



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*  
Dr. Sheldon Jacobs, *Member*  
Sara Pelton, *Member*

MEETING MINUTES  
FRIDAY, JANUARY 17, 2025 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 9:02 AM.
  - Board members present: Sara Pelton, Marta Wilson, Jennifer Ross, John Nixon, Lauri Perdue, Steve Nicholas (left at 3:47pm), Jenny Stepp, Sheldon Jacobs
  - Staff present: Joelle McNutt, Stephanie Steinhiser, Senior Deputy Attorney General Henna Rasul, Deputy Attorney General Matthew Feeley
  - Members of the public: Lyn Beggs, Debbie Rasmussen, Gwen Smithson, Heidi Konsten, A'Jah Love, Chelsea Baca, Jaime Clemens, Jennifer Leach, Jennifer Vobis, Keyahnah Anderson, Kimberly Wood, Laura Fussell, Michael Kalish, Quinnett Swank, Robert Soucy, Mendy Elliott (Flynn Giudici Government Affairs), Kaleigh Mancha, Karina Johnson, Toni Garguilo, Aiyyeimah Berry, Ashley Noel, Lisa Toms, Jamie Beidle

**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.
- Henna: I did communicate with Ms. Beggs yesterday via email and we came to an agreement, pursuant to NAC 641A.555, to consolidate the hearings.

## 3. Disciplinary hearing on Complaint and Notice of Hearing in the Matter of Deborah Rasmussen, Case No. NV23MFT011 and Gwen Smithson, Case No. NV23MFT012. This agenda item may include review and consideration of a consent decree (For possible action)

- Jennifer: So, this is the time and place for the hearings in the matter of Gwen Smithson. Case No. NV23MFT012 and Deborah Rasmussen, Case No. NV23MFT011. Is the respondent or counsel for the respondent present?
- Lyn Beggs: I represent both Ms. Smithson and Ms. Rasmussen who are present.
- Henna Rasul: I am Senior Deputy Attorney General, and I represent the Board.
- Jennifer: Are there any preliminary matters?
- Henna: I think we took care of that in the stipulation we agreed to.
- Jennifer: Would this be the time for any potential conflicts of interest for disclosure and discussion?
- Matthew Feeley: I suppose so. If you, or any other Board members, want to disclose anything now would be the time.
- Jennifer: Ms. Smithson and I worked together at an agency a while back and so given the fact that we have a prior professional relationship, I would like to check in with all of the parties and counsel.
- Henna: If you feel you can be impartial then I'm fine with you participating.
- Steve: How long ago did you have a working relationship with Ms. Smithson?
- Jennifer: It was during the period around 2011 to 2012.
- Lyn Beggs: I would agree with Ms. Rasul. If Ms. Ross feels that she can be impartial in this matter, I would have no objection to her participating in the adjudication of this matter today.
- Jennifer: Then we can go ahead and move forward. Are all persons who will be providing testimony present this morning?
- Matthew Feeley: I suppose you could do this now with everybody that's going to give testimony, or you could do it as they get called by their respective sides, but all of them are going to have to

swear in. If everybody's available now. I can't see why everybody can't just do it right now. So, if who exactly is going to be testifying?

- Henna: For the state, it would be Stephanie Steinhiser and Joelle McNutt.
- Matthew Feeley: Are both of those people present right now?
- Henna: They are.
- Matthew Feeley: As far as the respondents?
- Lyn Beggs: Yes. Ms. Smithson and Ms. Rasmussen will be testifying today and both are present
- Matthew Feeley: Ms. Ross, you can go through the swearing in process with the four of them.
- Jennifer: Okay. I believe then maybe time for opening statements.
- Henna: Chairwoman and members of the Board, I represent the state of Nevada in this matter and the State has filed complaints to discipline Ms. Deborah Rasmussen and Ms. Gwen Smithson regarding their marriage and family therapy licenses. Ms. Rasmussen and Ms. Smithson both held marriage and family therapy licenses in the state of Nevada at all times relevant to the complaints. As such, they were charged with certain serious responsibilities as specified in both the Marriage and Family Therapist Act and its corresponding regulations. The evidence will show that both Ms. Rasmussen and Ms. Smithson fail to meet these responsibilities by failing to disclose that the contract between Medicaid and their business, which each are 50% owner, was terminated due to fraud. This resulted in a 10-year sanction. Further, they failed to notify the board of their sanction within 10 days as is required by the Board's Practice Act.

Consequently, Ms. Rasmussen's and Ms. Smithson's failure has caused the potential for harm to their clients and has compromised public health and safety. The state has filed complaints alleging that grounds of disciplinary action exist apart from any other compliance with the marriage and family therapy standards of conduct by Deborah Rasmussen and Gwen Smithson. In each of the complaints, the allegations are identical. The first allegation as alleged in the complaints states that the Board may suspend or revoke Ms. Rasmussen's and Ms. Smithson's licenses for using fraud or deception in applying for licensure. The second allegation states that the Board may suspend or revoke Ms. Rasmussen's and Ms. Smithson's licenses for committing unethical practices contrary to the interest of the public, as determined by the Board. The third allegation states that the Board may suspend or revoke Ms. Rasmussen's and Ms. Smithson's licenses for unprofessional conduct as determined by the Board.

