



State of Nevada

The Board of Examiners for Marriage and Family Therapists
and Clinical Professional Counselors

P.O. Box 370130
Las Vegas, NV 89137-0130
(702) 486-7388 Fax: (702) 486-7258

Colleen Peterson, Ph.D., President
Joan Winkler, M.A., Vice President
Richard Harrison, Secretary/Treasurer
Jeanne E. Griffin, Ed.D., Member
Donald Huggins, Ed.D., Member
John Nixon, Ed.D., Member
Erik Schoen, Member
Hal Taylor, Member

Approved: 5/12/16

PUBLIC WORKSHOP MINUTES

April 10, 2015

Purpose: To receive comments from all interested persons on the adoption and/or amendment of regulations to Chapter 641A of the Nevada Administrative Code:

- Endorsement requirements for a clinical professional counselor and a clinical professional counselor intern which authorizes the licensee to assess and treat couples or families
- Definition of "endorsement" (NAC 641A.035)
- Administrative changes to regulations to include "endorsement" language (NAC 641A.076) (NAC 641A.243) (NAC 641A.256) (NAC 641A.258) (NAC 641A.306) (NAC 641A.441) (NAC 641A.595)

Board Members Present

Colleen Peterson, President
Joan Winkler, Vice President
Richard Harrison, Secretary/Treasurer
Donald Huggins, Member
Jeanne E. Griffin, Member
John Nixon, Member
Erik Schoen, Member
Hal Taylor, Member

Board Staff Present

Raymond E. Smith Sr.

Others Present

Ms. Rose Marie Reynolds, Deputy Attorney General (DAG)

Public Attendance

Las Vegas

Michelle Abdo, maria.abdo@whsinc.com
Robin Switzer, robinswitzer813@gmail.com
Marj Castronova, PhD, mbcastronova@lincolnchristian.edu

Nevada State Board of Examiners for
Marriage and Family Therapists and
Clinical Professional Counselors
Public Workshop Minutes – April 10, 2015

Reno

Beverly Harvey, MFT

Bodie Coates, MFT Intern

Clare Fite, LPC Student Intern

Christy Butler, LCADC, LCPC Intern

Dr. Karen (last name illegible)

Dr. Katherine Unthank, CPC

Allan Ritchie, MFT

Steve Nichols, MFT

Denise Quirk, MFT

Jaquelyn Wotherspoon

Sabrina Lupo

Jinan Barghouti

Chuck Holt, MFT, CPC (Oregon)

Jenni Johnson, CPC

Adrienne Sutherland, LCPC Intern

Sharon Williams, LCSW, MFT

Joyce Larson, MFT

Laura Hale

Jess Williams,

Elizabeth Dear, MFT

Open Forum for Public Comment

Dr. Katherine Unthank – she stated that the LCPC should be allowed the full scope of practice without requiring the additional courses and hours stated in the proposed regulations.

Jenni Johnson – she agreed with Dr. Unthank’s comments and added that it would be difficult to prove obtaining 750 hours for face-to-face counseling in other states.

Denise Quirk – she agreed with Dr. Unthank that the proposed regulations are unnecessary. She believed the current requirements are sufficient training for practice. A discussion between Ms. Quirk and one board member ensued about what determined sufficient training.

Chuck Holt – he supported the proposed regulations, stating that additional training should be required for competency of practice. He referred to an article in “Counseling Today,” that addressed the scope of practice and limitations professional counselors have in working with couples and families, due to lack of education and training.

Nevada State Board of Examiners for
Marriage and Family Therapists and
Clinical Professional Counselors
Public Workshop Minutes – April 10, 2015

Dr. Allan Ritchie – he stated that an MFT who is licensed in both California and Nevada. He concurs with Chuck Stolt’s comments in supporting the proposed regulations. As a primary supervisor of two CPC interns, he recognized that early on, they did not have an understanding of families and couples, so these regulations are needed.

