

Steve Sisolak, *Governor*



Steve Nicholas, *President*  
John Nixon, *Vice President*  
Sara Pelton, *Secretary/Treasurer*  
Jenny Stepp, *Member*  
Jennifer Ross, *Member*  
Marta Wilson, *Member*  
Hal Taylor, J.D., *Public Member*  
Sheldon Jacobs, *Member*  
Lauri Perdue, *Public Member*

**MINUTES OF TELEPHONIC MEETING  
FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2021 at 9:00AM**

**Teleconference**

**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 three (3) 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 9:01 AM.
  - Board members present: John Nixon, Marta Wilson, Jenny Stepp, Jennifer Ross, Sara Pelton, Sheldon Jacobs, Hal Taylor (arrived 9:37am), Lauri Perdue
  - Board members not present: Steven Nicholas
  - Staff present: Sr. Deputy Attorney General Henna Rasul, Joelle McNutt, Stephanie Steinhiser
  - Public Members: David Morgan, Megan Evans, S.A., Lori Kearse, Sarah Barr
    - John: One more opportunity before we move forward. Initials S.A. Would you identify yourself for the record joining us from a member of the public?
    - S. A.: No response.
    - John: Our next item on the agenda is public comment. We turn it over to those members of the public who are here that would like to make a comment. We're not able to engage

in discussion on those comments or take any action, but we certainly would take note of what it is that you would bring forward to us. I would like to turn to those who joined this meeting as members of the public and ask if anyone would like to make a public comment?

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)

- Lori Kearse: I just have a question. I don't know if it can be answered, my question was, is there a record of how many CPCs are registered in the state, either as fully licensed or as an intern? I was looking for that information on the website, and I couldn't find it.
- Joelle: I'm going to cover that in my Executive Director report so that will be answered in my report at the end of the meeting.
- Lori: OK. Thank you.

3. Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding review and approval of minutes from the July 16, 2021 meeting (For possible action)

- John: Next, the discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding review and approval of minutes from the July 16, 2021 meeting. We have those in your supporting documents, agenda item number two. I'll give a moment for board members to just review those. Well, hopefully you reviewed them because it's several pages long. Refresh your memories of anything that you may want to append, note, and/or correct in those minutes. So, I take it by the silence, then that the minutes seem to be in order and have no one's objection. Ok, so could we have a motion to approve the minutes of the July 16th meeting?
- Motion to approve minutes from July 16th: Jen 1<sup>st</sup>, Sara 2<sup>nd</sup>. No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.

4. Review/Decision regarding the following licensees who have petitioned the Board to be Primary Supervisors for Marriage and Family Therapist (MFT) and Clinical Professional Counselor (CPC) Interns: (For possible action)

Supervision Applicant	AAMFT Approved Supervisor/Supervisor Candidate or CCE Approved Certificate/ Supervisor Course	Transcript of 45-hour Graduate-level Supervision Course	Mentor Signature of Supervisory Experience
<b>Sarah Barr</b>	Yes	N/A	N/A
<b>Amy Forton</b>	Yes	N/A	N/A
<b>Megan Evans</b>	Yes	N/A	N/A
<b>Griselda Lloyd</b>	Yes	N/A	N/A
<b>Patricia Hanisee</b>	Yes	N/A	N/A
<b>Amanda Samuels</b>	Yes	N/A	N/A

