



STATE OF NEVADA  
BOARD OF EXAMINERS FOR SOCIAL WORKERS  
4600 Kietzke Lane, Suite C121, Reno, Nevada 89502  
775-688-2555

MINUTES OF BOARD MEETING  
October 19, 2018

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:** The meeting of the Board of Examiners for Social Workers was called to order by Vikki Erickson, Board President, at 9:05 a.m. The meeting was held at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) System Computing Services Building, Room 47, in Reno, Nevada, 89557. There was a simultaneous videoconference conducted at Mojave Adult Clinic, 4000 E. Charleston Blvd., Suite B-230, Las Vegas, Nevada. President Erickson noted that the meeting had been properly posted and that the Board members present constituted a quorum. Roll call was initiated by President Erickson, with the following individuals present:

Members Present:

Vikki Erickson, LCSW, President (**Erickson**)  
Jodi Ussher, LCSW, Vice President (**Ussher**)  
Susan Nielsen, Secretary / Treasurer (**Nielsen**)  
Monique Harris, LCSW, Board Member (**Harris**)  
Stefaine Maplethorpe, LCSW, Board Member (**Maplethorpe**)

Staff Present

Michael Detmer, Esq., Board Counsel (**Detmer**)  
Miranda Hoover, Capitol Partners (**Hoover**)  
Richard Miller, Investigator (**Miller**)  
Karen Oppenlander, Executive Director (**Oppenlander**)

*Board members and Board staff will be identified by the above **bolded** means throughout the minutes.*

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** No public comment was offered at this time.

**REGULAR AGENDA:**

**Board Operations**

**Erickson** introduced item 3A (For Possible Action) Review, Discussion and Possible Approval of the September 21, 2018 Board Meeting Minutes.

**Ussher** motioned to approve **September 21, 2018 Board Meeting Minutes**, seconded by **Maplethorpe**. Passed unanimously.

Next, **Erickson** turned to item 3Bi under Board Operations (For Possible Action) Review, Discussion and Possible Approval of Hearing for Licensure. **Detmer** commented on a series of items that are to be considered confidential based on his review of our statutes. He went on to state that this is why the application documents are put within these packets so that they are solely for the Board's consideration. **Erickson** had the Board read their first individual packet prepared for a Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, SAC, Applicant for Licensure Pursuant to NRS 641.B260 and NAC 641B.090.

When the Board members had completed reading the packets for licensure applicant SAC, **Erickson** checked with Board Counsel **Detmer** about confidentiality when an applicant has a signed waiver as is the case with this applicant. Shirley Coffman by signing the waiver has agreed to let the Board address her by name during this meeting. **Erickson** turned to Shirley Coffman and asked her to describe the scenario that has led to her being here. Coffman responded that there was a lot that led her to this point. About 10 years earlier, she took advantage of her position at a skilled nursing facility; was convicted because of the amount of money taken using two credit cards and this theft led to a conviction against her for elderly abuse. Coffman was required to serve three days in jail and paid restitution and also completed the required hours of community service. She claimed that she was emotional and that this matter is something she is really embarrassed about. It occurred almost a decade ago. She stated that, "I'm trying to be better and do better... I realized that I didn't want to go that in that direction and basically started to change my life around". **Erickson** thanked Coffman for discussing this with the Board. Erickson stated that "it looks like you completed your probation in 2011" and Ms. Coffman responded that it might have been sooner than that. **Maplethorpe** asked about when Coffman had started working on her master's degree. With emotional difficulty, Coffman responded and discussed her background living in San Diego and overseas with her husband in Okinawa; how she had eventually decided to go to college to become a social worker rather than complete a nursing program; about a marital separation that was extremely challenging; how she is now married for over 21 years; how they have moved from Okinawa 4 weeks ago; how she was confused about why she is required to be at the Board meeting; about difficulty that she is having in reliving this mistake and how much she wants to move past this.

