

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
BUREAU OF PROFESSIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL AFFAIRS

**F I N A L M I N U T E S**

MEETING OF:

**STATE BOARD OF SOCIAL WORKERS,  
MARRIAGE AND FAMILY THERAPISTS,  
AND PROFESSIONAL COUNSELORS**

TIME: 11:41 A.M.

Held at

**PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

2525 North 7th Street

CoPA HUB, Eaton Conference Room

Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110

as well as

**VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS**

April 23, 2024

1                   State Board of Social Workers,  
2                   Marriage and Family Therapists,  
3                   and Professional Counselors  
4                   April 23, 2024

5  
6  
7 BOARD MEMBERS:  
8

9 Michelle Santiago, Psy.D., NCC, CCMHC, LPC, Chair  
10 Arion R. Claggett, Acting Commissioner, Bureau of  
11 Professional and Occupational Affairs  
12 Richard Joseph Behun, Ph.D., LPC, NCC, ACS  
13 Farida E. Boyer, MS, LMFT, AS - Absent  
14 Eric DeCriscio, MA, LPC, ACS  
15 Kimberly Early, LSW  
16 Erika Evans-Weaver, Ph.D., LMFT, Vice Chair - Absent  
17 Linda A. Martin, LCSW, RN  
18  
19

20 BUREAU PERSONNEL:  
21

22 Carolyn A. DeLaurentis, Esquire, Executive Deputy  
23 Chief Counsel, Department of State  
24 Cynthia K. Montgomery, Esquire, Deputy Chief  
25 Counsel, Counsel Division, Department of State  
26 Gregory Darr, Esquire, Assistant Counsel, Office of  
27 General Counsel  
28 Jacqueline A. Wolfgang, Esquire, Regulatory Counsel  
29 Shana M. Walter, Esquire, Senior Board Counsel  
30 Sean C. Barrett, Esquire, Board Counsel  
31 Heather J. McCarthy, Esquire, Senior Board Prosecutor  
32 and Prosecution Liaison  
33 Jason T. Anderson, Esquire, Board Prosecutor  
34 Patrick M. Greene, Esquire, Board Prosecutor  
35 Berk V. Demiral, Esquire, Board Prosecutor  
36 Adam J. Williams, Esquire, Board Prosecutor  
37 Adrienne Rachelle McClendon, Esquire, Board  
38 Prosecutor  
39 Courtney J. Restemayer, Esquire, Board Prosecutor  
40 Sarah E. McNeill, Board Administrator  
41 KaVaughn Webb, Board Administrator  
42 Andrew LaFratte, MPA, Deputy Policy Director,  
43 Department of State  
44 Michael McDonald, Policy Director, Department of  
45 State  
46 Holly Hoffman, Law Clerk, Department of State  
47  
48  
49  
50

State Board of Social Workers,  
Marriage and Family Therapists,  
and Professional Counselors  
April 23, 2024

ALSO PRESENT: (cont.)

- Shannon Taylor, NCCP, LPC
- Eric Owens, President Elect, Pennsylvania Counseling Association
- Jennifer Jones, LCSW, International Obsessive Compulsive Disorder Foundation
- Troy Stevenson, Director of State Advocacy Campaigns, The Trevor Project
- Cindy Eppinger, on behalf of Michael Pykosh, Dethlefs, Pykosh, & Murphy Attorneys at Law
- Ashleigh Strange, Executive Director, Governor's Advisory Commission on LGBTQ Affairs
- Edgar Doerr, Consultant at Lifespan Family Services
- Shannon Snyder
- Taylor Dilling, Supervisor, Lifespan Family Services
- Kathleen Hays, LPC, LLC, Counselor, New Horizon Counseling Center
- Johanna Byrd, ACSW, IOM, CAE, Executive Director, National Association of Social Workers, Pennsylvania Chapter
- Melissa
- Sophia Mahoney, Sargent's Court Reporting Service, Inc.

1 \*\*\*

2 State Board of Social Workers,  
3 Marriage and Family Therapists  
4 and Professional Counselors

5 April 23, 2024

6 \*\*\*

7 [Pursuant to Section 708(a)(5) of the Sunshine Act,  
8 at 9:00 a.m., the Board entered into Executive  
9 Session with Sean C. Barrett, Esquire, Board Counsel,  
10 for the purpose of conducting quasi-judicial  
11 deliberations on a number of matters currently  
12 pending before the Board and to receive the advice of  
13 counsel. The Board entered into public session at  
14 11:00 a.m.]

15 \*\*\*

16 The regularly scheduled meeting of the State  
17 Board of Social Workers, Marriage and Family  
18 Therapists, and Professional Counselors was held on  
19 Tuesday, April 23, 2024. Michelle Santiago, Psy.D.,  
20 NCC, CCMHC, LPC, Chair, called the meeting to order  
21 at 11:41 a.m.

22 \*\*\*

23 [Sean C. Barrett, Esquire, Board Counsel, informed  
24 everyone that the meeting was being recorded, and  
25 those who continued to participate were giving their

1 consent to be recorded.

2 Mr. Barrett also noted the Board entered into  
3 Executive Session for the purpose of conducting  
4 quasi-judicial deliberations on a number of matters  
5 that are currently pending before the Board and to  
6 receive the advice of counsel.]

7 \*\*\*

8 Roll Call of Board Members/Introduction of Attendees  
9 [KaVaughn Webb, Board Administrator, provided a roll  
10 call of Board members and introduction of attendees.  
11 A quorum of Board members was present.]

12 \*\*\*

13 Approval of minutes of the March 12, 2024 meeting

14 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

15 The first item on our agenda is  
16 approval of the draft minutes.

17 Does anybody have any questions or  
18 things that we need to correct?

19 Hearing none.

20 MR. BARRETT:

21 I believe the Board Chair would  
22 entertain a motion to approve the March  
23 12, 2024 draft minutes.

24 DR. BEHUN:

25 So moved.

1 MS. EARLY:

2                               Second.

3 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

4                               Any other discussion, Board members,  
5                               for our minutes? Seeing none. Could  
6                               we have the roll call vote, please?

7

8                               Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
9                               aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
10                              Martin, aye.

11 [The motion carried unanimously.]

12   \*\*\*

13 Report of Prosecutorial Division

14 [Heather J. McCarthy, Esquire, Senior Board  
15 Prosecutor and Board Prosecution Liaison, introduced  
16 new Board attorneys, Patrick Greene, Berk Demiral,  
17 Courtney Restemayer, and Adrienne McClendon.

18               Chair Santiago welcomed the new Board attorneys.]

19   \*\*\*

20 [Jason T. Anderson, Esquire, Board Prosecutor,  
21 presented the Consent Agreement for Case No. 23-69-  
22 017283.]

23   \*\*\*

24 [Patrick Greene, Esquire, Board Prosecutor, presented  
25 the Consent Agreement for Case No. 20-69-013735.]

1 MR. BARRETT:

2 Based on the presentation of the  
3 prosecution division, does any member  
4 of the Board wish to enter Executive  
5 Session for further deliberations?  
6 Hearing none.

7 Based on the presentation of  
8 prosecution and the discussion in  
9 Executive Session, I believe the Board  
10 Chair would entertain a motion to  
11 approve the Consent Agreement at agenda  
12 item 2, Case No. 23-69-017283, and item  
13 3, Case No. 20-69-013735.

14 For the record, Linda Martin did  
15 recuse herself from any discussions or  
16 deliberations in this matter.

17 Do we have a motion?

18 DR. BEHUN:

19 So moved.

20 MS. EARLY:

21 Second.

22 MR. BARRETT:

23 Could we have a roll call?

24

25 Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,

1 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
2 Martin, recuse.

3 [The motion carried. Linda Martin recused herself  
4 from deliberations and voting on the motion for item  
5 3 on the agenda. The Respondent's name at item 2,  
6 Case No. 23-69-017283, is Robert Michael Skamai, LPC.  
7 The Respondent's name at item 3, Case No. 20-69-  
8 013735, is Gregory Patrick Miscik, LPC.]

9 \*\*\*  
10 Report of Board Counsel - Matters for Deliberation

11 MR. BARRETT:

12 Item 4 is Lori Simmons, Case No. 23-69-  
13 016106.

14 Based on Executive Session  
15 deliberations, I believe the Board  
16 Chair would entertain a motion to  
17 direct Counsel to draft an Adjudication  
18 and Order consistent with discussions  
19 in Executive Session.

20 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

21 I will entertain that motion. Could I  
22 have a motion, please?

23 DR. BEHUN:

24 So moved.

25 MS. EARLY:



1 Second.

2 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

3 Any additional discussion, Board  
4 members?

5

6 Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
7 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
8 Martin, aye.

9 [The motion carried unanimously.]

10

\*\*\*

11 Report of Board Counsel - Motion to Deem Facts

12 Admitted

13 MR. BARRETT:

14 Item 5 is Melissa Jenereski, Case No.  
15 23-69-005541. Chair Santiago and Board  
16 member Martin have to recuse themselves  
17 from deliberation in this matter; and  
18 therefore, under the quorum  
19 requirements, the Board cannot take any  
20 action on this matter at this time.

