the complaint. Ms. Eddens seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

In the case #200804, after receiving a letter stating that Ms. Mayfield would no longer use the credentials U/S for LCSW, Ms. Schwartz recommended that the complaint against **Anedra Mayfield** be dismissed. Ms. Eddens moved to dismiss the complaint. Mr. Chace seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Before Ms. Schwartz left, Ms. Lempicki wanted to discuss an application of licensure submitted by **Lahoma Roebuck**. Ms. Lempicki began by stating that Ms. Roebuck is licensed in Maryland, but working in Oregon. She had an Oklahoma license which expired in 2007. She did not send in any evidence that she has the necessary continuing education requirements for renewal. Mr. Chace said that Ms. Roebuck has not responded to letters sent earlier from the Board requesting proof of continuing education. Ms. Lempicki then pointed out that Ms. Roebuck does not want to renew her license. She wants a new license as a LCSW, which would get her around the continuing education requirements.

Ms. Hoehner said that Ms. Roebuck is meeting the requirements for a new license. She has historically not gotten the required continuing education, let her license lapse and submitted a new Application for Licensure. Obviously, she has found a loophole in the statute.

Mr. Cassil called the Board's attention to provision 1261.1a(D). It states:

> "However, a person who has been licensed in the laws of the state and the license has expired, but has continually practiced social work in another state, may renew the license upon completion of the continuing education requirements and payment of the fee."

Mr. Cassil felt as though this clause would make Ms. Roebuck ineligible to be an initial applicant.

Ms. Schwartz said that after determining the meaning of this statute it must be applied consistently to everyone in the same situation. She also stated something will need to be put in the statute preventing people from doing this in the future.

Mr. Chace commented due to Ms. Roebuck's non-resident status, she must reapply as an initial applicant and pass the current licensure exam, or in the alternative produce her continuing education and renewal fee.

Mr. Chace moved to approve Ms. Roebuck's Application for Licensure as a LCSW and grant her permission sit for the ASWB Clinical exam, issue no provisional license, exam ID only. Mr. Cassil seconded the motion and the vote is as follows:

Toni Lempicki, LSW	Yes
Jeff Chace, LCSW	Yes
Larry Cassil	Yes
Eunice McDowell, LSW	Abstain
Elaine Eddens, LMSW	Yes

Ms. Schwartz left the meeting.

The Board began review of Applications for Licensure. Mr. Chace moved to approve **Chani Cochran** for LMSW, issue provisional license. Ms. Eddens seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Mr. Chace moved to approve **Amy Crowder** for LMSW. Mr. Cassil seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Mr. Chace moved to approve **Andrew Allen** for LCSW, pending receipt of a clear background check. Ms. Eddens seconded the motion and the vote was unanimouns in the affirmative.

Mr. Chace moved to approve **Barbara Tunney** for LCSW, pending receipt of ASWB registry. Ms. McDowell seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Mr. Chace moved to approve **Erin Koos** for LCSW, pending receipt of a clear background check, issue provisional license. Ms. Eddens seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Mr. Chace moved to approve **Deborah Mitchell** for LCSW, pending receipt of a clear background check, issue provisional license. Ms. Eddens seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Mr. Chace moved to approve the following applicants for LCSW, issue provisional license:

Veronica Damron
Sarah Lohrey
Yok Fong Paat
Stephanie Watkins

Ms. McDowell seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Mr. Chace moved to approve **Alma Burrell-Pearson and Roslyn Jones** for LCSW, no provisional license, exam ID only. Mr. Cassil seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Mr. Chace move to approve **Phyllis Sue Lamon** for LCSW, no provisional license, exam ID only, with ADA accommodation. Ms. Eddens seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Mr. Chace moved to approve **Rose Mary Shaw** for LCSW, no provisional license, exam ID only. Mr. Cassil seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Mr. Chace moved to approve **Beth Venus** for LCSW, no provisional license, exam ID only, and pending receipt of a clear background check. Ms. Eddens seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Mr. Chace moved to approve **Marc Chevalier** for LCSW. Mr. Cassil seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Mr. Chace moved to table **Jennie Roland's** application for LCSW, pending an additional 800 clinical practice hours. Ms. McDowell seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Ms. Eddens moved to approve **Karen Lazenby** for LMSW, issue provisional license. Mr. Chace seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Ms. Eddens moved to approve **Leondra Moore** for LCSW, no provisional license, exam ID only. Mr. Chace seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Ms. Eddens moved to approve **Kathi Turner** for LCSW. Mr. Chace seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Ms. McDowell moved to approve **Janice Kimball and Evelyn Taylor** for LCSW. Mr. Chace seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Ms. McDowell moved to approve the following for LCSW, issue provisional license:

Robyn Haley
Jenna Howard
Christy Robertson

Mr. Chace seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Ms. Lempicki moved to approve **Melanie Clevenger and T. Jefferson Pounders, III**, for LCSW, issue provisional license. Ms. Eddens seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Ms. Lempicki moved to approve **Suzanne Koenig** as a clinical Board Approved Supervisor. Mr. Chace seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Ms. Lempicki moved to table the application of **Suzanne Bass** for clinical Board Approved Supervisor due to lack of LCSW reference letter. Mr. Chace seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Ms. Hoehner reported that all rule changes go into effect June 26, 2008.

She advised the New Board Member Training for Lanny Endicott will be June 27th and 28th in Arlington, Virginia and Larry Cassil will attend the training August 22nd and 23rd in Chicago, IL.

The ASWB Fall Conference, in Rhode Island, will be November 5-8, 2008. The Spring Conference will be in Quebec.

Ms. Hoehner advised Board retreat is scheduled for August 16 and 17 and a copy of the new ASWB Model Act will be handed out at the retreat.

Ms. Hoehner discussed the ASWB DARS reporting system which can only be accessed by administration of jurisdictions who are members of the Association of Social Work Boards. She discussed the possibility of reporting Consent Decrees to the DARS databank. Ms. Lempicki said this is something she would like to discuss at the retreat in August.

She stated there will be no Board member's page and no online supervision for now due to financial restraints.

She suggested the possibility of having supervisees not fluent in English be required to take the ESL (English as a Second Language) test.

Ms. Hoehner briefly gave an updated report on Elizabeth Ashton's status.

She then reviewed the current status of Sharolyn Wallace who is not compliant with supervisor requirements and her Board Approved Supervisor status has expired due to her non-compliance. Ms. McDowell suggested sending a letter of notification to Ms. Wallace's supervisees. Ms. Hoehner stated that she did send a letter to Ms. Wallace notifying her of the impending expiration date.

Ms. Hoehner asked if the Board should begin requesting tax reporting documentation with Supervisor/Supervisee Contracts. It was suggested that at the time the forms are rewritten we would include a check box requiring the supervisee to confirm they are not a contract employee but we would not require that information at this time.

Ms. Hoehner suggested adding questions regarding mental health to the application for licensure form.

She concluded her report by reviewing the topics that were discussed at the NASW meeting in Montana, one of which was the suggestion of adding questions regarding mental health on the Application for Licensure, along with questions regarding any disciplinary actions taken by a university against the Applicant.

There was no Chair report, other than discussing the retreat location.

There being no new business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m..