

MINUTES

**UTAH
SOCIAL WORK
LICENSING BOARD
MEETING**

June 8, 2006

**Room 4B – 4th Floor – 9:00 A.M.
Heber Wells Building**

CONVENED: 9:06 A.M.

ADJOURNED: 2:40 P.M.

Bureau Manager:
Board Secretary:

Noel Taxin
Karen McCall

Board Members Present:

Kathryn M. Della-Piana, Chairperson
Mark de St. de Aubin
Dennis R. Frandsen
Patsy J. Smith
Jean V. McAfee

Board Members Absent:

Joyce Stowe-St. Clair
Steven Fisher

Guests:

Craig Jackson, Division Director
Karl Perry, AAG
Dee Thorell, Investigator

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

DECISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS:

Read and approve the May 4, 2006 Minutes.

Mr. de St. Aubin made a motion to approve the minutes with minor revisions. Mr. Frandsen seconded the motion. **The Board vote was unanimous.**

Read and approve the February 28, 2006 Mental Health Therapy Boards and Substance Abuse Counselors Board Minutes.

Mr. Frandsen made a motion to approve the minutes with a minor revision. Mr. de St. Aubin seconded the motion. **The Board vote was unanimous.**

FYI

Ms. Taxin explained that it appeared there would not be a quorum for all of today's meeting due to Board members call in absent or needing to leave early and she and the Board Secretary readjusted the schedule to

fit in the probationers that would require a quorum.

Ms. Taxin stated that Henry McCloyn, Tamera McArthur and Nichole Salazar were rescheduled to meet July 13, 2006.

APPOINTMENTS:

9:30 A.M.

Robert Anderson, Probationary Interview

Mr. Anderson met for his probationary interview.

Karl Perry, AAG, was present for the interview. Mr. Perry was introduced to the Board. Dee Thorell, Investigator, was present for the interview.

Ms. Della-Piana conducted the interview.

Ms. Della-Piana notified Mr. Anderson that the Division has not received the following:

- 1. The required psychological evaluation from Dr. Joan Zone.**
- 2. The required letter from someone who has agreed to supervise Mr. Anderson stating they have read the Stipulation and Order and agree to support the Division and Mr. Anderson to complete his probation successfully.**
- 3. The required monthly supervision reports.**

Mr. Anderson responded that he did have the psychological evaluation completed about 2 months ago and signed a release for the report to be submitted to the Division. He stated he was sorry but did not feel responsible as Dr. Zone should have sent the report.

Mr. Anderson stated that M. Shaun Palau, LCSW, has agreed to be his supervisor and he will contact Mr. Palau regarding the letter and the supervision reports. Mr. Anderson stated that supervision has not yet been finalized but it should be finalized soon. He stated that Mr. Palau works for Magellen, has a private mental health therapy practice and also has a used car lot so he is very busy.

Mr. Anderson apologized for some of his display at the last meeting and explained that his blood sugar had

dropped which then he displays his anger.

Ms. Della-Piana acknowledged that all experienced some negativity at the last meeting.

Ms. Della-Piana suggested that he might want to locate a different supervisor as it appears that Mr. Palau might be too busy.

Mr. Anderson responded that Mr. Palau is busy but when he makes an appointment he does keep the appointment. Mr. Anderson explained that he and Mr. Palau know each other personally and professionally.

Mr. de St. Aubin asked Mr. Anderson to explain his understanding of the supervision.

Mr. Anderson responded that his understanding is that the supervisor must meet with him at his agency, review files he decides to review and submit monthly reports.

Mr. de St. Aubin asked what Mr. Anderson plans to get out of being supervised.

Mr. Anderson responded that he plans to complete his probation.

Mr. Jackson asked if there is an issue regarding confidentiality.

Ms. Taxin explained that Mr. Anderson will need to notify his clients that there will be another clinician reviewing the files and request they sign a release of disclosure.

Mr. Anderson stated that Mr. Palau will be hired to supervise.

Ms. Taxin and Ms. Della-Piana responded that Mr. Anderson must contract with Mr. Palau for supervision. Ms. Taxin stated that Mr. Palau will be in charge and Mr. Anderson cannot terminate him as the supervisor.

Mr. Perry suggested Mr. Palau submit a copy of his billing for supervision services of Mr. Anderson for

the Board to review. Mr. Perry explained that the billing will establish that Mr. Palau is in control and will then be able to submit honest reports without obligation.

