



MINUTES OF TELEPHONIC MEETING  
FRIDAY, JANUARY 21, 2022, 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 9:00 AM.
  - Board members present: Steven Nicholas, Marta Wilson, Jenny Stepp, Sheldon Jacobs, Lauri Perdue, Jennifer Ross (left at 10:44am), Sara Pelton, Hal Taylor, John Nixon (joined at 9:10am)
  - Staff present: Deputy Attorney General Harry Ward, Joelle McNutt, Stephanie Steinhiser
  - Public Members: Gena Segno, Sara Duerksen, Lori Ann Kearse, Sussan Fung

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)

- Gena Segno: Gena provided information and narrative regarding her experience attempting to obtain licensure in Nevada as an intern.
3. Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding review and approval of minutes from the December 10, 2021, meeting (For possible action)

- Steve: Moving forward to agenda item number three discussion recommendation action to approve our meeting minutes from December 10th of 2021 to the board. Are there any comments or reviews necessary or revisions necessary for our meeting minutes in December? If there are not. Would somebody please unmute acknowledge themselves, make a motion and we will also need a second?
  - Motion to approve minutes from December 10th: Sheldon 1<sup>st</sup>, Marta 2<sup>nd</sup>. Abstentions: Sara Pelton, Jennifer Ross, John Nixon. 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
<b>Tayla Hadley</b>	Yes	N/A	N/A
<b>Stephen Salter</b>	Yes	N/A	N/A
<b>Christopher Cummins</b>	Yes	N/A	N/A
<b>Armeda Winter</b>	Yes	N/A	N/A
<b>Victor Caruso</b>	Yes	N/A	N/A
<b>Kenneth Coll</b>	N/A	Yes	Yes

- Steve: Moving forward, agenda item number four to discuss the petition for primary supervisors for Marriage and Family Therapists, Clinical Professional Counselors we have as I reviewed them, I did not see any issues, but I welcome the feedback from the board members.
  - Marta: I did have a question. Is he a CPC in the state of Nevada also?
  - Steve: Joelle, you can confirm, but yes.
  - Joelle: Yes.
  - Marta: Ok, thank you. I move that we accept the primary supervisor candidates.
  - Motion to approve Tayla Hadley, Stephen Salter, Christopher Cummins, Armeda Winter, Victor Caruso, and Kenneth Coll as Primary Supervisors: Marta 1<sup>st</sup>, John 2<sup>nd</sup>; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
5. Disciplinary Matter – Recommendation for Dismissal (For possible action)
- a. Case No. NV19CPC001
  - b. Case No. NV19CPC002

- Motion to dismiss Case No. NV19CPC001 and Case No. NV19CPC002: John 1<sup>st</sup>, Sheldon 2<sup>nd</sup>; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
6. Review, discussion, and possible action for the approval the audited financial statements for the fiscal year-end June 30, 2021 (For discussion/possible action)
- Agenda item removed.
7. Report from President (Advisement)
- Steve: I really want to challenge us to hustle for this first quarter so that we can tighten up a handful of the administrative codes. That's our opportunity to do that. We don't get to touch NRS. We would need some legislators and legal folks to help us with that. There are a couple of details that just need to be tightened up and we'll get to those in a few minutes.
8. Report from Treasurer (Advisement)
- Sara: The audit went well. It was a very clean audit and I'm really pleased. Also, next month, we'll be talking about the we have a surplus from the budget, from the last biennial renewal. Something that came out from the 2020 audit for the new folks here was the creation of a treasurer checklist that I do monthly, and my goal is to update that to include a record of all meetings and proceedings, a record of all examinations and applicants, a register of licenses and licenses and an inventory of the property of the board.
9. Report from Executive Director (Advisement)
- Joelle: We processed 1,649 renewals so far. The number checks we are getting is slowing down now. Most licensees are aware of their online licensure portal and how to access it. The great thing about that is now everybody understands there's an online portal, everyone knows how to access it. The online licensing system allows us to accurately project deferred revenue. Credit card integration will be available through Certemy by the end of February. I've already reached out to the Treasurer's office to initiate set-up and make sure we are in compliance. I followed up with the Department of Public Safety regarding the FBI review of our NRS that allows for federal background checks.
  - Hal: 1,649 renewals. MFT, CPCs both?
  - Joelle: Both.
  - Hal: All right.
10. Report from Deputy Attorney General Harry Ward (Advisement)

Harry Ward: No report but wanted to remind Board members to respond only to the Executive Director in correspondence and let the Executive Director gather the data and communicate it out.