21

\*\*\*

22 Report of Board Counsel - Proposed Adjudication and

23 Order

24 MR. BARRETT:

25 Item 6 is Patrick Shea, Case No. 18-69-

1 005228.

2 Based on Executive Session  
3 deliberations, I believe the Board  
4 Chair would entertain a motion to  
5 direct Counsel to draft an Adjudication  
6 and Order consistent with discussions  
7 in Executive Session.

8 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

9 I will entertain that motion. Could I  
10 have a motion, please?

11 DR. BEHUN:

12 So moved.

13 MS. EARLY:

14 Second.

15 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

16 Any additional discussion? Roll call,  
17 please.

18  
19 Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
20 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
21 Martin, aye.

22 [The motion carried unanimously.]

23 \*\*\*

24 Report of Board Counsel - Final Adjudication and  
25 Order

1 MR. BARRETT:

2 Item 7 is Rowan Levy, Case No. 22-69-  
3 013905.

4 Based on Executive Session  
5 deliberations, I believe the Board  
6 Chair would entertain a motion to  
7 approve the Adjudication and Order in  
8 this matter.

9 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

10 I will entertain a motion.

11 DR. BEHUN:

12 So moved.

13 MS. EARLY:

14 Second.

15 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

16 Any additional discussion, Board  
17 members? Seeing none. Could we have a  
18 roll call vote, please?

19

20 Santiago, nay; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
21 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
22 Martin, aye.

23 [The motion carried. Michelle Santiago opposed the  
24 motion.]

25

\*\*\*

1 Report of Board Counsel - Miscellaneous

2 [Sean C. Barrett, Esquire, Board Counsel, referred to  
3 House Bill 1564 on the agenda, noting it is now Act 4  
4 of 2024 and was signed into law by the General  
5 Assembly. He noted the act provides for licenses for  
6 associate licensed professional counselors and  
7 associate marriage and family therapists. He  
8 mentioned that the licenses are now available and  
9 could be found on the Pennsylvania Licensing System  
10 (PALS).

11 Ms. Martin asked whether it is considered a  
12 regulation since it is already in the act or whether  
13 it is already law since it is an act, noting the  
14 Board cannot change anything unless the Board changed  
15 the law. She commented that an act is a law and then  
16 the Board writes regulations to enforce the law and  
17 requested clarification regarding the procedure when  
18 the Board begins to write regulations.

19 Ms. Martin mentioned that the Board has discussed  
20 being more general in their regulations about items  
21 like fees, so the Board would not have to open the  
22 regulations every time a change in fee is decided.  
23 She requested an explanation of what the Board can  
24 and cannot do legally as it begins to write  
25 regulations.

1 Ms. Wolfgang noted Ms. Martin to be correct as  
2 far as a fee in the act. She explained that the fee  
3 was added to move the act as soon as possible, but  
4 noted the Board does have the ability by the  
5 regulation to change that fee. She mentioned that  
6 the Board could consider that when drafting the  
7 regulation.

8 Ms. Wolfgang informed Board members that the  
9 Board drafts regulations based upon this act, noting  
10 there are some matters in the act the Board would  
11 want to explain, implement, and would have to be  
12 included in their regulations.

13 Ms. Wolfgang noted the need for further Board  
14 discussion as to whether it should be a separate  
15 regulation or be included as a part of their General  
16 Revisions.

17 Chair Santiago requested a copy of the  
18 application and asked whether the license is  
19 currently available on PALS.

20 Acting Commissioner Claggett noted Chair Santiago  
21 could be provided with a copy of the application, and  
22 the license is currently available.

23 Ms. Martin asked why the act on the two licenses  
24 was considered so urgent and passed through  
25 essentially in a way that bypassed the Board.

1 Mr. Barrett stated the General Assembly could  
2 provide a better answer, because it implemented the  
3 act and have procedures for enacting legislation.]

4 \*\*\*

5 Legislative Report - No Report

6 \*\*\*

7 Report of Board Chairperson - No Report

8 \*\*\*

9 Report of Acting Commissioner - No Report

10 \*\*\*

11 Report of Board Administrator - No Report

12 \*\*\*

13 Review of Applications

14 MR. BARRETT:

15 Based on Executive Session  
16 deliberations, I believe the Board  
17 Chair would entertain a motion to  
18 provisionally deny the Application of  
19 Valerie Albro for a Social Worker by  
20 Examination.

21 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

22 I will entertain a motion for the  
23 provisional denial. Could I have a  
24 motion, please?

25 DR. BEHUN:

1 So moved.

2 MS. EARLY:

3 Second.

4 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

5 Any further discussion, Board members?

6 Seeing none. Could we have the roll  
7 call vote, please?

8

9 Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
10 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
11 Martin, aye.

12 [The motion carried unanimously.]

13

\*\*\*

14 MR. BARRETT:

15 Number 10. Based on Executive Session  
16 deliberations, I believe the Board  
17 Chair would entertain a motion to  
18 provisionally deny the Application of  
19 Abby Squire for a Clinical Social  
20 Worker by Examination.

21 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

22 I will entertain a motion to  
23 provisionally deny the Applicant at  
24 number 10. Could I have a motion,  
25 please?

1 DR. BEHUN:

2 So moved.

3 MS. EARLY:

4 Second.

5 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

6 Any further discussion, Board members?

7 Seeing none. Could we have the roll  
8 call?

9

10 Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
11 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
12 Martin, aye.

13 [The motion carried unanimously.]

14

\*\*\*

15 MR. BARRETT:

16 Number 11. Based on Executive Session  
17 deliberations, I believe the Board  
18 Chair would entertain a motion to grant  
19 the Application of Justin Cipkala-  
20 Gaffin for a Professional Counselor by  
21 Examination.

22 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

23 I will entertain a motion to grant the  
24 license to the Applicant at number 11.

25 Could I have a motion, please?



1 DR. BEHUN:

2 So moved.

3 MS. EARLY:

4 Second.

5 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

6 Any further discussion, Board members?

7 Could we have the roll call, please?

8

9 Santiago, nay; Claggett, aye; Behun,

10 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;

11 Martin, aye.

12 [The motion carried. Michelle Santiago opposed the  
13 motion.]

14

\*\*\*

15 MR. BARRETT:

16 Number 12. Based on Executive Session

17 deliberations, I believe the Board

18 Chair would entertain a motion to

19 provisionally deny the Application for

20 a Professional Counselor by Examination

21 of Cindy Pilcher.

22 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

23 I will entertain a motion to deny the

24 Applicant at number 12.

25

Could I have a motion?

1 DR. BEHUN:

2 So moved.

3 MS. EARLY:

4 Second.

5 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

6 Any further discussion? Seeing none.

7 Could we have the roll call, please?

8

9 Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,

10 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;

11 Martin, aye.

12 [The motion carried unanimously.]

13

\*\*\*

14 MR. BARRETT:

15 Number 13. Based on Executive Session

16 deliberations, I believe the Board

17 Chair would entertain a motion to

18 provisionally deny the Application of

19 Kathleen Perlman for a Professional

20 Counselor by Examination.

21 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

22 I will entertain a motion to

23 provisionally deny the Applicant at

24 number 13.

25 Could I have a motion, please?

1 DR. BEHUN:

2 So moved.

3 MS. EARLY:

4 Second.

5 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

6 Any discussion? Seeing none. Could we  
7 have the roll call vote?

8

9 Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
10 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
11 Martin, aye.

12 [The motion carried unanimously.]

13 MR. BARRETT:

14 Number 14. Based on Executive Session  
15 deliberations, I believe the Board  
16 Chair would entertain a motion to  
17 provisionally deny the Application of  
18 Nilsa Ulerio for a Professional  
19 Counselor by Examination.

20 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

21 I will entertain a motion to  
22 provisionally deny the Applicant at  
23 number 14.

24 Could I have a motion?

25 DR. BEHUN:

1 So moved.

2 MS. EARLY:

3 Second.

4 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

5 Any further discussion, Board members?

6 Seeing none. Could we have the roll  
7 call, please?

8

9 Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
10 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
11 Martin, aye.

12 [The motion carried unanimously.]

13

\*\*\*

14 Review of Applications - Act 41 Review

15 MR. BARRETT:

16 Based on Executive Session  
17 deliberations, I believe the Board  
18 Chair would entertain a motion to table  
19 agenda numbers 15 and 16 on the agenda.

20 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

21 I will entertain a motion to table  
22 number 15 and 16.

23 DR. BEHUN:

24 So moved.

25 MS. EARLY:

1 Second.

2 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

3 Any discussion? Could we have the roll  
4 call vote, please?

5

6 Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
7 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
8 Martin, aye.

9 [The motion carried unanimously.]

10

\*\*\*

11 MR. BARRETT:

12 Based on Executive Session  
13 deliberations, I believe the Board  
14 Chair would entertain a motion to  
15 approve the Application for Licensure  
16 of a Professional Counselor by  
17 Endorsement of Courtney Purslow.

18 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

19 I will entertain a motion to approve  
20 the Applicant at number 17.

21 Could I have a motion, please?

22 DR. BEHUN:

23 So moved.

24 MS. EARLY:

25 Second.

1 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

2 Any further discussion? Seeing none.

3 Could we have the roll call, please?

4

5 Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,

6 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;

7 Martin, aye.

8 [The motion carried unanimously.]