**Ussher** commented, "I can appreciate that it's embarrassing for you. The reason we're going through this is because we're social workers; and as social workers, when crimes are committed against the elderly and people that are disenfranchised, that speaks very much against who we are as a profession. So in that regard, that very clearly is the reason that you're here today. I can appreciate you're embarrassed by it, but that's why. I have some specific questions. When did you get your bachelor's degree in social work?" Coffman replied that she did not get her bachelor's degree in social work; her bachelor's degree was in human resources and organizational management in 2013. Coffman affirmed that she was a practicum student at West Care in 2016 as a master's level student. **Ussher** asked about: specific training in substance abuse counseling, about co-facilitating group therapy, individual sessions and providing substance abuse counseling services to adult males. **Ussher** stated that as social workers, when we are going to be doing substance abuse counseling, we must have had that specific training. Coffman

stated she had not had prior training and rather received on hands training. **Maplethorpe** asked if Coffman co-facilitated with a licensed practitioner; Coffman replied that she did work with a licensed practitioner and worked under their direction. **Ussher** asked if all of the substance abuse counseling sessions were co-facilitated. Coffman responded that most of them were; the only time that she did not co-facilitate was when there was another counselor on property and she was calling in because the one that she was paired up with was not there that day; she was asked to call in and check in with maybe eight to maybe eleven residents – spending enough time just to check in and make SOAP notes. *(The SOAP note (an acronym for subjective, objective, assessment, and plan) is a method of documentation employed by health care providers to write out notes in a patient's chart).* **Ussher** thanked Coffman for the explanation.

**Ussher** commented that typically when somebody comes before this Board, there is something on the application that has to be addressed. So, what she has seen is that people provide the Board with letters of recommendation and that's indicative of the progress that you've made, the changes have you made in your life. It shows some support for you and your character by other people. She asked Coffman, "Is there a reason you didn't include any letters of recommendation of your work since the incident occurred?" **Oppenlander** spoke for the record: "I am learning today that this is what is commonly expected and I did not indicate that with this applicant and several others. So I'm going to have to provide more information about what is expected in their packet in the future. At this point, **Maplethorpe** agreed that she would like to see letters of reference that attest to the work that applicants have done.

**Erickson** asked for other questions, comments from the Board. **Harris** asked about Coffman's work history as it seems fairly brief. She also noted her background in nursing and asked why she changed her mind and decided to pursue social work. Coffman replied that her nursing privileges were revoked due to her criminal history. **Harris** asked for additional information about what happened. Coffman described how she and a co-worker had taken two credit cards in a skilled nursing facility. **Maplethorpe** asked Coffman if she was caught or did she turn herself in. Coffman responded that it was a matter of "hoping to be caught" although she didn't technically turn herself in.

**Ussher** then added, "Because of the gravity of the charges that were substantiated", **Ussher** would need letters of reference before she would be able to vote yes on this. Coffman asked, "Why is this happening now? How was it that I could get approval to take the test? To get licensed in Nevada? Why is it required now? I just don't understand this setback. This happened ten years ago. I graduated in December of last year. I took the test. I took it overseas. I don't understand what it is I need to do to prove to you that I'm not that person anymore."

**Ussher** said, "I believe that I just clarified that for you. I appreciate what you're saying. I understand what you're saying about when it occurred. I am also listening to you very carefully. I'm hearing you say that you wanted to be a social worker because of more opportunities. You're not understanding why this is a problem when you applying for a clinical license as a social worker. I'm hearing you say you've made changes and you

feel bad about this. And I'm hearing minimizing language." Coffman stated that she is sorry if she is not stating this in the best way; that this is a highly stressful situation that she hasn't had to be in before. She apologized for not being more well-informed. If letters of recommendation are what is needed, she would be happy to provide these letters.

**Erickson** added some more information about why the Board wants applicants to be at the Board meeting in person. She stated, "As we are social workers, most of us really support rehabilitation and moving forward and learning from things that we've done wrong in the past. To clarify further, the purpose of this Board is for protection. We protect the community from "us" and it is a public protection issue. I don't think we deny that you've really worked hard and that you've come a long way; Congratulations on your test, that's a tough one; And for graduating from college and maintaining your relationship. Kudos to you also for really wanting to move forward with this (application). That's very well understood. Your background sounds very good but the letters of reference generally are to show good moral character. Also, if you read through any of the Association of Social Work Boards information on licensure and the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics, that's really what we have to ensure as well. It's our duty as a Board. We hear you, we understand you, I think we support you, but we also need support from others that have worked with you and been with you and understand you -- that they also feel the same.

A conversation ensued re: moving forward or to putting this application on hold until a future meeting.