11. Review and discussion regarding possible regulation changes including, but not limited to: (For discussion)

a. NAC 641A.146, #5(c) subsection 2 & 5

- Joelle: This is consideration of increasing the maximum allowable hours in the group therapy category, as well as the training category.
- Sara: I've noticed that a lot of interns, they max out on those training hours, so it limits them in their opportunities to expand their knowledge. And I think it also limits the supervisors in being able to encourage that interns have specific training in HIPPA, ethics and suicide prevention. We have a lot of interns who work in inpatient hospitals and intensive outpatient programs. They max out on those 300 group hours quickly. Those are optional hours anyway. So, it's not a requirement that they have to do this, but it gives a lot more flexibility to the interns and the supervisors, I think.
- Marta: Yeah, this is Marta Wilson and I agree wholeheartedly with Sara, and I know a lot of our MFTs, and CPCs are also working on dual licenses, and I think increasing the hours to 600 would be very purposeful and meaningful to our interns. I agree with Sara on these changes.
- Sheldon: I have some feedback regarding the moving the minimum 300 group hours. When it comes to process groups versus psychoeducation groups, I feel like it gets abused very easily. Some groups are on the psychoeducation end and there's no process a lot of times to it. So that's so that's my concern. if we are increasing the maximum, that is going to open the door for more abuse of those hours.
- John: I would I want to echo what Dr. Jacobs addressed, and that is that psychoeducational groups, unlicensed people can do those. That's not an activity that is restricted to a licensee. So, it's not really in the scope of practice, but it's not excluded for us, but it's not specifically what we're being licensed to do if that makes sense. So, I think putting some sort of limit on. I am concerned about the group issue being abused by racking up lots of psychoeducation hours that are in fact, not psychotherapy.
- Marta: And I agree with that. Is there any way that we can put that into that line item to specify what type of group to distinguish between the psychoeducation and the processing?
- Steve: NAC 641A.146, #5(c) subsection 3 says Not more than 200 hours of teaching, including, but not limited to, leading sessions for parent or family education, leading workshops or participating in other teaching activities. It looks to me as if that is already described or delineated.
- Jenny: It already looks to be somewhat filtered out already, and this is where we would trust our supervisors to be working with the interns and monitoring and signing off on their work so that they would know what kind of groups they're leading and participating in.
- Marta: I still would say 600 hours. There's not a lot of categories for interns to get the indirect hours. I think 600 is very reasonable. Some interns are going into specialized

fields. So, their certification process for those specialized fields is already more than 150 CEUs.

- Joelle: We are discussing two separate categories. Group hours increase to 600 and then there's also the additional training approved by the primary supervisor would increase to 200. Correct?
- Sara: Yes.
- Steve: This ultimately falls on the signature of the approved supervisor to bless these hours. Just a point of detail.
- Sara: Being mindful of the mental health crisis, I think this would also help the hospitals retain employees and we need them. I would love for my interns not to have to move jobs to get their hours.
- Stephanie: NAC641A.178 is the statute that specifically talks about supervision and the role of supervisors. I feel if we're going to increase these other numbers, we really need to examine what is required of the supervisors just to make sure that everything is in compliance.
- Steve: Yes, some sort of education for all supervisors out there because their responsibilities could potentially change.
- Jennifer: And I'm also wondering if it's possible to require interns to take the ethics, suicide diversity CEUs that the licensed folks are required to take. We all need them, but I think it's important for folks who are newer in the profession. They are still getting to know how to do things.