9

\*\*\*

10 MR. BARRETT:

11 Number 18. I placed this on the agenda  
12 just to have further discussions with  
13 the Board relating to the rationale of  
14 the previous decision since I was not  
15 Counsel, so the Board does not need to  
16 take any further action at that number.

17 The same thing goes for number 19  
18 as well. That was already previously  
19 considered by the Board. I just needed  
20 to confirm with them on that, so there  
21 is no further action on that.

22

\*\*\*

23 MR. BARRETT:

24 Number 20 and 21. Based on Executive  
25 Session deliberations, I believe the

1 Board Chair would entertain a motion to  
2 table the discussion for number 20 and  
3 21 on the agenda.

4 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

5 I will entertain a motion to table  
6 number 20 and number 21.

7 Could I have a motion?

8 DR. BEHUN:

9 So moved.

10 MS. EARLY:

11 Second.

12 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

13 Any other discussion, Board members?  
14 Seeing none. Could we have the vote,  
15 please?

16  
17 Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
18 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
19 Martin, aye.

20 [The motion carried unanimously.]

21 \*\*\*

22 Review of Applications - Continuing Education

23 Applications

24 MR. BARRETT:

25 Number 23. Based on Executive Session

1 deliberations, I believe the Board  
2 Chair would entertain a motion to  
3 approve the Continuing Education  
4 Application for CES for the Soul. I  
5 will note that Board Chair Santiago did  
6 recuse herself from any deliberations  
7 and discussion in this matter.

8 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

9 I will entertain a motion to approve  
10 the Applicant at number 23. Any  
11 additional discussion? Seeing none.

12 Could we have the roll call,  
13 please?

14  
15 Santiago, recuse; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
16 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
17 Martin, nay.

18 [The motion carried. Michelle Santiago recused  
19 herself from deliberations and voting on the motion.  
20 Linda Martin opposed the motion.]

21 \*\*\*

22 MR. BARRETT:

23 Based on Executive Session  
24 deliberations, I believe the Board  
25 Chair would entertain a motion to



1                   approve the Application to be a  
2                   Preapproved Provider of Center for  
3                   Anxiety and Behavior Therapy.

4 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

5                   I will entertain that motion. That is  
6                   the Application under agenda item  
7                   number 22.

8                                Could I have a motion?

9 DR. BEHUN:

10                               So moved.

11 MS. EARLY:

12                               Second.

13 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

14                   Any discussion, members? Seeing none.  
15                   Could we have the roll call, please?

16  
17                               Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
18                               aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
19                               Martin, aye.

20 [The motion carried unanimously.]

21   \*\*\*

22 MR. BARRETT:

23                   Number 24 on the agenda. Based on  
24                   Executive Session deliberations, I  
25                   believe the Board Chair would entertain

1 a motion to approve the Preapproved  
2 Provider Application of Ed Compass LLC  
3 DBA Mindful Continuing Education.

4 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

5 I will entertain that motion to approve  
6 the Applicant at agenda item number 24.

7 Could I have a motion, please?

8 DR. BEHUN:

9 So moved.

10 MS. EARLY:

11 Second.

12 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

13 Any further discussion? Seeing none.  
14 Could we have the roll call, please?

15  
16 Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
17 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
18 Martin, aye.

19 [The motion carried unanimously.]

20 \*\*\*

21 MR. BARRETT:

22 Moving to number 25. Based on  
23 Executive Session deliberations, I  
24 believe the Board Chair would entertain  
25 a motion to approve the CLE Course

1 Application for CGRC.

2 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

3 I approve that motion at number 25.

4 Could I have a motion, please?

5 DR. BEHUN:

6 So moved.

7 MS. EARLY:

8 Second.

9 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

10 Any further discussion, Board members?

11 Seeing none. Could we have the voice  
12 vote, please?

13

14 Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
15 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
16 Martin, aye.

17 [The motion carried unanimously.]

18

\*\*\*

19 MR. BARRETT:

20 Based on Executive Session  
21 deliberations, I believe the Board  
22 Chair would entertain a motion to  
23 approve the CLE Course at agenda item  
24 26 for Lancaster/Lebanon IU13.

25 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

1 I will entertain that motion for the  
2 Application at number 26 on the agenda.

3 Could I have a motion?

4 DR. BEHUN:

5 So moved.

6 MS. EARLY:

7 Second.

8 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

9 Any further discussion, Board members  
10 on item 26? Seeing none. Could we  
11 have the roll call, please?

12

13 Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
14 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
15 Martin, aye.

16 [The motion carried unanimously.]

17

\*\*\*

18 MR. BARRETT:

19 Based on Executive Session  
20 deliberations, I believe at agenda item  
21 27 the Board Chair would entertain a  
22 motion to approve the application for a  
23 CLE Course of Lakeside Global  
24 Institute.

25 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

1 I will entertain a motion to approve  
2 the Applicant at agenda item number 27.

3 Could I have a motion, please?

4 DR. BEHUN:

5 So moved.

6 MS. EARLY:

7 Second.

8 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

9 Any discussion, Board members? Seeing  
10 none. Could we have the roll call  
11 vote, please?

12  
13 Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
14 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
15 Martin, aye.

16 [The motion carried unanimously.]

17 \*\*\*

18 MR. BARRETT:

19 Based on Executive Session  
20 deliberations at agenda item 28, I  
21 believe the Board Chair would entertain  
22 a motion to approve the CLE Course of  
23 Optimized Aging, LLC.

24 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

25 I will entertain that motion for the

1 Application at number 28.

2 Could I have a motion, please?

3 DR. BEHUN:

4 So moved.

5 MS. EARLY:

6 Second.

7 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

8 Any further discussion, Board members?

9 Seeing none. Could we have the vote,  
10 please?

11

12 Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
13 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
14 Martin, aye.

15 [The motion carried unanimously.]

16

\*\*\*

17 Miscellaneous

18 MR. BARRETT:

19 Based on Executive Session  
20 deliberations, I believe the Board  
21 Chair would entertain a motion to grant  
22 the Exception Request related to  
23 Section 49.13(b)(6) of the LPC  
24 Regulations.

25 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

1 I will entertain that motion to grant  
2 the Exception Request for agenda item  
3 29.

4 Could I have a motion, please?

5 DR. BEHUN:

6 So moved.

7 MS. EARLY:

8 Second.

9 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

10 Any discussion, Board members? Seeing  
11 none. Could we have the vote, please?

12  
13 Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
14 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
15 Martin, aye.

16 [The motion carried unanimously.]

17 \*\*\*

18 Regulatory Report - April Regulatory Report  
19 [Jacqueline A. Wolfgang, Esquire, Regulatory Counsel,  
20 provided a Regulatory Status Report for the month of  
21 April for the Board's review.]

22 \*\*\*

23 Regulatory Report - Conversion Therapy Statement of  
24 Policy

25 [Jacqueline A. Wolfgang, Esquire, Regulatory Counsel,

1 noted the Statement of Policy sets forth guidelines  
2 that should be considered by licensees regarding  
3 conversion therapy on minors.

4 Ms. Wolfgang noted the Shapiro Administration and  
5 Department of State are strongly committed to  
6 protecting the rights and well-being of lesbian, gay,  
7 bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning,  
8 intersex, asexual/aromantic/agender (LGBTQIA+)  
9 Pennsylvanians, especially young members of those  
10 communities.

11 Ms. Wolfgang stated Governor Shapiro is calling  
12 on the licensing boards to adopt statements of policy  
13 clarifying that the practice of conversion therapy  
14 may constitute a disciplinable offense.

15 Ms. Wolfgang referred to Executive Order 2022-02,  
16 which was adopted by Governor Wolf in August 2022 to  
17 protect Pennsylvanians from conversion therapy and  
18 supporting LGBTQIA+ Pennsylvanians.

19 Ms. Wolfgang noted Executive Order 2022-02  
20 indicates that conversion therapy has been rejected  
21 by the scientific, medical, and educational  
22 communities, and numerous professional organizations  
23 have denounced conversion therapy due to its lack of  
24 scientific validation and negative and dangerous  
25 impact on the health and well-being of LGBTQIA+



1 persons and communities, along with the specific harm  
2 it causes to the mental health of LGBTQIA+ children.

3 Ms. Wolfgang stated all agencies of the  
4 Governor's jurisdictions were directed to protect  
5 Pennsylvanians, including children and youth, from  
6 conversion therapy. She noted the Executive Order  
7 specifically directs the Department of State to  
8 discourage the practice and inform the public of  
9 mechanisms to report licensed professionals who cause  
10 harm to patients as a result of practicing conversion  
11 therapy.

12 Ms. Wolfgang also stated a recent report by a  
13 national research and advocacy organization found  
14 that conversion therapy is practiced by licensed  
15 professionals across the country, including  
16 Pennsylvania.

17 Ms. Wolfgang provided information regarding the  
18 role of the statement of policy as compared to a  
19 regulation. She explained that a statement of policy  
20 is a guidance document and basically an announcement  
21 to the public of a policy an agency or Board intends  
22 to implement in future adjudications. She noted it  
23 also serves as a notice to licensees.