Mr. Anderson commented that the billing of services is really not the Board business and he did not agree with submitting the documentation.

Ms. Taxin suggested she speak with Mr. Palau and explain the responsibilities of the supervisor.

Mr. Perry suggested Mr. Palau meet with the Board and the Board be very clear about the supervision expectations.

Ms. Della-Piana stated that Mr. Anderson would be hiring Mr. Palau as an independent contractor for supervision only and cannot do any other type of contract work for Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Anderson stated that he did not see any problems with Mr. Palau being an independent contractor for supervision and Mr. Anderson referring clients to him as a clinician.

Ms. Della-Piana stated that referring clients out to Mr. Palau would be ok.

Ms. Taxin stated that Mr. Anderson should have a different supervisor if Mr. Palau is involved in his business. Ms. Taxin stated that the supervision relationship must be separate and if Mr. Anderson has an agreement to refer business to Mr. Palau it might not be good for the supervision as it could be a dual relationship. Ms. Taxin explained that the Board is trying to be sure there will be no problems that arise later.

Mr. Anderson clarified that Mr. Palau has no other relationship with him.

Ms. Taxin stated that Mr. Anderson must submit all required information by June 15, 2006 to be in compliance with his Order. Ms. Taxin stated that if the supervision letter and supervision reports are not received by June 15, 2006, Mr. Anderson will

be expected to locate a different supervisor.

Mr. Anderson agreed to getting the Division/Board the reports.

Mr. Anderson responded that he has read the psychological report and Dr. Zone stated that he might benefit from therapy but does not make any recommendation.

Ms. Taxin stated that the psychological evaluation must give a recommendation. Ms. Taxin asked if the issues that put Mr. Anderson on probation were discussed during the evaluation and interview and, if the issues were brought up, did Dr. Zone have any concerns.

Mr. Anderson responded that Dr. Zone read the Stipulation and Order and did not mention any concerns.

Mr. de St. Aubin asked if the Board can request the issues to be addressed by the evaluator if there is no indication in the report.

Ms. Taxin responded that the Board may make a request.

Ms. Taxin stated that Mr. Anderson and his supervisor will need to meet July 13, 2006 to be sure the supervisor understands his role to supervise and to be sure the issue of boundaries with the clients is addressed in supervision.

Mr. Anderson asked if he needed to meet next month as it costs him a lot of money to come and meet and not see patients.

Ms. Taxin stated that the Board may recommend quarterly appointments with Mr. Anderson after the July meeting if they deem a decrease of frequency of the meetings is appropriate.

Mr. Anderson asked if Mr. Palau must attend or does he not have to attend the July meeting.

Ms. Taxin stated that the Board would like to meet

with him for discussion.

Mr. Jackson stated that the supervisor is not required to meet with the Board but the Board is not required to approve Mr. Palau as the supervisor. Mr. Jackson stated that it would be advantageous to Mr. Anderson for the supervisor to meet in July.

Mr. Anderson asked again if Mr. Palau has to meet with the Board.

Mr. Perry again stated that it would be advantageous to Mr. Anderson for Mr. Palau to meet with the Board in July.

Mr. Anderson responded that the cost to him for Mr. Palau to attend might be prohibitive.

Ms. Taxin stated that she would not recommend Mr. Palau as a supervisor if he is charging Mr. Anderson an unreasonable amount as there are supervisors that do not charge anything and many who charge minimum. Ms. Taxin stated that Mr. Palau may call her if he has any questions prior to meeting with the Board and he should be prepared with any questions he may want the Board to address.

An appointment was made for Mr. Anderson to meet again July 13, 2006 at 10:45 A.M.

Ms. Taxin asked the Board if they would feel comfortable with her and Ms. Della-Piana interviewing Mr. Palau and making a recommendation regarding him supervising Mr. Anderson when he submits the letter agreeing to supervise.

Board members agreed for Ms. Taxin and Ms. Della-Piana interviewing Mr. Palau and making a recommendation.

10:15 A.M.

Mary Cannon, Clarification of Requirements

Mary Cannon met with the Board for clarification of requirements.

Ms. McAfee disclosed that she works with Ms. Cannon and asked if Ms. Cannon would feel uncomfortable with her remaining in the room and participating in the discussion.

