

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

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  
VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE**

TIME: 11:02 A.M.

May 4, 2021

1                   State Board of Social Workers,  
2                   Marriage and Family Therapists,  
3                   and Professional Counselors  
4                   May 4, 2021

5  
6  
7 BOARD MEMBERS:

8  
9 Joy E. Corby, Ph.D., LMFT, Chair  
10 Theodore Stauffer, Executive Secretary, Bureau of  
11 Professional and Occupational Affairs, on behalf of  
12 K. Kalonji Johnson, Commissioner, Bureau of  
13 Professional and Occupational Affairs  
14 Michelle Santiago, Psy.D., LPC, Vice Chair  
15 Jeanne Elberfeld, M.D., LSW  
16 Erika Evans, Ph.D., LMFT  
17 Christian Jordal, Ph.D., LMFT - Absent  
18 Amy K. Keisling, LCSW  
19 Kurt L. Kraus, Ed.D., NCC, ACS, LPC  
20 Linda A. Martin, LCSW, RN  
21 Marilyn L. Painter, Public Member  
22  
23

24 BUREAU PERSONNEL:

25  
26 Jaime D. Black, Esquire, Board/Regulatory Counsel  
27 Dean F. Picarella, Esquire, Senior Counsel  
28 Nathan C. Giunta, Esquire, Board Prosecutor  
29 Adam Williams, Esquire, Board Prosecutor  
30 Jason T. Anderson, Esquire, Board Prosecutor  
31 Cynthia K. Montgomery, Esquire, Deputy Chief  
32 Counsel/Regulatory Counsel, Department of State  
33 Marc Farrell, Deputy Policy Director, Department of  
34 State  
35 Sandra E. Matter, Board Administrator  
36  
37

38 ALSO PRESENT:

39  
40 Billy Myers  
41 Johanna Byrd, ACSW, IOM, CAE, Executive Director,  
42 National Association of Social Workers, Pennsylvania  
43 Chapter  
44 Amy Sagen, Chief Operating Officer, National  
45 Association of Social Workers  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

1 \*\*\*

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

5 May 4, 2021

6 \*\*\*

7 [Pursuant to Section 708(a)(5) of the Sunshine Act, at  
8 9:30 a.m. the Board entered into executive session  
9 with Jaime D. Black, Esquire, Board Counsel, for the  
10 purpose of conducting quasi-judicial deliberations on  
11 a number of matters that are currently pending before  
12 the Board on today's agenda. The Board returned to  
13 open session at 11:00 a.m.]

14 \*\*\*

15 [Theodore Stauffer, Executive Secretary, Bureau of  
16 Professional and Occupational Affairs, noted the  
17 meeting was being recorded, and those participating  
18 were giving their consent to be recorded.]

19 \*\*\*

20 The regularly scheduled meeting of the State  
21 Board of Social Workers, Marriage and Family  
22 Therapists, and Professional Counselors was held on  
23 Tuesday, May 4, 2021. Joy E. Corby, Ph.D., LMFT,  
24 Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:02 a.m.

25 \*\*\*

1 Introduction of Board/Public Members

2 [Chair Corby requested Board members and the public  
3 introduce themselves.]

4 \*\*\*

5 Approval of minutes of the March 16, 2021 meeting

6 CHAIR CORBY:

7 I believe we will approve the draft  
8 minutes of the March 16, 2021 Board  
9 meeting. I believe also that the Board  
10 members sent corrections to Sandy  
11 already, so I would ask for a motion to  
12 approve the draft minutes with  
13 corrections.

14 MS. PAINTER:

15 So moved.

16 DR. SANTIAGO:

17 Second.

18 CHAIR CORBY:

19 All in favor, raise your hand. Opposed?  
20 Abstentions?

21 [The motion carried. Ms. Keisling abstained from  
22 voting on the motion.]

23 \*\*\*

24 Report of Board Prosecutorial Division

25 [Nathan C. Giunta, Esquire, Board Prosecution Liaison,

1 presented the Consent Agreement for Case No. 19-69-  
2 018450.]