**A motion made by Ussher to move this item to the next available Board meeting so that the Board can review three letters of recommendation for Shirley Coffman. Nielsen seconded. Passed unanimously.**

Before moving to the next agenda item, it was determined at 9:40 a.m. that the next applicant for licensure had eight letters of reference with her. To move this item forward on this agenda, the Board took a break while the letters of reference were copied and distributed to Board members.

**Erickson** called the meeting back to order at 9:53 a.m. and introduced item 3Bii, Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, SDE, Applicant for Licensure Pursuant to NRS 641.B260 and NAC 641B.090. The Board opened their packets for applicant SDE and read the enclosed materials. At 10:10 a.m., Stephanie Elswick, who had signed a waiver for release of her name as an applicant for licensure was thanked by **Erickson**. She asked Elswick to present her story. Elswick thanked the Board and stated that she definitely was not the same person that she used to be when in an active addiction. After 40 years, she indicated that she is now comfortable in her own skin. She continued that it took a lot of tears and a lot of perspective. It was a lot of work to get clean and stay clean for almost five years; but it's not me, it was God, 12-step meetings, the Alpine Center for Recovery and Counseling that helped her so much. She wants to be a licensed social worker and feels that it would be a great honor to be a social worker. And she really feels like it could be her calling. In a study published in 2013 by Psychology Today,

they followed 1200 addicts and the takeaway was that if you can remain clean and sober for five years, your chance of relapse is less than fifteen percent. She assured the Board that she now has no inkling, no desire, to go back to the way of life that she lived back then. And yes, everything you read in her packet is true. She did it. She's guilty. Mistakes are mistakes. There are events in her life, but they don't define who she is. She feels like this life is more about sharing compassion and being a voice of support for herself, to others, encouraging others. She has learned during her journey that she is a strong, responsible, dependable woman with great value and has a lot to offer others. She now can set healthy boundaries for herself and for others. She is looking forward to helping others in need. She really does have a heart for it. She really wants to love on people and serve them and be there for them. She doesn't regret her past mistakes as they have helped her to become who she is today. She feels like the lessons she learned and trials she has faced will benefit others who are facing personal struggles. She requested that the Board would take a vote on her application and grant it. And she thanked the Board for giving her the opportunity to speak to them today.

**Erickson** congratulated Elswick on her sobriety. **Erickson** then asked Elswick to discuss about her arrest history. Elswick responded that when she worked at Sterling Heights, she felt like she had to be super woman. Then she thought, well, maybe if she took a pill to help her; however, it didn't help; it made it worse. And then she was arrested. It was very humbling experience and she doesn't ever want to and will never go back down that road ever again with the shame and guilt. **Nielsen** asked for more background information. Elswick went on to discuss her family, her upbringing, her search for colleges beyond community college, and the support she receives from her current husband. **Ussher** asked Elswick about her plans to become a licensed social worker (LSW) working with addictions, and / or becoming a licensed clinical social worker as the applicant has a master's degree. Elswick described that she would take it slow and apply for her LSW license and get that going before looking for a placement. **Ussher** said that she appreciated reading all of the letters of recommendation for Elswick and that this really speaks to the work that the applicant has done, who she is as a person; thanking her for providing those. **Harris** wanted more clarification about how the applicant got charged with adult cruelty (dual narcotic and elderly). Elswick replied that she had taken pills from an elderly person; and that she was charged and arrested for stealing pills from someone in her care.

**Erickson** asked about what the applicant does for continued wellness for herself. The applicant responded that she reads her Bible, goes to church, has a group of women in her life who are so strong and she can run stuff by them; has a sponsor who has 22 years clean and sober and she is a rock. **Harris** clarified and learned that some of the reference letters came from colleagues and friends. **Maplethorpe** wanted to know if the applicant continues to own and operate recovery homes and learned that the applicant doesn't do this currently.

**Ussher moved to approve Stephanie Elswick for licensure, seconded by Nielsen. Motion was passed by a majority of Aye votes by Nielsen, Ussher, Erickson, and Maplethorpe, with Harris as a Nay vote.**

**Erickson** introduced item 3C (For Possible Action) Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Approval of Consent Decree (Settlement Agreement) in the Matter Pertaining to Randi Baraniecki, Licensed Social Worker (LSW) for Disciplinary Case Number G17-25. **Erickson** asked the Board members to open their packets for review. After review of the consent decree, **Oppenlander** was asked to describe item 3C; she walked the Board through the draft of the consent decree that was initiated by the former Director of Social Work Practice and the former Senior Deputy Attorney General (SDAG) prior to **Oppenlander's** assumption of her current role in the Compliance Unit.