Ms. Cannon stated that she was comfortable with Ms. McAfee participating in the discussion.

Board members and Division Staff were introduced to Ms. Cannon.

Ms. Della-Piana conducted the interview and asked Ms. Cannon to explain her specific situation.

Ms. Cannon explained that she had sent in her supervision forms with a letter requesting the Board for a review and requesting the Board to accept hours she worked at the Utah State Hospital as a volunteer. Ms. Cannon explained that she submitted her information in April 2006 and was surprised that she did not receive a response or her license within a few weeks. She stated that she asked Ms. McAfee to check on her application. She stated that when Ms. McAfee asked about the application she was informed by the Board Secretary, Ms. McCall, that the Division received only a letter and the supervision forms. Ms. Cannon stated that she then received a letter from Ms. McCall requesting she meet with the Board. Ms. Cannon stated that she discussed the issue of the hours with Mr. de St. Aubin, a Board member, Kym Meyer, the Utah NASW Association and with Jean McAfee, a Board member, and was of the understanding that she met qualifications.

Ms. Della-Piana read the portion of Ms. Cannon's letter regarding her hosting many of her patients for home visits with her family over a holiday. Ms. Della-Piana asked Ms. Cannon to explain why she would bring clients into her home as that is a conflict in boundaries.

Ms. Cannon explained that many children had received home visit passes for the holiday and did not have anywhere to go. Ms. Cannon stated that she had children of similar ages and felt it would be good for her family and the children she brought in.

The Board informed Ms. Cannon that it is not appropriate to bring clients home for activities.

Ms. Della-Piana commented that Ms. Cannon is required to submit a complete application if she is applying for a license.

Ms. Cannon responded that she wanted her supervision reviewed and approved before she submitted a complete application.

The Board reviewed the experience forms and Ms. Cannon's letter and determined it was clear that Ms. Cannon was not a paid employee of the State Hospital.

The Board read the Mental Health Therapy Practice Act Rules Definition of an employee: R156-60-102(3), "Employee" means an individual who is working or providing services for compensation paid in the form of wages or salary from which there is withheld or should be withheld income taxes or social security taxes under applicable law; or who meets any other definition of an employee established by the Industrial Commission of the State of Utah or the Internal Revenue Service of the United States government.

Mr. de St. Aubin stated that the Board was faced with the dilemma of making an exception to the Law and Rule by accepting volunteer work based on a letter referring to Ms. Cannon as an unpaid employee and determining if an unpaid employee meets the definition or categories of an employee as defined by the industrial Commission and the IRS.

Ms. Taxin asked if the Board would accept the hours if Ms. Cannon had been a paid employee.

The Board responded that the hours would count if Ms. Cannon had been a paid employee.

Ms. Taxin recommended she contact the AG's office for clarification and then make a determination if Ms. Cannon meets the requirements even though the definition of an employee is specific. Ms. Taxin stated that she

would contact Ms. Cannon regarding the decision.

Ms. Cannon stated that she discussed the issue of the hours with Mr. de St. Aubin, a Board member, Kym Meyer, the Utah NASW Association and with Jean McAfee and was of the understanding that none of them thought there would be any question regarding the hours counting toward the required 4000 hours of supervised mental health therapy. Ms. Cannon asked why Kym Meyer would tell her the hours would count if they did not.

Ms. Taxin responded that Ms. Meyer may voice a personal opinion but the Board and the Division must follow the guidelines of the Laws and Rules.

Ms. Taxin stated that the review of Ms. Cannon's experience is an exception to the normal review of information as only complete applications are reviewed. Ms. Taxin suggested Ms. Cannon read the application instructions and the Utah Laws and Rules to be sure she understands requirements before submitting incomplete information.

During a break Ms. Taxin contacted the AG's office for clarification.

Ms. Taxin stated that the AG's office was concerned about Ms. Cannon contacting the Association and Board members for approval without going through the appropriate forum of a Board meeting. Ms. Taxin reported that the Board would be recused if Ms. Cannon should appeal the decision to not accept the hours.

Ms. Taxin reported to the Board that the AG's office advised her and the Board to follow the guidelines of the Law and Rule and since the definition of an employee states compensation paid in the form of wages or salary, Ms. Cannon's experience at the State Hospital would not meet that requirement.

