

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, DECEMBER 10, 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 9:06 AM.
 - Board members present: Steven Nicholas, Marta Wilson, Jenny Stepp, Sheldon Jacobs, Lauri Perdue, Hal Taylor (joined at 9:51 AM)
 - Board members not present: John Nixon, Sara Pelton, Jennifer Ross
 - Staff present: Sr. Deputy Attorney General Henna Rasul, Joelle McNutt, Stephanie Steinhiser
 - Public Members: Ashia McReynolds, Kisha Walker, Toni Garguilo, Brighid Fronapfel, Kimberly Schwartz
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 the September 17, 2021 meeting (For possible action)

- Steve: Let's go to agenda item number three and this will be to discuss recommend the approval of our minutes from September 17, 2021. I was not in attendance, so I will be abstaining from that approval vote. Is there any review or discussion for the meeting minutes dated back to September? Being none, will somebody please make a motion to approve the meeting minutes from September 17, 2021. I'll also need a second.
 - Motion to approve minutes from September 17th: Sheldon 1st, Lauri 2nd. Steve abstains; Motion approved.
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
Paula Johnson	Yes	N/A	N/A
Tanea McKee	Yes	N/A	N/A
Denise Manandik	Yes	N/A	N/A
Ashia McReynolds	Yes	N/A	N/A
Kimberly Kerr	Yes	N/A	N/A
Jennifer Antonucci	Yes	N/A	N/A

- Steve: We are going to try to onboard some new supervisors. This is to review the applications and discuss the following licensees who have petitioned our board to be primary supervisors for MFTs and CPCs. As I reviewed these, I have a couple of clarifying comments and or questions. For example, the first one, Paula Johnson, when she checked the transcript showing at least a forty-five-hour graduate level supervision course. I believe it's just a checkbox error because she has her ACS Certification.
- Joelle: Paula was on the agenda for July and her application was denied. I put her application back in for review now she has her certificate. I'm sorry about that.
- Steve: It's just the incorrect box that is checked because it should be on the top half of the form. Other than that, I don't see anything out of order for her. I see that Tanea McKee's address is in Georgia. I also see reciprocity.
- Joelle: Correct.
- Steve: Miss McKee is licensed in Nevada?
- Joelle: Correct.
- Steve: I'm wondering if Miss McKee will be practicing supervision from Georgia. I question the risks and accountability practices of supervision from afar, let alone out of state. I also see that Denise Manandik has an address in Truckee, California. I also see a reciprocity license, correct?
- Joelle: Correct.
- Steve: Do you know if she is practicing in California or Nevada or supervising folks?

- Joelle: I know that she's licensed here so she can see Nevada clients.
- Steve: Truckee is just over the hill. Denise Manandik did use our old form, so that's worth noting. You see that?
- Joelle: Yes.
- Steve: Let's be mindful of making sure we just have current forms. I didn't see any problems except for a couple of checkboxes. When people check the box for a transcript showing a forty-five-hour graduate level supervision course, that's usually a doctoral level course taught from an accredited university or at least a three credit forty-five-hour graduate course. Just dotting the I's and crossing T's. Does anybody have any thoughts to add about the panel of supervisor candidates?
- Marta: I'll just make a comment that before the pandemic hit, all supervision was face-to-face. Changes were made when the pandemic hit to include Zoom supervision, so it wouldn't be out-of-the ordinary for somebody to be living out-of-state that far away and providing supervision in our state.
- Steve: Thank you for your thoughts. Yes, I'll always be concerned, ultimately for the safety of the public, which represents the clientele of our practicing interns. It is similar to counseling within your jurisdiction. You can provide resources and emergency services to somebody if there was a problem. I think that that concept extends to supervisory relationships. If we are supervising interns within the state, we must be able to provide immediate services to them within that state or within that area. Well. Any other thoughts about our panel of supervisor candidates?
- Jenny: Is that something that we want to maybe add administratively? For example, a location or practicing address to clarify a Nevada location?
- Steve: I think that we could clarify it, but I think in spirit, it already exists within statute. To provide services to clients in Nevada, you would have to be licensed in Nevada. By extension, a supervisor is accountable and ultimately responsible for their intern's clients. So therefore, I deduce that a supervisor must be licensed in Nevada because they have the caseload of interns. That's how I interpret it. Anybody think similarly or differently?
- Marta: I agree, Steve. There are changes with CEUs that include distance supervision so who knows what will happen in the future? Ultimately, the primary supervisor is responsible and that's a big responsibility to hold. Especially, if you're that far away?
- Steve: Agreed. In addition to the familiarity of Nevada law. Are we ready to make a motion?
- Motion to approve Paula Johnson, Tanea McKee, Denise Manandik, Ashia McReynolds, Kimberly Kerr, and Jennifer Antonucci as Primary Supervisors: Marta 1st, Sheldon 2nd; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
- Steve: Welcome and thank you for helping serve Nevadans gang. This is terrific. The work begins. Thank you, Miss McReynolds. I see that you're on the call.
- Joelle: Congratulations, Aisha.