3 \*\*\*

4 Report of Board Counsel

5 MS. BLACK:

6 Pursuant to Section 708(a)(5) of the  
7 Sunshine Act, the Board entered into  
8 executive session prior to today's  
9 meeting for the purpose of conducting  
10 quasi-judicial deliberations and to  
11 receive advice of counsel specifically  
12 regarding items 2 through 7 and 14  
13 through 20 on today's agenda.

14 I believe the Board would entertain  
15 a motion to accept the Consent Agreement  
16 at Case No. 19-69-018450 at Item No. 2.

17 CHAIR CORBY:

18 Motion?

19 DR. SANTIAGO:

20 Motion.

21 MS. KEISLING:

22 Second.

23 CHAIR CORBY:

24 All those in favor, raise your hand.

25 Opposed? Abstentions?

1 [The motion carried. Ms. Painter opposed the motion.  
2 Case No. 19-69-018450 is BPOA v. Paula Gonzalez-  
3 Kilduff, LSW.]

4 \*\*\*

5 MS. BLACK:

6 I believe the Board would entertain a  
7 motion to delegate for hearings to the  
8 Office of Hearing Examiner items 3  
9 through 5, Brent Weston Adams, PC, Case  
10 No. 20-69-007426; Jay Edward  
11 Cadwallader, LPC, Case No. 19-69-013582;  
12 and Christina R. Marshall, LSW, Case No.  
13 21-69-002382.

14 MS. PAINTER:

15 So moved.

16 DR. SANTIAGO:

17 Second.

18 CHAIR CORBY:

19 All those in favor, raise your hand.

20 Opposed? Abstentions?

21 [The motion carried unanimously.]

22 \*\*\*

23 MS. BLACK:

24 I believe the Board would entertain a  
25 motion to affirm the citation at Item



1 CHAIR CORBY:

2 All those in favor, raise your hand.

3 Opposed? Abstentions?

4 [The motion carried unanimously.]

5 \*\*\*

6 Review of Applications

7 MS. BLACK:

8 I believe the Board would entertain a  
9 motion to grant the Continuing Education  
10 Preapproved Provider Renewal Application  
11 for Lehigh Valley Health Network and to  
12 send a letter along with the approval  
13 notice based on the Boards discussion.

14 MS. PAINTER:

15 So moved.

16 DR. SANTIAGO:

17 Second.

18 CHAIR CORBY:

19 All in favor, raise your hand. Opposed?

20 Abstentions?

21 [The motion carried. Ms. Keisling abstained from  
22 voting on the motion.]

23 \*\*\*

24 MS. BLACK:

25 I believe the Board would entertain a



1 motion to grant the Continuing Education  
2 Preapproved Provider Application for  
3 item 15, Defender Association of  
4 Philadelphia.

5 MS. PAINTER:

6 So moved.

7 DR. ELBERFELD:

8 Second.

9 CHAIR CORBY:

10 All in favor, raise your hand or say  
11 yes. Opposed? Abstentions?

12 [The motion carried. Dr. Santiago abstained from  
13 voting on the motion.]

14 \*\*\*

15 MS. BLACK:

16 I believe the Board would entertain a  
17 motion to grant the Continuing Education  
18 Preapproved Provider Application for  
19 item 16 on today's agenda, American  
20 Association of Christian Counseling.

21 DR. KRAUS:

22 So moved.

23 DR. ELBERFELD:

24 Second.

25 CHAIR CORBY:

1 All in favor, raise your hand. Opposed?  
2 Abstentions?

3 [The motion carried. Dr. Santiago and Ms. Painter  
4 opposed the motion.]

5 \*\*\*

6 MS. BLACK:

7 For items 17 and 20, Kristen Say and  
8 Daniel Cooper, the Board is directing  
9 the Board administrator to send a letter  
10 to those individuals based on  
11 discussions in executive session.

12 I believe the Board would entertain  
13 a motion to grant the Applications for  
14 Professional Counsel by Examination for  
15 Stephanie Sarafinas and Christina  
16 Marinaro at items 18 and 19.