Ms. Taxin stated that she will contact Ms. Cannon regarding completing hours as a paid employee prior to submitting a complete application for LCSW licensure.

Board members concurred.

10:45 A.M.

Curtis Watson, Probationary Interview

Mr. Watson met for the probationary interview.

Ms. Della-Piana conducted the interview.

Ms. Della-Piana explained that the Board recommended termination of Mr. Watson's probation at the May 4, 2006 Board meeting. Ms. Della-Piana stated that Mr. Watson's supervisor, Beverly Roesch, submitted 2 letters to the Division regarding Mr. Watson since the last meeting. Ms. Della-Piana read both letters. The letters documented that Mr. Watson submitted his resignation to Cirque Lodge and then an alumni reported that Mr. Watson was going into business with a former client. Ms. Roesch's letter stated that she checked the telephone records and discovered Mr. Watson had been calling the former client over a period of time. Ms. Roesch's letter stated that Mr. Watson was terminated from his employment as he had been dishonest with Cirque Lodge and was being dishonest with the Board by not disclosing his plan of going into business with the former client which violated his probation.

Ms. Della-Piana requested Mr. Watson to respond.

Mr. Watson distributed and read a document to the Board. Mr. Watson stated that the individual was a former client who did not complete therapy with Mr. Watson and is a part investor in the California business where he will be the director. Mr. Watson stated that the former client contacted him several times and he always gave the response that he could not work with the former client. He said that after he reviewed the offer he decided that he could work in the position as there would not be direct contact with the former client and the former client was not a full investor. Mr. Watson stated that he read the NASW Code of Ethics and discussed the situation with an attorney who assured Mr. Watson that the former client was only an investor and there would be no conflict. Mr. Watson stated that the boundaries have been clearly set in that the former client must stay

away from the facility for another year and have no day to day personal involvement until then. Mr. Watson stated that the boundaries have been set to minimize harm to the former client. Mr. Watson stated that the attorney and the therapist for the former client have assured him that there is no exploitation taking place.

Mr. Watson stated that he informed his supervisor when the former client contacted him with the employment proposal and Ms. Roesch did not appear to be concerned or have any questions. Mr. Watson stated that the contact from the former client only became an issue after he had turned in his letter of resignation.

Mr. Watson stated that he was of the opinion that he learned from his past experience and he is committed to the California position as it will be an opportunity for him.

Ms. Della-Piana asked if he was so thorough in his research on the position why he was not more upfront and honest with Ms. Roesch and the Board.

Mr. Watson responded that he was of the opinion that he was honest and upfront with Ms. Roesch and the Board but did not think disclosure of going into business with a former client was something that he needed to share with the Board.

Ms. Della-Piana reminded Mr. Watson that he consistently told the Board that he was not in contact with former clients.

Ms. McAfee stated that one of Ms. Roesch's reports stated that she had not reviewed all phone records but was aware that Mr. Watson had contacted a former client a couple of times.

Ms. Taxin stated that the Board was open with Mr. Watson and thought he was also being open. Ms. Taxin asked why he did not disclose the contact.

Mr. Watson responded that he did not know why he did not disclose the contact. He stated that he was

shocked at Ms. Roesch's last 2 letters as he had informed her of the contact.

Ms. McAfee asked why the previous reports stated there was no contact if she knew there had been contact.

Mr. Watson responded that he could not answer that question. He stated that his agreement with Cirque Lodge and Ms. Roesch was to disclose any contact with former clients and he did disclose to her.

Ms. Taxin stated that the boundaries are clear to her and she asked why they are not clear to Mr. Watson as to how he can harm clients and former clients by continuing to have a relationship with them.

Mr. Watson responded that he was not being dishonest as he worked with the former clients attorney, therapist and current companion and not directly with the former client.

Ms. Taxin asked if Mr. Watson thought there might be a problem by being in contact with the therapist of the former client.

Mr. Curtis responded that there is no problem as the therapist is not an investor.

Ms. McAfee stated that the end result is the same whether Mr. Watson contacted the former client or allowed the former client to contact him as contact was made.

Ms. Della-Piana stated disappointment regarding being in several meetings with Mr. Watson and him giving dishonest answers to questions.

Ms. Taxin stated that Mr. Watson should have disclosed to the Board that one of the investors was a former client for the issues to be discussed.