5. Review, discussion, and possible action regarding waiver of supervised clinical practice course requirement for her MFT Intern application (For possible action) – Kisha Walker

- Steve: This is a review, discussion, and possible action regarding waiving the supervised clinical practice course requirement for a MFT Intern application for Miss Kisha Walker. I hope that everybody had the opportunity to review the supporting documentation in detail. Joelle, you can walk us through this, or I can. It's your call.
- Joelle: I can start and then if you want to chime in, that's fine. Miss Walker did an application in 2020 and had an academic review done for both MFT internship, as well as a courtesy academic review for CPC Internship. She did not have three courses in supervised clinical practice. She has one. In 2021 she submitted for re-evaluation of academic review, and it was determined that she only has the one course. It is in statute that the Board may consider experience in lieu of academic requirements. Miss Walker is here today to speak to her experience in lieu of those courses. She has provided documentation for you in supporting documents.
- Steve: Miss Walker, I see that you're on the call. I'd like to ask a few questions, and I want the Board to feel welcome to ask some clarifying questions as well. Miss Walker, you are trying to start a new internship in the state of Nevada. Is that correct?
- Kisha Walker: Yes.
- Steve: I appreciate that you're trying to do that. I don't think we need to discuss anything from your California internship between October 2007 and October 2012 as I see the status is canceled. Miss Walker, you do not have an internship or a license in the state of California?
- Kisha Walker: No, I moved here. I finished my hours and I worked three years in California as an Associate MFT.
- Steve: You're hoping for credit on your transcript.
- Kisha Walker: Yes, so I can repeat the 3,000 hours.
- Steve: Right for your stipend work that was done. I looked up that clinic and such. Let me pass it around to the rest of the Board members to ask some questions before I continue. Otherwise, I can continue. Ok. I do have a couple of concerns with your documentation, and I apologize for being this needling. Your letters quite literally don't have signatures on them. I'm not trying to be cynical, but those don't pass my judgment on being a legitimate letter of documentation or referral. I also see that you were supervised by an LCSW. I'm not trying to defame that licensure but that isn't a licensure that traditionally gets the recognition for hours for an MFT or CPC practicum or internship. I also notice that you documented that your degree from National University and the only accreditation that I saw from what I pulled up online from your graduate degree was from Western Association of Schools and Colleges but not COAMFTE or CACREP. That's not actually what we're here to talk about as much as you're hoping for our granting acceptance of your stipend internship because what we require is 40 weeks of practical experience, which ends up being close to six hundred hours of experience. You can only substantiate about half of that. I'm not comfortable granting internship experience to a place that isn't what we see in Nevada as an approved practicum site. But again, that's my position and we work as a Board, so I'm hoping for the input and consideration from the other Board members.