17 DR. SANTIAGO:

18 Motion.

19 DR. KRAUS:

20 Second.

21 CHAIR CORBY:

22 All in favor, raise your hand. Opposed?  
23 Abstentions?

24 [The motion carried unanimously.]

25 \*\*\*

1 Report of Board Counsel (Continued)

2 [Jaime D. Black, Esquire, Board Counsel, informed the  
3 Board that the Bureau of Professional and Occupational  
4 Affairs received reports of persons pretending to be  
5 from one of the health-related boards contacting  
6 licensees by phone and mail about the status of their  
7 licenses. She stated the scammers are altering their  
8 information to reflect a caller ID that appears to be  
9 from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

10 Ms. Black also noted the scammers are threatening  
11 license suspension for failure to act and falsely  
12 claiming involvement with the Federal Bureau of  
13 Investigation (FBI) and the Drug Enforcement  
14 Administration (DEA). She provided reminders from the  
15 Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs (BPOA)  
16 concerning contact and personal information.

17 Ms. Black mentioned that those who are the  
18 subject of an investigation or disciplinary action  
19 will receive notice by certified mail and/or personal  
20 service and are provided with a contact name and phone  
21 number. She informed everyone to contact their local  
22 police department or the state police if they have  
23 been a victim of the scam. She noted a link on the  
24 Department of State's website under professional  
25 licensing to view the scam alert.

1 Ms. Black addressed House Bill 681, which would  
2 prohibit the enforcement of covenants not to compete  
3 in health care practitioner employment agreements.  
4 She stated the bill would apply to health care  
5 practitioners as defined by the Health Care Facilities  
6 Act, which includes an individual who is authorized to  
7 practice some component of the healing arts by a  
8 license, permit, certificate, or registration issued  
9 by the Commonwealth, licensing agency, or Board.

10 Ms. Black noted the bill was referred to the  
11 House Health Committee on February 26, 2021, and  
12 requires nothing from the Board at the current time.]

13 \*\*\*

14 Report of Regulatory Board Counsel  
15 [Cynthia K. Montgomery, Esquire, Deputy Chief  
16 Counsel/Regulatory Counsel, Department of State,  
17 addressed proposed rulemaking 16A-6919 updating the  
18 child abuse reporting requirements. She mentioned no  
19 public comments were received on the proposed  
20 rulemaking implementing the changes to the Child  
21 Protective Services Law. She noted receiving comments  
22 from the Independent Regulatory Review Commission  
23 (IRRC) and included those on the agenda.

24 Ms. Montgomery addressed comments from IRRC  
25 regarding § 47.58(a), § 48.58(a), and § 49.58(a)

1 concerning mandatory training requirements. She  
2 referred to § 47.58(a), requiring an individual  
3 applying for a license to complete at least 3 hours of  
4 training in child abuse recognition and reporting.  
5 She noted IRRC's comment, stating the subsection does  
6 not address the documentation and reporting of  
7 completion of training as required under the Child  
8 Protective Services Law and asked the Board to revise  
9 the subsection to include the implementation  
10 procedures for submitting proof of training.

11 Ms. Montgomery noted the State Board of Physical  
12 Therapy received the same comment and revised their  
13 rulemaking, where the Office of General Counsel (OGC)  
14 and Office of Policy approved the change. She noted  
15 IRRC suggested the Board amend § 47.58(a) to be  
16 consistent with § 47.58(b), where training must be  
17 required by the Department of Human Services and the  
18 bureau as set forth in § 47.59, § 48.59, and § 49.59  
19 relating to child abuse recognition and reporting  
20 course approval.

21 Ms. Montgomery noted that the applicant shall  
22 certify on the initial application for licensure  
23 either the completion of the required training or the  
24 granting of an exemption under subsection (c), where  
25 the Board will not issue a license or certificate

1 unless the bureau received an electronic report from  
2 an approved course provider documenting the attendance  
3 and participation by the applicant or the applicant  
4 obtained an exemption under subsection (c). She  
5 stated similar amendments need to be made to  
6 regulations § 47.58(a), § 48.58(a), and § 49.58(a).

