# 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



Jake Wiskerchen., President Roberta Vande Voort, Vice President Suzanne Cram., Secretary/Treasurer Erik Schoen, Member Hal Taylor, J.D., Member John Nixon, Ed.D, Member Wendy Nason, M.A., Member Marta Wilson, Member Adrienne O'Neal, Member

APPROVED: 1/19/2018

# STATE BOARD OF EXAMINERS FOR MARRIAGE & FAMILY THERAPISTS AND CLINICAL PROFESSIONAL COUNSELORS

# NOTICE AND AGENDA OF BOARD MEETING

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY ATTEND IN PERSON AT THE FOLLOWING LOCATION:

DATE & TIME	Friday – December 15, 2017 at 9:00 a.m.		
LAS VEGAS LOCATION FOR PHYSICAL ATTENDANCE	Kayenta Legacy 9418 W. Lake Mead Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89134 (Located directly behind Walgreens)		
RENO LOCATION FOR PHYSICAL ATTENDANCE	Sierra Counseling Center 1855 Sullivan Lane, Suite 145 Sparks, NV 89431		

- 1) Call to Order/roll call to determine the presence of a quorum
  - Meeting called to order at 9:12 a.m. Members absent: Marta Wilson and Erik Schoen; all others present
- 2) Public Comments

Public present for meeting: Bryant Murphy, Janie Cortez, Lea Engle, Bruce Harkreader, Grace Ravenelle, Chris Parkhurst, Lucas Stephenson

Janie Cortez: Asked about supervisor list and exhausting all names. Jake asked about how current the list is and Sherry replied that it was last updated in September. Janie stated that of the approximately 60 people on the list, of those who replied, not one was available. Jake stated that he was bothered by supervisors who do not call people back and suggested Janie reach out to northern or rural supervisors. Janie was invited to come by the office and see about newer supervisors. Her second issue was that she is short of qualifying for Nevada regulatory code requirements by three credits and a practicum class. Jake clarified the NAC requirement, highlighted the Board's endeavor to change NAC and offered some suggestions on how to acquire the final course that she needs.

Lucas Stephenson: Read from a prepared statement and submitted it for the record (attached). A dialogue ensued between Lucas and the Board about process regarding his complaint and its present status. Hal stated that he would speak with Lucas in the hallway afterward.

Grace Ravenelle: Requested to be on the agenda for today's meeting but was denied. She expressed that she is urgently seeking approval for her internship so that she can move forward with her career and cited several obstacles.

3) Approval of the meeting minutes for December 1, 2017

Roberta moved and John Nixon seconded; Hal and Wendy abstained.

Susie requested modifications after the minutes were produced and Jake stated that modifying content is not acceptable but modifying typographical and clerical errors is. He sent the conversation back to Susie and Laurel to work out between them.

Motion passed unanimously

4) The following interns and/or supervisors inform the Board of a request to terminate the Primary internship supervision relationship. (For Possible Action)

Wendy moved and John seconded to approve dissolutions of Wamala, Rodgers, Shannon, and Gorin. Motion passed unanimously with Hal absent.

Roberta moved and John seconded the dissolution of Hollis. Discussion from Wendy stated that it bothered her that the intern made a statement about wanting "a decent supervisor" and Jake reminded the body that it cannot take action on anything not agendized but if the Board wanted to pursue a complaint of its own, it can. Motion passed unanimously with Hal present.

Intern	Old Supervisor	New Supervisor	
Jacent Wamala (MFT- Intern)	Renee Khan, MFT*	Nancy Ostrum, MFT*	
Diamond Rodgers (MFT-Intern)	David Gennis, MFT*	Mary Brennan Vertucci, MFT*	
Paula Shannon	Francesca Marshall	Joan Vlach	
Miyisha Hollis(CPC-Intern)	Rhonda Kildea, MFT	Lynne Berardi, MFT*	
Andrea Gorin (MFT-Intern)	Jennifer Brenn, MFT*	Laura McAuliffe. MFT*	

5) The following interns and/or supervisors inform the Board of a request to terminate the Secondary internship supervision relationship. (For Possible Action)

Adrienne moved and Susie seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

<u>Intern</u>	Supervisor		
Khristie Cury (CPC-I)	Ramona Beasley, MFT		

 Review/decision regarding the following applicants for new interns and internships for MFTs and CPCs. (For Possible Action)

John moved and Wendy seconded to approve new internships for Auldridge, Jackson, Murphy, Cambridge, and Johnson. Motion passed unanimously.