The fourth allegation pertains to Ms. Rasmussen's and Ms. Smithson's negligence fraud or deception in connection with services they were licensed to provide pursuant to NRS and NAC chapter 641A. The fifth allegation the state is making is that Ms. Rasmussen and Ms. Smithson gave or received directly or indirectly a fee, commission, rebate or other compensation for professional services that they had not actually personally provided. The sixth allegation alleges that Ms. Rasmussen and Ms. Smithson failed to critically examine and keep current with emergent knowledge relevant to the practice of marriage and family therapy as applicable. The seventh allegation states that Ms. Rasmussen and Ms. Smithson failed to comply with the provisions of NRS and NAC chapter 641A and all other applicable federal laws and regulations. The eighth allegation

states that Ms. Rasmussen and Ms. Smithson failed to notify the board in writing within 10 days after an action was taken against their registration with Medicaid. The ninth allegation states that Ms. Rasmussen and Ms. Smithson violated several provisions of the AAMFT Code of Ethics. Ms. Rasmussen and Ms. Smithson were given proper notice of this hearing. They and their attorney were sent the Complaint and Second Notice of Hearing via certified and regular mail on November 20, 2024. The certificate of service was subsequently signed for by their attorney, Ms. Beggs. At this time, I would like to submit exhibits one through nine in the Rasmussen matter and exhibits one through eight in the Smithson matter, if there are no objections.

- Lyn Beggs: No objections.
- Henna: That concludes my opening statement. Thank you.
- Lyn Beggs: If I may proceed, I'll just do brief opening comments this morning. Good morning. My name is Lynn Beggs. Thank you for having us today. The first thing I would like to remind the Board today is that the Board has the burden of proof in this matter. The Board must support the allegations laid out in the grounds that Ms. Rasul just went through by a preponderance of the evidence. We believe that the Board will not be able to support the allegations that are contained within the complaints regarding Ms. Smithson and Ms. Rasmussen by a preponderance of the evidence. The crucial thing I think that the Board should know at the outset of this case and that will be provided for you through testimony and documentary evidence is this case has absolutely nothing to do with services rendered under either Smithson's or Ms. Rasmussen's MFT licenses. The termination of the Medicaid contract by Balance Therapy was due to BST, PSR, and Medication Management Services, not MFT therapy services that were rendered by either Ms. Smithson or Ms. Rasmussen. You'll hear that that termination was based on billing errors, not intentional fraud. Further, we are of the opinion, and I believe the law supports this, that what Balance Therapy had with state Medicaid is a contract to provide healthcare services. Medicaid is a provider of healthcare, as the exhibits that we will be offering today support. It is not a registration, it is not a certificate, it is not a license, or a credential issued by a state or federal agency. It is basically an insurance contractor that happens to receive money from CMS and state funds. At the end of the testimony and the proceedings today, the board will find, in my opinion, that there is no support for the allegations contained within the nine grounds that were set forth in the complaint. I will go through those with you at the end of testimony today because as I say, there is no support for these allegations. There are no services that were rendered to therapy clients of Ms. Smithson or Ms. Rasmussen. And at the end of the proceedings today, we will be asking the Board to dismiss the complaints against both respondents in full. Thank you.
- HEARING PROCEEDS
- Henna: Members of the Board, thank you for your time this morning. As demonstrated, the evidence submitted shows, and there is sufficient evidence to establish that Ms. Rasmussen and Ms. Smithson committed those acts, as stated, and are in violation of NRS 641A.310, NAC 641A.243, NAC 641A.247, and NAC 641A.252. It's important to note that Medicaid arguably is a registration as contemplated in NAC 641A.243, subsection 17, subsection (a). Medicaid is a state and federally funded program. It's not a private insurance company. As the owners of the company, Ms. Rasmussen and Ms. Smithson were personally sanctioned, not the other persons that were discussed. Consequently, I asked the Board to find both Ms. Rasmussen and Ms. Smithson guilty of counts one through nine as specified in the Complaint and Second Notices of Hearing.

- Further, I ask that the Board take the following actions against both Ms. Rasmussen and Ms. Smithson. Each would get a public reprimand; each would have an imposition of a fine in the amount the Board deems appropriate pursuant to NRS 641A.320. For Ms. Rasmussen, recovery of reasonable attorney's fees and Board costs in the amount of \$2,968.06 cents in attorney's fees as of yesterday, plus attorney's fees and costs accrued today and in future preparation of the order pursuant to NRS 622.400 at a rate of \$157.04 cents per hour for attorney's fees, an administrative fine of \$500.00. The attorney fees and costs includes my costs, as well as Board counsel costs today. For Ms. Smithson, recovery of reasonable attorney's fees and costs, Board costs in the amount of \$3,015.17 cents in attorney's fees as of yesterday, plus attorney's fees and costs accrued today, and in the future preparation of the order pursuant to NRS 622.400 at the rate of \$157.04 cents per hour for attorney's fees and an administrative fine of \$500.00. The attorney's fees and costs includes my costs, as well as Board counsel costs.
- Next, respondents may pay the above stated fees by way of payment plan prepared by the Board on the condition that the payment plan is set up with the Board within 45 days from the date of this order, which goes into effect today. The fine and attorney's fees will become due within one year of this order. Next, report any actions taken by the Board to the NPDB reporting bank and any National data bank that is required by law. Respondent's Marriage and Family Therapist licenses shall be placed on probation for one year and during the term of probation, respondents shall maintain their marriage and family therapy license during the probationary period and complete fifteen hours of Board approved interactive continuing education courses in ethics and ethical billing practices. These courses cannot be used towards CE requirements already required for continued licensure as a marriage and family therapist by the Board. Thank you.
- Lyn Beggs: As a preliminary note, I would state that a recommendation on discipline is appropriate after the Board makes a finding on each of the grounds. So, I'm going to withhold any commentary on discipline until after the Board adjudicates on the eight grounds that are contained within the complaint. As an initial note, I would note to this Board that under 233B.125, a decision by a Board that's adverse to a respondent must be supported by findings of facts and conclusions of law. Findings of facts and decisions must be based on preponderance of the evidence and must be accompanied by a concise and explicit statement of the underlying facts supporting the findings. I know that would be in a written order, but as part of the adjudication of the Board today, it is your mandate to make a concise finding of facts that support these grounds.