- Kisha Walker: I worked my internship at UCLA Women's Center, which was for one year, and then after that I went to Shields for Families. After that, I went to Amanecer where I worked there as an MFT.
- Steve: You worked there as a MFT Intern, to be frank.
- Kisha Walker: Yes. At Shields for Families for a little bit more than a year and a half and at Amanecer.
- Steve: Miss Walker, were these locations approved practice sites from your university for practicum?
- Kisha Walker: Yes.
- Steve: We have no documentation stating that.
- Kisha Walker: East L.A. Women's Center was approved. Even though at the time our school was only requiring six months, East L.A. Women's Center required a year because of the stipend. And once I finished that, I went to working at Shield for Families as an MFT-I.
- Steve: As for the university program of study granting a particular agency as an approved practicum site for their credits, I don't see any evidence of that. I know you worked there.
- Kisha Walker: Yeah, it was approved. I received my degree from that one, I also have where everything was turned in from my supervisor and the class was approved and I was passed.
- Steve: You passed classes, yes, and I see that. You're still missing approximately half of your internship hours for that education.
- Kisha Walker: At that time in California, that's all that was required. That was back in 2006.
- Steve: Okay, I see that too and that doesn't change the fact that we require more than that in the state of Nevada.
- Kisha Walker: That was the reason why I used the experience from when I worked and before, for all of that. It was all done in trauma. East L.A. was basically PTSD and a lot of trauma and client focused and then Shields for Families was basically dual diagnosis, and Amanecer was children.
- Steve: Okay.
- Kisha Walker: I did full assessments. All DMH paperwork, everything was done.
- Steve: I see that in these letters that have been sent. And yet again, it is worth noting, that these letters aren't all signed.
- Kisha Walker: Dr. Brenda Ingram, she is listed, she's at the USC School of Medicine. She emailed it to me, and she didn't sign it. But you more than welcome to contact her. All our information is there.
- Steve: Miss Walker, that's not our role or responsibility to run down the people who wrote you letters.

- Kisha Walker: Okay.
- Steve: Board, questions?
- Sheldon: I echo those same sentiments that Steve proposed. There's some discrepancy in terms of the number of hours that Nevada requires. I went to National University way back when and I transferred from National University to another university. One of the issues that I had at National University was the lack of accreditation and the lack of clinical experience that the program offered. That's the reason why I end up having to transfer out from that program because of the accreditation standards or lack thereof. I have some concerns in regard to some of the documentation, like Steve was saying. It's hard for us to determine or to verify if we have documentation that has not been signed off on. That's another concern that I that I have.
- Steve: Thank you, Dr. Jacobs. Other thoughts?
- Jenny: I just want to make sure I'm clarifying that National University didn't have the three full terms to offer of the practicum?
- Kisha Walker: At that time, it wasn't required. In 2005/2006, it wasn't required. It was only the six months. That was all that was required at that time. Once I was completed, I went through and filed for my licensure and with the State of California board, which I was given and worked as an MFT-I. I didn't know of any other ones. Then when I came here, I went to try to do this and that's when I'm hearing about the changes. They have grandfathering and they're willing to do that if I go back to California, but I live in Nevada now and that is why I'm trying to get licensed here because of the experience. I did work for the two years, three years as an MFT-I.
- Steve: I do see that you would likely be able to be grandfathered in the state of California should you try to wake that up and pursue that. If you were fully licensed and in good standing in the state of California, the licensure by reciprocity process is quite simple. Our hands are perfectly tied. We cannot grant you a grandfathered-in consideration based on you taking coursework for California licensure back in 06. That's just a moot point for our services here. In front of us is a Board, we have the opportunity to consider whether we want to grant her stated professional experiences as credit for her additional hours of coursework.
- Marta: Back in 2005/2006, the state of Nevada requirements were the same with having to have the three courses. Every state has their own requirements and applicants when transferring or wanting to go to another state need to look at the requirements of that state, even if they're, you know, even if they're completing their degrees in another state so that they can pick up those courses to move it forward when they get to that state. Unfortunately, that's just the process that we all have had to go through. I'm also concerned in some of the correspondence that happened between Miss Walker and the Board office, and those are concerns for me to.
- Steve: Ok, Marta, I'm going to ask you to continue with that. I do recognize that you did perform the academic reviews and kick them back twice. Would you describe your concern with her correspondence with the Board?
- Marta: Just that it didn't appear with the documentation that it was professional. **it** was documented by Joelle that profanity was used. As a human being, I understand how frustrating this process can be. However, it's up to us to individually maintain professional and courteous correspondence. So

that concerns me. For the academic review, I don't believe I performed it in 2020. I believe there was a MFT and a courtesy CPC that was performed. I did not do this, so I was looking at it through fresh eyes. I had absolutely no idea of any correspondence that had gone on. To me, it was just a brand-new academic review and I just saw that the requirements weren't made, I believe that I asked for several syllabi to be sent, which they were. I was able then to approve everything except the category of the supervised clinical practice. It was for the very reasons that everybody has mentioned.