In mid-June, the consent decree was sent to Ms. Baraniecki for her review to determine if she would agree with the terms. In August, the Board received her Baraniecki's wallet card and wall certificate. In September, the Board received the consent decree signed by Baraniecki and the SDAG. At this point, we looped in our new deputy attorney general **Detmer** who advised **Oppenlander** on next steps for the consent decree i.e. to bring it to the Board for review. **Oppenlander** became familiar with the consent decree but wasn't privy to the investigation process, the drawing up of the consent decree, or with the stipulations contained within. At this point, **Detmer** continued summarizing that this consent decree under Case 17-25 includes charges levied against her of unprofessional conduct, inability to maintain professional boundaries, and improperly entering into a dual relationship, and failure to report a change of employment. These charges are fully stated within the consent decree. When the consent decree is fully executed, Baraniecki is to pay fees in the amount of \$1,265.75 or enter into an approved payment plan. She can't apply for a license for one year and if she does apply she can be subject to additional conditions including that she submit to a forensic evaluation, take additional courses and be subject to a probationary period. These are stated more fully in the consent decree on pages eight through nine. **Maplethorpe** wanted to know if Baraniecki was still involved with her former client. **Detmer** stated that he only could respond to the facts provided within the consent decree. **Maplethorpe** disagrees with the terms of the consent decree. **Ussher** also has questions about the possibility of an intimate relationship with a former client who allegedly lived with Baraniecki. She went on to state that the Board had asked the SDAG for an admission of guilt in consent decrees of this type after a similar consent decree was accepted by the Board in the past. **Detmer** followed up by stating that if the Board was to vote and approve, it has to be in total. So to deviate from the consent decree, for any condition or stipulation, would create a need to effectuate either a new consent decree or proceed to disciplinary if an agreement could not be reached. **Nielsen** commented that there was a scarcity of dates in this document. **Ussher** had some questions about the decision-making process that occurred during the recent staff transition. **Nielsen** shared that she did not understand what the remedy might be if the Board's standards are to be met. **Erickson** asked what Baraniecki's current status is. **Oppenlander** shared information within the file jacket e.g. the license is expired, that we haven't been able to get the former social worker to pick up certified mail, aren't able to get our subpoenas answered by various jurisdictions, and so forth; that this consent decree may be the best that we can manage to get. If the Board agrees to this consent decree, it goes beyond stopping her from practicing and would keep her from applying in another state because we would place her on the Association of Social Work Boards' Public Protection Database – a databank that is available to social work licensing boards

in the United States and Canada. **Erickson** stated that on page eight, if Baraniecki should reapply for licensure, she must meet with us during a scheduled Board meeting for the purpose of examining her fitness to provide services. After additional discussion, the Board was ready for a motion.

**A motion was made to approve the Consent Decree (Settlement Agreement) in the Matter Pertaining to Randi Baraniecki, Licensed Social Worker (LSW) for Disciplinary Case Number G17-25 by Ussher, seconded by Maplethorpe; a Nay vote was made by Nielsen and the motion was passed by majority of Aye votes made by Maplethorpe, Erickson, Ussher, and Harris.**

After the vote, the Board discussed ways for the Board Counsel to build more stringent conditions into consent decrees including but not limited to an admission of guilt (**Ussher**); **Harris** spoke about a template for consent decrees; **Detmer** spoke briefly about sentencing guidelines; **Maplethorpe** spoke about including conditions that the Board would want (according to the law) that would provide more security for the public.