b. NAC 641A.146, #6

- Joelle: Adopted Regulations R051-19, page 15 says, except for the hours of experience required by subparagraph, 1 of paragraph C of subsection 5, 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. It's up for discussion if you, as a Board, would like to allow for the experience from other states or if you want to keep it restricted.
- Marta: I think historically before this new adoption, we did allow for intern transfer from another state with postgraduate hours from another state. Specific situations were brought to the Board for consideration, otherwise it was handled in the office. My thought is that we go back to the historic way that we handled interns, I think we're going to lose a lot of potential interns into our state. Also, with the way people move and travel. It would be to our advantage to accept interns from out of state. I think there's a way that we can make sure that they've had the proper type of supervision, indirect and direct hours. They would have to demonstrate and provide that type of information to us. But I think that we should consider receiving interns from other states and looking at their hours to see if they match the qualification and requirements of our state.
- Jenny: I know that this could be challenging get we'd get into some gray areas, but if we could create clear-cut process, I think this would be very beneficial for our state.

- John: I'm thinking if you have hours from another state, you have to use our forms and the supervisor from the other state has to sign on our forms. It would have to be someone we could contact.
- Sheldon: When I came to this state from California, I had to complete 400 hours when I got here. There are some things that were counted differently for example, the minimum hours and the maximum hours required in different categories. There wasn't a whole lot of congruencies in the categories. And so, because of that, I was required do some extra hours when I arrived here in Nevada.
- Steve: I have great hesitations for giving reciprocity of internship hours for the following reasons: (1) there is not consistent educational standards, (2) there are not parallel pathways to internships and (3) there is not consistent pathways to supervisory credentials nationwide in all the states. There is not a very clear vetting process to make sure that they meet the standards that we expect in the state of Nevada for the protection of the public. So, if we can create an appropriately rigorous method of vetting internship hours that were accumulated outside of Nevada, that that would be helpful, but until then, I don't support it.
- Jennifer: I hadn't thought about it quite that way, and I'm wondering if it would be worth considering implementing a maximum, in terms of all the hours. That there's no more than X number of hours transferred from out of state to so that we know that that we are requiring at least a minimum that are completed in Nevada. So maybe just some more clarity around what the limits are might be helpful.
- John: I like the idea of putting limits. That's certainly in keeping with academic tradition. If someone transfers to a new school, the school typically has a cap on transfer hours because they want the majority of the degrees seeking hours from the institution that's granting them. So that that makes it that makes a logical sense. In principle Steve, I agree with you. When we did not have a reciprocity pathway, then that's consistent. But now that we have reciprocity, it is inconsistent. It seems to me the way we should deal with training hours should be in light of the standards that we have with that we have, or we're forced to have, perhaps with reciprocity. I'm tossing that out for consideration.
- Marta: I've had to sign an affidavit for other states saying these are the number of hours that I supervised with this intern for them to be able then to count with that new board. I think we could add something like having that supervisor sign an affidavit. Maybe we do want to put a cap on that, but I think that when you have a supervisor who has the same standards as we have here in Nevada, providing supervision, we could consider it.
- Lauri: I like the idea of putting that all together with some traditional thought to it where you have a maximum, you have a documentation or a standard of what that needs to say and who needs to sign it for the affidavit. If you do follow the traditional model of education, it's a standard that a person couldn't complete less than 30 percent of their degree somewhere. So having a similar mindset, I think, makes total sense.
- Sara: I was wondering if some of the some of the folks who've been on the board for a while can talk about the problems that they've seen throughout all of this with out-of-state interns coming in.

- Marta: I don't recall seeing an issue with it. If the board office didn't recognize something to just transfer over nicely, they would always bring it to the board and then we would go over each one individually. And it wasn't every time we met, it happened maybe a couple of times, two or three times a year tops.
- Sara: I like that idea of the Board having to look at these special cases in that manner. I think it is worth our time to do so, even if it becomes tedious.
- Joelle: in speaking with potential applicants coming from another state, I always have conversations with them about how our Nevada categories are specific. So, I think the way our categories are structured lends itself to exclusion of certain activities. But that could be changed, right? If we if we go back to our previous discussion about increasing training and group, that could potentially be expanded, so it could be a ripple effect into this discussion as well. There is huge discussion nationwide about transferability of licensure, not just for reciprocity, but also for interns. There is a big discussion about interstate compacts.
- Steve: If we're going to try to change some of these codes, then we do it with great specificity. But this is not a have to do. This is we get to do. So, the code, as it reads right now, says that out of state, hours cannot be applied. So, if we want to start creating a menu and then tune it or do nothing, that's our prerogative right now.