I would submit to you that there are not facts that support these grounds. As I mentioned to you in my opening comments, I would like to go through each of these counts now. Now that you have heard the evidence in this matter. Count one is a violation of NRS 641A.310 (4); using fraud or deception in applying for a license. There was no fraud or deception here. This was simply a decision that I believe is supported by Ms. Smithson and Ms. Rasmussen to answer the ethical consideration questions as they did. I've heard a lot of commentary today about unethical conduct related to that renewal application and that somehow Ms. Smithson and Ms. Rasmussen have been unethical because they did not consult with their licensing Board as to what Medicaid is. Medicaid is the entity that states what Medicaid is, not the personal decision of a Board member or a Board staff member. So, with all due respect, and I have the utmost respect for licensing boards, I used to work for a licensing board. It's not appropriate without some sort of support to find that that was required or necessary.

Moving on to count two of the complaint. There is an allegation of NRS 641A.310 (6), committing unethical practices contrary to the interest of the public as determined by the Board. Again, I'm

unclear what is unethical here. There was no underlying allegations that Ms. Smithson or Ms. Rasmussen engaged in unethical conduct. There were billing errors that ultimately resulted in Medicaid terminating the provider contract. I want to be very clear with the Board, and this is supported within the materials that we've provided to the Board, and was in the fair hearing request. That is part of the exhibits, is Medicaid has very specific definitions of credible allegations of fraud and if you would look at the request for fair hearing that we had submitted, we addressed those issues and ultimately, as you've heard testimony, this case resulted in a settlement and would have gone to hearing if we hadn't reached a settlement.

There is just simply no unethical practices here. These are two practitioners who were engaged in providing wraparound services, which they are no longer doing and we're having billing issues that were ultimately corrected back in 2019. Count three of the complaint alleges a violation of NRS 641A.310 (7), unprofessional conduct as determined by the Board. I would state this is a procedural non-starter because unprofessional conduct is actually defined for the purposes of that section in a NAC 641A.256 (1). There is no reference to what provision of NAC 641A.256 (1) is allegedly violated. Count three simply fails as a procedural issue. Count four, there is an allegation of NRS 641A.310 (8). The violation is negligence, fraud or deception in connection with services he or she is licensed to provide pursuant to this chapter. Nothing in this case has indicated that Nevada Medicaid took any action against either Ms. Smithson or Ms. Rasmussen for services that they provided under their MFT licenses. In fact, the settlement agreement in this case had Medicaid providing to Ms. Rasmussen and Ms. Smithson the suspended payments for those services. So, count four simply fails. There were no services provided by Ms. Smithson or Ms. Rasmussen under their MFT licenses. Count five, there's an allegation of NAC 641A.243 (5). A violation that a marriage and family therapist shall not give or receive directly or indirectly a fee, commission, rebate, or other compensation for professional services that he or she has not actually or personally provided. There has been absolutely no evidence provided in this case to show that Ms. Rasmussen or Ms. Smithson obtained any improper compensation here. There was a group NPI, Balance Therapy, that was appropriately billing for services for the various wraparound services. The NPI of the rendering provider was provided on those invoices. The remittances went to Balance, Balance paid their providers. There's nothing illegal or fraudulent or unethical about that. That is a commonplace practice and there is simply no evidence to support count five. As far as count six, an alleged violation of NAC 641A.243 (11). An allegation that a marriage and family therapist must keep current with emergent knowledge relevant to counseling as applicable, including without limitation adherence to national professional standards related to telehealth. Again, there is absolutely nothing that has been provided to you to show that Ms. Smithson or Ms. Rasmussen is not keeping current with emergent knowledge relevant to counseling. Again, that's what that allegation, you would have to have factual information to support that allegation that they have not kept current with knowledge related to counseling. Count seven, a violation of NAC 641A.243 (15) which states that a marriage family therapist shall comply with the provisions of this chapter and Chapter 641A of the NRS and all other applicable federal laws and regulations.

The Medicaid Services Manual is not a state or federal law. They are internal policies of Nevada Medicaid. It does not go through the state regulatory process. That is something that Nevada Medicaid promulgates, and it is the failure to document properly, as far as Medicaid is concerned, is not a violation of an applicable federal law or state law. Count eight, an alleged violation of NAC 641A.243 (17). Again, which states that a marriage family therapist must report within 10 days any action against a license, certification, registration, or other credential held by the marriage and family therapist issued by the State or District of Columbia or another state or territory of the United States. There's been a lot of commentary on whether or not a registration is what happens when

you enroll with Medicaid. There is absolutely no factual support for that other than personal opinion, which is not beyond a preponderance of the evidence.