Lauren Hale – she works for the State Division of Behavioral and Public Health and read a letter written by Richard Whitley, which was submitted to the Board on January 9, 2015. The letter indicated that the proposed regulations could impact recruiting behavioral health professionals out of state, resulting in a further shortage of behavioral health professionals in Nevada. She added that there is an ambiguity by the Board regarding state employed CPCs who provide counseling to couples and families, and the proposed regulations fail to acknowledge the state experience the CPCs have gained. The letter requests the Board include in-state experience with documented competency, and allow CPCs to demonstrate competency with the national examination and without additional coursework and supervision, similar to MFTs. A board member stated that CPCs don’t typically obtain experience with couples and families in practice. Hale responded that they do obtain experience, but can’t bill for it, since they are not licensed to do so.

Dr. Steven Nichols – he mentioned the scope of competence versus the scope of practice. The focus needs to be on the clients, and what is in the best interest of the clients served. He supports whatever additional training and supervision is needed to ensure appropriate competency for both MFTs and CPCs when providing service to clients.

Sharon Williams - she was interested in an overview of how the Board deliberated on deciding upon the proposed regulations to get their point of view and if they explored viable alternatives. She stated that there is a lack of behavioral health professionals in Nevada and concurred with the statements made in Richard Whitley’s letter.

Dr. Robin Switzer – she stated that being an LPC from Colorado who recently moved to Nevada, she understands how the proposed regulations may make it difficult for an out of state CPC to practice in Nevada. Other states, such as Mississippi, have imposed strict regulations which have deterred out of state licensees from moving there.

Dr. Marj Castronova – she endorsed the proposed regulations requiring additional training and supervision, because many CPCs fail the MFT exam due to lack of strong systems training.

John Nixon - Board member, CPC in Nevada and Arizona – read a statement about requirements for CPC/MFT licenses. He stated that the Board discussed at an earlier meeting about training for hypnotherapy and biofeedback, which was similar to child play therapy. Neither CPC nor MFT requires specifications for training in child therapy, even though working with children differs from adults. He suggested one three semester course in family systems and one three semester course in

Nevada State Board of Examiners for
Marriage and Family Therapists and
Clinical Professional Counselors
Public Workshop Minutes – April 10, 2015

family interventions; or, the MFT exam would be sufficient minimal criteria for CPCs to work with couples and families for non-systemic models.

Colleen Peterson provided an overview of how the Board considered the proposed regulations. She stated that the Board has been working on this issue for two years and that they respect both the MFT and CPC practices as equals. The Board recognizes that flexibility is important when evaluating the experience for those licensees from out of state who come to Nevada. However, the challenge is determining competency. The Board has thoroughly reviewed educational and training requirements in other states in helping determine the skills needed for CPC and MFT practices. Two areas were vital: 1) CPCs don't obtain marital and family systems knowledge as part of their CPC educational training; and, 2) MFTs obtain three courses in marital and family therapy, and theory and models. The CPCs need to demonstrate knowledge in these areas. The suggestion is for CPCs to obtain one course in marital and family therapy; and two courses in theory and models: a) one course working with couples; and b) one course working with families – which are now in the regulations. If courses were taken, competency can be proven by presenting the course syllabus.

Through research, it was decided that Continuing Education Units (CEUs) are not enough training to prove knowledge of coursework.

Those coming from other states may document how they earned 750 face-to-face hours. Those trained in Nevada are required to have 500 face-to-face hours.

The MFT and CPC exams differ in that the CPC exam does not contain the same amount of couples and family questioning as the MFT exam.

The Proposed Regulations for NAC 641A were recited and defined.

NAC 641A Section 4.1 will be amended. No public comment.

NAC 641A Section 4.2 will be amended. A question was raised about requiring 750 face-to-face hours of couples/family counseling when MFTs seemed to need less than 500. Colleen stated that those hours related to supervisory hours for graduate school work.

NAC 641A Section 4.3 will be amended. No public comment.

NAC 641A Section 4.6 will be amended. No public comment.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

President's Note: The Board of Examiners for Marriage and Family Therapists and Clinical Professional Counselors would like to thank the members of the public who participated in the Workshop this day. The Board would like you to know we are continuing to work as quickly and diligently as we can to get those who are qualified endorsed as soon as possible. Thank you.

Nevada State Board of Examiners for
Marriage and Family Therapists and
Clinical Professional Counselors
Public Workshop Minutes – April 10, 2015

- The public workshop was recorded.

Submitted By: _____
Sandra Reed, Executive Director

Board Minutes are not subject to revision after approval.

9436 W. Lake Mead Boulevard #11-J, Las Vegas, Nevada 89134