

State of Nevada
Board of Examiners for Marriage & Family Therapists & Clinical Professional

MEETING MINUTES

Friday, October 16, 2020 at 9:00 a.m.

Teleconference Location –
Zoom

<https://zoom.us/j/6475292787>

Nevada Board of Examiners
For Marriage & Family Therapists and Clinical Professional Counselors
7324 W. Cheyenne Avenue, Suite 10
Las Vegas, NV 89129

Please Note: The Board may (a) address agenda items out of sequence to accommodate persons appearing before the Board or to aid the efficiency or effectiveness of the meeting; (b) combine agenda items for consideration by the public body; and (c) pull or remove items from the agenda at any time. The Board may convene in closed session to consider the character, alleged misconduct, professional competence or physical or mental health of a person. (NRS 241.020, NRS 241.030).

Public comment is welcomed by the Board. Public comment will be limited to five minutes per person and comments based on viewpoint will not be restricted. A public comment time will be available prior to any action items on the agenda and on any matter not specifically included on the agenda prior to adjournment of the meeting. At the discretion of the President, additional public comment may be heard when that item is reached. The President may allow additional time to be given a speaker as time allows and at his/her sole discretion. (NRS 241.020, NRS 241.030) Prior to the commencement and conclusion of a contested case or a quasi-judicial proceeding that may affect the due process rights of an individual, the Board may refuse to consider public comment. (NRS 233B.126)

Action by the Board on any item may be to approve, deny, amend or table.

1. Call to Order, roll call, Confirmation of Quorum. Meeting called to order at 9:04 AM.
Board members present: Steve Nicholas, Erik Schoen, Sheldon Jacobs, John Nixon, Adrienne O'Neil, with Marta Wilson joining at 9:25 AM
Board members absent: Sara Pelton, Hal Taylor
Admin staff present: Henna Rasul, Stephanie Steinhiser, Lynne Smith, and Joelle McNutt
2. Public comment

No vote may be taken upon a matter raised during a period devoted to public comment until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020)
--

No public comment.
3. Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding review and approval of minutes from September 18, 2020 meeting (For possible action)
Sara: per her email, abstention on item #6
Motion to approve last month's minutes made by Sheldon; Adrienne 2nd. Motion approved unanimously by those present.
4. Discussion regarding schools whose student conduct codes conflict with professional codes of ethics. (For discussion/possible action)

Steve: CACREP did not get back to me so I want to continue this discussion, Liberty's honor code is in conflict with the ACA code of ethics, it conflicts with our statute of equal marriage in our state and is in conflict with ASUS supervision ethics. What is our role as a board when there are conflicting codes?

Lynne: Sara reported that the Liberty counseling students need to sign an honor code, diversity code, and they say that they adhere to the ACA code of ethics

Sheldon: I agree that it is very concerning and there is incongruence with the accrediting bodies. I reached out to AAMFT and am waiting for contact information for the AAMFT council. It is a significant issue, I was talking to a doctoral student from BYU and there have been some changes to broaden the practicum sites, they now have a couple of sites that serve the LGBTQ community

Erik: I feel ambivalent regarding the Board's position, this is something that can be handled with the accrediting bodies, at minimum we could write a letter to CACREP and any other accrediting bodies that state there are schools that are not inclusive and are in direct conflict with ethical codes

Steve: we have the ability to give attention to academic reviews and interviews

Henna: we can disagree with the honor codes, however, it may not be constitutionally/legally prudent to pursue this issue

Sheldon: could we get back to doing interviews for everyone as a general rule?

Henna: that would be a better way to go to avoid potential lawsuits

Steve: I would be open to that, we could come up with a list of preselected questions

John: my concerns have already been expressed; we cannot target certain individuals. It is necessary to exercise personal ethical bracketing, in terms of our personal views, we can bracket those views and operate in what is best for the client. Our concerns need to be how to clinicians interact with clients whose values differ from theirs.

Lynne: given the amount of people we license and number of applicants we have, that is a lot of work for the Board members

Erik: that is a great deal of work for members of the Board and the staff, even if we did the interviews virtually.

5. Lynne Smith petitions the board to discuss the proposed Nevada Board Administrative Collaborative (For discussion/possible action)

Lynne: in your exhibits is an outline for a collaborative that is about sharing resources among various Nevada agencies

John: it sounds like a great way to share resources and that there are processes and procedures that we might learn from others, we tend to operate in silos. I see this as good thing

Erik: are you wanting us to move to approve this?

Lynne: yes, they need at least three boards to join the collaborative for it to exist

Steve: I don't see a draw back to us joining something this

Erik: we are a member of other associations, so this makes sense.

Motion to approve joining the Nevada Board Administrative Collaborative made by Erik, Steve 2nd. Motion approved unanimously

6. Disciplinary Matter – Recommendation for Dismissal (For possible action)

- a. Case No. NV12MFT006
- b. Case No. NV19CPC003
- c. Case No. NV19MFT011

Motion to approve to dismiss these cases made by Erik, Sheldon 2nd. Motion approved unanimously.

7. Report from President (Advisement)

No report

8. Report from Complaints Investigator (Advisement)

We have 30 open complaints, 90% of them are 2018-2020

Erik: how many cases do you have that can be substantiated?

Stephanie: we may have one in January

Sheldon: what are some of the common issues?

Stephanie: we see more of high conflict divorce involving custody issues, confidentiality breaches, a couple of cases that there are really egregious allegations

9. Report from Treasurer (Advisement)

Nothing to report

10. Report from Executive Director (Advisement)

Lynne: complaints that come to the office are often workplace disputes which are dismissed.

Our CPAs should have the draft of our audit for last fiscal year next week. I am accumulating information for the out of state registry that we talked out last month.

We went live with Certemy this month, all applications are available. We are tying up loose ends. There are no new primary applications; secondary supervisor applications are being processed regularly by Joelle. Joelle is maintaining the supervisor lists, primary and secondary, north and south.

11. Report from Senior Deputy Attorney General Henna Rasul (Advisement)

No reports, but am working on cases

12. Discussion regarding future agenda items and possible future meeting dates:

- a) Friday, November 20th @ 9:00 AM (Public Meeting)
- b) Friday, January 16th @ 9:00 AM (Public Meeting)

Erik: No meeting in December

13. Public comment

No vote may be taken upon a matter raised during a period devoted to public comment until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020)

14. Board member comments

15. Adjournment (For possible action) Meeting adjourned at 9:48 AM.