And I would also note that there was also an appeal of this, which eventually resolved through a settlement. Count nine, an alleged violation of NAC 641A.252 (4), which is a violation of a Code of Ethics adopted by the AAMFT. There are two provisions that are noted in that. First, AAMFT Code of Ethics, standard three, section 3.20, that an MFT must pursue appropriate consultation and training to ensure adequate knowledge of an adherence to applicable laws, ethics and professional standards. Again, this is a billing issue. This has nothing to do with ethics, and I'm not saying that billing issues cannot be fraudulent or unethical. This was a billing error. There was never any findings that there were services not rendered. It was a documentation issue. Finally, the final Code of Ethics, standard is 8.40 stating that a marriage and family therapist must represent facts truthful to clients, third party payers and supervisees regarding services rendered. Again, no MFT services were ever rendered at issue in this case. There is no information or facts to support any finding that Ms. Rasmussen or Ms. Smithson was not truthful to their clients, third party payers or supervisees. There's no allegation that there was misinformation provided to Nevada Medicaid. It was simply that there was documentation that they did not feel was in compliance with the changes to how the billing process worked. So, as I stated at the of this, as far as the Board requiring a finding of a preponderance of evidence on every single one of those counts, or at least each individually, we do not believe that the evidence and testimony provided to you during this hearing supports those allegations beyond a preponderance of the evidence. Thank you.

- Jennifer: I propose then if possible that we confirm the allegations and then take the counts one by one. So, opening up the floor.

Matthew Feeley: I would go through each count one by one and do a vote that each factual allegation paragraphs one through six have been proven. The complaints are combined into one. Both parties have agreed to consolidate the matters. It could also be noted that the complaints are almost identical, other than the named respondent. So, in effect, unless there's objections from either party, I would think it's safe to consider allegations one through six as applying to both parties.

- Lyn Beggs: The only objection I would have to Mr. Feeley is that allegations, one and two, on the complaints are going to be a little different regarding different respondents.
- Jennifer: Okay. So can we do the allegations separately and then go through the counts as a whole. Does that work for you, Ms. Beggs?
- Lyn Beggs: Yes. I think it just makes for a cleaner record.
- Jennifer: So, starting then with case NV23MFT011 for Ms. Rasmussen. Allegation or statement of fact one that Deborah Rasmussen was a duly licensed marriage and family therapist in state of Nevada at all times relevant to this complaint. Do we have any point of discussion about that? Or we approve that it's fact?
- Motion that allegation of fact number one has been proven: 1st Marta, 2nd Sheldon: No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.

- Jennifer: Statement of fact number two. Respondent was licensed as a marriage and family therapist on March 2, 2007. Discussion or motion?
- Motion that allegation of fact number two has been proven: 1st Marta, 2nd Jenny: No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
- Jennifer: A statement of fact three. An administrative complaint was filed by the Board based on information received on or about July 31, 2020. Discussion or motion?
- Motion that allegation of fact number three has been proven: 1st Sheldon, 2nd Lauri: No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
- Jennifer: Number four, it is alleged the Board received notification from the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services in a letter dated July 31, 2020, stating that the provider contract between Medicaid and Balance Therapy Centers, a business which respondent is 50% owner was terminated due to a credible allegation of fraud. This resulted in a 10-year sanction. Discussion or motion?
- Motion that allegation of fact number four has been proven: 1st Jenny, 2<sup>nd</sup> John: No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
- Jennifer: Paragraph five. Respondent failed to report this sanction to the Board, in writing, within 10 days, which is required by statute. Discussion or motion?
- Motion that allegation of fact number five has been proven: 1st Lauri, 2<sup>nd</sup> Sheldon: No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
- Jennifer: Sixth and final. The respondent failed to disclose this sanction on her application for license renewal received on December 19, 2021, by the Board. Discussion or motion?
- Motion that allegation of fact number six has been proven: 1st John, 2<sup>nd</sup> Steve: No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
- Jennifer: So, moving on to statement of facts then for Ms. Smithson, regarding case number NV23MFT012. The respondent was a duly licensed marriage and family therapist in the state of Nevada at all times relevant to this complaint. Discussion or motion?
- Motion that allegation of fact number one has been proven: 1st Marta, 2nd Steve: No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
- Jennifer: Statement two. Respondent was licensed as a marriage and family therapist on December 7th, 2012. Discussion or motion?
- Motion that allegation of fact number two has been proven: 1<sup>st</sup> Steve, 2nd Jenny: No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
- Jennifer: Item three. An administrative complaint was filed by the Board based on information received on or about July 31, 2020. Discussion or motion to accept?