c. NAC 641A.247, #13

- Joelle: The statute reads sexual intimacy and romantic relationships with current clients, former clients, known members of the client's family are known romantic partners of any current or former client is prohibited. Do you want it to be prohibited forever, or do you want some other language in there to set some other type of limitation? This has come up in the past.
- John: I think the previous statute may have been two years, which is reflected in most of the professional association's codes. We've had several complaints from people, even though it was passed the two years, that there was alleged exploitation. The professional codes have a caveat that provided it is clear and that there is no exploitation, abuse of power, et cetera. Arizona has moved to a more restrictive standard. I taught an ethics class where a student, who's background was in law, made the argument that once you've established a power differential in a relationship, can you really ever un-establish that? I think in that consideration, we adopted this higher standard, if you will.
- Steve: I agree, John, that this is intended to protect people from exploitation and said power differentials. I hesitate at trying to legislate, especially in a state with as many rural communities, as we have to try to command that after two years of dissolving a counseling relationship, a professional relationship that we wholeheartedly ban any other type of relationship that would be business relationships, that would be romantic relationships.
- John Nixon: I'm wondering if in light of that, if perhaps we can adopt some of the language from the professional codes. We can research what they use in the ACA and AAMFT Code of Ethics.

- Sara: I have the AAMFT code of ethics pulled up right now. There's no nuance at all. 1.4 is sexual intimacy with current clients or with known members of the client's family system is prohibited. Period. 1.5, sexual intimacy with former clients or known members of the client's family system is prohibited. Period.
- John: It's certainly a higher standard than ACA.
- Hal: And then the other question is, we've got this two-year limitation on these other kinds of relationships. We've got to be able to justify not having a two-year limitation with regards to this.
- Jennifer: One of the concerns that I have about changing the language in terms of sexual relationships is that if we've got an NRS that references codes of ethics and then we create language in the administrative code that contradicts the statute, then I think we create a bit of a bind.
- Hal: I think it's a good point. We have to look at what those professional association codes say and how that interacts then with what we're proposing to put into our regulations.

d. NAC 641A.252

- Joelle: Do you want to add the ACA Code of Ethics as well to this language?
- John: The NBCC code of ethics is for National Certified Counselors. To be an NCC, you also you also have to abide by the ACA Code of Ethics. The problem with it standing alone is that it's not intended to be a set of robust universally applicable code of ethics. It is more focused on professional identity. I would say that the ACA Code of Ethics can stand alone because it is very robust. The NBCC code does not really add substantively with regard to counseling practice, but more about the NCC credential.
- Steve: I agree with you 100 percent. I do not think that our codes need to have the NBCC in them. I believe that ACA would more than suffice as a substitute.
- Stephanie: If we put the ACA in there instead of NBCC, it's more consistent with MFTs having AAMFT and CPCs having ACA.
- Jenny: I am delighted to be talking about this, and I agree. I think that ACA should replace the NBCC.
- Marta: I agree that ACA can stand alone. I agree that we should replace it, not add it. Or that's my suggestion.
- Hal: I think that's one of the best things we're doing here is say we're going to be working with whatever the current codes are. If we have a problem with the current code, then we'll deal with that. This automatically updates it and I really like that aspect of this.
- Sheldon: I agree. I think I feel that ACA is very robust. One thing I appreciate is it's always updated.