<b>Nicole Moreggi</b>	Yes	N/A	N/A

- John: Number four on the agenda is a review and discussion regarding the following licensees who have petitioned the board to be primary supervisors for marriage and family therapist and clinical professional counselor interns. So, these all seem to be in order. Is there any objection to taking them as a group?
- Joelle: I do have one comment, John, if I may. Amy Forton does have a transcript, as well as the letter of supervision experience. That was my mistake on the agenda. If you would like to pull her out, the other ones are correct. Nicole Moreggi is back on the agenda from the previous meeting in July. There is an email included in your supporting documentation. She has not received her ACS certificate yet, but she has been approved and has completed the requirement. If you want to pull those two out and do the rest as a slate, it's up to you. I just wanted to make you aware of that change.
- John: Ok, so then why don't we? In the case of Amy, she has additional documentation that's not that's not necessary because she has the certificate of completion, is that correct?
- Joelle: No, that was my mistake, so I should have put transcript yes, mentor's signature, yes and no in the first column. So, she does have her transcript and her other documentation in the supporting materials.
- John: And the other person you mentioned was?
- Joelle: Nicole Moreggi. Nicole has her application in the packet, as well as an email from CCE to state that she has been approved as a clinical supervisor. She just doesn't have her certificate yet. That would take six weeks to come.
- John: Right. But we have objective verification of her having attained that status and successfully completing the training. It's simply that the proper, suitable for framing, parchment is on its way but not present. But we have a letter of verification. We can just take those two out and then do the others as a slate. Would anyone like to move that we approve Sarah Barr, Megan Evans, Griselda Lloyd, Patricia Hennessy, Amanda Samuels to be supervisors as marriage and family therapist or clinical professional counselors, as indicated? Would anyone like to make that motion?
- Motion to approve Sarah Barr, Megan Evans, Griselda Lloyd, Patricia Hennessy, Amanda Samuels as Primary Supervisors: Marta 1<sup>st</sup>, Lauri 2<sup>nd</sup>; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
- John: The motion carries with the slate. Let's take the other two now individually. Amy Forton has the transcript of the training, has the mentor signature, I believe you said, and she's in process but has not quite gotten the CCE approval, is that correct?
- Joelle: She's using the transcript and experience in lieu of certificate.
- John: And this one came up before, did it not? Or one similar to it?

- Joelle: Yes. At the last meeting we had in July, we had three candidates who presented the continuing education certificate as part of the ACS requirements. Amy is different because Amy has an official transcript from Great Basin College as well as the supervisory experience.
- John: Yes, I see that, which is interesting. Great Basin is a community college. So is there anything that says that it has to be a graduate level training. Does Great Basin do that?
- Jen: That was the question I was going to bring up as well, that it doesn't appear to be a graduate level class. I don't know if that matters.
- John: It's a four hundred level. I'm just looking real quickly to see what might pop up on that, because usually the numbering by itself does not indicate graduate level, but there's no universal system on that. There's a Human Services HMS 495B, clinical supervision training. It is human services undergraduate degree course. It does not appear to be graduate level, which would be consistent with the charter of community colleges, that they do not provide graduate level training. Is it stipulated in the in the law or the code that it must be graduate level?
- Joelle: Yes.
- John: I'm seeing a couple of heads, three heads nod. Ok. It does not appear that that she meets criteria. She has supervision training that is admirable but is not graduate level. Would we like to make a motion regarding her petition to be a supervisor?
- Motion to deny Amy Forton's Primary Supervisor application due to not meeting the standards of our regulations: Marta 1<sup>st</sup>, Sheldon 2<sup>nd</sup>; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
- John: Amy Forton's application is denied for not having the proper training. That brings us to Nicole Moreggi. She has the training. She has a letter saying that, yes, she's completed the training, but there's still a backlog for getting her actual certificate. At any rate, it seems to be clear if I understand that she has met the criteria to be a supervisor. Would anyone like to make a motion that her application to be an MFT supervisor be approved?
- Motion to approve Nicole Moreggi as a Primary Supervisor: Jen 1<sup>st</sup>, Marta 2<sup>nd</sup>; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.

5. Review, discussion, and possible action regarding approval of out-of-state intern hours – Marta Wilson (For discussion/possible action)

- John: The next item we have is regarding out-of-state interns, and this is something that is for review, discussion, possible action, and it looks like that you, Marta, requested that this be brought to the agenda. So please.
- Marta: So just a little background, I took on an intern, maybe not quite a year ago, and when it came to her first six-month report, she informed me that it was up to me to approve her out of state internship hours. And I've been a supervisor for quite some time, and I had never heard of that before. So, I called the office. I spoke to Joelle, and Joelle shared with me that there had been a change in office procedure and that it was up to every individual primary supervisor to make that decision. At the time, I was uncomfortable with it, and so I did nothing with it. I was

hoping that I could get some more feedback. And now the intern has moved along and is still asking questions about some hours, so I contacted Joelle and asked her to put it on the agenda. I don't know how many primary supervisors are out there, but if we're all using a different standard to accept hours, it could raise some complications for the board. So, I wanted to bring it up for discussion and possible action.