7 Ms. Montgomery addressed subsection (c)(3), where  
8 an applicant or licensee can apply for an exemption  
9 and (c)(1) and (2) concerning required training under  
10 the public school code and domestic relations code and  
11 Child Protective Services Law for other individuals.  
12 She stated individuals who have already taken the  
13 course to meet those requirements do not have to take  
14 it again to meet Board requirements.

15 Ms. Montgomery addressed IRRC's comment regarding  
16 subsection (c)(3), where the Board can grant an  
17 exemption if the individual demonstrates to the Board  
18 that they should not be subject to this requirement.  
19 She noted the proposed rulemaking essentially parented  
20 what the statute said, where the applicant or licensee  
21 submits documentation demonstrating that the applicant  
22 or licensee should not be subject to the training  
23 requirements and each request for exemption under this  
24 paragraph would be on a case-by-case basis.

25 Ms. Montgomery explained that IRRC believes the

1 standards for the documentation to be submitted and  
2 for the Board's evaluation are vague and requested  
3 that the Board explain the standards for sufficient  
4 documentation and the evaluation process for reviewing  
5 a request for exemption.

6 Ms. Montgomery stated it was difficult to set  
7 standards for what type of documentation would be  
8 acceptable to the Board, because it would depend on  
9 the reason the applicant or licensee was advancing for  
10 the reason they should not be required to complete the  
11 training or continuing education.

12 Ms. Montgomery suggested editing subsection (c)  
13 to clarify that it was not enough to state that one's  
14 practice did not include children, because the  
15 expanded scope of the duty to report used to be only  
16 if an individual came into contact with children in  
17 the course of their practice and had to make these  
18 reports. The Child Protective Services Law (CPSL) was  
19 amended to expand the duty to include somebody making  
20 a specific disclosure that an identifiable child is  
21 the subject of abuse and it did not matter whether a  
22 practice does not have children.

23 Ms. Montgomery mentioned requests are usually  
24 granted if training would be duplicative of other  
25 training an individual already took. She noted many

1 licensees for the Board work for the Department of  
2 Human Services Office of Children, Youth, and Families  
3 or county agencies and investigate reports of  
4 suspected abuse who would also be granted an  
5 exemption.

6 Ms. Montgomery suggested amending subsection  
7 (c)(3) to require the licensee submit documentation  
8 acceptable to the Board demonstrating why the  
9 applicant or licensee should not be subject to the  
10 training and each request or exemption would be  
11 considered on a case-by-case basis to include the  
12 standard for evaluation.

13 Ms. Montgomery addressed another comment from  
14 IRR, where the Board did not include the phrase, "a  
15 portion of the total continuing education required for  
16 biennial renewal" in section § 48.58(b) and suggested  
17 amending 48.58(b) to include that phrase, noting it to  
18 be her error.

19 Ms. Montgomery noted the same concept for § 49.51  
20 regarding the definition section in the chapter for  
21 licensed professional counselor (LPCs). She noted the  
22 definition of mandated reporter cross-references the  
23 regulations and IRRC wanted a cross-reference to the  
24 statute. She noted the change was made in § 47.51 in  
25 the proposed rulemaking but missed it in § 49.51 and



1 suggest amending the definition to read, "A person who  
2 is required under Pa.C.S. § 6311 relating to persons  
3 required to report suspected child abuse to make a  
4 report of suspected child abuse." "For purposes of  
5 this chapter, the term would include all licensed  
6 professional counselors."

7 Ms. Montgomery addressed the final comment from  
8 IRRC, where IRRC points out that under the CPSL, an  
9 individual supervised or managed by a licensee who has  
10 direct contact with children in the course of their  
11 employment is designated as a mandated reporter. She  
12 noted the Board did mention in the preamble that the  
13 Board reminds its licensees that individuals they  
14 supervise or manage should be aware of the reporting  
15 requirements.