- Sheldon: I want to echo Marta's sentiments in terms of the correspondence because I saw the documentation and it is concerning. We are also here as a support and I get it, it's easy to get frustrated. We've all been there. I was once a licensee and trying to get my licensure packet approved and things sometimes got lost and misplaced and that's frustrating. It was paramount that I maintain a level of professionalism. As we move forward, no matter what we decide today, I think it's important that you maintain a level of conduct that is professional because that doesn't reflect well on you when that type of behavior is demonstrated. So, I just wanted to echo those sentiments.
- Steve: Thanks to you both. Any other members of the Board want to chime in here?
- Jenny: I'll say the same thing, that it can be a really frustrating process, and I'm certainly appreciative people who want to work here in our state. With this situation, though, where we're looking at using experience in lieu of practicum classes. First of all, then I think everything needs to be really tight and above board. If we're going to be looking at years of experience, we would really need that documentation signed, verified and really tight. And secondly, as professionals, we're working with clientele, especially in this day and age, who are in crisis and many people are really needing support right now. It's our responsibility, as professionals, to come forward with a professional demeanor, and we don't want our interactions with the Board to be a reflection of how we may be with our clients. I just want to put that out there and be really mindful of that.
- Steve: Thank you, Jenny. The isomorphic process wasn't lost on me, either. Any final comments? Miss Walker, I definitely want to encourage you if you'd like to give us any more information or thoughts you're invited to right now.
- Kisha Walker: I understand. I had a lot of stress and everything else that was going on. I was taking care of my father from a distance, and I lost him. That's no reason for that and dealing with the state of Florida and trying to keep my father alive was hard.
- Steve: Of course. Any other final comments before we make a motion for this. I am not in support of passing this consideration for approval of the clinical practicum course, but I don't want to start the motion. If anybody does want to offer a motion, we can consider that. All right, I will bring a motion.
- Marta: I'd like to make a further comment before we vote. There are options for Kisha, and I am sorry for the loss of your father. There is the thought of going forward in California and then getting reciprocity since you've already done the hours. You can also pick up courses here in Nevada and complete the internship here in Nevada.
- Motion to deny Kisha Walker's request to waive supervised clinical practice course requirement for her intern application: Steve 1st, Jenny 2nd; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.

- Steve: Miss Walker, you are most invited to keep pushing and come join us in the state of Nevada and help us. We'll move now to agenda item number six: review, discussion, and possible action regarding the approval of an 11th intern for primary supervision for Ramona Beasley.
6. Review, discussion, and possible action regarding approval of an 11th intern for Primary Supervision (For discussion/possible action) – Ramona Beasley
- Steve: As I looked at the supporting documents, this one was articulated very specifically that there is the expectation that she will be back down to the 10 number as of January 31, 2022, as her intern has passed exam and hours should be finalized by then. Do we have any comments from the Board members?
 - Marta: Historically, we have allowed for this and because the time is so short, I don't have a problem with it.
 - Steve: Any other members?
 - Joelle: I have a comment if I might add. I did just process and review final hours for one of Ms. Beasley's primary interns so we're just waiting on payment for full licensure. There will be two spots available.
 - Steve: She just hasn't been awarded a race medal yet for crossing that finish line.
 - Joelle: Yes.
 - Steve: Got it. Good detail. I don't have any problem with this one. It looks pretty clean.
 - Sheldon: I feel the same way, Steve. I commend Ramona and all of our supervisors who take on our supervisees. It's obviously much needed. I commend her and with the timing of it, I don't have a problem. I'm always cognizant, especially for the supervisors taking on that many supervisees, of burnout and career stuff that a person may have, can be daunting for some. I think we're in a good spot, considering the timing. I'm in full support.
 - Steve: Let's have somebody move it.
 - Motion to approve Ramona Beasley's request to add an 11th intern for Primary Supervision: Marta 1st, Lauri 2nd; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously
7. Review and discussion regarding allocation of intern hours (for discussion) – Sara Pelton
- Steve: Did Sara join us?
 - Joelle: Sara is not here today but she did want to have it as an agenda item so that her suggestions could be reviewed. I don't think it's actionable at this point because it would require a workshop, but she did want to make sure that the Board was aware of her suggestions.
 - Steve: Joelle, would you quickly walk us through what her suggestions are? I believe that they're very grounded. Go ahead.

