



**DRAFT**  
**Virginia Board of Social Work**  
**Regulatory Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**Friday, May 22, 2026, at 10:00 a.m.**  
**9960 Mayland Drive, Henrico, VA 23233**  
**Board Room 3**

- PRESIDING OFFICER:** Elke Cox, MSW, LCSW
- BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Denise Purgold, MSW, LCSW  
Sherwood Randolph, Jr., MSW, LCSW  
Teresa Reynolds, MSW, LCSW
- BOARD STAFF PRESENT:** Krystal Blanton, Discipline & Compliance Case Specialist  
Jennifer Lang, Deputy Executive Director  
Maria Stransky, LPC, CSAC, CSOTP, Executive Director  
Sharniece Vaughan, Licensing & Operations Supervisor
- DHP STAFF PRESENT:** Matt Novak, Agency Regulatory Coordinator, Department of Health Professions
- PUBLIC ATTENDEES:** John Richardson-Lauve, LCSW  
Mark Smith, Greater Washington Society for Clinical Social Work (GWSCSW),  
Virginia Society of Clinical Social Work (VSCSW)
- CALL TO ORDER:** Ms. Cox called the Regulatory Committee meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.
- ESTABLISHMENT OF A QUORUM:** Four members of the regulatory committee were present; therefore, a quorum was established.
- MISSION STATEMENT:** Ms. Cox read the mission statement of the Department of Health Professions, which was also the mission statement of the Board.
- ADOPTION OF AGENDA:** The agenda was adopted as presented.
- PUBLIC COMMENT:** No public comment was provided.
- APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Ms. Reynolds made a motion to approve the February 6, 2026, Regulatory Committee meeting minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.
- LEGISLATIVE & REGULATORY REPORT:** **Regulatory Changes for LMSWs and Supervisees in Social Work**
- Mr. Novak informed the committee that regulatory changes will be required to combine the Licensed Master Social Worker (LMSW) and Supervisee in Social Work categories. He noted that proposed changes may be presented at the next Full Board meeting.
- Mr. Novak reminded the committee members of the changes discussed in the prior meeting, and outlined updates to the regulations.
- Pages 11 and 12: Definition of generalist social work and changes to Section 18 VAC 140-20-37. The noted changes are currently pending in a separate regulatory action. The Board can determine at a later date if the pending changes should be incorporated into this regulatory action.
  - Page 13, subsection B: Reporting requirements changed from quarterly to

semi-annual.

- Page 14, subsection C: Added language addressing total face-to-face client contact hours and inclusion of the LMSW credential.
- Page 15: Reorganization of sections; Sections A and A(1) removed.

Ms. Lang recommended adding language requiring LMSWs to remain under active supervision. Additionally, regarding the proposed requirement that supervisors report to the Board within 60 days following the termination of supervision, she noted that the draft regulation currently requires reporting only when there are concerns about the supervisee's ability to practice safely. Ms. Lang advised that, based on complaints received by the Board, all supervisors should be required to report supervision hours within 60 days of either the termination of supervision or the supervisee's completion of the hours required for LCSW licensure. The committee discussed whether 60 days is sufficient and whether consequences should exist for supervisors who refuse to sign off on supervised hours. Ms. Lang clarified that refusal is currently a potential violation but requiring submission within a specific timeframe will ensure that the Board receives timely information.

Ms. Reynolds requested adding safety-to-practice language directly to the termination form.

The committee continued reviewing changes and agreed that supervision contracts should be retained for at least five years.

Ms. Stransky reported that ASWB provided feedback regarding exam timing, though the response lacked clarity. Ms. Lang noted that for some state boards, the ASWB allows applicants to be approved to take the exam when they are within six months of completing their supervised experience. However, she noted that this Board is unable to approve applicants mid-supervision. While the ASWB can verify an individual's eligibility to take the exam, they charge the applicants an additional fee for this service.

Ms. Reynolds commented that delaying exam attempts makes testing more difficult. Ms. Cox noted that students receive more education now than in previous years. Ms. Lang suggested allowing individuals with an LMSW to take either the LMSW or LCSW exam depending on their intended practice path.

The committee briefly discussed documenting older supervised experience. Mr. Randolph requested that this be clearly addressed in the regulations. Mr. Novak recommended issuing a newsletter once the regulatory changes take effect. Ms. Reynolds suggested adding language notifying applicants that exam eligibility is available upon earning an MSW.

Mr. Novak then suggested creating a guidance document rather than placing all details in regulation. The committee agreed unanimously.

Mr. Randolph noted that, moving forward, applicants will be required to pass an exam to become an LMSW before progressing to LCSW, whereas the current Supervisee in Social Work category did not require an exam. Mr. Randolph raised concerns that some individuals may be unable to pass either exam, preventing them from becoming supervisees.

Ms. Lang questioned if a grandfathering provision needs to be included in these regulations. Mr. Novak advised that he would check into this and advise the Board when they are considering this action.

The committee identified an error in 18VAC140-20-105 on pages 19–20, which still references “Licensed Social Worker (LSW),” a credential no longer issued.

**Motion:** Ms. Purgold moved to approve the regulatory changes and recommend adoption by the Full Board. Ms. Reynolds seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**Exam Alternatives**

Mr. Randolph inquired about possible exam alternatives, including allowing additional supervised hours with oversight from an experienced supervisor and considering alternative exam pathways. The committee discussed modular testing as a potential option. Ms. Purgold expressed concern about limiting applicants to a single exam attempt, and Ms. Reynolds raised concerns regarding interstate compact requirements. Mr. Randolph suggested offering either a compact license or a state-specific license.

**Motion:** Mr. Randolph moved to continue discussion of exam alternatives at the next meeting. Ms. Reynolds seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Lang expressed interest in reviewing *Boost!* program data regarding supervision and exam pass rates.

**NEXT MEETING DATES:**

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, August 14, 2026, at 10:00 a.m.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Ms. Cox adjourned the Regulatory Committee meeting held on May 22, 2026, at 11:31am.

---

Maria Stransky, LPC, CSAC, CSOTP, Executive Director