John moved and Roberta seconded to approve Bruce Harkreader's internship. Discussion centered on Bruce's acknowledgement of an ethical violation and Bruce stated that a conflict between him and his supervisor was reported to Grand Canyon University, which sent him through a course to rectify the issue. No one from Grand Canyon found anything to substantiate the report and he found a new site for his practicum. Wendy asked about the proposed location "to be determined" and Bruce stated that he has a few on possibilities. Jake stated that only interns working in private practice need site supervisors and invited people to attend the next NAC change workshop. Hal asked Bruce what he learned and Bruce answered that he will report whenever anything unethical is going on. Wendy asked about the appropriateness of asking the nature of the violation and Jake stated that Bruce seemed to choose his words carefully so as not to disclose the situation and stated that he is unsure if the Board is in a place to demand him to ask, being that the issue is closed. Motion carried unanimously.

Wendy moved and Adrienne seconded to approve Kerstin Trachok's internship. Wendy stated that she only pulled her out because no site was listed and Jake stated that no site is necessary; that the requirement should be struck from the form. Motion passed unanimously.

Roberta moved and Susie seconded the internship for Vanessa Becerra Bautista. Wendy asked about a missing signature and Laurel stated that it was now in the Board staff's possession. Motion passed unanimously.

Wendy moved and Roberta seconded Ronald Faggins' internship. Wendy asked about a missing signature on the secondary form. Jake stated that the Board is not in the practice of looking for reasons to deny on technicalities, given the redundancy of a signature requirement. Motion carried unanimously.

## Reno

Nicole Auldridge (MFT-Intern) Primary-Elizabeth Dear, MFT \*

Secondary-Chuck Holt, MFT\*

(For Possible Action)

Bruce Harkreader Primary-Erik Schoen, CPC\*

Secondary-Leanne Hemenway, MFT\* Primary-Jacquelyn Kleinedler, MFT\*

Secondary-Thomas Harrison, MFT\*

(For Possible Action)

# Las Vegas

Kerstin Trachok

Vanessa Becerra Bautista (CPC-Intern) Primary-Shannon Smith, CPC\*

Secondary-Rebecca Suter, CPC\*

(For Possible Action)

Ronald Faggins (CPC-Intern) Primary-Tammi Johnson, MFT\*

Secondary-Yi-Ling Linda Kuo-Rice, CPC\*

(For Possible Action)

Michelle Jackson (CPC-Intern) Primary-Oscar Sida, CPC\*

Secondary-Ronald Lawrence, MFT\*

(For Possible Action)

Bryant Murphy Primary-Tabitha Johnson, MFT\*

Secondary-Lindsey Coombs, CPC\*

(For Possible Action)

Michelle Cambridge Primary-Marta Wilson, MFT\*

Secondary-Gabriele Waits, MFT\*

(For Possible Action)

Natasha Lau Johnson Primary-Claranna Petrie, MFT\*

Secondary-Sheldon Jacobs, MFT\*

(For Possible Action)

#### \*Board approved

7) Review/decision regarding changes to primary supervisors for the following interns. (For Possible Action)

Susie Cram moved and Wendy Nason seconded to approve all changes except Rodgers and Gorin. Motion carried unanimously.

Roberta moved and John seconded the supervisor change for Diamond Rodgers. Susie Cram mentioned some inconsistency with the supervisor contract regarding emergency contacts. Discussion resulted in a basic acknowledgment among Board members that the supervisor contract details are not something that the Board should be involved with examining; only that they contract has adequate supervision. Board members were comfortable, however, with the emergency contact arrangements after some perspective exchanges. Motion passed unanimously.

Wendy moved and John seconded to approve the supervisor change for Andrea Gorin. Discussion centered on the scheduling difficulty that was more of a logistics difficulty, which is why the "other" box was checked. All signatures were accounted for after consulting with Sherry. Motion carried unanimously.