- Joelle: Absolutely. She wanted to increase the number of training hours and group therapy experience hours. She would like 600 hours instead of 300 hours of group therapy experience and 200 hours instead of 50 hours of additional training.
 - Steve: Great. I think this is definitely worth discussing in the coming months, but I'll get to that. We will be reviewing our codes and our regulations to see if they need to be tightened up or expanded. Super cool. We will have a greater discussion on that. We can discuss it more now if you like.
 - Marta: I'm totally in favor of this. I'm requesting that we put that on the agenda for our next meeting with an action.
 - Steve: The action will have to wait for our regulatory process. Yes, we will do that in the first part of 2022.
8. Review, discussion, and possible action regarding review of financial statements 1st Quarter FY 2021 ending September 30, 2021
- Joelle: I have included the following reports: Profit & Loss, Balance Sheet and Bank Transactions Report. These are the standardized reports that our bookkeeper prepares for other Boards. I'm not sure in the past if your review of financials included a bank transaction report so that is new. I think overall it looks really good. Is there anything else that the Board would like to see regarding the financial reports? Are there any thoughts?
 - Jenny: I appreciate the transparency. Everything was clear and reasonable.
 - Sheldon: I was trying to decipher what the numbers in parentheses meant. Let me see. The second row, the first page under profit and loss at the top left, where it says initial licensing, license renewal and reciprocal licenses.
 - Joelle: Those are our fees. Those are the amounts.
 - Sheldon: Gotcha. Okay.
 - Lauri: Do you ever look at historical data? Year over year or quarter over quarter?
 - Joelle: I don't believe historically we have, but we could moving forward.
 - Marta: I don't remember that.
 - Lauri: Would there be value into looking at trends and where we are? What we have as reserves in comparison to other years?
 - Joelle: I do know that things changed in 2019 when the fee structure was increased, so before the Board didn't have much reserve. We do have reserves now. We have earmarked a certain amount of funds so that the Board could continue to operate. So, we do have savings. I think it would be worthwhile to do something like that. We had an increase in fees in 2019 for the 2020 renewal, which allowed us to do a lot, some of which was statutorily required, like the application processing system.
 - Steve: Ultimately discounting vets and spouses. Quite frankly, before 2019, I don't think that we would have been able to keep operating. We would have been in the red perpetually.
 - Lauri: Now that things are on the up and up, there might be an opportunity to start watching the trends and building those trend lines because if you decide that you need another administrative

person or you need to invest in a certain area, then we know what that baseline of savings looks like of what you need to keep in the bank versus what we have. You know, as an opportunity to invest in your operation.

- Joelle: Very good point.
- Steve: We'll get to our investing in operations, like Certemy here in a couple of minutes.
- Joelle: Thank you Lauri.

9. Report from President (Advisement)

- Steve: First and foremost, I'm so happy to be able to be back on this platform, even though it's in two dimensions and see you all and work with you all. It is an honor to serve our professions and I've missed it, so it's great to be back with you. While I wasn't around since this summer in this context; Joelle and I communicate on quite a regular basis and we've been talking about, among other things, it's time to really scrub our regs. This is where, as Board members, we get to really go through with a fine-tooth comb NRS and NAC because we got to fill some holes. Joelle has been compiling a list of essentially just the errors and omissions within our code. It is time to really clean some of the oversights from our legislative process two years ago and great intentions of all those codes, but there are a couple of pieces that need to be tightened up. For example, proration of hours, things like that. We can't prorate hours if they're not in our codes. At the beginning of 2022, I'm asking us to work pretty hard and meet monthly. In January and February, we will meet to have Board meetings and really discuss our regs so that in March and April, we can have workshops open to the public so that again, it is as transparent as possible for all the stakeholders. After that, we will be able to adjust our regs for the benefit of not just our licensees, but ultimately our licensees practicing for our public. So that's underway, but I'm going to ask that we work the next four months.