- John: Thank you, Marta. And I would add that, as one who has previously been doing academic reviews, that process is also kind of tuned us to reviewing documentation, interpreting information, and verifying information. It's an involved process. And I think that, without having done academic reviews, we probably would not be as careful in terms of reviewing those processes. That would be the same kind of thing for approving out-of-state hours. So, I would add my voice to yours of concern that there would be an issue of consistency across clinical supervisors, most of whom have not given that level of detailed and let's say dispassionate attention to the issue because there's a vested interest in the relationship between the supervisor and supervisee, etc. It's very appropriate to revisit this issue, and I'm glad that you brought it up. So, I would open the floor to other board members and their thoughts.
- Jen: I am so happy to see this on the agenda, I just had a primary intern bring this up to me and I did agree to sign off on some of the hours that she has submitted this time around. But it was a long conversation of "explain to me what you did here, explain to me what this means. Explain to me what this supervision looked like". I did not, at this point, choose to approve any of the supervision hours that she was carrying over because I don't know what the other person was doing or how they were doing it, and so to have some guidelines, I think, would be extraordinarily helpful. I do think, as a board, it would be great if we had some standard of practice. That said, this is a little more black and white about what counts and why and what doesn't and why. In agreement.
- John: Ok, so I'm hearing two possible things. If I recall them, this was not a board vote that changed this, but simply an administrative change. Is that correct, Joelle?
- Joelle: That is correct.
- John: So, it's not a board decision as such, but simply an administrative process change. We could look at making a motion. Also, we see a couple of different options have come up now. One is to take that process back, somehow, to the board, whether it is bringing it before the board perhaps as executive action investigation, as is done with the academic reviews. Or, simply providing guidelines to the approved supervisors in terms of vetting and approving those hours. That's what I'm hearing so far. I wonder if anyone has any action to propose.
- Marta: From my perspective, having one centralized place where everything is coming through and making the decision seems to be logical. I can only speak to what happened in the past, and that was if there was any kind of discrepancy, if it was not clear to the Board office, then we would have discussion with it at the Board level and make those decisions with all the documentation in front of us.
- John: Which is still the case with academic review. It just doesn't come up much because you have the standardization with things like transcripts. OK, so are you proposing a proposal?

- Marta: I would propose the appropriate approach, but I never considered standardized communication coming out to all of us who are supervisors, which is up to interpretation and how that gets answered. So, if there's more discussion, I'm more than willing to hear it. I would make a motion to put it back through the Board office and let them discern whether this needs to go to a board level or not. Since it was changed inside the office, without going through the board, can it just be changed inside the office back? I don't know. Maybe Heena would have a better answer for us on that.
  
- Joelle: I will chime in as the Board office; I would feel comfortable having direction from the Board. I would always be in favor of the Board voting to implement administrative changes. So, with that being said, if you want to bring those to the Board and have them on the agenda, that's fine. Or if you would like for me to communicate a certain process or standard, that would be fine too. But I would feel more comfortable having the Board weigh in on it. A few other thoughts to consider, I did include in your packet of information, there is public comment about this issue, and I will include it in the minutes. Do you feel like it's important to read what one of our newer primary supervisor's thoughts are? Or do you feel like it would be appropriate just to include it in the minutes? It's up to you.
  
- John: Actually, Joelle, I think it would be good to just to read that if you would. That was, I thought, insightful and thoughtful.
  
- Joelle: "In regards to interns transferring their out-of-state hours at the discretion of the supervisor: In the past, this went through the Board. I am concerned with the **consistency of application** when this task is given to supervisors. I feel the task is best suited with **clear guidelines** and the ability for **one central body to authenticate**. This avoids **favoritism, subjective interpretations, power differentials** (as often interns are supervised by a supervisor who owns or is connected to an agency/internship site and allows for **consistency across all applicants**. Additionally, the **amount of time** it would take a supervisor to truly authenticate and determine appropriateness of out-of-state hours acceptance is a lot. I would really like to see supervisors be able to focus on ensuring that the work interns are currently doing in Nevada is exceptional, that interns burn-out and professional growth are monitored, and the treatment of interns in the community by agencies in Nevada are the priority of supervisors. I think this is a huge issue in Nevada and quite a large task in itself for supervisors to administer or should be administering. This, as we discussed in our phone conversation, is vital and better suited for a subsequent email. I could easily see having supervisors approve hours as a task that gets **easily waved through** as it requires much more additional work. I know I have a stack and to actually go and check on these hours will take me some time. Also, hours or rather **what constitutes acceptable hours, varies state by state**. In my opinion, it is important for the Board to define approvable hours for out-of-state individuals seeking internships in Nevada by the acceptable hours that interns presently in our state are required to do. That is because those are what is defined and acceptable in Nevada for full licensure. I know this could rub incoming therapist interns a bit, however, IT IS THIS WAY it is done in other states. Other states do not bend their rules for in-coming intern applicants. And honestly, this has been known for years and people coming in and out of other states have had difficulty when they do not meet the requirements of a state, and they had to adjust. I am confused as to why now we would not hold incoming therapist interns to the same hour requirements as in state therapist interns are held to and for the same standards that incoming applicants would be required to follow once approved for internship in Nevada. It sets a **poor precedent**. I will provide some examples. In California,