e. NAC 641A.182



- Joelle: would you like board approved supervisors to reside in the state of Nevada? Our regulations currently state that a supervisor needs to be licensed for three years in any state. This subject came up when supervisor applicants licensed through reciprocity applied with an out-of-state address.
- Steve: Let's try to keep in mind the original stakeholders that we need to be concerned with. Those are the clients whom our interns and therefore supervisors are serving. If we are thinking what is in the best welfare and health of the public of client/public, then we want to make sure that our interns are adequately supervised. I hope that supervisors will take seriously the liabilities that that are there. And I think that that not only means obviously being licensed in the state of Nevada, but largely residing. I don't necessarily know what that operational definition would be, but I do not want conglomerate agencies or supervisors who may be far away from the Nevada identity and understanding how Nevada works and how our population is dissimilar to many populations around the nation.
- Lauri: I would worry that interns might get advised inappropriately, too, as to what they needed and how things needed to flow for them to get licensed. If it's somebody out of state.
- Stephanie: We probably want to be a bit more rigorous about what out-of-state licensees are required to know in order to supervise our interns.
- Steve: If we have a consistent standard and that is predictable, hopefully we can have a more predictable outcome.
- Hal: I also agree that supervisors who are working in Nevada may have a very different view of how the practices are done in the state than somebody who's a supervisor in New York. It is helpful for a supervisor to give good guidance to an intern. That we've got supervisors who are familiar with practices done in Nevada so they can be consistent.
- Jenny: As I read and understand this now, it really isn't clear. So, you could technically live elsewhere and be a supervisor here? Perhaps we don't allow supervisors who don't live in Nevada. That seems, I think, like an appropriate decision that we could potentially make. For all the reasons that we were talking about earlier. We do have a unique population and so people may be licensed and qualified to practice here. But the specific task of supervision so unique to our state that it just doesn't seem reasonable to have a supervisor who lives out of our community.
- Steve: That word exploitation just popped back into my mind, and it is possible of macro supervision opportunity from out of state into Nevada. You know, for our Southern Nevada friends, having an intern who's working in Caliente or Mesquite to have a supervisor that's in Fort Worth, Texas, they may not know what that place is about.
- Sheldon: So, what about supervisors who've lived here who've been licensed here but move out of state? I know a well-respected supervisor that moved out of state a couple of years ago, and she was still doing supervision with some of those supervisees. What are the thoughts around that?

- John: I wonder if there's a way then we can finesse the language that we require some residency in Nevada for the supervisor without stating it in a way that sounds like we are being exclusionary of others. Maybe that they need to have lived here, not necessarily be a current resident. That could be a way of approaching it.
- Jennifer: I don't think that it would be unreasonable to additionally require that a primary supervisor would be required to have an active Nevada license in good standing because that would then require them to be knowledgeable about the statutes and the code and to be able to provide that piece of the supervision in addition to having at one point lived here. I have some interns, for example, who are going through EMDR certification, and they're receiving some stellar specialized supervision for that. It would be cool to be able to still count for secondary if that person could sign on. So, so I just wonder if it's important to be specific to primary supervisors versus secondary with some conditions obviously around who's qualified.
- John: I think be more prescriptive regarding primary supervisors, which in general we are anyway. And then for secondary supervisors, if we still want to extend the parameters but allow for review of specific instances.
- Stephanie: I would be curious to see how other states handle this as well.
- Marta: I'm specifically speaking about secondary supervision and the extenuating circumstances. I'm wondering if we want to add some other professionals there. We could add a licensed LCADC.
- Steve: That language is already there in extenuating circumstances.
- Marta: LCADC is not listed in the regulation. And I would like to add an LCADC in there. They get specific training at their Alcohol and Drug Board to become certified a state approved supervisor. They have the mental health and the addiction background. Oftentimes our interns are working in alcohol and drug agencies, and they will have an LCADC on site who is state approved as a supervisor, but they do not have maybe a CPC or an MFT on site. And I think the LCADC, with their supervisory training, which like us, they have to get CEUs every year for to maintain that that special state approved status that it would be beneficial to add LADC in that language.
- Steve: I think it's appropriate to add the LCADC supervisor into that language, but I do want to reflect that these are considered in extenuating circumstances.
- Marta: Exactly, exactly. Always. I totally agree with that.
- John: Psychiatry is a field that includes psychotherapy in its scope of practice that is recognized by the state. The LCADC credential does not as recognized by state law. So, I'm fine for adding LCADC under extenuating circumstances and particularly if they're working in an alcohol and drug treatment program, then it is to their benefit to have that specialized supervision.