In addition to that, Joelle and I were both on a meeting a couple of weeks ago with the Governor's office on a Friday evening. Cheers to all the people who were grinding, and it was a fairly thoughtful offering in exchange. It was a meeting about the state of mental health in Nevada and a lot of people had some interesting takes. Some people are underscoring the fact that we do, and we do not have a lot of practitioners in the state of Nevada because we have several thousand licensed practitioners, that's for sure, but the access to their care is very challenging. So those were some topics that came up. We got into the weeds about why access to care is so challenging and one point that I brought up specifically was that incentivizing clinicians and interns needs a lot of attention. For example, considerations like student loan forgiveness, especially both working in the rurals where there aren't enough clinicians. In my opinion, managed care organizations really dictate what therapy and reimbursement looks like to practitioners, and that the Governor's office has the opportunity to try to level the playing field not just for Medicaid, but for MCOs across the board to make the practice of professional counseling and therapy much more legitimized and therefore affordable. While we do have a lot of clinicians on the books as licensees, so many of them are have no access because they are private pay, or they won't take many managed care insurance plans. We're going to work hard in the first quarter, first four months of 2022 and it's going to make our lives hopefully a lot easier.

Lauri: Can I ask a question? Would it be appropriate to have me involved in the regulation discussions just so that I could familiarize myself and really learn more about that? I'm not the resident expert, but I would really like to learn more.

Steve: Absolutely, yes. Our public members are absolutely there to be objective in our regulation

Lauri: Thank you.

Steve: Crush it and Hal, you're pretty familiar with them and we would ask that you stay familiar with our regs.

10. Report from Treasurer (Advisement)

- Steve: We don't have our treasurer with us right now, but Joelle, is there anything to report there that hasn't been?
- Joelle: We reviewed the financials in a previous agenda item. I gave Sara increased access to QuickBooks online and that is helpful to her. We stay in close communication, so everything is good on that front.
- Steve: QuickBooks has become very expensive because its subscription based, and it goes up every year. That's a fee that we can factor in moving forward.
- Hal: My thanks to staff on the financials. I remember years when we spent more time on financials than anything else. It was a very distracting part of our agenda and the fact that we now have things under control means we can work on the things that we need to work on rather than that.

11. Report from Executive Director (Advisement)

- Joelle: During the meeting in September, Marta brought to the Board's attention the inconsistencies in the transfer of intern hours from other states. There was communication from the office that the transfer of hours from another state was up to the Primary Supervisor to determine. I was tasked to do research on what other states do and come up with a policy. We discovered that in the Adopted Regulations that were passed on February 27, 2020, that credit must not be given for experience gained by a person before the person was licensed as an intern pursuant to the provisions of NAC 641A.156. The only hours that are accepted prior to becoming an intern are the 500 direct client hours from school.
- Steve: So, no hours outside of Nevada. So, that cleaned it up.
- Joelle: This could be on our list of things that we that we want to change. I will say that there is huge discussion in the AASCB monthly meetings regarding the transferability of licensure, even for interns. I think Tennessee and Virginia have similar regulations that do not allow for the transfer of hours. It would be something that if you, as a Board, wanted to discuss that and change language, we could do that next year. But as it stands right now, we cannot accept hours. Any questions on that?
- Marta: I'll just make a comment that before February 27, 2020. historically those type of hours were brought to the Board. If everything looked good inside the office, then they were just transferred and if there was any type of anomalies, they actually came to us as a Board. I would like to see us go back to that and I want to have that put on our regulatory list that we can work on that starting in January.
- Steve: Some people have called the board the office and said, "Well, some of these have been approved in the past and now you tell them that they're not". Unfortunately, the explanation of that is once the truth of our regs was illuminated in the forefront of our minds, we can't disregard that. We have to stay within regulation. We were operating slightly askew of that. Now that we know that we can't continue to do that. So, because we know we are bound by the reg, we have to be bound by the reg. So, noted Marta. On the list for sure.