24 Ms. Wolfgang explained that any agency applying  
25 the statement of policy in a particular situation

1 must be prepared to support the policy as if the  
2 statement of policy had never been issued. She  
3 mentioned that a statement of policy is not a rule to  
4 be used in adjudication or a case. She explained  
5 that a regulation establishes a standard of conduct  
6 which has the force of law, whereas a statement of  
7 policy does not create that binding norm.

8 Ms. Wolfgang explained that the Conversion  
9 Therapy Statement of Policy provides guidelines that  
10 should be considered by licensees to ensure  
11 compliance with the practice act and the Board's  
12 regulations. She noted the Statement of Policy  
13 explains that being lesbian; gay; bisexual;  
14 transgender; queer; questioning; intersex; or asexual  
15 is not a disease, disorder, illness, deficiency, or  
16 shortcoming.

17 Ms. Wolfgang explained that the Statement of  
18 Policy also announces that a licensee who uses  
19 conversion therapy on a minor may be subject to  
20 discipline by the Board. She requested the Board  
21 adopt the Statement of Policy.]

22 MR. BARRETT:

23 Based on presentation of Regulatory  
24 Counsel, I believe the Board Chair  
25 would entertain a motion to adopt the

1 Conversion Therapy Statement of Policy  
2 at 16A-6926.

3 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

4 I will entertain a motion to adopt 16A-  
5 6926 dealing with conversion therapy.

6 Could I have a motion, please?

7 DR. BEHUN:

8 So moved.

9 MS. EARLY:

10 Second.

11 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

12 Any further discussion, Board members?

13 Seeing none. Could we have the vote,  
14 please?

15

16 Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
17 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;

18 Martin, aye.

19 [The motion carried unanimously.]

20

\*\*\*

21 Regulatory Report - Act 4

22 [Jacqueline A. Wolfgang, Esquire, Regulatory Counsel,  
23 addressed Act 4, noting the Board requested  
24 information concerning the background of the act in  
25 the proposed bills. She referred to the memorandum

1 stating that Pennsylvania is in a mental health  
2 crisis with increased incidents of depression,  
3 anxiety, and suicidal thoughts in adults and children  
4 due to isolation caused by forced business closures  
5 and remote learning resulting from COVID-19 pandemic.

6 Ms. Wolfgang noted it also states that measures  
7 to educate and encourage Pennsylvanians to care for  
8 their mental health while meeting the ongoing demand  
9 for mental health care providers is imperative. She  
10 explained that the legislation would create a  
11 licensed associate marriage and family therapist  
12 credential for the Commonwealth to add crucial  
13 resources for mental health care providers.

14 Ms. Wolfgang stated the credential would enhance  
15 access to mental health services by increasing  
16 employment opportunities for new marriage and family  
17 therapists with masters and/or doctorate training  
18 that have yet to meet the 3000 hours of clinical  
19 supervision, which is required for full licensure as  
20 a licensed marriage and family therapist.

21 Ms. Wolfgang reported that 26 states have  
22 established this credential to permit licensed  
23 marriage and family therapists to work with  
24 individuals, children, couples, and families under  
25 direct supervision of licensed clinical marriage and

1 family therapist supervisors.

2 Ms. Wolfgang stated holding the credential  
3 assures patients and healthcare employers that the  
4 licensed associate marriage and family therapist  
5 (LAMFT) is properly trained and pursuing full  
6 licensure while allowing them to engage with  
7 patients.

8 Ms. Wolfgang recommended the Board draft  
9 regulations with respect to the supervision part of  
10 the act requirements and the qualifications with  
11 respect to the fee. She mentioned that the fee in  
12 the act is the same fee for other professionals,  
13 noting the Board could review the \$75 and the \$95 for  
14 biennial renewal.

15 Ms. Martin commented that the Board has been  
16 working on revising regulations for over six years  
17 and made the decision to take out the specific amount  
18 of fees, where the applicant will pay the fee adopted  
19 by the Board, so the Board did not have to return to  
20 the regulation for changes. She mentioned that the  
21 new regulation for associate licensees was the change  
22 the Board were getting ready to make and would  
23 automatically be changing that as well.

24 Ms. Wolfgang referred to the General Revisions  
25 and sections within the regulations that refers to

1 the fee adopted by the Board, but noted that the fees  
2 adopted by the Board are in § 47.4 and is a regulatory  
3 schedule of fees, where the Board cannot just put  
4 something on the website and say it is the new fee.  
5 The change has to go through the regulatory process.

6 Ms. Martin asked whether the Board cannot make  
7 that particular change.

8 Ms. Wolfgang did not see that change in the  
9 regulations but did note the Board had referred back  
10 to the applicable fee, and the applicable fee is in  
11 § 47.4 of the regulations. She offered to review that  
12 in more detail, but noted it was not her  
13 understanding of what the Board was planning to do or  
14 had the authority to do.

15 Ms. Martin referred to the preparations for the  
16 meeting and wanted to make sure Ms. Wolfgang and the  
17 Board have the same copy of General Revisions.

18 Ms. Wolfgang stated she has made revisions and  
19 incorporated changes to 16A-6923 regarding the  
20 General Revision package and hoped to get a vote and  
21 send it out for an exposure draft. She also hoped to  
22 have a discussion regarding Act 4 and those  
23 requirements and whether the Board would need to  
24 incorporate those requirements into the General  
25 Revision package.

1 Ms. Wolfgang mentioned that the General Revision  
2 package has numerous revisions within the supervision  
3 and qualification sections, and it is a huge  
4 challenge to run two separate packages because the  
5 revisions may overlap. She suggested the Board  
6 choose the specific regulations needed for Act 4 and  
7 decide as to whether those regulations would be  
8 incorporated into those revisions with the General  
9 Revisions.

10 Ms. Martin commented that it would be helpful for  
11 the Board to consider the upcoming requirements  
12 before it votes.

13 Ms. Wolfgang mentioned that the Board had  
14 discussions over the last few meetings but offered to  
15 further discuss any issues or concerns when reviewing  
16 that part of the regulatory discussion.

17 Chair Santiago referred to the supervision plan  
18 in Act 4, noting the Board does not currently have a  
19 supervision plan and does not know the details. She  
20 asked when it would happen when the application is  
21 already live.

22 Mr. Barrett stated the applications are coming in  
23 on a rolling basis and believed the supervision plan  
24 is reviewed by staff.

25 Ms. McNeill noted reviewing the applications to

1 realize the type of questions that may arise. She  
2 mentioned following the requirements of the  
3 regulations as far as the supervision plan. She  
4 explained that somebody who only has a licensed  
5 clinical social worker (LCSW) supervisor has to  
6 confirm that their understanding of the need for at  
7 least half of their hours with a licensed  
8 professional counselor (LPC).

9 Ms. McNeill also explained that an LPC would  
10 provide information on the supervision, such as  
11 individual versus group, and where the supervision  
12 and experience will occur.

13 Chair Santiago commented that it is something the  
14 Board should know, because the administrative staff  
15 and people who review applications are also reviewing  
16 what is deemed an appropriate supervision plan when  
17 the Board has never seen it. She asked how often  
18 those plans are being checked for compliance.

19 Mr. Barrett stated the Board has the regulations  
20 concerning what is required in supervision, and it  
21 does not change the process as long as the plans are  
22 meeting the requirements of an approved supervisor.  
23 He noted that staff has been reviewing applications  
24 and making determinations without coming to the  
25 Board, and any issues with a supervision plan would



1 come back before the Board.

2 Mr. Barrett noted the act has items the applicant  
3 has to submit, including meeting the educational  
4 experience, and can be read in with the supervision  
5 regulation requirements currently in terms of what is  
6 expected. He believed a regulatory package will make  
7 that clear to applicants and also allow the Board to  
8 have more standard fixed posts relating to the  
9 associate license types themselves.

10 Chair Santiago stated the Board would like to  
11 review the application and the regulations being  
12 plugged into the supervision plan, along with an  
13 outline of the evaluation process.

14 Chair Santiago referred to Chapter 47 and asked  
15 how people are now applying for this when there are  
16 matters currently in the process of being written,  
17 rewritten, deleted, or changed around.

18 Ms. Wolfgang explained that anything the Board is  
19 writing or drafting is a proposed regulation and is  
20 not a law or regulation. She noted the existing  
21 regulations are in effect and are the law with  
22 respect to qualifications and supervision or anything  
23 else that is in the regulations.

24 Chair Santiago asked whether the Board could have  
25 some certainty that their changes would be passed

1 through as fast as the associate license.

2 Ms. Wolfgang explained that Act 4 is a law, and  
3 regulations take longer because it is part of the  
4 regulatory processes. She asked whether the Board  
5 agreed with the changes and requested a vote from the  
6 Board to be able to send the act out as an exposure  
7 draft. She suggested the Board review the  
8 application and look at Act 4 in more detail and then  
9 reconvene and discuss what needs to be in the  
10 regulations.

11 Ms. Wolfgang mentioned that the Board can always  
12 add it and then send it out as an additional exposure  
13 draft, so it does not have to delay those regulations  
14 if the Board decides the regulations need to be part  
15 of the General Revisions. She mentioned that the  
16 application could always be modified by making a  
17 recommendation to the Commissioner's staff.