Next, **Erickson** introduced item 3D (For Possible Action) Review, Discussion and Possible Approval to Discharge Disciplinary Case Numbers G16-06, G16-11, G17-23. **Erickson** referred this item to **Miller** who started with Case G16-06. This particular case is for a licensed clinical social worker in southern Nevada. The complaint was received from an investigator for the Clark County Division of Family Services. The complainant was a Division of Family Services (DFS) investigator who asserted that the respondent committed unprofessional conduct and/or professional incompetence when the respondent allegedly divulged information to investigation subjects that the respondent received during a complainant's interview. The compliance unit recommends discharging this complaint. During the investigation, we received notice from DFS that the complainant is no longer employed by DFS (she retired). DFS further stated that they are unable to answer any follow-up questions or provide additional details about the allegation. DFS realizes that this may mean that we are not able to complete an investigation without being able to interview the complainant about the alleged violation. Therefore, there is not sufficient evidence to go forward.

Next, **Miller** presented Case G16-11 initially submitted by the Board of Examiners for Social Workers (BESW). The respondent submitted a 2016 licensed social worker renewal application wherein she stated that in 2015, claims were made in relation to a community management certificate that she held. The claims were resolved without adverse findings. The respondent stated that at her discretion, she chose to surrender her certificate. It was asserted that this was a false statement as a relevant Nevada division of real estate complaint was resolved through settlement agreement. BESW has recommended discharging this complaint as the real estate settlement agreement has a provision in which states in a stipulation that no statement can be made concerning the stipulation may be discussed or introduced into evidence to prove guilt, liability, admission, or responsibility.

Last, **Miller** brought forward Case G17-23 for a licensed social worker from southern Nevada. This accusation was originated by the Nevada Medical Board suggesting that BESW conduct an investigation. Complainant said that respondent may have been deceptive and may have filed a false report re: exploitation of elderly patients. The compliance unit recommends discharging this case as during the course of the investigation, the respondent was not implicated in the crime i.e. she was not tied together with the person(s) that were found to have committed the crime.

On behalf of **Detmer** and **Miller**, **Oppenlander** stated that it's been a work in progress as we are learning to work together as a team. We are pleased to be able to tier the cases as approved by the Board last month. It helps us to look at provability, harm to the public, as well as the age and cost of the case. This way we can work together to bring you a substantially more thorough review of your cases before you see them. She thanked the new Board Counsel for bringing a fresh perspective. **Detmer** explained the distinction about the use of the terms discharge and dismissal: Dismissal means that the case is completed (it's gone) while a discharged case can be reopened if new information becomes available. **Ussher** said, that she appreciates the level of detail that's being presented to the Board and for doing such a nice job of explaining the cases.

**Maplethorpe made a motion to approve the discharge of cases G16-06, G16-11, and G17-23, seconded by Harris. Motion passed unanimously.**

**Erickson** introduced 3E (For Possible Action) Review, Discussion and Possible Approval of the September 30 2018 Financial Report. **Oppenlander** covered a one sheet financial report for the first quarter ending September 30<sup>th</sup> in comparison with budget. For total income, we are at 22 percent of projections; In expenses for salaries, in the first quarter we've spent 21%; For non-salary expenses, we've spent 28 percent; In total expenses we're at 23 percent. To explain why we're above 25 percent in non-salary expenses, she covered specific line items: Under line item 6200 In- state travel – this includes expenses for travel for the Board retreat; Line 7020 is at 54 percent because we have spent extra money for the office reconfiguration; In printing, we are at 36 percent; In trainings we're at 51 percent because of the CLEAR investigative training; In 7060 strategic plan costs, we came slightly under budget at 99 percent; in line 7062 you've had Greg Ott, Senior Deputy Attorney General was at your Board Retreat for 2 full days and then **Detmer** is your new Board Counsel so there are some transition costs that are taking us over budget. Computer software includes the contracted services for Albertson Consulting for our online renewals project - we're paying in predetermined increments. Questions arose about the meanings of EICN\* (see Line Item 5100 -- \$1250) as well as information about Regis\*\* Insurance.

**Oppenlander** promised to research these answers and put these in writing before the next meeting:

*\*EICN stands for Employers Insurance Company of Nevada. This is for the Worker's Comp.*

*\*\*Regis is the employer paid portion of employee health insurance.*



**Harris made a motion to approve the September 30 2018 financial report, seconded by Nielsen, passed unanimously.**

**Erickson** introduced item 3F (For Possible Action) Review, Discussion and Possible Approval of Revisions to L-010 Screening Question Policy for the Issuance or Renewal of a License to Practice as a Social Worker in the State of Nevada (“Yes Policy”). **Oppenlander** stated that staff is presenting a copy of the screening questions/ policy with the changes that you requested as well as an application for the social worker license that goes together with that. The questions that you focused on during the last Board meeting were questions one and two. We have a draft revision of the screening questions on the initial application and policy (to be correlated after this meeting with questions posed on renewal form).