Ms. Taxin asked the Board for a recommendation regarding Mr. Watson continuing probation or to let the recommendation of termination of probation be processed. Ms. Taxin stated that Mr.

Watson would be required to be licensed in California, to be on probation there and to meet the requirements of the probation if the Board recommends the Utah probation to continue.

Mr. Watson apologized to the Board and stated that he did not think there would be any problem based on his discussions with the attorney and the length of time since the former client had been a client.

Mr. Frandsen made a motion to withdraw the recommendation of termination of probation and to continue Mr. Watson's probation. Ms. Smith seconded the motion. The Board vote was unanimous.

Ms. Taxin concluded that she will review the original Order regarding an amendment.

Mr. Watson commented that he is leaving Utah tonight to move to California.

No appointment was made at this time for Mr. Watson to meet again with the Board.

11:30 A.M.

Jennie Gwilliam, Probationary Interview

Ms. Gwilliam met for her probationary interview.

Ms. McAfee conducted the interview.

Ms. Taxin informed Ms. Gwilliam that the Division has not received the required reports from Dr. Lynne Brunson.

Ms. Gwilliam responded that Dr. Brunson mailed the reports on Monday and they should be received soon.

Ms. Taxin read the report and noted Mr. Humphries report is more specific and he stated he feels Ms. Gwilliam is following procedures and has not done any constraint procedures.

Ms. McAfee asked if Ms. Gwilliam would like to report anything in addition to the information in the report.

Ms. Gwilliam responded that she is still working part

time as she is in school and learning new things in her classes. She stated that she is happy in her work as there is always a challenge when working with kids. Ms. Gwilliam explained that she is working on helping the kids understand early attachment and giving them an assignment to talk with their mothers regarding when they were born, their childhood, etc. She stated that even those born under horrific circumstances can do things to recover. Ms. Gwilliam stated that she discusses nutrition, breathing techniques and thought patterns with her clients.

Ms. Gwilliam stated that her classes have been difficult and she has two more years of classes before she begins the dissertation.

Ms. Taxin asked Ms. Gwilliam to talk about her supervision with Dr. Brunson as we have not received a report.

Ms. Gwilliam responded that she and Dr. Brunson have discussed a class Dr. Brunson attended. She stated that Dr. Brunson shared the paperwork with her to read. Ms. Gwilliam stated that she is content in her work. She stated that she is moving on with her life and doing types of therapy other than holding therapy. She stated that the field of attachment therapy has grown so much and it is exciting to be working in that field. Ms. Gwilliam stated that her former partner came across Heart Math and she is using the program. She stated that it monitors the heart beat and finds the state where the client feels safe. She stated that the computer is able to track the anxiety or relaxed heart rate so the kids can visually see if they have made progress. She said it is used in schools, sports, games, videos, etc. and helps people regulate their heart beat. She stated that it has an immediate feedback and people learn they have the power to control themselves. Ms. Gwilliam stated that the program is portable as you connect it to your laptop and take it with you. Ms. Gwilliam stated that she brought the computer and asked if any Board members would like a demonstration. She stated that she was requested to do a demonstration in a class last spring which was a success.

Ms. McAfee asked if Mr. Humphries is aware that

she is using Heart Math on clients.

Ms. Gwilliam responded that he is aware that she is using Heart Math and she has conducted demonstrations on the staff. She stated that all staff members liked the program.

Ms. Taxin requested Ms. Gwilliam to be sure reports are submitted prior to her appointments in order to prepare the information for the Board to review.

Ms. Taxin stated that Ms. Gwilliam's probation is going well and the Board and Ms. Gilliam are working well together now.

An appointment was made for Ms. Gwilliam to meet again September 7, 2006.

The Board secretary checked today's mail and located 3 monthly reports from Dr. Brunson regarding Ms. Gwilliam. Ms. McCall submitted the reports to the Board for review.

Ms. McAfee read the reports to the Board and noted Ms. Gwilliam is in compliance with her Stipulation and Order.

12:30 P.M.

Mr. de St. Aubin, Board member, was excused from the meeting.

WORKING LUNCH

1:15 P.M.

Gregg Lott, Probationary Interview

Mr. Lott met for his probationary interview.

Ms. Della-Piana conducted the interview.

Ms. Della-Piana remarked that the monthly reports were received and the supervisor, Lane Cannon, reported that he and Mr. Lott have been working on several safety goals and some personal goals.