16 Ms. Montgomery noted IRRC asked that the Board  
17 explain if it will use additional methods to  
18 communicate with its licensees that supervised and  
19 managed employees are mandated reporters and the Board  
20 should consider requiring licensees to advise  
21 employees of their mandated reporter status. She  
22 mentioned that no other boards have received that  
23 comment at this point.

24 Ms. Montgomery questioned whether the Board  
25 believed it was appropriate to impose such a duty on

1 licensees because people can be disciplined for not  
2 doing it.

3 Ms. Montgomery referred to CPSL § 6311(a) and  
4 provided an overview of the list of all mandated  
5 reporters. She stated individuals under CPSL are  
6 mandated reporters, and IRRC's concern is perhaps they  
7 do not know they are considered mandated reporters and  
8 should be advised of that.

9 Ms. Keisling commented that this places the  
10 burden of notifying mandated reporters on the licensed  
11 person as opposed to the statute that requires  
12 individuals to know they are mandated reporters.

13 Ms. Montgomery questioned whether the Board  
14 considered it appropriate to require licensees to  
15 advise supervised and managed employees of their  
16 status of mandated reporter. She noted it was put in  
17 the preamble to the proposed rulemaking to make  
18 licensees aware that their supervised employees who  
19 come into contact with children are mandated  
20 reporters.

21 Ms. Montgomery believed the Board could address  
22 IRRC's comment by saying the Board reminded licensees  
23 in the proposed rulemaking but supervised and managed  
24 employees have their own duty under the Child  
25 Protective Services Law to be identified as a mandated

1 reporter if they come into contact with children in  
2 the scope of their employment and was their duty to  
3 know the law and their responsibilities.

4 Ms. Montgomery noted the Board could encourage  
5 training so the individual is prepared to react if  
6 they do come across a child in the course and scope of  
7 their employment that they suspect is the victim of  
8 child abuse.

9 Ms. Martin noted the preamble still states that  
10 licensees should remind individuals they supervise and  
11 manage to be aware of the reporting requirements and  
12 questioned whether licensees can still be disciplined  
13 if an individual they were supervising omitted to  
14 report some form of abuse.

15 Ms. Montgomery explained that an individual could  
16 be disciplined for not notifying employees of their  
17 mandated reporter status but not for their failure to  
18 report.

19 Ms. Montgomery commented that it seemed the Board  
20 did not subject its employees to disciplinary status  
21 for not notifying an individual that a law applied to  
22 them.

23 Dr. Elberfeld suggested the addition of a  
24 statement in mandated reporter training slides that  
25 would inform people who are supervising individuals

1 who work with children of their mandated reporters'  
2 status.

3 Ms. Montgomery noted that the statement could be  
4 added when training is targeted to the licensee  
5 population and will speak with one of her contacts at  
6 the Department of Human Services because DHS approves  
7 training content.

8 Ms. Montgomery referred to § 47.59 and § 48.59  
9 regarding requirements for course approval by BPOA,  
10 noting only a general description. She discussed  
11 whether it would be appropriate to amend those  
12 sections to include a specific requirement that they  
13 notify participants that individuals they supervise or  
14 manage are also mandated reporters. She will reach  
15 out to contacts at DHS and ask them about their  
16 standards for reviewing the curriculum.

17 Ms. Montgomery stated the training is targeted  
18 for a mandated reporter, so those receiving the  
19 training are named as a mandated reporter. She  
20 mentioned that just adding the slide noting that  
21 people being supervised and managed who come in direct  
22 contact with children are also mandated reporters.

23 Ms. Montgomery will draft the final-form  
24 rulemaking consistent with discussions and revise the  
25 preamble for a Board vote at the next meeting.

1 Chair Corby requested an update on the status of  
2 general regulations.

3 Ms. Black stated the Regulatory Analysis Form  
4 (RAF) is being finalized and will be brought to the  
5 Board for review when completed.]

6

\*\*\*

7 Report of Board Chair

8 [Joy E. Corby, Ph.D., LMFT, Chair, noted the need for  
9 discussion regarding qualifications for instructors of  
10 continuing education units (CEUs). She commented that  
11 questions have been raised concerning people who are  
12 instructing attendees when their background is so  
13 different than those who are attending the training.