18 Ms. Martin commented that she has only seen House  
19 Bill 1564 but never saw the act.

20 Mr. Barrett explained House Bill 1564 is on the  
21 agenda, because it is the same language from the Act  
22 4 that was voted on by both houses and signed by  
23 Governor Shapiro.

24 Ms. Martin again referred to item 8 on the agenda  
25 regarding the associate LPC and associate MFT

1 licenses and believed there were good intentions but  
2 also believed it caused problems with the way this  
3 was processed and how the regulations started being  
4 written in the act.

5 Ms. Martin commented that the LMFT and LPC  
6 licenses have been round for 20 years and did not see  
7 the reason for the urgency for the licensed  
8 associates. She believed bypassing the Board was a  
9 mistake and disrupted the whole legislative process,  
10 noting that acts get written and are sent to the  
11 Board and the Board starts to write the regulations.

12 Ms. Martin stated it is unfortunate the General  
13 Assembly decided to bypass the Board and try to write  
14 the regulations into this Act. She mentioned that  
15 the time it takes the Board to get regulations passes  
16 or revised is a systemic problem that needs to be  
17 fixed.]

18 \*\*\*

19 Regulatory Report - 16A-6923  
20 [Jacqueline A. Wolfgang, Esquire, Regulatory Counsel,  
21 addressed 16A-6923 regarding the General Revisions  
22 package. She noted making all of the revisions  
23 requested by the Board. She mentioned not being  
24 involved in the original drafting and asked why the  
25 Board thought it needed a definition of the term

1 "year."

2 Chair Santiago explained that defining the year  
3 was in place when she and Ms. Martin came on the  
4 Board and did not come from the current Board  
5 members.

6 Mr. Barrett mentioned that there are limitations  
7 in certain situations on how many years someone could  
8 earn supervision hours and may be a change to keep  
9 them as a consecutive block, where someone could not  
10 say they were supervised for four months in 2020,  
11 four months in 2024, and then another four months in  
12 2018. He believed the definition is constructed to  
13 keep "year" to mean 12 consecutive months versus any  
14 other computation.

15 Ms. Martin commented that the initial regulations  
16 had language in it like social workers would need  
17 three years of supervision, but when the hours were  
18 included, it was only two years' worth of actual  
19 hours. She mentioned being very involved in  
20 reviewing and writing some of the early regulations  
21 before she was on the Board and noted that it would  
22 be helpful to have the questions in advance.

23 Ms. Wolfgang stated the questions are on the  
24 annex on the Board's agenda and offered the Board  
25 more time before voting. She noted the particular

1 issue is more for her understanding, so she can  
2 explain it in the preamble and asked the Board to get  
3 back with her.

4 Ms. Wolfgang addressed § 47.1a regarding  
5 qualifications for supervisors, noting it is  
6 applicable to Chapter 47, Chapter 48, and Chapter 49.  
7 She referred to 47.1a(a)(1) and asked whether a  
8 supervisor is required to have a PA license for  
9 electronic supervision as opposed to in-person  
10 supervision. She noted making a distinction on that  
11 because electronic supervision requires a PA license.  
12 She asked why there were different standards.

13 Chair Santiago believed the Board agreed that  
14 anyone supervising a person in Pennsylvania is  
15 required to have a Pennsylvania license, and Board  
16 members agreed.

17 Ms. Wolfgang referred to (a) education and  
18 experience, where it states to qualify as a  
19 supervisor, an individual shall meet one of the  
20 following criteria, including hold an active license  
21 as a clinical social worker in the state where the  
22 supervisee's experience is occurring. She asked  
23 whether that is not what the Board intended to have  
24 in that separation section. She asked whether the  
25 Board wanted to change that to Pennsylvania.

1 Chair Santiago noted that it should be changed to  
2 Pennsylvania, because their whole discussion revolved  
3 around how someone would know the rules and  
4 regulations for licensure in another state.

5 Ms. Wolfgang asked whether there is no  
6 requirement for PA licensure.

7 Mr. Barrett explained that there is no  
8 requirement for a supervisor generally, where someone  
9 getting their supervision in New Jersey even by a New  
10 Jersey licensed supervisor, as long as that  
11 individual met the qualifications and the  
12 requirements, then that would be acceptable. He  
13 noted reviewing several applications from people who  
14 received their degree in a different state, received  
15 their supervision in a different state, and then come  
16 to Pennsylvania to apply for licensure, which would  
17 be accepted.

18 Mr. Barrett commented that he understands saying  
19 if a person is getting their hours in Pennsylvania or  
20 being supervised in Pennsylvania that the person must  
21 hold a license but is kind of a tricky way to mesh it  
22 with the other situations, where if someone is in  
23 person, it is not a requirement. He explained that  
24 if he is being evaluated by someone in Ohio and doing  
25 his hours in Ohio and physically in Ohio, that is

1 fine, but if that same person is supervising him in  
2 Pennsylvania via electronic supervision that it is  
3 not acceptable and creates a rift between the two  
4 provisions.

5 Ms. Wolfgang noted it to be more restrictive by  
6 requiring Pennsylvania in the electronic supervision  
7 She mentioned that if the Board is considering  
8 changing all supervision to Pennsylvania, that it is  
9 not what is being suggested in the regulation at this  
10 time.

11 Ms. Wolfgang stated it would be a little tricky,  
12 because people are currently getting their experience  
13 in other states who are with supervisors in other  
14 states and would possibly require an effective date  
15 at a different time as those people might have  
16 several years of experience that would not be  
17 counted.

18 Mr. DeCriscio commented that an applicant doing  
19 their work in Pennsylvania under supervision should  
20 come from a licensed PA professional, but if that  
21 individual is serving clients outside of the state of  
22 Pennsylvania, then that would be a different  
23 scenario.

24 Ms. Wolfgang referred to (1) Hold an active  
25 license as a clinical social worker in the state

1 where the supervisee's experience is occurring, where  
2 if it is in Pennsylvania, they have to be licensed in  
3 Pennsylvania, and if it is in New Jersey, then they  
4 have to be licensed in Jersey.

5 Ms. Martin believed that is why it was changed to  
6 include out-of-state supervision, which was recently  
7 written into their new regulations.

8 Ms. Wolfgang referred to § 47.12f regarding the  
9 electronic supervision provision. She noted the  
10 discussion regarding the above section, where the  
11 supervisor would have to be in the state where the  
12 experience is occurring. She referred to § 47.12f  
13 under electronic supervision, where the supervisor  
14 must hold an active license in this Commonwealth.

15 Ms. Wolfgang asked why the Board is suggesting a  
16 different standard for electronic supervision than in  
17 person and requiring the supervisor to hold an active  
18 license in the Commonwealth.

19 Ms. Wolfgang mentioned that there was not an  
20 overwhelmingly number of people who want to be  
21 supervisors and mentioned that it may have a  
22 detrimental effect on people who want to be licensees  
23 because the Board would be requiring a supervisor who  
24 has a license in the Commonwealth no matter where the  
25 individual is getting that experience.



1 Mr. DeCriscio commented that the way she  
2 explained it did not fit with what the Board agreed  
3 to overall. He mentioned that whether it is in  
4 person, virtual, or electronic, if someone is working  
5 and seeing clients in Pennsylvania, the supervisor  
6 should be a Pennsylvania licensed professional. He  
7 did not know where the Board meant to make that  
8 distinction between the two.

9 Chair Santiago explained that the Board started  
10 to talk about it at the start of COVID, because  
11 people were from another state supervising a  
12 Pennsylvania person who wanted a license not knowing  
13 the rules and regulations of the state of  
14 Pennsylvania.

15 Ms. Wolfgang referred to § 47.1a and asked  
16 whether the language the Board is adding in (1), Hold  
17 an active license in clinical social work in the  
18 state where the supervisees experience is occurring,  
19 gets the Board where it wanted to be, because if the  
20 electronic experience is happening in Pennsylvania,  
21 then the person would have to have a licensed  
22 supervisor in Pennsylvania.

23 Ms. Martin commented that these are  
24 qualifications for supervisors in Pennsylvania and  
25 the supervisor must be licensed in Pennsylvania. She

1 noted the qualifications for a Pennsylvania  
2 supervisor is that the individual be licensed in  
3 Pennsylvania and should be licensed in New Jersey too  
4 if the individual would supervise someone in New  
5 Jersey.

6 Ms. Wolfgang again referred to § 47.12f(c) and  
7 suggested the addition, to engage in electronic  
8 supervision in this Commonwealth, the supervisor must  
9 hold an active license in this Commonwealth. She  
10 noted it would not be a general requirement to  
11 maintain a license in the Commonwealth for all  
12 supervision, only when the individual is supervising  
13 in the Commonwealth.

14 Mr. Barrett commented that the addition makes it  
15 clear, so having someone in New Jersey who got any  
16 amount of their supervision potentially  
17 electronically even in New Jersey by a New Jersey  
18 licensed supervisor, the Board could potentially say  
19 that the New Jersey supervisor also needed to have a  
20 Pennsylvania license because it was done with  
21 electronic supervision. He noted the addition of  
22 getting the experience in the Commonwealth would  
23 eliminate the issue that could happen with outside of  
24 the state licensees.