the hours an intern is allowed to submit to their board have expiration dates and include paperwork hours and not just direct client hours. I believe they can have **up to 1,250 non-clinical hours. This does not align with Nevada.** Each state has a set of criteria, and all applicants must meet the criteria of the state they are applying to. Yes, some states offer reciprocity or endorsement rather than meeting exact criteria, but I think most of this applies to full licensure and many have a minimum length of time the license must be held for or used as full time use to qualify. In many states that is five years. Allowing reciprocity or endorsement like abilities for intern hours does not seem appropriate.” Felisa Dunlap, approved Primary Supervisor

- Stephanie: May I weigh in also? When I was the Executive Director, as you noted, John, we were a lot more of a working Board and John and Marta were primarily doing academic reviews. So, they would be the ones that would actually see that information and review it. And because they did so many of them, they had sort of background on the different universities and what would be considered equal in terms of hours. So, my concern with having a standardized thing for supervisors kind of echoes what she said in her email. Is it still then up to an individual's interpretation? I know that Marta, you still do help with a lot of the academic reviews. I don't know when this administrative, in-office change was made. It was obviously after I left. But I think putting it back to the office and then allowing us to get consult from the Board would probably be a good way to go.
- John: This was actually like at the last meeting or the meeting before last because I remember a little bit of the discussion on it. And I remember a couple of eyebrows going up. I think mine was one of them, but I'm glad this is coming for more careful consideration. I think that certainly that letter was pretty thorough in the points that it raised. The issue of reciprocity, we said, “well, you know, we had to accept fully licensed people and just give it a rubber stamp of approval. If they're in good standing, you know, why not just do that with interns?” But I think that the points are well raised that the internship is a training process. And so, when we license someone with a fresh new independent license, it is for meeting our internship requirements. And so in terms of numbers of hours, yes, every state counts hours differently. I don't know what our next step then would be to ensure that this goes back to the office or to the Board. Then, beginning with the executive function, when there is a situation of some of uncertainty or dispute it is then brought before the Board. I think is kind of how we did it before.
- Stephanie: I believe that since it was not voted on by the Board and it was just an administrative change, it can just be an administrative change to go back to that.
- Jen: Is there a document or a set of standards that was in place before and Steph, you might know that too, but was there something that the Board was using prior to that administrative change that sort of was guiding those decisions? Or was it case by case?
- Stephanie: When I was the ED, John and Marta were integral to my survival because they were doing all the academic reviews because I was part time. So there was not a procedure in place. Now prior to me, I honestly could not speak to that, but I know that at that time it was primarily John and Marta that would do the reviews and they would make that determination.
- Joelle: Jen, can I chime in on this piece? There is a Summary of Experience form where people were plugging in their hours based on our statutory requirements and our categories. So, I could modify that form and outline what's outlined in NAC for us. For example, when I talk to applicants

from California and they ask me if their hours will transfer, I tell them that their hours must fit into our categories outlined in statute. California allows a category of notetaking or something like that. When I tell them that we do not have a corresponding category in Nevada like that and they will lose those hours, some people choose not to pursue licensure here. Some of these concerns are already flushed out by what's outlined in statute anyway. Those are my thoughts.

- Sara: I think it would help us identify any blind spots that we have in our regulations and then we can start tightening them up as we identify some of those areas.
  