**Nielsen** asked for clarification about an application question re: the ASWB examination and learned that ASWB directly informs us about examination scores. **Ussher** raised questions about the packet and the format of the application. **Maplethorpe, Erickson, Harris, and Nielsen** also had questions. **Oppenlander** suggested that we have the Deputy Directory work with the Board to get our application language clarified and perhaps simplified.

**Erickson:** It looks like we can take a vote on the changes we made to the screening questions portion of the initial application with intent to correlate these changes with questions posed on the renewals form. Also, we see that the screening questions are changed based on our suggestions at the last Board meeting including: arrest charge or conviction of any misdemeanor, gross misdemeanor and / or felony other than a minor traffic violation. It now asks for clarification, a list of the arrest(s), the court certified information/ verification, a letter from the applicant describing rehabilitation efforts and circumstances. Also, after item one, it states that information provided will be compared to the information received from the legal background check; if this information does not match, the application process will be pended until the discrepancies are addressed to the Board’s satisfaction.

**Erickson** stated she wanted to break the motions in Item 3F - Revisions to L-010 Screening Question Policy for the Issuance or Renewal of a License to Practice as a Social Worker in the State of Nevada (“Yes Policy”) into two parts.

**Maplethorpe made a motion to accept the draft revision of screening questions on the initial application to be correlated with questions posed on renewals, seconded by Ussher. Passed unanimously.**

**Ussher made a motion to accept the revision of content of Screening Question Policy L-1010 as presented in draft, seconded by Nielsen, passed unanimously.**

Erickson introduced Item G (For Possible Action) Review, Discussion and Possible Approval of Update re: Legislative and Regulatory Issues, (i) Lobbyist Report, (ii) October 1 2018 Letter to Board from the Sunset Subcommittee of the Legislative Commission.

**Hoover from** Capital Partners made a Lobbyist Report for Item 3Gi and stated that she is working with the Deputy Director and the Executive Director to attempt to get a bill sponsored in the 2019 legislative session. She told the Board that she has been working with a several assembly members uncovering their concerns or questions so that we can go forward. She has spoken with members from both sides of the aisle - Republican and Democrat, in the north and in the south. She is very optimistic about getting a bill into the legislature at the very least. The Governor's 2019 plan includes a social workers kind of excerpt that does include getting the fees for initial licensure increased and making sure that the initial licensure and also the renewal becomes a little bit more balanced so that everybody's on the same page and it's the same for everyone. **Hoover** looks forward to continuing these conversations over the next few weeks. Based on her conversations with staff, we are interested in other items but we are also pacing ourselves to see what we can get, especially based on the Sunset Committee's perception of the Board at this time. First, she will get a sponsor and then work on getting a cosponsor. **Maplethorpe** clarified and found that **Hoover** was referring to AB457.

As an aside, **Nielsen** mentioned that she sits in on quite a few meetings in Carson City and has learned that there is an omnibus statement that is being developed by the psychology board that would include LCSWs and any equivalent positions in any of the behavioral sciences. **Nielsen** brought this up to Theresa Benitez-Thompson, a member of the Nevada State Assembly, who agreed that this would be important to consider.

At this time Mendy Elliott, the managing partner at Capitol Partners, walked the Board through the legislative process. Elliott has been working in the legislative building since 1991. She's been there as a director of an agency, was deputy chief of staff for a previous governor, etc. Elliott's background is primarily in the financial and regulatory area including 30 years with Wells Fargo; and as their government relations person for almost half of those 30 years. She let the Board know that they will have a unique, personalized and strategic bill tracking system. Utilizing key language, they will track various pieces of proposed language. For example, if the language in the omnibus statement is tracked, we will know when that language is being introduced. Capitol Partners will plan to send a copy of this to the Board Counsel **Detmer** and someone from the Board will determine where the information will be circulated. **Oppenlander** will be also be copied on these emails because sometimes Capitol Partners can't get through. When bills are introduced, sometimes the hearings are scheduled very quickly. And we know that we have to be diligent as the bill moves forward through both the Assembly and the Senate.