25 Ms. Wolfgang referred to 47.1a(3), until January

1 1, 2016, the following criteria to qualify for a  
2 supervisor. She asked whether the provision is still  
3 relevant.

4 Ms. McNeill informed Ms. Wolfgang that it is rare  
5 but do see it occasionally.

6 Chair Santiago noted the Board wrote five years  
7 as a professional counselor into their regulations  
8 for supervisors and asked whether the five years  
9 start the first two years that someone is still under  
10 supervision or after the license is in their hand.

11 Mr. Barrett agreed it is vague, and there could  
12 legally be an argument made that someone could count  
13 two years of actually being supervised. He suggested  
14 adding language to clarify that the time not be  
15 counted when the individual is directly under  
16 supervision or post-licensure.

17 Chair Santiago referred to 47.1a(a)(1), where it  
18 says 5 years of postmaster's experience within the  
19 last 10 years as a clinical social worker.

20 Johanna Byrd, ACSW, IOM, CAE, Executive Director,  
21 National Association of Social Workers Pennsylvania  
22 Chapter, stated it is fairly standard, noting her  
23 years of experience from working in Florida, where  
24 the rule was five years of experience, two of which  
25 must be post Florida license, so those two years in

1 training were included.

2 Ms. Byrd also mentioned that their regulations  
3 did not specify postlicensure or post Pennsylvania  
4 licensure and just said five years of clinical  
5 experience, where somebody could get their  
6 Pennsylvania license, and presuming the individual  
7 already had five years of experience upon arrival,  
8 the individual would be qualified to supervise the  
9 next day.

10 Ms. Wolfgang read the law concerning  
11 qualifications of a license, where a supervisor shall  
12 hold a current and active license to practice or  
13 practice in a related field as approved by the Board  
14 and shall have no less than five full-time years of  
15 experience.

16 Mr. DeCriscio noted prior Board discussion where  
17 some Board members stated professional experience  
18 should begin after licensure and some stated it  
19 should begin after graduation and starting their  
20 clinical experience under supervision. He reported  
21 it is simply five years of clinical experience in  
22 most states, where the experience begins once an  
23 individual graduates and starts their employment.

24 Mr. DeCriscio mentioned that some states started  
25 the years of clinical experience when an individual

1 started their practicum and reduced it even further.  
2 He commented that across licensures and  
3 certifications that it typically starts once an  
4 individual began their clinical experience and does  
5 not have to start after they have earned their  
6 licensure.

7 Ms. Wolfgang mentioned that postmaster's  
8 experience as opposed to just experience may have  
9 been to clarify that provision, and Board members  
10 agreed.

11 Ms. Wolfgang referred to § 47.1a(b) under  
12 required continuing education, where a supervisor  
13 shall complete at least six continuing education  
14 clock hours on clinical supervision before beginning  
15 as a supervisor for individuals who are providing  
16 supervision on the effective date of this section,  
17 the six continuing education clock hours shall be  
18 completed by the end of the next biennial renewal  
19 cycle.

20 Ms. Wolfgang pointed out that it could  
21 potentially be close to four years and wanted to make  
22 sure that everyone agreed.

23 Ms. Martin addressed the history and noted  
24 differences between the professions on this because  
25 social work has not had a requirement to be certified

1 in supervision like licensed marriage and family  
2 therapists (LMFTs). She believed it was written into  
3 the regulations, because it was not part of the  
4 social work professional background. She noted the  
5 effort of regulators was to get all the professions  
6 sort of consistent in their requirements. She noted  
7 the Board encourages supervisors to take courses on  
8 supervision but has not been part of their  
9 professional standards where someone has to be  
10 certified to be a supervisor.

11 Mr. DeCriscio noted the current language as it  
12 stands would not be acceptable. He believed an  
13 individual should meet the requirements before  
14 becoming a certified supervisor. He noted the  
15 Commonwealth does not have that certification  
16 specific to a supervisor in the state of  
17 Pennsylvania, but many states have that.

18 Ms. Wolfgang wanted to be clear that it would be  
19 the requirement in the first sentence, but the second  
20 sentence deals with individuals who are currently  
21 providing supervision on the effective date of the  
22 regulation and what then transpires. She mentioned  
23 two years, noting there is more than likely going to  
24 be a deadline within a biennial period.

25 Ms. McNeill expressed concern with how the Board

1 would verify or track it and whether they would have  
2 to submit certificates for staff to review. She  
3 noted somebody who is going to be a supervisor does  
4 not apply. She mentioned the Board did not get  
5 anything from supervisors until the applicant's  
6 experience is complete and their experience is  
7 verified by the Board.

8 Ms. Wolfgang mentioned that the question should  
9 probably go on the biennial renewal application, so  
10 there is a record of the person indicating that an  
11 individual served as a supervisor and have or have  
12 not taken the course if there is an audit.

13 Ms. Wolfgang also mentioned another solution,  
14 where an individual could say by the end of the next  
15 renewal cycle unless that cycle ends within six  
16 months of the effect date of that cycle in which case  
17 another renewal cycle could be approved, noting it  
18 may be a little complicated and cumbersome.

19 Ms. Wolfgang suggested going with the straight  
20 two years to see how that goes.

21 Ms. Martin noted everyone could ask for an  
22 exemption to get more time.

23 Mr. Barrett explained that the Board would have  
24 to write that into the regulation. He noted the  
25 point is to get everyone doing the CE credit before

1 becoming a supervisor and does not know why they  
2 would need more than two years.

3 Ms. Early commented that it only applies to  
4 someone who is currently supervising when the  
5 regulations take effect.

6 Ms. Wolfgang stated the Board could send an email  
7 blast notifying the licensee population that the  
8 regulation passed and have a certain amount of time  
9 if they are currently supervising. She noted that  
10 the email blast would be sent after the regulation is  
11 published as final.

12 Acting Commissioner Claggett approved the email  
13 blast.

14 Ms. Wolfgang noted clarifying the term "clinical  
15 supervisor certification program" and asked Board  
16 members whether it is accurate.

17 Mr. DeCriscio mentioned that it is more than 6  
18 continuing education clock hours. He noted the  
19 program was 30 continuing education clock hours when  
20 he obtained a certified clinical supervisor  
21 certificate, which was substance abuse addiction  
22 specific, through the International Certification and  
23 Reciprocity Consortium (IC&RC) Board.

24 Chair Santiago asked whether taking a 3-credit  
25 graduate level course at 44 hours or taking it



1 through another organization at 30 hours matters.

2 Ms. Wolfgang did not believe it mattered because  
3 the guidepost is 6 continuing education clock hours,  
4 and the Board is just saying that if they met certain  
5 requirements, they met the requirements. Board  
6 members agreed with the language.

7 Ms. Wolfgang addressed § 47.12d standards for  
8 supervisors, where supervisors and those to whom  
9 supervisory responsibilities are delegated under  
10 47.12c(a)(5) relating to licensed clinical social  
11 worker shall comply with the standards in this  
12 section. Supervisors shall test to compliance on the  
13 verification of experience form, which shall be  
14 submitted by the supervisor directly to the Board as  
15 part of the supervisees application for licensure. A  
16 supervisee may obtain a verification of experience  
17 form after applying with the Board.

18 Ms. Wolfgang requested information regarding the  
19 administrative process to reflect the current  
20 process.

21 Ms. McNeill noted it is within the PALS  
22 application process, and it is accurate. She stated,  
23 as soon as an individual has paid the fee to submit  
24 their application, there is a button next to  
25 verification of supervised clinical experience to

1 download the form. She noted it is prepopulated with  
2 a barcode if they are mail that can get attached to  
3 their application, and it has all their demographic  
4 information prepopulated, so the supervisor just  
5 needs to fill out their part and send it to the  
6 Board.

7 Ms. Wolfgang informed Board members that she  
8 would change the language to reflect that it can be  
9 obtained online.

10 Ms. Wolfgang referred to § 47.21 under  
11 professional corporations, where an individual  
12 licensed by the Board as a bachelor social worker,  
13 social worker, or clinical social worker may  
14 professionally incorporate with other licensed  
15 bachelor social workers, social workers, clinical  
16 social workers, marriage and family therapists,  
17 professional counselors, or with licensed  
18 chiropractors, medical doctors, nurses, optometrists,  
19 doctors of osteo, pharmacists, podiatrists,  
20 veterinarians, dentists, nursing home administrators,  
21 physical therapists, psychologists, occupational  
22 therapists, audiologists, and speech-language  
23 pathologists.

24 Ms. Wolfgang stated the Board is suggesting to  
25 delete teachers of hearing impaired and asked why

1 those individuals are being deleted from this  
2 provision.

3 Chair Santiago recalled that it changed back in  
4 2018, because everything else on the list requires a  
5 master's degree.

6 Ms. McNeill noted being the Board administrator  
7 for the Speech Board, and the Speech Board used to  
8 regulate the teachers of the hearing impaired but no  
9 longer regulate them.