f. NAC 641A.105

- Joelle: Should continuing education providers fees be collected annually or just one time fee, like a primary supervisor application fee?
- Steve: I believe that the intent was not a lifetime pass. I believe that the intent was essentially a renewal, and I believe that the renewal could probably parallel what licensure is and that would be every two years. So, if it's \$150 a year, it would be \$300 every two. I believe that the intent is for it to be a renewal and not to be a lifetime awarding as a CEU provider in the state of Nevada.
- Marta: I believe that the intention was that it was an annual fee.
- Sara: Do you know the number of CEU providers that we have for this year?
- Hal: We have to put clarifying language in this. If we make it annually or whatever, I mean here it looks like a one-time fee. So, we had to put clarifying language. I mean here it looks like a onetime fee.
- Stephanie: We currently have 28 CEU providers.
- Steve: I recognize the intent is to be an annual provider, not a lifetime provider.
- Sara: I'm comfortable with changing it to become biennial providers consistent with our renewals.
- Jenny: I think that makes the most sense to do it every two-year period.
- Joelle: NRS says approval of a provider of continuing education, is \$150 and item number one says the following items must not exceed the following amounts. So, would you want it to be every January? Do you have a particular day? Our licenses expire on the first day of the first month of the even numbered years. Do you want something like that?
- Steve: I imagine the beginning of every calendar year for simplicity's sake.
- Joelle: if there isn't any more discussion on this one, inactive status fees are operationally problematic. In NRS, it says that a person can put their license on inactive status not to exceed three years. And then the fee to renew to place a license on inactive status is \$200. Now that our licenses are on a biannual renewal cycle, the three years puts them in the middle, so we will need clarifying language if you want the inactive status to be two years. We need to specify it in NAC because without the NAC to specify that we have to go by NRS, which is not to exceed three years. But we don't have any language to support any other time frame. We can't mandate someone to renew their license in two years if we don't have language to support it.
- Jenny: what makes the most sense administratively?
- Joelle: Operationally, it would maintain consistency if it was on the biennial cycle and leave it at \$200.
- Steve: So, making it fiscally responsible and administratively streamlined. Joelle, you're going to know what that looks like more than I certainly do.

- Marta: I'd like some more feedback on something. I'm thinking that sometimes people have catastrophic events in their lives, and they need more than two years. Would they then be able to reapply for inactive status if they needed to?
- Joelle: In the NRS language as it is, you either have to renew or let it lapse, not to exceed five years to operate within the language we have.
- Steve: We're really going to go off of what is not only clean and clear, but what's going to be helpful administratively because it seems like it's a mess.
- Joelle: I will write down Marta your comments because that's a good point that you bring up.

g. NAC 641A.131

- Steve: This is about continuing education for a renewal. I know there's an option, so this was very painful for new licensees because as the law reads, they had to find 40 hours of continuing ED because there is no proration put into our regs. We have an opportunity to put in NAC an ability to prorate so that somebody who got licensed in November doesn't have to figure out how to hustle 40 CEUs.
- Joelle: this is supported in NRS 641A.265. So, the board does have the ability to waive the requirements for continuing education. It's states: for circumstances beyond their control.
- Steve: I do believe that licensed interns should throughout their internship, have to have the required CEUs. To Dr. Ross's earlier point today, these are the least experienced practitioners who deserve continual training in the most important subjects on how to protect their clients and the public. As far as 641A.131, I believe that we need to articulate a proration for people who are who attain licensure in the middle of a cycle so that they don't have to grab all 40. So that's what I'd like us to discuss.
- Marta: I agree with Steve that we should have a proration. In my head, it's 20 a year, 10 and 10 every six months. That makes it easy and if it's in the last six months, then the especially the required CEUs could be plugged in there.
- Sheldon: I agree wholeheartedly with Marta.
- Sara: I want to echo Marta and Sheldon.
- Steve: Here is a little bit of what the math would look like. So, its 20 CEUs under 12 months or 10 under six and that if it's under 12 or six, they would have to be the mandated CEUs.
- Sara: I think that's reasonable.
- Marta: Minimally the mandated.
- Steve: I feel pretty good on behalf of the public for that one.
- Sheldon: Yes.