- Motion that allegation of fact number three has been proven: 1st Sheldon, 2nd John: No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
- Jennifer: Item four. It is alleged the Board received notification from the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services in a letter dated July 31, 2020, stating that the provider contract between Medicaid and Balance Therapy Centers, a business which respondent is 50% owner, was terminated due to a credible allegation of fraud. This resulted in a 10-year sanction. Discussion or motion to accept?
- Motion that allegation of fact number four has been proven: 1st Steve, 2<sup>nd</sup> Lauri: No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
- Jennifer: Item five. Respondent failed to report this sanction to the Board, in writing within 10 days, which is required by statute.
- Motion that allegation of fact number five has been proven: 1st Steve, 2nd John: No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
- Jennifer: Finally, item six. Respondent failed to disclose this sanction on her application for license renewal received on January 4, 2022 by the Board. Discussion or motion to accept?
- Motion that allegation of fact number six has been proven: 1st Sheldon, 2nd Jenny: No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
- Jennifer: So, the allegations one through six for each of the cases have been accepted by the Board and now merging the two cases to review the counts. So, count one, the allegations contained in paragraphs one through six are hereby incorporated as if fully set forth herein. The conduct is in violation of NRS 641A.310 (4), which states that the Board may suspend or revoke a license for any of the following reasons: using fraud or deception in applying for a license or in passing the examination provided for this chapter. So, discussion from the Board about whether this count stands. You've heard the arguments.
- Steve: A supervisor of mine many years ago wanted to remind us throughout our careers that many unethical practices are not ill intended, but nonetheless they do constitute ethical violations and missteps and oversights. I do believe that that has happened with these two cases. I think that it's worth noting that Nevada Medicaid withheld \$19,405.97 upon appeal. They returned some of that money. They were suspended for 10 years and then that was reduced down to three years, which is still an acknowledgement of wrongdoing. I don't think that they were intentional with these practices, however practices happened, and it was under their watch. And the buck does ultimately stop with them as the 50% business owners. Even if it's a company, the individuals who were running the company are licensed marriage and family therapists. Some of those documents required their signatures and one would assume the acknowledgement and understanding of that. So, I do believe that this has been found, but I do want to note for the record, I don't think that it was with malice, but nonetheless, intentional versus negligent. I think that this has been negligence.
- Jennifer: I think much of what you've said, I agree, and I think that may be more in line with count two in terms of count one, looking at fraud or assumption in that license renewal, right? And clicking the no instead of the Yes.

- Steve: There are a lot of us who have quite a bit of experience collectively doing this. One's license expires and should they not apply for an extension of that license, then it is no longer a license to practice. Semantics being what they are, of course that's a license application because without that continual reapplication, there is no license to have.
- Marta: I would agree that's how we have looked at it in the years before.
- John: I would agree as well. A renewal application is an application. It's not simply a renewal. It's a new application. It's a reapplication, you have to attest to things.
- Steve: Both of the folks in question here acknowledged that they did not think it necessary to check those boxes for the attestation. And again, I don't deem that it was intentional deception, but it was negligent deception. For folks who have been licensed for the amount of time that they have, they've gone through multiple renewals before and whether or not they're in supervisory capacities, I'm under the impression that they would know better. Additionally, as they acknowledged the diligence that they did put forth to look for their answer, they neglected to look at the sources that would've given them a different response. So, I do think that that was essentially, they didn't check those boxes and they didn't seek out enough information to know whether or not they should.
- Lauri: I'm in agreement with that.
- Marta: I'm in agreement with that.
- Motion that alleged violation of law number one has been proven: 1st Steve, 2nd Lauri: No abstentions; Motion passed unanimously.
- Jennifer: Moving on to count two. The allegations contained in paragraphs one through nine are hereby incorporated as if fully set forth herein. This conduct violated NRS 641A.310 (6), stating that the Board may suspend and revoke a license for committing unethical practices contrary to the interest of the public as determined by the Board. So, Dr. Nicholas, this is where I think what you said earlier.
- Steve: I spoke quite thoroughly about this, that I do believe that there were negligent oversights and responsibilities with count two.
- Jenny: I do not think this profession is for the faint of heart and I don't think that this was malicious with the intention to be deceitful, but according to this count, I do believe that it's been shown that unethical practices were committed.
- Motion that alleged violation of law number two has been proven: 1st Jenny, 2<sup>nd</sup> Sheldon: No abstentions; Motion passed unanimously.
- Jennifer: Moving on to count three. Allegations contained in paragraphs one through twelve are hereby incorporated as a fully set forth herein. This conduct violated NRS 641A.310 (7), stating that the Board may suspend or revoke a license for unprofessional conduct as determined by the Board. So, while count two speaks to unethical practices, contrary to the interest of the public, we're now looking at unprofessional conduct. That one sticks with me a little bit because I do hear the thoughtfulness and some of the diligence that was reported by the respondents.