Ms. Taxin asked Mr. Lott to bring the Board up to date on his practice plan and review the discussions he has with his supervisor.

Mr. Lott distributed his updated practice plan to Board members and Division Staff.

Mr. Lott responded that he and Mr. Cannon have worked on safety where therapy is performed, interpersonal relations between the therapist and the client, supervision areas and therapist competency. Mr. Lott stated that he now has a more formal procedure for the supervisors and those being supervised. He stated that he was going out to the therapy sites with the interns and now he is also going out with all the therapists. Mr. Lott explained that going out to the therapy site is for training and discussion to identify therapy location options and to make recommendations. He stated that the therapists are discouraged from conducting therapy in a car and in their own home. Mr. Lott stated that he encourages the therapist to go out on the client's porch if the client is home alone. Mr. Lott stated that he now discusses boundary issues, sexual boundaries and attractions with the therapists and how the therapist role is for therapy rather than friendship. Mr. Lott stated that he is trying to define the therapist's role more clearly. He is trying to identify authority and identify where to place the children in the system with the authority given to make decisions and recommendations. Mr. Lott explained that he now has a check list for the supervisor to follow which will be extended as needed. Mr. Lott stated that he included in the plan several personal requirements, such as, all applicants submitting a copy of their license, demonstrating a basic knowledge of the agency and requiring criminal background screening and abuse screening. Mr. Lott stated that there are some things in the plan specific to the agency and some to remind him and to help him be more aware of his responsibility as the director.

Ms. Taxin responded that she can see that Mr. Lott has thought through what a practice plan should include and his agency, the clinicians and clients will benefit by having the plan in place and following it. Ms. Taxin stated that Mr. Lott has included several areas that many directors do not consider.

Mr. Lott stated that therapists who do therapy in their office is very different than the therapist who goes to a

home or another type of setting. Mr. Lott stated that he has to explain how the therapist fits into the program of the agency. If they go as a teacher they can review and assess at the time to determine if they want to do therapy at that setting or go to a different setting. Mr. Lott stated that the family knows there is a problem as their youth is involved with a gang and the things written in the practice plan will help him be a better supervisor and to concentrate on specific areas.

Ms. Taxin asked Mr. Lott to discuss his supervision and asked if the supervision is helping him.

Mr. Lott responded that Mr. Cannon has volunteered to be a consultant at the agency. Mr. Lott explained that anyone in the agency may use the consultant if they are feeling stressed etc. He stated that Mr. Cannon has brought up some discussion items that he has not considered and the consultation for the agency has helped the agency. He stated that he will continue to use Mr. Cannon as a consultant.

Mr. Frandsen asked why therapists might be discouraged from doing therapy in a public location such as a restaurant or the library.

Mr. Lott responded that confidentiality is a big issue in a public setting which limits what you can discuss as clients will not open up with others around. Mr. Lott stated that therapy in the home is good as you have a chance to engage other family members as they need assistance as much as the child.

Ms. Taxin asked Mr. Lott if he had completed any continuing education (CE).

Mr. Lott responded that he did complete 6 hours at a conference, attended a sex specific conference and is looking for something on supervision.

Ms. Taxin stated that he still needs 14 more hours and perhaps those hours could be in management, ethics or boundaries. She suggested Mr. Lott not narrow the list of topics as the CE should be helpful to him.

Ms. Taxin reminded Mr. Lott that the supervisor reports are due monthly for 6 months and, due to being a little slow in the beginning, the monthly reports should continue until the September 2006 meeting and then the Board may consider going to quarterly reports.

Ms. Taxin asked if Mr. Lott had any questions or concerns to discuss.

Mr. Lott stated that he has CSW's that are being supervised by other LCSW's and there are no student interns at this time. Mr. Lott asked if the Board would consider reinstating supervision privileges for him.

Ms. Taxin responded that Mr. Lott should discuss it with his supervisor and request the supervisor to make a recommendation in his report. Ms. Taxin asked how many Mr. Lott is requesting he be allowed to supervise.

Mr. Lott responded that there is one new CSW coming into the agency next week.

Ms. Taxin asked if the Board would recommend supervision of one CSW.

The Board approved for Mr. Lott to supervise one CSW.

Mr. Lott thanked the Board. Mr. Lott commented that there are different responsibilities as an owner of an agency than there are as a therapist and he has been thinking how removed he is from the clinical element of the agency. Mr. Lott stated that all the group homes have therapy going on and the agency is looking at having a lead therapist in each home.

