



Dr. Jennifer Ross, *President*
Jenny Stepp, *Vice President*
Lauri Perdue, *Secretary/Treasurer, Public Member*
Dr. Steve Nicholas, *Member*
Dr. John Nixon, *Member*
Marta Wilson, *Member*
Lisa Kalkes, *Public Member*
Dr. Sheldon Jacobs, *Member*
Sara Pelton, *Member*

MEETING MINUTES
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2024 at 9:00AM

Teleconference

**Nevada Board of Examiners
For Marriage & Family Therapists and Clinical Professional Counselors
500 N. Rainbow Boulevard, Suite 201
Las Vegas, NV 89107**

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).

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 9:03 AM.
 - Board members present: Sara Pelton, Marta Wilson, Jennifer Ross, John Nixon, Lauri Perdue, Steve Nicholas, Lisa Kalkes (left at 10:08 AM)
 - Board members not present: Jenny Stepp, Sheldon Jacobs
 - Staff present: Joelle McNutt, Stephanie Steinhiser, Senior Deputy Attorney General Henna Rasul
 - Members of the public: Bodie Coates, Gwendolyn Greene, Theresa Cicchetto, Jacquelyn Kleinedler, Nick Vander Poel (Flynn Giudici Government Affairs), Jaime Clemens, Trey Dunlap, Darlyn Magana, Cheree Tanon

Public comment is welcomed by the Board. Persons wishing to provide public comments remotely may access the meeting by telephone at (253) 215-8782 or through the electronic link posted on the agenda. 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)

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. Review, discussion and possible action regarding presentations by the Director of the Department of Business & Industry, Dr. Kristopher Sanchez and the Deputy Director of the Office of Boards, Commissions & Councils Standards, Ms. Nikki Haag, regarding a proposed new structure of government including the State of Nevada Board of Examiners for Marriage Family Therapists & Clinical Professional Counselors (For discussion/possible action) – Dr. Jennifer Ross, Joelle McNutt

- Joelle: I did extend an invitation to both Dr. Sanchez and Ms. Haag as you requested, Dr. Ross. They did respond to let me know that they were unable to attend board meetings to answer questions from the Board. They did say that if individual board members had questions that they would be more than happy to schedule individual meetings with anybody that requested to have individual meetings. I met with them on November 5, 2023, and I did let them know that I would be putting a presentation on the agenda because that's what you requested, Dr. Ross, and that I would instead give an update from that meeting. It was proposed that our Board will be part of a behavioral health superboard representing five individual boards (Psychology, Social Work, Drug, Alcohol & Gambling Counselors, Applied Behavior Analysts and us) with thirteen members total. Potential representation for our professions would be 2 MFTs and 1 possible CPC. I strongly advocated for a guaranteed spot for a CPC, not a possible spot that could be filled with a CPC, Social Worker or Psychologist.
- Steve: I think part of the important argument would surround codes of ethics that we have two licenses under our board and obviously their scopes are incredibly similar, but their codes while being similar are indeed different codes. They're ethical codes and that might be a good compelling reason for them to at least put one and one or two and one.
- Joelle: I'm going to watch for the draft language closely.
- Steve: I'm perceiving this process as lacking transparency through and through. It's lacking intentionality of informing and considering the boards and our experiences. That is very disheartening.
- Joelle: I prepared a list of questions regarding our industry such as application processing times, academic review completion, participation on several national associations and customer service. They said that anything specialized will stay with us.
- Lisa: Who is the sponsor of the bill?
- Joelle: The Department of Business and Industry.
- John: This is much more heavy-handed, top-down approach and the transparency thing concerns me, but I have to wonder how are they determining board composition?

- Joelle: They didn't say.
 - Marta: In response to what Steve said about transparency, which is such a huge concern to me too. So how are they meeting with everybody? I know the first meeting everybody was together, so how are they meeting with everybody in that spirit of transparency? So, everybody may or may not be on the same page
 - Joelle: They met with each board individually.
 - Marta: So, the first meeting, everybody met together and now they're only meeting individually with the different boards. They're not putting them all together anymore so that there can be group discussions.
 - Joelle: Correct.
 - Marta: I would say that that would also be something of concern for us. We may be getting similar information but different information because they're going to be different groups meeting and we know that ideas get generated when we're all together and we can talk openly with one another.
 - Nick Vander Poel: Thank you Joelle and thank you board for having this conversation. There's a lot of information as it relates to this. I will just add, it's one thing meeting with individual boards, it's another thing having to educate all these legislators on the process to get a bill of this magnitude going. I've spoken to my colleagues and we're just waiting for language. Joelle did an excellent job on offering her insight as it relates to the industry and the role that the board has and how it serves Nevadans who are in this industry. I think it was well received.
 - Jennifer: Thank you everybody. I am looking at the time and I want to make sure we get to other items before we lose quorum. So, I want to open up for any final thoughts here. Also, before we lose you, Lisa, I want to give you a chance for a formal introduction as our new public member.
 - Lisa: I am a chief marketing officer and VP of public affairs. I'm very passionate about mental health. I'm also an army veteran. I know mental health is a big thing in the veteran community, so very passionate about that. So, looking forward to working with you all.
4. Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding review and approval of minutes from the October 18, 2024, meeting (For possible action)
- Motion to approve minutes from the October 18th meeting: 1st Lauri, 2nd Steve; No abstentions; Motion approved.
5. 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 Approved Clinical Supervisor	University transcript showing 45-hour graduate-level supervision course	Mentor Signature of Supervisory Experience
Theresa Cicchetto	Yes	N/A	N/A
Susan Dow	Yes	N/A	N/A
Georgina Fontein	Yes	N/A	N/A
Bodie Coates	Yes	N/A	N/A
Rodney Johnson	N/A	Yes	Yes
Kimberly Wood	N/A	Yes	Yes