- Steve: I do believe that count three is met. The lack of oversight. The lack of auditing for things that have their names on them is indeed unprofessional conduct as a licensed marriage and family therapist. In addition to follow the money, the money went to the business and the money then paid out owners. So, a significant, an intense auditing of all of that is appropriate and it seems like it happened in hindsight and with some humility I acknowledge that, but nonetheless it did happen.
- Jenny: I hear it, and I see it the same way that when someone agrees to work with Medicaid, the professional standards are heightened. The administrative, the clinical duties are heightened and so anybody who is going to take that on is agreeing to abide by those standards, those rules, and that's where this got dicey. So, I do think count three has been proven here.
- Motion that alleged violation of law number three has been proven: 1st John, 2nd Lauri: Jennifer opposes, No abstentions; Motion passed.
- Jennifer: I believe that count four captures the essence of what we're talking about here. The allegations contained in paragraphs one through fifteen are hereby incorporated as if fully set forth herein. Conduct violated NRS 641.A.310 (8), stating that grounds for discipline exist for negligence, fraud or deception and connection with services he or she is licensed to provide. Pursuant to this chapter, the word negligence has been used many times and there's been some discussion that Medicaid's issue was not with the respondents but rather with the contracting entities, and yet the MFT license that relates to counseling is also the license that relates to any type of clinical oversight, administrative oversight and the overall running of the business. So, the QMHP and the Quality Assurance. I do think that they're related.
- John: I think it came up in previous discussion that we had in past cases. I recognize that the individual license cannot be completely ignored with regard to things that happened with the corporate license because ethics reflect not simply the code of the scope of practice of therapy, but the broader aspect in every which way that the licensee is involved in treatment of persons.
- Marta: I would agree with that. The mere fact of signing off on a BST or a PSR case note indicates that that person doesn't have the type of license that could bill without the licensed QMHP signing off on that note. So, the service can't even be provided within the agency unless there's proper QMHP supervision, the writing of the note, and putting the note forward for billing.
- Jenny: I'm going to bring up something just a hair different here. Now I know both of these owners are 50/50 on the business, which that's where the buck stops. Ms. Smithson didn't sign off on notes. I'm not saying that she doesn't hold some responsibility here as a business owner. Just recognizing that's slightly different between the two providers here, if that makes a difference.
- Steve: I think that the word negligence is in play for both folks on this. They are the licensed providers that are authorizing the diagnoses and as we had said earlier today, they are not light diagnoses. Gender dysphoria and oppositional defiant disorder are very significant diagnoses with vulnerable populations of children, for example. And in my opinion, it is negligent to not have consistent, but incredibly diligent attention paid to all of the services and seemingly that didn't happen.
- Sheldon: I'm in agreement with Steve.

- Motion that alleged violation of law number four has been proven: 1st Steve, 2nd Lauri: No abstentions; Motion passed unanimously.
- Jennifer: Count five allegations contained in paragraphs one through eighteen are hereby incorporated as if fully set forth herein. The conduct violated NAC 641A.243 (5), stating that a marriage and family therapist, clinical professional counselor or intern shall not give or receive directly or indirectly a fee, commission, rebate or other compensation for professional services that he or she has not actually and personally provided. Do we believe based on the evidence we have that this has occurred?
- Jenny: Dr. Ross, you asked a really great question today to get clarification on the fee structure, which I think was helpful. What I heard in the testimony is that there was an audit and Medicaid, and the providers did work together to address any of the billing issues or mistakes. So, I'm not sure. I need some discussion on whether or not, I don't know if we have shown this count.
- Jennifer: I'm also considering that even though the flow of funding came through the agency, that our respondents, according to the testimony, didn't take a cut or get compensated, that it then flowed directly back to the provider at a rate of 100%.
- Steve: I hear, and I agree with everything up to that point. The respondents also acknowledge that the 1099 contractors pay them space rent. So, there is, in my estimation, indirect compensation if they are referring these services that they have to sign, diagnose, and undersign for billing purposes, even if they're giving 100% of the compensation to those contractors, in turn, then the contractors are charged money for rent. So, there is money coming back from services that they're providing. It is not as simple as a landlord and tenant relationship. There is a business being sent to the 1099 contractors and in return, there's rent being paid for place of service.
- John: I am wondering if I'm missing something because in these type 14 agencies, there's always a clinical director and that's the QMHP who signs off and typically they're paid not per case or per signing or a percentage of the billing coming in, but a flat monthly rate for performing those functions. I'm not sure that this paying the rent for example, that's a flat fee regardless of what the billing is. But over time, if they're not making money, they're not going to continue. So, I'm not sure that I share your same hesitation.
- Jennifer: In thinking about the way that most businesses run, if you have a contractor that's recouping a hundred percent of their billable services, then a company has a hard time continuing to be a company. So, then the assumption would be that, rent at whatever rate that was, but that there is some financial gain from the agency, right, or for the agency rather through that process of billing.
- Steve: Mr. Feeley, can you please help remind us of a working understanding for preponderance of evidence in making decisions?
- Matthew Feeley: Basically, that it's more likely that it happened, then that it didn't. It's not like in a criminal case where we are asked to be beyond a reasonable doubt, just simply more likely that one thing is true than the other.