Elliott continued and said that we are already up to 535 bill draft requests and we anticipate there will be about 1100. We've met with both governor's camps and are creating relationships with the potential chiefs of staff. Also, the Attorney General's office is going to have a change and we were in discussions with both camps there too. Because from a regulatory perspective, we want to make sure that we have friends no matter what

happens, we're a friendly group. We're really honored to be representing you this year. And because I read things very 'bottom line', we have Miranda and we look to you, the experts, as the bills are introduced. You've given me a few moments to provide some information about the firm and how we're going to be working moving forward and especially responding to you. **Nielsen** asked questions about bill sponsorship; Mendy explained how different bills are sponsored.

Next, **Erickson** introduced 3Gii about an October 1, 2018 letter to our Board from the Sunset Subcommittee of the Legislative Commission. **Oppenlander** stated that we received this letter on October 3, 2018. We had talked to the Board about this after the May 21<sup>st</sup> and June 13<sup>th</sup> 2018 Sunset Subcommittee meetings. This letter reiterates and formalizes those prior discussions.

**Erickson** introduced 3H, the Executive Director's report. **Oppenlander** began with 3Hi by referring to comments made a few months ago by a Board member regarding a potential agenda item at a future Board meeting. As she understood the comment, she believes that the agenda item would be about professionalism and the de-professionalizing of the social work profession. Two related ideas that have come up: one is to discuss a draft BDR from the Marriage and Family Therapy Board; the other is an opportunity to have the head of the Nevada Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers come to our Board meeting in February.

**Oppenlander** continued by relaying a discussion about two questions the Board received in June 2018 from employees of the Washoe County Human Services Agency (previously known as Social Services) re: concerns with title change from Social Worker to Case Worker. When I contacted our SDAG to better understand the position of the Board of Examiners for Social Workers on this issue, we learned that this is an employment issue and the Board does not have legal authority to advocate. Therefore, I want to be careful about what we're supposed to be involved in and what we're not supposed to be involved in. **Erickson** added that she had worked with the Executive Director when these questions came in and asked **Oppenlander** to contact our SDAG for advice. **Erickson** wanted to consult with the SDAG so that we don't cross boundaries or create conflicts; for her, she said that it gets confusing for her as a both a professional social worker as well as being on the Board. **Ussher, Nielsen, and Maplethorpe**, each added their own perspectives and the need for definition and delineation of responsibilities for the Board. There was general agreement to stay aware of and on top of this conversation.

Next in 3Hii, **Oppenlander** provided a 'Sample Form' that is going to be utilized by the Compliance Unit. Moving to 3Hiii – she updated the Board on progress with Albertson Consulting Company and getting our renewals online by January 2019.

Last, **Oppenlander** moved to 3Hiv to discuss the Board's Strategic Plan. She discussed a format that she will want to bring to the Board next month as a way to portray the Board's Strategic Plan. It allows us to talk about how we are completing items on an ongoing basis e.g. attendance at NASW meetings: **Harris** attended the NASW south meeting recently and **Oppenlander** attended the NASW north meeting where she was able to meet Dr.

Shadii Martin, who is going to be the new Dean of the School of Social Work at the University of Nevada Reno. The next day, we met with the Director of NASW Nevada, Kyle Hillman. He came by the Board office for several hours to discuss intersecting points where the association may be able to take up particular social work causes; especially if we discover that as a regulatory board that we cannot. So that meeting was very timely. Also, **Oppenlander** briefly discussed a handout she wanted use at the next Board meeting about using volunteers in our “work groups” that comes from Board Source. **Maplethorpe** referred to a potential volunteer who was at our meeting earlier today. **Detmer** made comments about quorum being three for our Board; and that we could have up to two Board members participating in a work group.

Last, she concluded her report by informing the Board that the field practicum director for the University of Nevada, Reno came by the office to meet with us and suggested that we accept a master’s level candidate for a social work practice practicum next August. The Deputy Director and the Executive Director have agreed to this as we knew that this was one of items in the Board’s Strategic Plan.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** No public comment was offered at this time.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**A motion was made by Ussher to adjourn the meeting at 12:50 p.m., seconded by Maplethorpe and passed unanimously.**

Meeting Minutes Respectfully Submitted by Karen Barsell, LISW, Executive Director.