Miyisha Hollis (MFT-Intern) Primary-Lynne Berardi, MFT\*

(For Possible Action)
Diamond Rodgers (MFT-Intern)
Primary-Mary Brennan Vertucci, MFT\*

(For Possible Action)

Jacent Wamala (MFT-Intern) Primary-Nancy Ostrum, MFT\*

(For Possible Action)

Paula Shannon (CPC-Intern) Primary-Joan Vlach, MFT\*

(For Possible Action)

Andrea Gorin (MFT-Intern) Primary-Laura McAuliffe, MFT\*

(For Possible Action)

#### \*Board approved

8) Review/decision regarding changes and/or additions to secondary supervisors for the following interns. (For Possible Action)

Wendy moved and Susie seconded to approve all changes as a group. Motion carried unanimously.

Jacent Wamala (MFT-Intern) Secondary-Renee Khan, MFT\*

(For Possible Action)

Ida Davis (MFT-Intern) Secondary-Marivelle Nunez, MFT\*

(For Possible Action)

Danielle Turner (CPC-Intern) Secondary-Dawn Moore, CPC\*

(For Possible Action)

Danielle Turner (CPC-Intern) Secondary-Dena Johns, MFT\*

(For Possible Action)

Khristie Cury (CPC-Intern) Secondary-Gretchen Grierson, MFT\*

(For Possible Action)

Andrea Gorin (MFT-Intern) Secondary-Don Huggins, MFT\*

(For Possible Action)

5 of 11

Kristina Rogers (CPC-Intern)

Secondary-Oscar Sida, CPC\* (For Possible Action)

9) The following Clinical Professional Counselor (CPC) Interns petitioned the Board for approval of an extension of their internship. (For Possible Action)

Wendy moved and Susie seconded to approve all extensions except Fisher, Frutos, and Kimble. Motion carried unanimously.

Roberta moved and Susie seconded the approval of Fisher's extension. Wendy stated that she only pulled this one out because of looking at something incorrectly. Motion carried unanimously.

Adrienne moved and John seconded the approval of Frutos' extension. Wendy stated that she did not see her paperwork and Laurel stated that she has the paperwork but did not send it. Wendy asked about the reason for the extension, which Laurel read. Jake stated that NAC does not give the Board latitude to examine reasons and hold up extensions. Susie inquired why this is necessary and Jake suggested perhaps delegating this task to the staff, stating that the Board has never not approved an extension. Wendy stated that the discussion should be held for another day to compare how everyone is interpreting the code. Motion carried unanimously.

Roberta moved and Susie seconded the approval of Kimble's extension. Wendy stated that she pulled this motion because of lacking supervision hours and made the point that lingering supervision hours at the end of an internship is not in the spirit of supervision. Jake stated that the proposed NAC changes offer a one-hour-per-week requirement so that this does not happen. Motion carried unanimously.

Melissa Fisher	(CPC-Intern)	04-10-2015
Mayra Frutos	(MFT-Intern)	01-23-2015
Teronia Gilmore	(MFT-Intern)	01-23-2015
Ana Hernandez	(CPC-Intern)	01-23-2015
Brittni Kimble	(MFT-Intern)	01-23-2015
Meghan Rice	(MFT-Intern)	01-23-2015
Gail Silva	(MFT-Intern)	11-29-2017 (Per J.W. 11-29-2017)
Myrna Toledo	(CPC-Intern)	02-13-2015
Kendra Bott	(MFT-Intern)	04-24-2015

10) Review/decision regarding the following candidates for licensure as a Marriage and Family Therapist or Clinical Professional Counselor. (For Possible Action)

John moved and Roberta seconded the approval of all applicants listed. Discussion centered on the lack of supporting documents and Jake reminded the Board that those will be delegated to staff rather than requiring pdfs of test scores, hours, and other extraneous materials to be included. Motion carried unanimously.