- Jennifer: I have a couple of questions here.
- Joelle: I just wanted to bring to the board's attention that I'm including additional information in your packet moving forward regarding supervisors because of the next agenda item. So, I have included the standard information you normally see plus license verifications for your review. If they are reciprocity licensees, I included both their Nevada current license and the license verification for the other state that they're in.
- Steve: I didn't find any discrepancies with the math. I am wondering about the Issues in Clinical Supervision course for Rodney Johnson.
- John: What does this course description say? Usually when the word "issues" is in the title, it's a seminar course which is not the same as a theory and practice of supervision course.
- Steve: I'd be more comfortable seeing the course description.
- John: Moving forward, I really want to put the expectation on the applicant to do the legwork and demonstrate how their course that they want to use does apply. They should be responsible to do that.
- Marta: The syllabus or syllabi are so important because sometimes the course description is kind of generic.
- Steve: Think we're in the same boat with Kimberly Wood, looking at her transcript from University of Phoenix does say supervision management and clinical mental health counseling.
- Jennifer: So, it sounds like, am I hearing from the group that we may want to hold those two applicants and request a syllabus for the course that they're using?
- Steve: I would like that.
- Motion to approve Theresa Cicchetto, Susan Dow, Georgina Fontein and Bodie Coates as Primary Supervisors: 1st Jennifer, 2nd Steve; No abstentions; Motion approved.
- Motion to deny Rodney Johnson and Kimberly Woods applications for Primary Supervisor pending syllabus verification: 1st Steve, 2nd John; Sara opposes; Motion approved.

6. Review, discussion and possible action regarding the revocation of Primary Supervisor approval for Robyn Flores (For discussion/possible action) – Joelle McNutt

- Joelle: Robin submitted her application for primary supervisor, and upon reviewing that application, I reached out to her because there was full licensure from the state of Colorado in 2022. I called her because I wanted to verify with her when she was actually fully licensed. So, during that conversation I had with her, we talked about full licensure in Colorado, happened in 2022, but she told me original issue date in the state of Texas was 2020. That was indicated on the Texas license verification, so I put her on the agenda, but that was a misrepresentation of her credentials. It was brought to my attention that there was a discrepancy in what she verbally reported to me and what was on her CV. I reached out to the state of Texas to verify, and she did misrepresent that date. So, she has not been fully licensed for three years.
- Steve: Does she have active supervisees?
- Joelle: No, she has never had any supervisees in Nevada.
- Steve: I think it is pretty straightforward that she doesn't meet the qualifications.
- Motion to revoke Primary Supervisor approval for Robyn Flores: 1st Steve, 2nd Lauri; No abstentions; Motion approved.

7. Review/Decision regarding the following applicants who have petitioned the Board for approval of prior experience hours from out-of-state: (For possible action)

Applicant	Total Number of Hours	Prior Experience Form	State Verified Hours	Letter from Previous Supervisor
Cheree Tanon	1468.5	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ariel Cohen	951.69	Yes	Yes	No

- Jennifer: Does the Board have any questions about approving hours for these applicants?
- Steve: I have some questions. I see that in 2023 Ms. Tanon was working at an elementary school and I would like more understanding of the nature of that work to see if they qualify.
- Cheree Tanon: They were individual, confidential sessions. I would have to go through the process of doing intakes, psychosocials, meet with parents, depending on ages. Most of the ones I was seeing were under the age of 12. So, I was meeting with parents for consent. I would have one-on-one sessions. I also was having group therapy sessions as well with the students.
- John: Would you say your position was as a school counselor or as a mental health counselor placed in the school?
- Cheree Tanon: Our titles were mental health professionals, so we were mental health therapists at the school. We also had school counselors, which were separate on the campuses.
- Marta: Cheree, were you providing a diagnosis in those sessions?
- Cheree Tanon: We would do preliminary, and we would go through our supervisors.