- Marta: That was kind of a similar procedure that we had. This was even before Stephanie, and these issues did not happen when Stephanie was the Executive Director. We would get documentation of the hours that were coming in from out-of-state and then we as a Board would have to determine that. And then also, I have had interns that have gone to other states, and I have received affidavits from the other states that I had to sign, saying "I'm stating that this intern did receive these kinds of hours from me that it was under a licensed, approved, state approved supervisor, et cetera, et cetera, so that they could, in another state, accept the supervisory hours.
  
- John: Let the record show that Hal Taylor has joined the meeting at 9:37 am. Welcome, Hal.
  
- Jen: Right. I think that's a really great idea to require an affidavit or a letter or something from the licensed professional who provided supervision. That comforts me.
  
- Henna: Well, you can only do what's authorized in statute, though. Yeah. So, if it's not authorized in statute, you can't require that. So, if it's not authorized in statute, you can't require that.
  
- Stephanie: So that would require us to do a regulation change and maybe what would be best at this point would be to at least to create an office policy and then have the Board approve the policy. But it can't go against what's in our regulations if that makes sense. You can also research with other states to see what their Boards are doing. That might be a good way to go as well, and that could be something that we do, and we can maybe pick this up after we've done a little research.
  
- John: What's the Board's pleasure?
  
- Lauri: I would suggest exactly what Stephanie just said, do a little bit of research and let's see what others are doing first.
  
- John: Ok, so do we want to leave it in the hands of supervisors until then?
  
- Marta: I don't want to leave it in the hands of supervisors. I'd like to go back and make an administrative change and put it back into the hands of the Board and we can still do the research. I like that idea.
  
- John: Yeah, we can do what has worked in the past and has allowed for some standardization of process. But in the meantime, we can still research how other states do it so we can improve

those processes. And so, the previous approach was within the regulations, but didn't require additional steps, you know, formalized affidavits and things like that, which I think is where we would then run afoul of the regs because they're not specified. So, Joelle, do you have a sense of what we're saying?

- Joelle: Here's what I take from that. What we're doing today is to remove responsibility from the primary supervisors and give it back to the Board office. With that being said, I will do some research on what other states do to transfer hours. Then I'll create a policy, which I will present to the Board at our next meeting along with the additional research I have conducted. The Board can then approve or deny that policy. How does that sound?
- John: It sounds wonderful. So, I would just suggest that you use your use your connections to ask AASCB, so we get even more out of our membership. What is your perspective as the Executive Director?
- Joelle: My perspective is that I support whatever the Board decides, and I will let people know accordingly if I speak to applicants. I have no problem letting applicants know that this is issue is in process. A primary supervisor must establish a relationship with that intern to properly assess them and that takes time.
- John: Ok, that's a good deal.
- Stephanie: There would be no motion today, I don't believe, because there was never anything voted on by the Board. So it really just points back to an office policy. And then once we get more research, we can revisit and then look at possible not changes in the future.
- John: Yeah. And I think as that supervisor pointed out, she hit on something that is really a Nevada thing, if not a particularly a Las Vegas thing. And that is the, for me, sometimes uncomfortable lack of boundaries between supervisor and supervisee when the supervisor owns the business. First, when you pay for supervision, you're making your supervisor, your employee. So, anything that we can do that helps to level the power differential between supervisor and supervisees that could potentially even get in the way of effective and objective supervision, I think would be a step in the right direction. What I'm hearing then, is that for now, we're going to revert to the previous process that's going to go through the Board office. Any points of uncertainty, then you would utilize Board members before the full board for a resolution determination pending any discoveries from other state practices that we may want to then adopt and or formalize as appropriate. But does that work? Ready to move on.

6. Review, discussion, and possible action regarding allocation of intern hours – Sara Pelton (For discussion/possible action)

- John: Sara, you have brought before a request for review, discussion, and possible action regarding allocation of intern hours.
- Sara: Yeah, and I brought this up about a year ago, too, but I think it's important for us to revisit it. Especially the group therapy hours and the additional training hours the interns receive. It's

hard to get into a therapist and group therapy can provide a really efficient way to meet the needs of our community. It also helps interns expand the settings they work in. They max out at 300 hours. So that's a concern for me and for my interns. Also, about the additional training hours. I think we should be in a position where we're encouraging lifelong learning and while the interns are in training, that's when they take these things and run with it, and they don't have to unlearn some old habits when they're going through a new training 10 years later. Like I recently had to do. I think we should quadruple those hours to 200. I have interns who do Gestalt trainings, EMDR, EFT, hypnosis, and I just want to encourage them to keep pursuing these.