14 Ms. Black stated the regulations do not have any  
15 requirement that the instructors have a specific  
16 background or be licensed in a specific way.

17 Dr. Santiago expressed a concern for having no  
18 standards for providers, noting they are not governed  
19 by any type of licensing board as far as what they are  
20 teaching.

21 Ms. Black stated there was nothing in the  
22 regulations that require CE instructors to be licensed  
23 in a specific way or have a specific background but do  
24 require Board approval. She cautioned the Board in  
25 instituting those requirements.

1           Chair Corby commented that there are people who  
2 are not licensed but have incredible background and  
3 training experience and suggested requiring the  
4 providers explain how they choose their people.

5           Dr. Kraus mentioned recently sending several CE  
6 applications back to Ms. Matter, noting credentials  
7 and resumes were attached, but many of these  
8 individuals had no degree at all. He noted not  
9 wanting to eliminate people from providing but wanted  
10 to make sure the person knows what they are doing and  
11 was hesitant to leave that up to the hiring agency.

12           Ms. Matter stated the regulations state that the  
13 provider shall ensure instructors have suitable  
14 qualifications and a good reputation and character.

15           Ms. Black explained that it was within the  
16 authority of the Board to require CE instructors to  
17 explain their qualifications whenever the Board is  
18 uncertain as to whether the instructor has the  
19 appropriate credentials to be speaking on a specific  
20 matter.

21           Chair Corby requested more information regarding  
22 what could be included in the application to place  
23 more onus on the providers to provide more  
24 information.

25           Ms. Black recommended taking language right from

1 the regulation by asking the CE applicant what  
2 criteria was considered when selecting and evaluating  
3 the faculty that is presenting the topic.

4 Dr. Elberfeld referred to a CE approval  
5 application, noting under standards for courses and  
6 programs that there must be established criteria for  
7 selecting and evaluating faculty or source material.  
8 She noted the application specifically states that  
9 "see attached" is not an acceptable answer. She  
10 mentioned the importance of enforcing it.

11 Ms. Martin agreed with Dr. Elberfeld that the  
12 requirements were established but Board members still  
13 have to enforce it. She also agreed with Dr. Kraus,  
14 where those presenting a package CEU who do not seem  
15 to have any knowledge or experience would not be  
16 approved and required to provide more information  
17 regarding how the person was chosen or let them come  
18 back and challenge the Board as to why it was not  
19 approved.

20 Chair Corby commented that everyone needs to  
21 agree as Board members to make sure when looking at  
22 the instructor part of applications that questions are  
23 answered appropriately. She also recommended Ms.  
24 Matter and Ms. Black review the application and let  
25 the Board know if there was any wording that might be

1 worth adding.

2 Chair Corby addressed Act 41, where there have  
3 been at least one or more people who have applied and  
4 licensed in another state and their state has taken  
5 months and months before providing evidence that the  
6 individuals are in good standing with the state and  
7 sometimes never hear back. She questioned whether  
8 approval to accept a license lookup as proof could be  
9 given.

10 Ms. Matter stated the Board staff already  
11 completes a license verification online for other  
12 state boards if there is no letter of good standing at  
13 the time of the application review. She noted the  
14 only thing they are unable to determine is whether an  
15 applicant has completed the 3000 hours of supervised  
16 clinical experience and that is the document Board  
17 Staff wait on for review from the other state  
18 licensure board.

19 Chair Corby stated Act 41 allows the Board to  
20 accept their license without having to look at  
21 everything they did beforehand and questioned the need  
22 to wait to verify the 3000 hours. She noted Dr.  
23 Jordal suggested accepting a Board lookup as  
24 sufficient documentation

25 Dr. Santiago questioned whether the Board would



1 have access to information if an individual's license  
2 is in the process of being put on hold, suspended, or  
3 revoked during a lookup and what action the Board  
4 could take.