Robert Hardee	CPC-Intern	(Passed Exam)	(For Possible Action)
Abigail Peddieson	MFT-Intern	(Passed Exam)	(For Possible Action)
Odelia Duhel	CPC-Intern	(Passed Exam)	(For Possible Action)
Alison Guinan	MFT-Intern	(Passed Exam)	(For Possible Action)

The following have submitted plans to be approved by the Board for CPC-Interns and MFT-Interns to engage in private practice and **In-Home Therapy** at facilities without a Licensed Mental Health Professional on the site. (For Possible Action)

Hal moved and John seconded an approval of the intern plan. Hal stated that he is curious about training related to potentially dangerous situations, which is unlike other applications. Wendy stated that the Board does not require a safety plan for standard private practice site supervision agreements. Jake outlined the history of off-site supervision plans and the nebulous nature of what is and is not a "crisis," offering to pull back to minimum competence so as not to obstruct care delivery. Susie inquired as to who completes a home assessment that determines necessity of in-home care because most agencies in home health care have someone who does that and Jake stated that almost never happens and is left entirely up to the client to ask and the clinician to assess upon intake. John and Hal discussed an older document that outlined proposed Board requirements for off-site supervision, noting that any policy adopted must go through regulatory process. Motion carried unanimously.

Site	Supervisee	Supervisor	Administration	Signatures	Consulted Policy	Previously Approved Agency
A+ Hospice Care	Jillian Anderson	Elizabeth Dear	Chuck Holt	YES (3)		NO

12) Review/decision for the following candidates for licensure as a Marriage and Family Therapist (MFT) of Clinical Professional Counselor (CPC). Pursuant to NRS 641A.241 Expedited license by endorsement. (For Possible Action)

John moved and Roberta seconded the approval of reciprocity for both applicants. A discussion was had about suicide-specific CEUs for the final two weeks of the year prior to renewal when coming in from out of state. It was determined that, yes, all licensees by endorsement coming in to the state for the first time must complete the CEU requirements prior to renewal. John suggested staggering renewals to avoid this problem. Jake stated that adjusting it in NRS and code is something the Board could explore. Jake stated that this is what happens when policy decisions are made by the legislature without consulting licensees to whom the policies (laws) are binding. Motion carried unanimously.

Sarah Jane Howard.

CPC-Reciprocity

(For Possible Action)

Abbey Askin

**CPC-Reciprocity** 

(For Possible Action)

Tracy Moore MFT-Intern petitions the board to accept her hours from her previous internship be applied to her new current internship.

Adrienne moved and Susie seconded the approval of Ms. Moore's previously accumulated hours. Motion carried unanimously.

14) Shannon Harrison petitions the board to be able to use her 20 online CEUs s that were obtained during the 2017 year due to extenuating circumstances.

John moved and Susie seconded to approve Ms. Harrison's online CEUs. Motion passed unanimously.

15) Discussion of Board President Report. (Advisement)

Jake welcomed Laurel and commended her work to date, noting that she started December 8 and is contracted through February 28.

16) Discussion of Board Treasurers Report. (Advisement)

Susie reported that she has about \$20k in checking and about \$37k in savings but will not have a more complete report until January when the bulk of revenue comes in and she can reconcile the expenses with revenues. Jake noted that Bill Sikkens will now be sending his invoices to the Board office rather than to Zephyr Wellness, so that will help bring better responsiveness to the financial reports.

17) Discussion of Board Staff Report. (Advisement)

Laurel gave thanks for the opportunity and reported that the phone rings constantly, the filing system is outdated and needs expansion, along with the filing cabinets themselves, which are rickety. Jake stated that we can discuss changing filing systems under the website agenda item, though the Board cannot act on it as it is not an action item. Laurel emphasized the need for a new system where information is searchable altogether. Susie reported that within the first day Laurel had already cleaned and straightened the office to a degree that it presented as professional in a way that it had not looked in her time. Laurel praised Sherry for her efforts and referred to her not as a receptionist but as a "licensing specialist" as she knows under her experience. Jake concluded with stating that the Board staff has been bombarded with an immeasurable volume of requests and not all of them are polite. He admonished the clinicians who had badgered staff in public settings, such as Facebook and stated that he found the comments and postings personally and professionally unacceptable. Hal suggested that should something need a response, the Board members should do so and not the staff.