- Joelle: We do have to talk about language regarding the cultural competency. If we leave it the way it is in NRS for the new cultural competency CEU that's required, it would be two hours which is inconsistent with our language for CEUs being in the licensing period. If you want to make it consistent with the licensing period, you're going to make these cultural competency CEUs four hours instead of two.
- Steve: If we are not pro rating those. So, the proration of the mandatory ethics for one year. Would be three, two and two. Nonetheless, that's still seven CEUs. But for somebody who is only licensed for six months, I believe that's responsible and reasonable.
- Jenny: I was thinking the same thing that with the math, it would be the pro-rated, so it would be the three, two and two. Ok.
- Sara: If we do expand the number of training hours interns are allowed, they could theoretically use these toward internship hours while also aiding these toward licensure anyway. I think we have a lot of flexibility with how we want to approach this.
- Steve: Any other feedback on the proposed NAC changes to this point? Any other suggestions for NAC changes at this time?
- Marta: Yes. There are so many individuals who hold a school counseling credential applying for CPC. They may even be coming from a CACREP approved program for school counseling and even the way that it reads in their internship coursework. It will use the words clinical and non-clinical, so it would appear as if they're getting a clinical mental health internship. But when the student or applicant replies to us about what their internship looks like, it will say something like, well, I didn't, you know in some of the internship for practicum, say, diagnosed and did therapy, but in others they did not diagnose. And if there was a mental health issue that arose in their student, then that was referred out. So, they're not getting the CPC internship experience. And so, I can't in good conscience pass that coursework through, even though the way the coursework reads would indicate that there's a clinical experience. But when they actually did the internship? It's not it's not clinical. So, I think it's important that we have some really qualified people who are getting wonderful education with the school counseling degree background, but we don't have a place to fit that in our state to get them the license that would demonstrate that they've had the full mental health background to give them that CPC licensure.
- John: The issue is that they do lack in their curriculum. There are a couple of courses that they need for clinical licensure, especially now with the new requirements. In one case, there was a very narrow, specific area of psychology practice and that did not map into the into the robust general practice license that we have because it was just an advanced training in working with a particular diagnosis. We need to be sure that that those who come in from school counseling that that recognizing that the school counseling practicum internship itself is not giving them a clinical experience, probably no diagnosing and no hour-long sessions. I don't see it as adequate.
- Steve: Thinking about those academic reviews, some very well-intentioned and probably very talented school counseling professionals wanting to become a CPC or MFT. Quite frankly, they don't. They largely don't meet the academic review.

- Marta: That's what was so challenging. I knew that the experience of the internship site, which was in a school setting, was not congruent with what the syllabus actually said. Yes, there was 240 direct hours services for school counseling, not for mental health counseling.
- Steve: It seems to me that perhaps we don't have NAC changes to consider with our academic review process, but it seems to be appropriate that on a semi-regular basis that, as a board, we have this conversation about the depth and considerations for reviewing coursework.
- Marta: I wasn't suggesting a NAC change. I was suggesting that school counselors in our state don't have a licensing place that they can go to.
- Steve: It's the Department of Education.
- Marta: My question would be just for feedback. Why aren't they applying there?
- John: So, they are licensed school counselors. But their scope of practice does not include mental health counseling. Their scope of practice is school counseling.
- Steve: I think just anecdotally, what's going on in our world out there is you're finding a lot of folks who are leaving the profession of school counseling and wanting to do something that they deem to be a parallel profession when in actuality, it's not. Their training is different.
- Marta: Just for feedback from what John said about the psychology degrees and whether their internships are equivalent. Again, this is this is a challenge again on academic reviews because there are at times an academic review that someone's highly, highly specializes in ABA, but they have all of their internships and clinical experience has only been in ABA and not in mental health. I can't legitimately pass that academic review because a bachelor's degree person can get certified in ABA. It's not the full scope, it's only very specialized. And so that comes up oftentimes in the academic reviews, and I don't pass them through because of that.

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

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

13. Board member comments

- No Board member comments.

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)

- Sara Duerksen: Sara had a question about who she can supervise as a AAMFT supervisor candidate since you can take that course before you meet eligibility requirements outlined by the state of Nevada.

- Sussan Fung: Sussan expressed appreciation to the Board for reviewing coursework and requirements and hopes to join licensees to help the public in Nevada.

15. Adjournment:

- Meeting adjourned at 11:32 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/>