Ms. Taxin asked Mr. Lott to be prepared to discuss updates on how the plan is working, some of the challenges and how he has redirected the plan.

An appointment was made for Mr. Lott to meet again September 7, 2006.

Board members and Division staff were introduced.

Ms. Della-Piana conducted the interview.

Ms. Della-Piana stated that the Division had sent a letter of concern to Ms. Gaunt regarding the duties as a supervisor. She asked Ms. Gaunt to explain the circumstances.

Ms. Gaunt stated that she was notified by Dee Thorell, an investigator, that she was not suppose to supervise anyone until she had been in licensed clinical practice for a minimum of 2 years. Ms. Gaunt stated that she did not think she should be supervising but her employer said she could. Ms. Gaunt stated that she did not do very much supervision and if it had been ok to supervise, the supervision was not being done properly. Ms. Gaunt explained that she was at the agency Friday with everyone there and Saturday by herself. She stated that she was not there enough time to supervise properly. Ms. Gaunt stated that she also found out that the she could not supervise her employer.

Ms. Taxin asked Ms. Gaunt to explain how supervising an employer would not be right.

Ms. Gaunt responded that Ms. Thorell explained that the supervisee/employer signs the paycheck and if she said something the supervisee/employer did not agree with she could loose her job.

Ms. Taxin asked if Ms. Gaunt has now read the Laws and Rules.

Ms. Gaunt responded that she has now read the Laws and Rules.

Ms. Taxin asked what date could she start to supervise someone.

Ms. Gaunt responded that she will have been in clinical practice for 2 years next April 12, 2007 and could start supervising at that time. She explained that she has learned that she must make the supervision formal, organized and regular. Ms. Gaunt stated that

she must make sure the supervisee is not the person writing out her paycheck and she must have approval to review files if the supervision is not at her own agency.

Ms. Taxin suggested Ms. Gaunt print out the Laws and Rules for the Substance Abuse Counselors (LSAC) as she was supervising two LSAC's, John and Sandra Misrasi, and review them carefully regarding supervision requirements as she must do the minimum of the requirements when supervising an LSAC. Ms. Taxin stated that Ms. Gaunt may work for the Misrasi's but the supervision must be obtained from another facility and supervisor. Ms. Taxin stated that Ms. Gaunt could supervise the Misrasi's if they were not the owners.

Ms. Della-Piana stated that the letter from the Division to Ms. Gaunt documents that Ms. Gaunt was aware of a boundary issue. Ms. Della-Piana asked Ms. Gaunt to explain how she would handle the situation differently if it came up again.

Ms. Gaunt responded that she is aware of the guidelines now and if a situation came up again she would notify the Division immediately.

Ms. Della-Piana stated that it is important to always be discussing boundaries, transference and counter transference as there are many clinicians that get into trouble with boundary issues.

Ms. Taxin stated that Ms. Gaunt has more responsibility as an LCSW and if she chooses to supervise she is accountable. Ms Taxin suggested Ms. Gaunt have a very clear plan or program for supervision so that when she does start supervising she has something in place that is clear and organized. Ms. Taxin stated that the Board is sure that she did not make the mistake intentionally and we are here to assist her with answers to questions she may have so that she does not get herself into another situation in the future. Ms. Taxin recommended Ms. Gaunt review the Laws and Rules each year to be familiar with them and any changes that may occur. Ms. Taxin recommended

Ms. Gaunt contact the Division if she has any questions.

Ms. Gaunt thanked the Board and Division for their time and feedback and stated the meeting was helpful.

NEW APPLICATIONS:

Barbara Chapple, Application review for
LCSW Licensing

Ms. Taxin explained that an application was submitted from Barbara Chapple for the LCSW license. Ms. Taxin stated that Ms. Chapple contacted Mr. de St. Aubin to discuss licensing requirements. Ms. Taxin requested Board members to refer people to the Division when they call for opinions.

Ms. Taxin explained that Ms. Chapple would like to be licensed by endorsement as she cannot document the original 4000 hours of mental health therapy supervision. She explained that the application information does not meet the endorsement requirements as she has not documented 4000 hours of licensed mental health therapy practice within the last 3 years as required.