## 18) Approval for new website in whole or in part (Advisement)

Jake stated that the reason this needs to be approved is because the original budget, as approved, does not have any money approved for such an endeavor. Unfortunately, this item as written can only be discussed. Jake elaborated that the proposal as written be should be approved next meeting because of the pure cost savings involved (labor, FTE for work that will be performed by the site, paper, toner, postage, etc.), not just the benefits of taking the Board into the present. Hal asked about how soon it could be completed and Jake replied that had it been approved at this meeting, it could be completed by sometime in February but if it is approved in January, which would take it to March or April. Susie asked about the ongoing costs and Jake stated that he would follow up but that he believed the Board would not incur any further ongoing costs beyond what is already being spent. Wendy asked how this presentation stacks up with other boards and Jake replied that it would be above and beyond any other board's system and cited the Cosmetology Board's site as what people point to as the ideal, and Hal stated that improving access will also improve complaint response and investigation. Adrienne asked about searchability of licenses, supervisors and their openings for interns; John asked about searching for complaint and sanction history; Jake acknowledged that all is possible. Susie asked for letters of reference to validate Bill Sikkens' work being that this is a nobid contract and Jake pointed out that perhaps soliciting other bids is inappropriate if Bill is already under contract with the Board and deferred to Rosalie, who stated she would have to see the contract.

# 19) Update on status of Board complaints (Advisement)

Hal reported that he has 31 complaints active files in his possession and apologized for taking as long as he has; one file is from 2014, 5 are from 2015, 22 are from 2016, and 3 are from 2017. Hal proceeded to give an outline of the nature of the complaints and how difficult they are to investigate, given all the dynamics surrounding them; general competence issues, boundary issues, scope issues, family law cases, impairment, and sexual misconduct are the major issues. Hal further explained that the family law cases are sometimes not allowed to be investigated by the licensing board simply because of jurisdictional considerations. He also stated that at least eight cases are prepared to go to Rosalie (who will serve as prosecutor) in the next few weeks. Hal articulated that Jake's role will be to assist as a "field expert" and noted that the problem is that the Board does not have the money to fund an effort to create an ongoing case review. Wendy suggested a committee and both Hal and Jake stated that was their goal as well, with Hal stating that he suggests a north committee and a south committee, which geographically review the other region's complaints. Hal emphasized that he needs license numbers from Laurel and it is not the first time he has made that request from the Board office. Laurel stated that she used to be a legal analyst and a paralegal so she can help with that. All parties stressed the importance of due process for both complainants and respondents and the need to streamline the entire process.

20) Items for future agendas. (Discussion)

A .Review dates for next Board Meeting. (For Possible Action)

Next meeting will be January 19, as will the public workshop. Wendy inquired as to the process for posting notice of public workshops and Jake replied that the minimum is what is required in NRS but that last public workshop he personally emailed the NAC changes to a long list of professionals in advance of the meeting. Wendy requested that Sherry and Laurel send a mass email to all licensees. Jake asked about why the meeting minutes since 9/22 have not been posted and there seemed to be some confusion as to how that was supposed to occur. Jake asked members to block out every third Friday for as long necessary.

B. Review dates for next intern interviews. (For Possible Action)

Public Comments. No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item of the agenda action will be taken. (Discussion)

USMC Col. Chris Parkhurst (ret.) spoke to the bureaucratic system and how stymied he is by the Board's system and stated that the essence of the profession is to self-regulate. Statutorily, the job of the Board is to protect people. Jake cautioned Chris that he needs to watch his words because if he discloses too much the members will be tainted. Wendy asked if Rosalie is okay with that, and Rosalie acknowledged that she is. Chris began again with personal testimony and Hal interrupted, offering to meet with Chris in the hallway afterward about his case. Chris continued that he is concerned about the public being harmed and reminded the Board of that. Wendy summarized that Chris is stating that he would like the Board to be quicker and more efficient in responding to complaints so that the public is protected, which Chris acknowledged. He empathized but stated that no reasonable explanation can justify the time that has lapsed, which Jake validated. Wendy stated that the reason she asked to be appointed was to help the Board be more efficient in the complaint process because her priority is to protect the public and promised to work very hard to ensure better protection of the public. Jake assured Chris that his voice is being heard and promised that the Board will improve its function so that everyone receives due process will be delivered promptly, at least under his oversight for the next 18 months.