10 Ms. Wolfgang noted she would research and include  
11 that in the preamble.

12 Ms. Wolfgang addressed § 47.32 under requirements  
13 for biennial renewal. She noted prior discussion  
14 regarding a law that was passed a few years back  
15 giving the Board specific authority to carry over CE  
16 if the Board choose to do so. She noted current  
17 regulations indicate excess clock hours may not be  
18 carried over to the next biennium and asked whether  
19 the Board wished to consider carryover. Board  
20 members agreed that clock hours should not be carried  
21 over.

22 Ms. Wolfgang referred to § 47.35a under  
23 preapproved providers. She informed Board members  
24 that former Board Counsel rearranged the existing  
25 regulations, and she deleted § 47.36 and rewrote it

1 under § 47.35a, because there were so many instances  
2 where items needed to be moved.

3 Ms. Martin commented that she is not sure why all  
4 of the changes were made. She noted two groupings of  
5 preapproved providers and some repetition. She  
6 mentioned that it is confusing as to whether an  
7 approved provider can also sponsor or cosponsor.

8 Ms. Wolfgang explained that the Board wanted the  
9 amendments and referred to § 47.35a(a)(1), where the  
10 entities are preapproved providers and may sponsor or  
11 cosponsor but may not approve CE courses. She also  
12 referred to § 47.35a(a)(2), where entities are  
13 preapproved providers and may provide; sponsor;  
14 cosponsor; and approve continuing education courses,  
15 programs, and workshops.

16 Ms. Wolfgang also referred to § 47.35a(a)(3),  
17 where entities and their regional, state, and  
18 affiliate preapproved providers may sponsor  
19 cosponsor, or approve continuing education courses.  
20 She noted the entities in (2) were formerly in the  
21 regulations but now added entities and their  
22 regional, state, and local affiliates that are now  
23 going to be able to approve continuous education  
24 courses, which is new.

25 Ms. Wolfgang stated the Board has to justify in

1 the preamble why it believes these entities  
2 specifically are capable of approving continuing  
3 education courses and programs.

4 Ms. Martin commented that some of those items  
5 were changed but did not believe the Board had much  
6 discussion.

7 Chair Santiago also did not remember any  
8 discussion with the exception of one whose names had  
9 changed, and the names were already on the list when  
10 she became a Board member

11 Ms. Wolfgang referred to § 47.36, noting it is  
12 the current regulation, and § 47.35a with respect to  
13 their preapproved providers.

14 Ms. Martin mentioned that the Child Welfare  
15 League of America, National Association of Black  
16 Social Workers, Clinical Social Work Association, and  
17 other ones following were previously on the list but  
18 then put into this new category for some reason.

19 Ms. Wolfgang requested information regarding the  
20 approval language and why the Board is giving  
21 providers the ability to approve continuing education  
22 courses. She mentioned that the Office of General  
23 Counsel and maybe the Office of Attorney General  
24 might take a look at this. She wanted to make sure  
25 everybody is on the same page as far as why the Board

1 thinks it is necessary to approve it as proposed.

2 Ms. Martin believed a lot of these entities may  
3 predate licensing or regulations, noting professional  
4 organizations have been providing continuing  
5 education for members for a long time. She mentioned  
6 that the Board decided to make standards for  
7 continuing education, and the National Association of  
8 Social Workers (NASW), Association of Social Work  
9 Boards, and marriage and family therapy and  
10 counseling boards and organizations all have been  
11 providing continuing education.

12 Ms. Wolfgang informed Board members that it is  
13 just an exposure draft and could be distributed for  
14 public comment. She mentioned that the Board should  
15 get more information on the entities being added that  
16 were not currently given that approval power,  
17 including the Child Welfare League of America and  
18 Wesley Family Services, to make sure they are  
19 appropriate entities to engage in the approval  
20 process.

21 Mr. DeCriscio commented that there are two  
22 entities, the National Board for Certified Counselors  
23 (NBCC) and the American Counseling Association (ACA)  
24 and their affiliates, who should be considered  
25 preapproved providers. He noted that adding the

1 additional agencies as an approval component is a  
2 mistake.

3 Ms. Wolfgang referred to (2) and further  
4 explained that the existing regulations gives the  
5 entities and national associations the ability to  
6 approve continuing education programs or workshops.  
7 She explained that the regulation is giving other  
8 regional, state, and local affiliates that same  
9 approval power.

10 Ms. Martin commented that there are entities that  
11 were on the list, including the National Association  
12 of Black Social Workers, American Family Therapy  
13 Association, Clinical Social Work Association that  
14 would certainly be included as preapproved providers  
15 that could approve other CEUs. She mentioned that  
16 they are national associations that meet and uphold  
17 standards, along with writing standards.

18 Ms. Wolfgang explained that the Board could  
19 include the entities in (3) but that the Board and  
20 counsel would need to review those entities and look  
21 at their approval process if the Board would want to  
22 give them that additional ability to approve  
23 continuing education courses.

24 Ms. Martin asked why the Board is redoing this  
25 when it was already written into their changes. She

1 referred to (3), where following entities and their  
2 regional, state, and local affiliates, preapproved  
3 providers, and they sponsor, cosponsor, and approve.  
4 She stated it is already written into their changes  
5 made to their regulations and asked why they are  
6 going back and revisiting this.

7 Ms. Wolfgang explained that they are draft  
8 regulations and would have to be approved through the  
9 process. She informed Board members that she is just  
10 giving it one last look over because she was not  
11 involved in drafting it. She noted that it is not  
12 their current regulations but what was drafted, and  
13 she did not have any insight as to why it was drafted  
14 this way or why the entities have this additional  
15 approval process.

16 Ms. Wolfgang mentioned that the Board has to do  
17 its due diligence when giving entities the ability to  
18 approve continuing education.

19 Ms. Martin again noted the Board already  
20 revisited this, and it is already in the regulations.  
21 She mentioned this will never get done if the Board  
22 kept going back and questioning what it did before.

23 Mr. Barrett stated the goal is to move forward  
24 but explained that counsel has to go before  
25 Independent Regulatory Review Commission (IRRC)



1 and be able to explain why the Board is making  
2 certain changes. He noted the Board cannot go before  
3 IRRC and explained what the Board did in 2018. He  
4 further explained that they are not saying to remove  
5 the providers, but more time is needed to look into  
6 them and make sure the approval process is  
7 appropriate for the Board.

8 Ms. Wolfgang informed Board members that she  
9 would not be able to send it out as an exposure if  
10 the Board cannot decide.

11 Mr. DeCriscio commented that he would not give  
12 Wesley Family Services the power to approve CEUs. He  
13 mentioned that the Board approved them as a provider  
14 but did not think they were a qualified entity. He  
15 mentioned that a large majority of the population  
16 they serve are folks with intellectual developmental  
17 disabilities.

18 Mr. DeCriscio stated they do have some programs  
19 that do work with counseling folks considered to have  
20 serious and persistent mental illnesses but do not  
21 seem to be a comparable. He noted Wesley Family  
22 Services to be an agency that provides services but  
23 did not believe they can adequately approve a  
24 provider and believed that with any agency.

25 Mr. Barrett commented that these organizations

1 are potentially specific to certain populations and  
2 could potentially approve programming in areas  
3 outside the community they typically serve or have  
4 expertise in. He noted that other ones on the list  
5 could provide but could not approve providers.

6 Mr. DeCriscio commented that he did not have a  
7 problem with national organizations, Clinical Social  
8 Work Association, or National Association of Black  
9 Social Work if they have given them the ability to  
10 provide, noting some of the agencies on the list do  
11 not add up.

12 Ms. Martin mentioned that it may be a  
13 professional differences issue because social workers  
14 have a very wide scope of practice and do not just  
15 practice in mental health settings, where they  
16 practice in children and youth settings and  
17 developmentally delay agency settings.

18 Ms. Martin reminded everyone that the Board was  
19 originally only the Board of Social Work, noting they  
20 have been trying, you know to meld their professions  
21 together.

22 Mr. DeCriscio stated professional differences is  
23 not the issue, and some of them may have a wonderful  
24 reputation in western Pennsylvania for providing  
25 services to certain populations, noting counselors

1 also provide services to a wide range of clientele,  
2 including folks with intellectual developmental  
3 disabilities as well.

4 Ms. Wolfgang suggested having the entities submit  
5 some sort of application telling the Board what they  
6 do in terms of their approval process. She  
7 recommended taking out that approval component so the  
8 Board could look into those entities because it will  
9 take some time for approval, and Board members  
10 agreed.

11 Ms. Wolfgang asked whether Wesley Family Services  
12 is a new name for Family Service Association of  
13 America of a new entity. She referred to what would  
14 be deleted under § 47.36, noting the entity that is no  
15 longer on the list is Family Service Association of  
16 America. She asked why the Board is deleting that  
17 entity and substituting it with Wesley Family  
18 Services.

19 Ms. Martin stated it has been Wesley Family  
20 Services for a long time and did not know anything  
21 about the other entity. She mentioned that it is  
22 discouraging that all of those entities were already  
23 vetted and part of their regulations, noting it is a  
24 mistake to delete them. She believed it would be  
25 better to go with what had been approved instead of

1 debating it again.

2 Ms. Wolfgang explained that they are not taking  
3 anything away, and the entities are still preapproved  
4 providers and may sponsor or cosponsor. She noted it  
5 is just the approval component that is new to these  
6 providers that would not be included in the  
7 regulation.