Ms. McAfee commented that the mental health therapy Boards and the LSAC Board discussed at the February 2006 combined meeting about developing a form that would be submitted regularly or, at least, completed and signed on a regular basis during the supervision rather than waiting until the end of the supervision. Ms. McAfee stated that she regularly updates the form in the application for her own personal hours. Ms. McAfee suggested Ms. Taxin give a presentation to the graduating social work classes and refer to the form.

Ms. Della-Piana stated that Ms. Chapple must either document valid supervised hours or document the licensed practice in Texas as required by the Law in order to be licensed in Utah. Ms. Della-Piana recommended the application be denied if Ms. Chapple is unable to meet the new license requirements or the endorsement requirements.

Board members concurred.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Update on Rules and Human Service Worker Licensing

Ms. Taxin reported on the Board's request to check on the possibility of including a level of social work licensing called Human Service Worker. Ms. Taxin stated that the Law would have to be changed to include a Human Service Worker level of licensing. Ms. Taxin suggested Farrina Coulam, Utah Chapter of NASW, be invited to meet with the Board to discuss making a change in the Law.

The Board thanked Ms. Taxin and recommended Ms. Coulam be contacted to meet with the Board.

FYI

Ms. Taxin stated that the Board has discussed licensure by endorsement today. Ms. Taxin stated that the endorsement issue has also been discussed in the other Mental Health Therapy Board meetings. Ms. Taxin stated that many applicants for LCSW are able to document continuing education but have not been licensed 3 years or they have not worked 4000 hours in the last 3 years so do not meet the endorsement requirement.

Ms. Taxin requested Board members to review the Law section of licensure by endorsement, 58-60-115, and be prepared for discussion and possible options for endorsement applicants. Ms. Taxin stated that she will review and coordinate the options for the Mental Health Therapy Boards to review.

Board members agreed to review the endorsement section of the Law and to be prepared for discussion at another Board meeting.

CORRESPONDENCE:

ASWB Correspondence

The Board reviewed the following ASWB correspondence:

1. 2006 ASWB Election Information. **No action taken.**
2. Board Member Training Information for August 25-27, 2006. Noel was invited by ASWB to attend the August meeting. **Ms. McAfee and Ms. Smith stated that they**

would be unable to attend. Ms. McAfee stated that she believed Mr. Fisher would also be unable to attend.

3. Amendment and Resolution Deadline of July 12, 2006. **No action taken.**

FYI

Ms. Della-Piana and Ms. McAfee notified the Board and the Division that they will be unable to attend the July 13, 2006 Board meeting.

Ms. Taxin suggested the Board consider meeting every other month.

Board members declined considering meeting every other month at this time.

Board members and Ms. Taxin reviewed their calendars to try to accommodate Ms. Della-Piana and Ms. McAfee by changing the date of the Board meeting.

Based on Board members schedules and Ms. Taxin's schedule the July 13, 2006 Board meeting date was not changed.

Ms. Della-Piana requested further discussion at the July meeting regarding meeting less frequently.

FYI

Ms. Taxin discussed the issue of applicants calling the Division for information and then when we receive their application we discover information disclosing they have already talked with Mr. de St. Aubin and/or Kym Meyer at the Utah Chapter of NASW. Ms. Taxin recommended Mr. de St. Aubin contact Ms. Meyer and ask that his name and number not be given out as a reference and request all questions be referred to the Division.

Ms. Taxin also stated that the Division has recently received several LCSW applications with the experience form signed by LCSW's who did not supervise the CSW and applications with SSW's as the director of the agency giving direction to the LCSW's and CSW's.

Ms. Della-Piana responded that the students are not given clear information regarding the

requirements for licensure and the application process. She suggested Ms. Taxin conduct some presentations at the Utah Universities.

Ms. Taxin stated that she went to the University of Utah and had about 40 minutes to present information on licensing. She stated that she asked the group to contact ASWB directly regarding examination information. Ms. Taxin stated that most of the questions asked were about the examination and she had to keep explaining that she was there from the licensing agency and ASWB is the testing agency.

Ms. Della-Piana remarked that the students were told that they would be given the examination information.

NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR:

July 13, 2006

MEETING ADJOURNED AT:

2:40 P.M.

Date Approved

Chairperson, Utah Social Work Licensing Board

Date Approved

Bureau Manager, Division of Occupational & Professional Licensing