22) Adjournment. (For Possible Action) Meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

NOTE: Items may be taken out of order.

NOTE: Items may be combined for consideration

NOTE: Items may be pulled or removed from the agenda at any time.

NOTE: Public comment may be limited to five minutes per person at the discretion of the chairperson.

NOTE: 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. See NRS 233B.126.

NOTE: All supporting documentation is available from Sherry Rodriguez, at the Board office located at 7324 West Cheyenne Ave., Suite #9, Las Vegas, NV 89129. Anyone desiring supporting documentation or additional information is invited to call the Board office at (702) 486-7388 or email at <a href="mailto:mftbd2@mftbd.nv.gov">mftbd2@mftbd.nv.gov</a>.

NOTE: Members of the public who are disabled and require accommodations at the meeting are requested to notify the Board office in writing at 9436 W. Lake Mead Blvd, Suite 11-J, Las Vegas, NV 89134, or by calling the Board office at 702-486-7388, prior to the date of the meeting.

This Agenda has been sent to all persons on the Board's mailing list of interested parties in this regard, posted on the Board's website at <a href="http://marriage.nv.gov/">http://marriage.nv.gov/</a>, the State's website at <a href="http://marriage.nv.gov/">http://marriage.nv.gov/</a>.

Board of Examiners for Marriage and Family Therapists & Clinical Professional Counselors 7324 West Cheyenne Ave., Suite #9 Las Vegas, Nevada 89129

Sierra Counseling Center 1855 Sullivan Lane Ste. 145 Sparks, NV, 89431

Kayenta Legacy 9418 W. Lake Mead Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89134

Zephyr Wellness 418 Cheney Street Reno, NV 89502

www.zephyrwellness.org/events

Good morning, my name is Lucas Stephenson, thank you for allowing me to make this statement. I come before you in hopes at being heard constructively, although some of what I'll read could be taken as a complaint. I appreciate the enormous task that this professional board has under taken, to ensure licensees are held to the highest standards and to provide the citizens of Nevada the highest quality of mental health care. I am thankful for the many individuals who choose this career path.

I need to address the situation revolving around the backlog of complaints and applications at offices of The Board of Marriage and Family Therapist and Clinical Professional Counselor Examiners for the State of Nevada. It has come to my attention that the board is not processing paper work whether it is a potential licensee application or a complaint against a licensed MFT. As to what extent and the number of unprocessed complaints and applications is unknown but what is known is that the office isn't able to meet its current financial needs. We also know that the office funds itself by processing licenses for future licensees; the fees for this license haven't increased for about 30 years. When you do the math and add current inflation costs, how is it possible to run an office in 2017 with a budget plan from 1987? How did this happen and under whose watch? But more importantly how can we quickly fix this situation or risk losing the trust of the public. The public deserves to know the truth.

I am affected personally by the backlog of work; I have a situation where I believe a therapist is acting unethically, unprofessionally and possibly illegally. On March 13, 2017 I filed a notarized complaint against this therapist; I received a letter from the Board on July 25, 2017 stating my complaint had been received and states; I quote, "We are processing your complaint, and will notify you of developments as they occur", end quote. However back in January when I first started contacting the MFT Board office trying to learn how to file a complaint against an MFT in Nevada I also learned that at that time the office was under staffed and some staff were pulling double duty on top of that. No one ever admitted that my complaint hadn't been looked at yet, and I kept following up. In addition to following up, I was also concerned about additional incidents that had transpired since the initial complaint. Also, I'm trying to find out if it's a conflict of interest to wear two hats with a client family /AAMFT Code of Ethics, Standard III, 3.4 Conflict of Interests], how does the board oversee therapists practicing while impaired (Therapist in question was at concert in Vegas where guy shot everyone from hotel window overseeing crowd), [AAMFT Code of Ethics, Standard III, 3.3 Seeking Assistance, and finally how is the public supported from a licensed therapist retaliating against them in any manner after filing such a complaint against the therapist? [AAMFT Code of Ethics, Standard III, 3.8 Exploitation]

Which brings us to the present, I'm about to file additional complaints of concern and I now find out that not only has the board been struggling with staff, but I learn they have no money to fund the office, according to Jake Wiskerchen, and according to standard procedure if they started legislating today the office wouldn't

see any money for 2 years if legislation passes. This is unacceptable, I'm only learning about these problems this year which tell me the problem is endemic and has been festering for some time all the while those who were supposed to care about oversight and accountability dropped the ball, to speak lightly.