8 Ms. Wolfgang referred to (b), noting the  
9 providers are going to be individual providers that  
10 are approved by the Board on a case-by-case biennial  
11 basis labeled as Board-approved providers to keep  
12 that separate. She referred to where the Board may  
13 approve participation in other continuing education  
14 courses or programs for credits so long as the  
15 licensee submits prior to attendance an application  
16 for program approval and supporting documentation  
17 provided in § 47.35 and upon completion of the course  
18 or program submits verification of attendance.

19 Ms. Wolfgang asked whether it is consistent with  
20 how the Board administers other programs. She asked  
21 whether the Board would have them submit certificates  
22 of attendance or just be caught on audits like other  
23 programs.

24 Ms. McNeill explained that they do not have to  
25 have verification of attendance because they are

1 applying before they take it.

2 Ms. Wolfgang noted that she would remove the  
3 verification part.

4 Ms. Wolfgang stated most of the questions she had  
5 for Chapter 48 and Chapter 49 are similar to what was  
6 discussed in Chapter 47 and will make the same  
7 changes in those chapters.

8 Ms. Wolfgang referred to § 48.14(6) under  
9 standards for supervisors, where the supervisor shall  
10 be empowered to recommend the interruption of  
11 termination of the supervisee's activities in  
12 providing services to a client/patient and, if  
13 necessary, to terminate the supervisory relationship.  
14 Any hours accumulated for activities not approved by  
15 the supervisor will not count toward satisfying  
16 33,000 hours of supervised experience.

17 Ms. Wolfgang explained that the Board is deleting  
18 the 3600 hours and changing it to 3000 hours and  
19 asked the Board to provide background information as  
20 to why it is being changed.

21 Chair Santiago stated the Board never wanted it  
22 to be 3600 hours, noting 3000 is the standard in  
23 other states.

24 Ms. Martin further explained that it was  
25 initially written in a confusing way that said they

1 needed 3 years of supervision but did not say how  
2 many hours that was and then another part of the  
3 regulations talked more about the hours, where they  
4 could do the hours in 2 years' time and not 3 years.

5 Ms. Wolfgang referred to § 48.36a(a)(2)(xi) under  
6 preapproved providers, noting American Nurses  
7 Credentialing Center was highlighted by former  
8 counsel and asked if there were any outstanding  
9 issues. She mentioned the entity is currently in the  
10 regulations for the same authority.

11 Ms. McNeil remembered prior Board discussion  
12 regarding those preapproved providers, and the Board  
13 wanted to remove that entity but did not know why.

14 Ms. Wolfgang asked whether it would be acceptable  
15 to deal with this issue when the Board deals with the  
16 other providers in a different regulation.

17 Acting Commissioner Claggett informed Ms.  
18 Wolfgang that it would be acceptable to deal with the  
19 issue at that time because Board members did not have  
20 a comment.

21 Ms. Wolfgang referred to § 49.13(b) under  
22 supervised clinical experience, where experience  
23 acceptable to the Board means experience as a  
24 supervisee in a setting that is organized to prepare  
25 the applicant for practice of counseling consistent

1 with the applicant's education and training. At  
2 least 50% of the experience shall consist of  
3 providing supervised direct client/patient contact  
4 services in one of the following areas.

5 Ms. Wolfgang referred to § 49.13(b)(v), other  
6 therapeutic interventions, noting the addition of  
7 term "psychoeducation." She asked whether the Board  
8 is saying that is the only matter that other  
9 therapeutic interventions include or was it meant to  
10 be an example.

11 Ms. Martin explained that it was meant to be a  
12 general sort of statement because they do not know  
13 what other interventions will come along.

14 Ms. Wolfgang stated putting psychoeducation in  
15 the parentheses means that it is equivalent of the  
16 other therapeutic interventions and is limiting it.

17 Ms. Martin did not remember putting  
18 psychoeducation in there, and they have other  
19 therapeutic interventions so that it is not something  
20 that can change over time. Board members agreed to  
21 delete psychoeducation.

22 Ms. Wolfgang wanted to make the revisions in  
23 Chapter 48 and Chapter 49. She noted the revisions  
24 discussed are very limited, and the Board could vote  
25 to send it out as an exposure draft as discussed

1 during public session with the revisions instructed  
2 by the Board or she can provide a revised final  
3 version. She informed Board members that if they do  
4 the exposure draft that revisions could be made  
5 before it goes to proposed.

6 Chair Santiago provided Ms. Wolfgang with  
7 information regarding the number of exams listed for  
8 professional counselors and preferred the draft goes  
9 out with only the two listed exams.

10 Ms. Wolfgang asked why the Board is deleting so  
11 many examinations because it is going to change the  
12 landscape of people who are eligible. She noted they  
13 could put it out as an exposure draft but that she  
14 would need to provide a sufficient explanation as to  
15 why those examinations are being deleted.

16 Ms. Wolfgang mentioned that the Board may need to  
17 have an effective date that is different than the  
18 effective date on the regulation to give individuals  
19 who were set to take that exam some time to do that  
20 without just dropping a new regulation on them.

21 Chair Santiago informed Board members that she  
22 send an email to Ms. Wolfgang last night. She noted  
23 Pennsylvania is the only state that has 10 or 12  
24 different exams people can take for their LPC. She  
25 mentioned that everybody either asks for the National



1 Counselor Examination (NCE), National Clinical Mental  
2 Health Counseling Examination (NCMHCE), both, or one  
3 plus the jurisprudence.

4 Mr. DeCriscio commented that some states allow  
5 the Certified Rehabilitation Counselor Examination,  
6 but most states are now requiring individuals to pass  
7 the NCE to earn the licensed associate counselor. He  
8 noted that anyone who wants to get their LPC must  
9 pass the National Clinical Mental Health Counseling  
10 Examination.

11 Ms. Wolfgang informed Board members that she may  
12 circle back for more specific guidance and  
13 justification on removing the exams when she begins  
14 writing the preamble.

15 Ms. Wolfgang asked whether the Board wanted to  
16 see the regulation again before they send it out as  
17 an exposure draft or send it out as an exposure  
18 draft.

19 Ms. Martin mentioned that the exposure draft is  
20 for public comment, and the comments would come back  
21 to the Board for a chance to review them and see if  
22 they influence the Board.

23 Ms. Wolfgang explained that it is a public  
24 comment period before the public comment period that  
25 they will have again in the proposed rulemaking. She

1 explained that there is an Executive Order that  
2 requires the Board to do outreach to the regulated  
3 community prior to basically initiating the proposed  
4 regulation.

5 Ms. Wolfgang further explained that the exposure  
6 draft basically satisfies that, where it would have  
7 30 days of public comment and then sent to  
8 stakeholders who want to receive any type of pending  
9 regulation or proposed regulation. Board members  
10 agreed to send out the regulation as an exposure  
11 draft.

12 Ms. Wolfgang informed Board members that she  
13 would place all of the public comments received on  
14 the Board agenda for discussion and then the Board  
15 could decide whether to make revisions based upon the  
16 public comments received.]

17 \*\*\*

18 MR. BARRETT:

19 Based on the discussion in open session  
20 today, I believe the Board Chair would  
21 entertain a motion to direct Counsel to  
22 send out an exposure draft with the  
23 changes discussed and directed in open  
24 session today of the Proposed Annex of  
25 16A-6923.

1 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

2 I'm going to entertain that motion as  
3 presented by counsel.

4 May I have a motion, please?

5 DR. BEHUN:

6 So moved.

7 MS. EARLY:

8 Second.

9 CHAIR SANTIAGO:

10 Any additional discussion, Board  
11 members? Seeing none. Could we have  
12 the vote, please?

13

14 Santiago, aye; Claggett, aye; Behun,  
15 aye; DeCriscio, aye; Early, aye;  
16 Martin, aye.

17 [The motion carried unanimously.]

18

\*\*\*

19 Public Comment

20 [Eric DeCriscio, MA, LPC, ACS, commented he was not  
21 against Wesley Family Services or any other provider,  
22 but did not believe providers are in the business of  
23 or specialize in approving providers and believed  
24 that for any providers.]

25

\*\*\*



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing summary minutes of the State Board of Social Workers, Marriage and Family Therapists and Professional Counselors meeting, was reduced to writing by me or under my supervision, and that the minutes accurately summarize the substance of the State Board of Social Workers, Marriage and Family Therapists and Professional Counselors meeting.



Sophia Mahoney,  
Minute Clerk  
Sargent's Court Reporting  
Service, Inc.

STATE BOARD OF SOCIAL WORKERS,  
MARRIAGE AND FAMILY THERAPISTS,  
AND PROFESSIONAL COUNSELORS  
REFERENCE INDEX

April 23, 2024

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

TIME	AGENDA
9:00	Executive Session
11:00	Return to Open Session
11:41	Official Call to Order
11:43	Roll Call of Board Members
11:43	Introduction of Attendees
11:43	Approval of Minutes
11:47	Report of Prosecutorial Division
11:53	Report of Board Counsel
12:03	Review of Applications
12:19	Miscellaneous
12:20	Regulatory Report
2:44	Public Session
2:45	Adjournment