

**Kansas Behavioral Sciences Regulatory Board
Social Worker Advisory Committee Meeting
January 18, 2017, 1:00 p.m.**

Call to order: Meeting was called to order by Co-Chair Carolyn Szafran at 1:10 p.m.

SW Advisory Committee Members Present: Attending in person: Carolyn Szafran, Angie Heller-Workman, Rebecca Upshaw, and Marcia Simoneau
Attending by telephone: Mike Gillett, Jane Holzrichter and Carl Myers.

Staff Present: Attending in person: Max Foster, Leslie Allen, Joan Hahn and Linda Hoover

Guests Present: Attending in person: Sky Westerlund, KNASW representative, and Bassima Schbley, MSW Director of Washburn University.

- 1) **Agenda Presented.**
- 2) **Review and Approval of SW Advisory Committee minutes of October 26, 2016 meeting.**
Carl asked that his last name appear as Myers. Carl moved to accept the minutes as amended. Jane Holzrichter seconded. Motion carried.
- 3) **Reports and update from BSRB Executive Director.** Max Foster reported on legislative updates. To date, the BSRB budget is intact. Last week Max was contacted by a representative of the Association of Art Therapists who is working with the Reviser of Statutes to potentially draft legislation that would license Art Therapists under BSRB regulations. There are currently 51 art therapists in Kansas. This will be put on the March 13, 2017 Board agenda. Carl offered to follow up with a summary to present at the next SW committee meeting.
- 4) **Visitor Announcements.** None.
- 5) **Old Business.**
 - a. Update Report on LSCSW Supervisor Manual Subcommittee. LSCSW Supervisor Manual Subcommittee Members: Sheri, Marcia, Carl and Carolyn have met twice since our last meeting. Next meeting is set for Wednesday, January 25, 2017 at 2 p.m. Leslie mentioned that frequently, supervisors who sign the attestation included with the training plan, remark that they are not responsible and some go further by asking staff to describe where in the regulations supervisors are held responsible for the supervisee and what that means.
 - b. Preparing and planning for 2018 Legislative Session regarding the Clinical Supervisor Training Requirement. The consensus of the committee was to address this during future meetings; this is an ongoing process. Mike reviewed the ASWB website; this group offers training for clinical supervision. Anyone who is interested in becoming a clinical supervisor is encouraged to enroll. Carl offered to summarize “Issues of Clinical Supervision for Social Workers”; Carl will send his summary to Linda by email attachment before the next SW Advisory Committee meeting. Carolyn asked if

there were volunteers to form a subcommittee to further study this subject. No subcommittee was formed at this time.

- c. There was discussion regarding Social Worker Case Management services and can they be used to accrue hours towards LSCSW licensure. This should be reviewed case by case. Joan remarked that when a Case Manager position description is submitted that she reads further to see what that entails. Joan also includes a definition of Clinical Social Work practice so a Case Manager knows what will count toward the 4,000 hours.

6) **New Business.**

- a. **There was discussion regarding exam applicants who do not have two or three Social Worker references.** Joan explained that three references are required, one of which must be an onsite practicum supervisor and then two references from individuals who are either licensed Social Workers or academically eligible to be licensed. It becomes problematic when the applicant graduated two years to twenty years ago or longer and who were never licensed. Now they want to be licensed, submit their application and have not been working or who have not been employed in a setting that offered them the opportunity to work with social workers. Some are not working with anyone in SW profession but may have worked with LMFTs. This demographic has not worked with anyone who can provide them a reference. So, what is acceptable for references from applicants who fall into this set of circumstances? Is it appropriate for someone to submit a reference that is based on working with an applicant nine years ago? That is the dilemma. Joan described two categories: one group of applicants who graduated with a major in Social Work but who never applied for licensure. Another group of applicants who graduated, applied but who did not pass the exam. Neither group have ever been licensed in the State of Kansas. There is another group who have graduated and worked in the field for decades, whose employer never required a SW license until now, and those applicants must become licensed to keep their job but cannot find a reference. It was noted that similar concerns exist in the military. The regulation reads that an application is required to have two references who are either licensed or academically eligible to be licensed. Bassima Schbley, MSW Director of Washburn University, said that things are continually changing in the Social Worker field such as requirements, knowledge and experience. If an applicant has not worked in the Social Worker setting for 10 years, maybe a couple of courses could be developed to bridge the gap to prepare for licensure. Leslie remarked that the exam is the standard that the Board uses to determine eligibility. To make this type of change would require a statutory change.