#### Anecdotal:

When speaking to a board member about my situation, he asked me why I was still seeing the therapist acting like I should just find another therapist if I thought the current one was acting unethical, however the focus should be ensuring Licensed Therapists are held to a professional standard and complaints should be taken seriously.

Every time I called and tried to investigate any progress I felt I was being met with a degree of resistance and contempt, no one acted helpful, if I could get in touch with anyone at all. In fact I even had to call the Gov. Office, someone at the board for medical examiners suggested it, and essentially tell on the board for communicating so poorly. That's when I started to get acquainted with Erik Shoen, ex Director of the Board. Remember there are many boards that license professionals so googling info isn't a straight path. I finally found the right office

#### In Conclusion:

I'd like to say I want to help fix the problem. I believe that Jake Wiskerchen wants to fix the problem. But if you don't give him the resources he cannot fix anything. This problem needs immediate attention, it needs more staff that get paid to care about accountability, truth, justice, and continual upward progression as citizens are granted access to the highest quality care rivaling all other States. Not because we care about being number but because we care about people, we care about our community; we lift up our fellow brothers and sisters. Thank you for your time, all eyes on you.

NRS 641A.320 Grounds for denial, suspension or revocation of license. The board may refuse to grant a license or may suspend or revoke a license for any of the following reasons:

- Conviction of a felony, or of any offense involving moral turpitude, the record of conviction being conclusive evidence thereof.
- 2. Habitual drunkenness or addiction to the use of a controlled substance as defined in chapter 453 of NRS.
- Impersonation a licensed Marriage and family therapist or allowing another person to use his license.

- Using fraud or deception in applying for a license or in passing the examination provided for in this chapter.
- Rendering or offering to render services outside the area of his training, experience or competence.
- Committing unethical practices contrary to the interest of the public as determined by the board.
- 7. Unprofessional conduct as determined by the board.
- Negligence, fraud or deception in connection with services he is licensed to provide pursuant to this chapter.

#### AAMFT Code of Ethics

1.7 Abuse of the Therapeutic Relationship.
Marriage and family therapists do not abuse their power in therapeutic relationships.

#### 1.9 Relationship Beneficial to Client.

Marriage and family therapists continue therapeutic relationships only so long as it is reasonably clear that clients are benefiting from the relationship.

#### 3.4 Conflicts of Interest.

Marriage and family therapists do not provide services that create a conflict of interest that may impair work performance or clinical judgment.

#### 3.3 Seek Assistance.

Marriage and family therapists seek appropriate professional assistance for issues that may impair work performance or clinical judgment.

#### 3.8 Exploitation.

Marriage and family therapists do not engage in the exploitation of clients, students, trainees, supervisees, employees, colleagues, or research subjects.

### Is the Governor responsible for the MFT Board?

# NRS641A.100 Qualifications of members; removal for misconduct. The Governor shall appoint to the Board: 1.

Four members who are licensed marriage and family therapists and are in good standing with or acceptable for membership in their local or state societies and associations when they exist; (a)

Three members who are licensed clinical professional counselors and are in good standing with or acceptable for membership in their local or state societies and associations when they exist; and (b)

Two members who are representatives of the general public. These members must not be: (c)

A marriage and family therapist; (1)
A clinical professional counselor; or

The spouse or the parent or child, by blood, marriage or adoption, of a marriage and family therapist or clinical professional counselor. (3)

The Governor may, after notice and hearing, remove any member of the Board for misconduct in office, incompetence, neglect of duty or other sufficient cause.

(Added to NRS by 1973, 486; A 1977, 1258; 1987, 2124; 2003, 1198; 2007, 3056, 3057)