- Jennifer: So, given that a sum of around \$19,000.00 in billable services that were recouped by Medicaid then one would assume that in Medicaid's eyes there was compensation for services that had not been adequately substantiated? Is my thinking accurate on that one?
- Steve: I believe that directly and indirectly that it's more likely than not that there was compensation for services that they were not personally providing.
- Motion that alleged violation of law number five has been proven: 1<sup>st</sup> Steve, 2nd Sheldon: Jenny opposes, No abstentions; Motion passed.
- Jennifer: So, for count six allegations contained in paragraphs one through twenty-one are hereby incorporated as a fully set forth herein. This conduct violated NAC 641A.243 (11), stating that a marriage and family therapist, clinical professional counselor or intern shall critically examine and keep current with emergent knowledge relevant to the counseling as applicable, including without limitation adherence to national professional standards relating to telehealth. Do we have a preponderance of evidence to suggest that this count has been met?
- Jenny: I remember in one of our previous Medicaid cases, I had a question about this, and it was helpful to have, it explained to me that telehealth also meant our billing, electronic billing practices. So that gave me clarity to be able to say that I think count six was proven because the records and billing is all done through electronic means.
- John: I would see it differently from a HIPAA standpoint, in terms of what HIPAA law covers, that's true, but in the context of our statutes and code telehealth refers to the provision of therapeutic services within our scope of practice through telephonic or other electronic means. So, I don't see that the same way.
- Jennifer: I think these are all really helpful considerations and I want to bring us back to the question of, with all of this in mind, what is the current and emergent knowledge that we're focused on that may or may not have been critically examined by the respondents, right? If this count is looking specifically at whether or not the respondents were operating under current and emergent knowledge regarding the field, that's where I'm, I'm trying to identify something.
- Steve: This count six isn't only about telehealth. Telehealth is added in to this statute, so it's to include telehealth as it's ascribed to that latter statute. The statute that we, I think really is in play and we get to consider is NAC 641A.243 subsection 11 about the MFTs responsibility to critically examine and keep current with knowledge relevant to counseling as it would apply to diagnosing, supervising, auditing, collecting, reimbursement, auditing that, and in the cases of seeking consultation with sources that weren't the effective sources of information that didn't happen. And I'm still stuck on the fact that they didn't consult with the Board office, and they didn't consult with the American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy with their code. And so, I think that it is negligent, I won't say that it was intentional, but that it's negligent that they didn't even try to cite their own organization or code of ethics. That's really what they're governed by.
- Jennifer: So, the argument there, if I'm hearing you right, Dr. Nicholas, is that the current and emergent knowledge that you're also considering the source of the knowledge, the source of the consultation and sort of the accuracy of the information.

- Sara: I think they did consult with peers, but unfortunately, they didn't go beyond that. And I think when you have an agency or a group practice, you need to go beyond your normal peer consult groups.
- Jenny: Especially outside of your business, given that you're both 100% invested and involved to go beyond that. There are some resources, and I feel pained actually today that we're here talking about this because I think it would be so different if the box, the check mark on the attestation was checked. Yes, and we were coming back to review together what happened then the steps taken to remediate. I think this would be a different discussion too. So, in light of that, there were opportunities for a call to the Board for consultation outside of the business. That's problematic and it does speak to this count.
- Motion that alleged violation of law number six has been proven: 1st Steve, 2nd Sheldon: No abstentions; Motion passed unanimously.
- Jennifer: Moving on to count seven. Allegations contained in paragraphs one through 24 hereby incorporated as if fully set forth herein the conduct violated NAC 641A.243 (15), stating that a marriage and family therapist, clinical professional counselor or intern shall comply with the provisions of this chapter and chapter 641A of NRS and all other applicable federal laws and regulations. What needs to be said about count seven?
- Steve: I think this is almost a summary count of the four mentioned that we have found that they did not comply with the provisions of the chapter.
- Jennifer: That's my take as well.
- John: Agreed. It's kind of like when you have specific findings within the chapter, then that triggers automatically, this one as well. The way the code's written.
- Motion that alleged violation of law number seven has been proven: 1st Jenny, 2nd Lauri: No abstentions; Motion passed unanimously.
- Jennifer: Count eight. The allegations contained in paragraphs one through twenty-seven are hereby incorporated as a fully set forth herein. The conduct violated NAC 641A.243 (17a), stating that an MFT, CPC or intern shall notify the Board in writing within 10 days after an action is taken against any license, certification, registration, or other credential held by the licensee. This I think has been one of the biggest items in question when we think about testimony and perspective from Ms. Beggs. So, I am very curious to hear what members of the board are thinking about this one.
- Steve: I think registration is implied, therefore it's more likely true than not. There is a credential with Medicaid as there would be with any other MCO and it's been noted that they did not notify the board within 10 days even as an inquiry of seeking guidance.
- Jennifer: Our precedent would show that in similar cases we have determined sanctions by Medicaid or Department of Healthcare Financing and Policy to be part of the required reporting activities. That's just based on votes that I've been a part of.

- Jenny: All of the hearings that I've been involved in have indeed accepted and had an understanding that Medicaid is a government agency under the Department of Health and Human Services and that's the precedent that we've used, and I will follow that today.
- Motion that alleged violation of law number eight has been proven: 1st Lauri, 2nd Sara: No abstentions; Motion passed unanimously.
- Jennifer: Moving on to count nine, which gets us into our AAMFT Code of Ethics that is governed by NAC 641A.252, item four. So, looking specifically at AAMFT Code of Ethics standard three, section 3.20 stating that a marriage and family therapist pursue appropriate consultation and training to ensure adequate knowledge of and adherence to applicable laws, ethics and professional standards. And let's see, standard 8.4 that marriage and family therapists represent facts truthful to clients, third party payers and supervisees regarding services rendered. So, we have two separate codes applicable under count nine.
- Jenny: I really love that our professional liability insurances all do provide consultation lines and that's a service that's offered and I know that was one of the questions that came up and although there wasn't clarity in the answer, I think I would've personally opted to pursue that a little further. Just if there was any question that would've been a great resource, that's a great consultation line. And then we have really wonderful Board staff and office that take questions and calls, and a lot of our licensed interns call and ask Joelle for guidance when they're answering questions. I know the opportunity was there and available and although there was consultation sought, I don't think it went far enough in such an important and big move such as this.
- John: I think that the idea of seeking consultation is not simply within peers who are stakeholders, but really those who have no stakeholders so they can give you objective perspectives and avoid group think. I do think in terms of the two ethical standards cited here in this count, I don't think we need to separate them. Number one, seeking consultation is something that has been made clear as a result of today's case, but number two has been already determined by Medicaid, I think in terms of their process.
- Sheldon: I think that just moving forward, know we are a supportive Board, and our staff is as well, so I think it is very important to keep that in mind.
- Motion that alleged violation of law number nine has been proven: 1st Sheldon, 2nd Lauri: No abstentions; Motion passed unanimously.
- Jennifer: Count nine has been met. So, at this point, given that all nine counts have been voted on in the affirmative, it seems to me that our next step would be regarding the disciplinary action.
- Lyn Beggs: Can I impose on you to do a high level summary again without the detail as to dates and stuff? I know it was a public reprimand, but would you mind going over it again.
- Henna: I can go through it again. Of course. So, a public reprimand for each and them. For Ms. Rasmussen, recovery of reasonable attorney's fees and board costs, which include the court reporter that we have here today, in the amount of \$2,968.06 cents in attorney's fees as of yesterday, plus attorney's fees and costs recruited today and in future preparation of the order pursuant to NRS 622.400 at the rate of \$157.04 per hour for attorney's fees and also an administrative fine of \$500. The attorney's fees and costs also include my costs as well as Board