- John: Would you work up a preliminary diagnosis and would your treatment plan be then diagnosis informed?
 - Cheree Tanon: Yes.
 - Motion to accept the hours for Cheree Tanon: 1st Steve, 2nd Marta; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
 - Steve: For Ms. Cohen, I'm trying to figure out the name of the work setting is CBEM, LLC. I don't know what that is. Hours look good. The other placement is a Sherman Oaks Therapy. So that reads a little more straightforward.
 - Jennifer: I just was doing a search on CBEM and looking at their services. I see crisis management that shows critical intervention, de-escalation. I see training and skill development, mental health to behavioral strategies, maybe counseling falls under there, caregiver support and regional center resource integration.
 - Steve: I think it's a cleaner application if we have letters from the supervisors that are signing those documents.
 - Jennifer: My concern is that CBEM looks and sounds a little bit like the equivalent of our Sierra Regional Center. I know sometimes counseling can happen at places like that. A lot of times it's more like service coordination and case management types of things. And so, I think it would be nice to have a letter from the supervisor about what was being done, at least at that site specifically. I'm open to the group's thoughts.
 - Steve: I think as a board, our opportunity is to get more clarification on the nature of work that was provided at that first site.
 - Jennifer: Do we have the option to approve the hours from the other sites that are more clearly therapy, counseling related? And then would she have the opportunity to submit for additional hours to be approved if she had some way to show what the work was. Can that be a staged process?
 - Joelle: I don't think there's anything in regulations that say that they only have one opportunity.
 - Steve: I would prefer that she just submits a more comprehensive understanding of all the hours instead of us doing the division of the math, doing partial approval. I suppose we could do all of that, but I'm just not comfortable with that first site. I don't know anything about it.
 - The approval of hours for Ariel Cohen is tabled pending additional information submitted by the applicant.
8. Review, discussion, and possible action regarding review of financial statements 1st Quarter FY25 ending September 30, 2024 (For discussion/possible action) – Joelle McNutt
- Joelle: Everything looks good and there aren't any anomalies.
 - Lauri: I've been going through auditing and truing up all the statements and everything is perfect. Joelle did an amazing job after their move going through and updating the inventory. It was beyond

thorough. After we went back and read the regulations, we are overly inventoried, so no worries there. One thing I did suggest to Joelle, after we looked at the inventory and the vintage computers that they're using, they could go to the Smithsonian. So, I suggested she get a bid on new computers for the employees in the office that are of a date that has a two in it, not a one. So, she's going to work on that. And if you haven't had a moment to go check out the new office, you should stop by. Joelle, I'm very impressed with your patience and persistence in finding the right place for you and your team. So well done.

- Jennifer: Everything looks amazing. I'm always impressed every time I review those statements, so we get to approve. Do we have a motion?
- Motion to approve financial statements 1st Quarter FY25 ending September 30, 2024: 1st Sara, 2nd Lauri; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.

9. Review, discussion, and possible action for the approval of the audited financial statements for the fiscal year-end June 30, 2024 (For discussion/possible action) – Joelle McNutt

- This agenda item was stricken.

10. Report from President (Advisement)

- Jennifer: I have nothing to report this morning.

11. Report from Treasurer (Advisement)

- Lauri: I have nothing additional from before. Get new computers.

12. Report from Executive Director (Advisement)

- Joelle: I have been asked to be a part of the Healthcare Workforce Working Group and I have included my appointment letter in your packet. I have included the productivity spreadsheet for your review.
- Jennifer: Thank you as always for all the things.

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

- Jennifer: I know we had a disciplinary hearing that had to be pushed so I'm sure we have to talk about that.
- Henna: Yeah, it was pretty much ready to go, and it had to, unfortunately, be canceled, so I let the opposing counsel know that it will be rescheduled to sometime in January. So please, it's really important, especially when there's opposing counsel on the other side that we have not only a quorum, but we have a unanimous vote of the full panel of board members. When we have a strong record and robust discussions on the record, it just makes our case that much stronger and your case that much stronger. We have to block all day, nine to five.

14. Discussion regarding future agenda items and possible future meeting dates

- Joelle: The third Friday in January would be the 17th.
- Sara: I was thinking about Joelle being able to go ahead and approve supervisors that don't have any things that look like they need to go to the Board, just to give her that authority.

- Jennifer: To have that administrative approval process. Yes. Great.

15. Board member comments

- Marta: I just wanted to kind of reiterate something that John said about public workshops. I've been a member of public workshops for 20 plus years and I agree with John. You go and everybody thinks that this is going to be a working group and it's not. I've never ever seen anything in a public workshop effect the decision that the overhead people already had. And so, when we are told that we're going to get a public workshop and we're going to be able to express ourselves and that it's going to mean something. I've never experienced that in 20 plus years.
- John: I would add caveat to that and that I would say the exception would be our Board and our public workshops because I recall we would deliberate and recall the public sentiment, but outside of our Board and how we've operated, I have to agree.

16. 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.

17. Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned at 10:59 AM.