- Joelle: I have been getting a lot of calls from potential applicants and inquiries from schools regarding the new Nevada academic requirements impacting graduates after August 30, 2023. Our Nevada academic standards require additional classes that are not required for programs that have COAMFTE and CACREP accreditation. In reviewing the regs, it does say that the Board will consider a COAMFTE or CACREP accredited program as fulfilling the academic requirements for licensure. So that means, regardless of whether or not a COAMFTE or CACREP accredited program has all the coursework, the Board will consider it as meeting the academic requirements. Am I interpreting this correctly?
- Steve: I believe you are. I remember when all of this was being written up. Nevada's bar was a lot higher and still, in many ways, is a lot higher than most states. This brought it generally down for the majority of the educational programs to give them the ability to come in and practice, but it didn't drop it down below that. So, if you had CACREP or COAMFTE accreditation cool, come on in. If you didn't have that programmatic accreditation, you need to rise to a pretty high bar.
- Sheldon: I'm speaking as somebody who graduated from a COAMFTE accredited program, even though specific topical areas, like grief and loss, weren't necessarily a whole course, the topic was covered extensively throughout the program. Students are still receiving education around those topical areas.
- Joelle: There's one thing that's going to require our attention for sure in in the new year, and that's going to be AB366. We talked in a previous meeting about the recordings used in training programs. Correct?
- Steve: Right.
- Joelle: We do have to write some regs regarding that. It says in AB366 that "the Board shall adopt regulations", which means that we must write regulations regarding surrounding these recordings. AB327 will go into effect on 1/1/2022. This bill requires cultural competency CEUs. All fully licensed people will need two hours of instruction relating to cultural competency, diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- Steve: Does it say per year per licensing period? If it's vague, that's work for us in January and February to see how strong we want to make that. I like four.
- Hal: Part of the problem that happens sometimes is these issues come up and get discussed and they're very important at that moment. So, we make changes and all of a sudden, we're looking at CEU requirements, which have been filled up with a lot of these specialized kinds of areas that we're concerned about. What do we have time then for other CEU with regards to advances in practice and that kind of thing? Which are also extremely important. So, we've got to take a look at what areas essentially block out other areas with good intentions. We need to have a real sense of what our licensees are being exposed to in the CEUs that we require and see how that may affect our concerns about CEUs.
- Steve: So far, if we put in for four multicultural competencies, we'd be hanging at about a third of the mandatory CEU requirements would be in the ones that we think are in the best benefit of serving the public.
- Hal: We have to have a large sense of that as we go into working on the regulations.
- Joelle: Overall, renewals are going well, and the office has already processed 350 so far. The volume of calls and inquiries is obviously increasing and probably will increase as the month closes. I talked with Erica last Friday and their tech support team is working overtime. There are multiple

ways to access assistance. It takes me no time at all to process and actually issue a license, which is brilliant.

- Steve: Some minor bumps and mild learning curves.
- Joelle: People are getting the help that they need. I included the productivity spreadsheet for your review. We're in the middle of our financial audit for last fiscal year. The auditors have finished their internal controls interviews with Steph, Sara, and me. All the intern hours have been entered from the last reporting period. One other point I want to make about the Governor's Roundtable meeting is that the Governor's Assistant ran that meeting and listened to everything that was said and summarized the points beautifully. From an operational standpoint, I was able to give him numbers in terms of how many people are on the registry and practicing across state lines. It was a good meeting overall. Since the start of the pandemic, the office has given clinicians the information on how to be licensed in our state via reciprocity.

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

- Henna: I want to re-emphasize the email that Joelle sent out recently about being at the two-day hearing in January, which may or may not occur, but we would like as many of you there as possible.

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

- Friday, January 21, 2022 @ 9:00 AM (Public Meeting)
- Friday, February 18, 2022 @ 9:00 AM (Public Meeting)

14. Board member comments

- Sheldon: I'd be remiss to not mention the mental health crisis that we're in, especially amongst our youth and I guess not only in our state, but nationwide. I'm glad to hear that you were able to attend that roundtable with the Governor's office because there's a lot of discussions going around regarding the state of mental health in our state. I'm hopeful that we can address the issues that we are experiencing. I'm confident moving forward that we will right this ship and get it rectified. I just wanted to mention that that we are in a state of crisis.
- Steve: Indeed.

15. 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)

- Brigid Fronapfel: Expressed concerns about the academic review process and requested an opportunity to speak to the Board about her application.
- Steve: Thank you, Brigid. If somebody wants to have a formal agenda review of their application and then the academic reviews will be more fully presented at that time. I'm inviting you to ask our Executive Director to put you on an agenda in the new year.
- Kimberly Schwartz: Outlined her experience with the internship process including being advised after relocating here that hours she accrued in other states would not be applied to her required internship hours for licensure in Nevada. She expressed concerns that this would discourage other individuals from applying for internship in Nevada at a time when mental health providers are desperately needed.

- Steve: You are also invited in the next couple of next few months to come and give your thoughts because it helps us do our job.

16. Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 10:24 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. 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.

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 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/>