5 Ms. Black explained that the Board would not have  
6 that information if it was in progress and does not  
7 become relevant until there is a final disposition in  
8 that jurisdiction.

9 Dr. Santiago questioned what would happen if the  
10 Board issued the license in a pending case in another  
11 jurisdiction became final and information now exists.

12 Mr. Guinta explained that prosecution would move  
13 forward because the individual should be reporting  
14 pending matters, which would give the Board the  
15 opportunity to wait to see what happens before  
16 granting the application.

17 Chair Corby spoke in favor of speeding up the  
18 process, and when a license is good, then the Board  
19 ought to move forward.

20 Dr. Elberfeld expressed concern with states not  
21 keeping their online system up to date if they are  
22 being overwhelmed by providing documentation.

23 Chair Corby commented that Ms. Matter will be  
24 informing people that license lookup will be  
25 sufficient.

1 Ms. Matter wanted to clarify that the education  
2 and supervised clinical experience no longer need to  
3 be reviewed if the individual applies for a license by  
4 endorsement, the application is to be reviewed under  
5 Act 41 and the license is in good standing, and those  
6 who do not have the two years of active licensed  
7 practice would be issued a provisional license.]

8 \*\*\*

9 Report from Other Board Members - No Report

10 \*\*\*

11 Report of Commissioner - No Report

12 \*\*\*

13 Report of Board Administrator

14 [Sandra E. Matter, Board Administrator, informed the  
15 Board of a conflict with the July 20, 2021 Board  
16 meeting date.

17 Ms. Painter requested an update on in-person  
18 Board meetings.

19 Theodore Stauffer, Executive Secretary, Bureau of  
20 Professional and Occupational Affairs, on behalf of  
21 Commissioner Johnson, had not received a notification  
22 for in-person meetings as of yet.

23 Chair Corby commented that more people have  
24 consistently attended the public meetings online than  
25 ever in person and also mentioned the state is saving

1 a lot of money. She questioned whether the Board  
2 would have the option to decide to return to in person  
3 or continue online meetings.

4 Mr. Stauffer stated some boards are limited in  
5 their practice act, where meetings must be in person  
6 and are able to do online meetings through the  
7 Governor's waiver. He mentioned there is discussion  
8 concerning keeping some meetings online even after  
9 things return to normal because it is easier for Board  
10 members and saves money in travel. He also noted a  
11 hybrid model, where Boards would be meeting in person  
12 but still have that online component so people can  
13 join online as well.

14 Ms. Matter offered Monday, August 2 to replace  
15 the July 20 meeting date, and Board members agreed.]

16 \*\*\*

17 Miscellaneous - Board Meeting Dates

18 [Sandra E. Matter, Board Administrator, noted the  
19 proposed 2022 meeting dates for the Board's approval  
20 are January 25, March 8, April 26, June 14, July 18,  
21 September 6, October 18, and November 29.]

22 \*\*\*

23 Miscellaneous - Election of Officers

24 MS. KEISLING:

25 Unless people have something to discuss,

1 I would move that we maintain current  
2 leadership and vote to keep our chair  
3 and vice chair.

4 DR. KRAUS:

5 Second.

6 [The Board discussed expiration of terms. Ms. Painter  
7 suggested creating a nominating committee regarding  
8 election of officers.]

9 CHAIR CORBY:

10 We do have a motion before us. All in  
11 favor, raise your hand. Opposed?

12 Abstentions?

13 [The motion carried unanimously.]

14 \*\*\*

15 Correspondence

16 [Jaime D. Black, Esquire, Board Counsel, referred to  
17 correspondence regarding a change to § 47.1a(2)  
18 concerning supervisor qualifications, where a  
19 supervisor holds a license in a master's or doctoral  
20 degree in a related field and has 5 years of  
21 experience within the last 10 years. She noted the  
22 correspondence to be a request to expand the  
23 regulations regarding who could become a supervisor.

24 Dr. Santiago pointed out that only 1500 hours of  
25 supervised clinical experience may be completed under

1 a supervisor meeting the qualification, and the  
2 correspondence is requesting that the other 1500 hours  
3 be under the supervision of a medical doctor, nurse  
4 practitioner, or physician assistant for LSWs.