Sky remarked: Anyone who wants to be licensed as a Social Worker must meet the minimum qualifications set out in the statutes and regulations. References are required; if the statutes or regulations state that references may be no older than six months, the Board might have to work with what is given to them. Using the structures that are currently in place and if the applicant meets the public trust requirement, could the Board consider the application, approve the references that are 10 years old, and pass the exam, then put a CAO on the license and make it a conditional license with provisions for six months such as earn more CEUs or be supervised. The second issue the Board has is when the applicant does not pass the exam, they have not the basic

qualifications. If not, put a CAO on the license. Leslie reminded all attending the SW Committee meeting that Cheryl Reynolds said at the Board meeting, to tell the applicants to do the best they can, submit what they've got, and it will be left up to the Advisory Committees to decide. Sky added that those providing a reference may address the work when the applicant was an intern. There is that responsibility of the person providing the reference: you may address the work when the applicant was an intern which was several years ago. The reference is encouraged to note that I cannot speak to the applicant's current competency. This is something that likely occurs in every profession that our Board regulates. The committee decided to put this on the Board's March 13, 2017 agenda, provide a few examples of references discussed and ask for clarification.

b. Advancements in Technology and Best Practice Supervision Session Practice

How do we keep up with the advancements in technology while upholding best practice standards for supervision? What does research tell us? Is face-to-face supervision still considered the best practice? Thoughts about other Tele Mental Health practices such as Zoom, Skype, etc.? Should supervisors/supervisees in rural areas have special considerations? References include "Social Workers on the Move" at www.ASWB.org; The NASW Best Practice Standards: <https://www.naswpress.org/publications/standards/supervision.html>, The ASWB Model SW Act https://www.aswb.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Model_law.pdf; On-Line Supervision and Face to Face Supervision http://www.counseling.org/docs/default-source/vistas/vistas_2010_article_46.pdf?sfvrsn=7; Investigating the Effectiveness of Clinical Supervision http://www.counseling.org/resources/library/VISTAS/vistas12/Article_42.pdf.

Max said that this is a topic that all professions the BSRB regulates are struggling with. At the national level and state level. Carolyn asked committee members to review the links provided. It was decided to re-visit this at the next committee meeting. This is an important, complex, difficult and thought provoking matter that requires time for careful consideration. Leslie urged committee members to email their thoughts to either her or Max, Carolyn, Marcia or Linda. Leslie reminded the committee about the Kansas Open Records Act (KORA). Rural areas are asking for special consideration to have all supervision take place by televideo. Regulations allow Social Workers to use face to face supervision up to 50% of the time, and up to 50% by televideo. We need research to help determine best practice. This will be added to our next agenda.

c. Clinical Supervisor attestations with "Recommended with reservation". Consideration of a six-month performance evaluation requirement?

After clinical supervision is completed, the supervisor completes the attestation form and 'recommends with reservations' then mark exceptions that are very serious and cause for concern. The supervisor is typically asked to submit an addendum to explain why exceptions were marked. Yet, the same applicant also submits attestations with no reservations. The consensus was favorable to require during accrual of clinical experience hours, six-month performance evaluations from other supervisors. This change will require a regulatory change. If there is not a good mix between the supervisor and supervisee, at the end of the six-month the supervisee

could end that relationship and find a different supervisor. Also, on the form include a space for the supervisee to comment on the supervisor. For a supervisor to not address concerns during the 24 months and 4,000 hours with the supervisee, is to risk unprofessional conduct of the supervisor.

- 7) **Adjourn.** Marcia Simoneau moved to adjourn. Rebecca Upshaw seconded the motion. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m. Next Social Work Advisory Committee meeting is set for Wednesday, March 22, 2017 at 1:00 p.m.