- Stephanie: This one, for sure, would require a workshop and a NAC change because our NAC is very specific about the allocation of hours, unfortunately.
- Jenny: I was going to say I know it would be some working hours here, but I really love the idea of that and revisiting that.
- Marta: I echo Sara and Jenny on that. Especially those two categories.
- John: I wonder if Sara and any other Board members may want to work together, to draft out a proposed rule change to then bring it to the board?
- Henna: I would only recommend one member because then you're entering into subcommittees. You could create a subcommittee to do this if you'd like. That would be another committee that would meet separately on its own and prepare that document and then submit to you, the Board, as a whole to review.
- Hal: The other problem may be you have to give notices. Sometimes when you set up a subcommittee, you have to do public notices that subcommittees meeting, that kind of thing.
- Henna: Just like you would do for a regular board meeting. Correct, yes.
- John: Sara, would you take the initiative on this then. As a lone ranger here?
- Sara: I'll take a crack at it, and I'll request a subcommittee if I'm in over my head.
- John: I agree with everything that's been said about why it should be increased. We're kind of in a bind with academic hours. We rely on the COAMFTE and CACREP kind of standards of hours. We want to be careful of is creating a standard that they're not able to get those hours and then they're stuck, you know, for full licensure because the hours aren't available to be had.
- Sara: Those are optional hours. The group therapy is. The same with the additional training.
- John: You're simply going to raise the cap on those?
- Stephanie: Yeah, the way the statute is written is it's not more than three hundred hours of leading group therapy or counseling sessions. So, we could just change the number, but still have it be not more than.

- John: Anything more on this? Thank you, Sara. Appreciate it. And look forward to what you come up with.

#### 7. Disciplinary Matters – Recommendation for Dismissal (for possible action)

- John: Onto disciplinary matters. We have four cases recommended for dismissal.
- Hal: I assume we're to the point where I haven't had a lot of contact with these cases. I'm just asking again, just to be sure in case I have to recuse.
- Stephanie: Yes, Hal you are good on all of these.
- Hal: Good. I thought I should be.
- Stephanie: Yes, you are OK on all of them. Ok, so before I get into this, I wanted to speak a little bit about the statute. We have a statute that mandates and guarantees confidentiality on all investigations. So, everything that happens from the moment the complaint hits the office until there is either a hearing or a consent decree to be reviewed, is completely confidential. This is really important. I want to make sure that we uphold that statute because it discourages people from coming forward if they think that these things are going to be discussed if board members are aware of things because you are in the community as well. In many cases our complainants might be either licensees or they could potentially involve your interns. That's why we're very limited on what information provide about these. I assure you that when something is up for dismissal, it has been reviewed by myself, Joelle, and Henna. We have determined it does not warrant further investigation or pursuit. This does ask for a lot of faith and trust in us on your part. But that's sort of how this must go in order to protect and uphold that statute.
- Henna: Can I just add something to the reasoning behind this? Why you're receiving limited information on dismissals is because Nevada is a small community of any type of profession. We want to make sure that the integrity of the licensee being accused is protected. When dismissing cases, we want to make sure the licensee cannot be identified because it's meritless. And so that's just another layer of protection in addition to the confidentiality statute that Stephanie referred to.
- John: I would just add before Stephanie starts; I think that this is actually one area that is good in terms of recognizing that one person who has baseless accusations does not mar forever the record of one who is an ethically upstanding professional. I think that our predecessors and lawmakers are to be applauded for recognizing that and preserving this.
- Stephanie: I'll go ahead and start.
  - a. Case No. MFT180613-09
  - b. Case No. NV18CPC001
  - c. Case No. NV18MFT013
  - d. Case No. NV20MFT006

- Motion to approve to dismiss these cases: Jenny 1<sup>st</sup>, Lauri 2<sup>nd</sup>; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.

#### 8. Report from President (Advisement)

- John: The next item is the report from the president, and I have been given nothing to report on Steve's behalf unless someone else has. Joelle, do you have a report from the president?
- Joelle: No.
- John: There's no report at this time.

#### 9. Report from Treasurer (Advisement)

- Sara: I have nothing new to report.