5 Chair Corby noted having difficulty with that  
6 change and request, stating the medical world is  
7 different than psychotherapy.]

8 MS. BLACK:

9 Would the Board entertain a motion  
10 rejecting the request to move forward  
11 with a change to § 47.1a(2) of the  
12 regulations.

13 CHAIR CORBY:

14 Do I hear a motion?

15 DR. ELBERFELD:

16 So moved.

17 DR. SANTIAGO:

18 Second.

19 CHAIR CORBY:

20 All in favor, raise your hand. Opposed?

21 Abstentions?

22 [The motion carried unanimously.]

23 \*\*\*

24 [Jaime D. Black, Esquire, Board Counsel, referred to  
25 the correspondence request to change § 49.3 regarding

1 qualifications for a supervisor of LCPs. She stated  
2 the request is to consider the inclusion of licensed  
3 behavior analysts as a person who may provide a  
4 portion of the supervision for an LPC.

5 Chair Corby commented that licensed behavior  
6 analysts and board-certified behavioral analysts  
7 (BCBAs) are trained with specific behavioral things  
8 and are not therapists.]

9 MS. BLACK:

10 Would the Board entertain a motion to  
11 reject the request to change § 49.3 of  
12 the regulations?

13 DR. SANTIAGO:

14 I make a motion that we reject.

15 DR. KRAUS:

16 Second.

17 CHAIR CORBY:

18 All in favor, raise your hand. Opposed?  
19 Abstentions?

20 [The motion carried unanimously.]

21 \*\*\*

22 FYI

23 [Kurt L. Kraus, Ed.D., NCC, ACS, LPC, addressed  
24 correspondence from the National Board for Certified  
25 Counselors (NBCC). He stated there is merit in the

1 interstate compact, and it would enhance portability,  
2 noting it addresses Pennsylvania LPCs going to other  
3 states rather than those just coming to Pennsylvania.

4 Dr. Santiago noted the Association of Social Work  
5 Boards (ASWB) 2020 pass rates and Veterans' Licensure  
6 Survey for the Board's review.

7 Dr. Kraus noted appreciating receiving the  
8 Veterans' Licensure Survey.

9 Chair Corby referred to the ASWB 2020 pass rates  
10 and questioned whether LMFT or the National Board for  
11 Certified Counselors (NBCC) does a report like that.

12 Ms. Matter noted not seeing an email from NBCC  
13 and would need to see if a pass rate report comes with  
14 the AMFTRBexam score report.

15 Chair Corby mentioned that the Association of  
16 Marriage & Family Therapy Regulatory Boards (AMFTRB)  
17 does make all of the stats of the exam available at  
18 their annual conference but is not sure if it is sent  
19 to all of the states.]

20 \*\*\*

21 Adjournment

22 CHAIR CORBY:

23 Motion for adjournment?

24 DR. KRAUS:

25 So moved.

1 MS. PAINTER:

2                               Second.

3 CHAIR CORBY:

4                               All in favor?

5 [The motion carried unanimously.]

6   \*\*\*

7 [There being no further business, the State Board of  
8 Social Workers, Marriage and Family Therapists, and  
9 Professional Counselors Meeting adjourned at  
10 1:06 p.m.]

11   \*\*\*

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26



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.



Evan Bingaman,  
Minute Clerk  
Sargent's Court Reporting  
Service, Inc.

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

May 4, 2021

TIME	AGENDA
9:30	Executive Session
11:00	Return to Open Session
11:02	Official Call to Order
11:03	Introduction of Board/Public Members
11:06	Approval of Minutes
11:07	Report of Prosecutorial Division
11:14	Report of Board Counsel
11:17	Review of Applications
11:20	Report of Board Counsel (Continued)
11:23	Report of Regulatory Counsel
12:05	Report of Board Chair
12:32	Report of Board Administrator
12:43	Miscellaneous
12:55	Correspondence
1:04	FYI
1:06	Adjournment