#### 10. Report from Executive Director (Advisement)

- John: Now a report from the executive director.
- Joelle: I do have a report. Our intern reporting period was this week. It went as well as can be expected and so I was happy with that. To answer Lori's question from before, we have 770 interns of which 369 CPC Interns and 401 MFT Interns. We have 618 fully licensed clinical professional counselors, of which 236 were licensed by reciprocity. We have 1227 fully licensed marriage and family therapists, of which 225 were licensed by reciprocity. Our active licensees total 2,615 as of right now. As far as renewals, we have 1845 fully licensed people as of today that will need to renew their license at the end of this year. I have been working with Certemy to revise our renewal form. This means we had to include the Emergency Order from the Governor that states that we cannot withhold a person's renewal because they did not get their CEUs due to COVID. That's part of Emergency Order 011. There is a statute that we have to collect information pertaining to training in crisis response and disaster relief. Also, we have to ask if they're willing to respond to a crisis or disaster in our state. I coordinated with Certemy to do a massive reassignment that takes any previous version of the renewal out of the people's licensure portal and put the current on in there. I did get an update on credit card integration. We are not going to have credit card processing available in time for renewal. It is currently slated for early next year. Steve wanted me to convey that to you all as a Board and as a mechanism for the public to be aware. Steph and I did work out a process and a workflow for renewals. The good thing about this renewal season is that the renewal license will be available immediately upon processing the payment. Our goal is to make more frequent bank deposits during this time. We do have clerical help coming in to input hours and support this busy time of year. renewal time. I think that intern reporting will look very different next time in March 2022. I am in the process of still trying to update our website. We are in the process of putting our disciplinary complaints and those disciplinary complaints that resulted in board action on the website.
- Hal: Can ask a question regarding that? If they look up a licensee, will there be an indication in the licensee lookup portion that there's a disciplinary matter that they may want to go take a look at it?
- Joelle: Yes, that is public facing and that is available so if somebody goes to verify license and they verify that person. The board orders and the consent decree are already up there.

- Joelle: Two more things. Our audit is going to be scheduled for October, tentatively it's the end of October. I know that they wanted to do some on site things and meet with us the week of October 25th, so after we meet today, I'll contact Carol, who's our bookkeeper, to find out if she needs to be in communication with our auditing firm and then that will commence in October. I did provide you in your supporting documentation a Board Member Manual that was created in conjunction with the Administrative Collaborative. I think it's a comprehensive document. I will distribute that to each Board member and request a confirmation receipt that you've read and received that. It is easily laid out and it also outlines the roles and responsibilities of myself and you as a Board. As we were talking about boundaries and structure and things, I feel it's very, very useful to understand what all of us are responsible for and what our roles and responsibilities are. The Executive Director Performance Evaluation form I create will mirror what is outlined in the Board Member Manual. The goal is to put the Executive Director Performance review on the agenda around the same time that Board member officers are elected. Does anybody have any comments or questions?
- John: I would just want to commend you for your conscientiousness in addressing the things that you noted and the idea of also regularizing the annual review. That was kind of catch as catch can before. I appreciate that. And so, I would also add, because we had a discussion about the disciplinary actions and the out-of-date-ness of it, how, as you mentioned, you can look up by individual person and that needs to continue to be the case. But I also want to just put out there why it's important to me to have that public facing summary page of archive of disciplinary actions. Having a public facing summary of disciplinary actions is very good to show that we do address these issues. Helping people to see complainants, to see that we do take them seriously and that they are properly adjudicated, and that do result in in disciplinary action. And so, there's a trail there. Putting on my professor hat, it's valuable pedagogically because I want students to see, and I point them to other state boards that have more extensive lists to show that, people have had the same course that you have. That's a conversation we would have in a legal and ethical class. And so, you know, there is a pedagogical purpose for having that, as well as the fact that most states do so. I just wanted to add the rationale there.

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

- Henna: I have no report. Please make yourself available for the October two-day hearing. It's Thursday, October 14<sup>th</sup> starting at 9 am.

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

- Thursday, October 14<sup>th</sup> and Friday, October 15<sup>th</sup> @ 9:00 AM (Formal Complaint Hearing)
- Friday, November 19<sup>th</sup> @ 9:00 AM (Public Meeting)

#### 13. Board member comments

- Marta: I just wanted to say thank you to Stephanie for getting these complaints out. I know it's been a long time coming, and she's been doing a lot of extra work with the changes at the Board office, but I know as a board member, every time I see our complaint list go down, I just feel so good. She's really bringing us to be current, and I'm very grateful for that. Thank you, Stephanie.
- John: Let me echo that and I very much appreciate all the work that you're doing. Stephanie, in getting these complaints to currency and investigating them and working with you.

- Stephanie: Thank you.
- Sheldon: John, I want to add something. At the last board meeting I proposed the Board to maybe come up with a plan or something that we can do collectively to provide further education for some of our licensees. I bring it up now because I had two of my secondary interns not pass the test since that last Board meeting. It just kind of weighs pretty heavily in my heart in terms of just the number of licensees that I know that have taken the test multiple times and just cannot pass it for various reasons. Obviously, I think one of the things that I'm seeing for some licensees is that testers anxiety. The pressure of having to pass the exam or the pressure they put on themselves to pass the exam. And then I think it kind of works sort of counterintuitively, if you will, when they're taking exams. That's something that I've been seeing. Just food for thought. That's all. Thank you.
- John: I appreciate that, and it serves as a reminder to, particularly the MFT exam, that there's still an ongoing issue in terms of the pass rate. Looking at a statistically, there's not much, if I read it correctly, difference in the past rate between that and the NCMHCE. But the number of stories where you're just one point away from the minimum cutoff, you know, are pretty dramatic. And so, I think it's important that we continue our awareness and discussion of the role of licensing exams, the MFT exam in particular in terms of his viability.
- Joelle: I have a comment about MFT exam and the testing resources. Interns had shared great success with a testing resource through AATBS, I believe it is. I can forward the information out to all of the board members, if you'd like. And it's a critical thinking workshop. It's a live Zoom workshop in which they talk about what they're actually asking for on the exam. I have licensed 18 people between August and September. Five of them have come back to me and said that they have taken that workshop and they were able to pass their exam. I just wanted to put it out there.
- Sheldon: Thank you, Joelle, for that. If you can shoot us that information, that'll be very helpful.
- John: I would just add that that AATBS is one of several. So, we don't want to endorse any particular ones, certainly.
- Joelle: Yeah, and that's what I do say. This is what works for others. We're not endorsing or recommending anything. But here's what other people are saying.
- John: I'd also like to make note that within the last couple of minutes, someone named Sarah Barr has joined. Welcome to Sarah.

#### 14. 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)

- John: Sarah, you've just come in at the right time and that would be the opportunity at the end of the meeting for public comment, which we cannot take a vote on any matter or discuss with you, any matter. But you have the opportunity to state something of concern. I would ask I would ask if any of the members of the public present have any comment? Hearing none and seeing none, I do believe that the next item is the adjournment.

#### 15. Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 10:26 AM.

Meeting agendas are available for download at the Nevada State Board of Marriage Family Therapists & Clinical Professional Counselors website: <http://marriage.nv.gov>. Anyone who needs the agenda or supporting materials for this meeting is invited to call or email Joelle McNutt at (702) 486-7388 x 102 or [JMcNutt@mftbd.nv.gov](mailto:JMcNutt@mftbd.nv.gov). The agenda and supporting materials may be provided by email or can be arranged to be picked up in person. This agenda has been sent to all members of the Board and other interested persons who have requested an agenda from the Board. Persons who wish to continue to receive an agenda and notice should make a formal request to Joelle McNutt at [JMcNutt@mftbd.nv.gov](mailto:JMcNutt@mftbd.nv.gov).

We are pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who are disabled and wish to attend the meeting. If special arrangements for the meeting are necessary, please notify Joelle McNutt at (702) 486-7388 x 102 or [JMcNutt@mftbd.nv.gov](mailto:JMcNutt@mftbd.nv.gov) no later than 48 hours prior to the meeting. Requests for special arrangements made after this time frame cannot be guaranteed.

THIS MEETING HAS BEEN PROPERLY NOTICED AND POSTED IN THE FOLLOWING PUBLIC LOCATIONS AND WEB SITES:

State of Nevada Administrative Website: <https://notice.nv.gov/>

State of Nevada Board of Examiners for Marriage & Family Therapists and Clinical Professional Counselors: 7324 W. Cheyenne Ave. Suite #10 Las Vegas, Nevada 89129

State of Nevada Board of Examiners for Marriage & Family Therapists and Clinical Professional Counselors Website: <https://marriage.nv.gov/>