counsel's costs. For Ms. Smithson, recovery of reasonable attorney's fees and Board costs, which include the court reporter fees in the amount of \$3,015.17 as of yesterday, plus attorney's fees and costs accrued today and in future preparation of the order and also an administrative fine of \$500. The attorney's fees and costs will include myself and Mr. Feeley.

- Both Ms. Rasmussen and Smithson may pay the above stated fees by way of payment plan prepared by the Board on the condition that the payment plan is set up with the Board within 45 days from the date of the order, which goes in effect today. The fine and attorney's fees would become due within one year of this order. The Board shall report any actions taken today to the NPDB reporting bank and any national data bank that is required by law. Both respondents' marriage and family therapist license shall be placed on probation for one year and during the term of probation, the respondent respondents shall maintain their marriage and family therapy licenses during the stationary period and complete 15 hours, for each of them, of Board approved interactive continuing education courses and ethics and ethical billing practices. These courses cannot be used towards continuing education requirements already required for continued licensure as a marriage and family therapist by the Board.
- Lyn Beggs: Thank you. And we're assuming that there would be an itemization of the costs as under NRS 622.
- Henna: Correct.
- Lyn Beggs: Thank you. I appreciate that. With that Board members, I would submit to the Board in regard to the discipline today.
- Jennifer: Board, this is not unlike what we have seen before us in the past and so typically points of discussion that we land on are with regard to length of time in probation and CEUs seem to be the things that we discussed. As a point of clarification, can I ask Joelle, are either of our respondents approved supervisors with our Board and if so, does this impact the supervision credential?
- Joelle: They are not supervisors.
- Sara: I'm okay with some of these CEUs being non-interactive. Sometimes I find being able to rewind training and go back to it, it's been very invaluable for me.
- John: I don't see the need for us to specify. I think we could even say to include interactive that could be really limited that way, but I'm not going to fight for that. I don't think we need to specify the way that it gets, the way that it gets done. I would rather that the hours be more specifically dealing with the kinds of issues that came up that created the problems rather than something that's broader because it meets a contact method criterion.
- Sheldon: I also feel like just a broader option that focuses on those specific areas. I think I don't want to limit that if we were to say such amount of hours for in-person. So, I'm with John on that.
- Jennifer: Let me see if I can summarize. We've got an attorney's fees for Ms. Rasmussen in the amount of \$2,968.06, plus fees incurred from today and document prep at the rate of \$157.04 per hour with a \$500 administrative fine. For Ms. Smithson, we've got attorney's fees of \$3,015.17 plus the additional attorney's fees and court reporter fees accrued today at the rate of \$157.04 per hour plus the \$500 administrative fine. I didn't hear any issue with setting up a payment plan. I believe



the stipulation was payment would be made within a year. We have 15 hours of continuing education above and beyond those required focused on ethics and ethical billing practices to include some level of interactive learning and one-year probationary status. Does that sound correct?

- Motion to accept the stated disciplinary action for Ms. Smithson and Ms. Rasmussen: 1<sup>st</sup> Marta, 2<sup>nd</sup> Lauri: No abstentions; Motion passed unanimously.
4. Board consideration of Consent Decree in the matter of Geralynn Goddard, Case No. NV20MFT008 (For discussion/possible action)
- Henna: You may deliberate with each other and discuss the four corners of the document only and I can answer any questions regarding the document. We have Ms. Goddard's attorney here too.
  - Motion to edit and change the proposed consent decree: 1<sup>st</sup> Steve, 2<sup>nd</sup> Jenny: No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
5. Hearing in the Matter of Terri Jackson, Case No. NV23CPC008, to determine whether or not she is in violation of the terms of her Consent Decree (For possible action)
- Stephanie: The licensee actually was on the call several hours ago and now she's not. So, I have correspondence from her as well. So, I will go through each of these things with you to kind of get you to where you can make your decision. So, if you look at your supporting documentation under agenda item number six. Number one is the original consent decree that the Board reviewed and signed and went into effect for Ms. Jackson. Then we have number two. This is exactly what is sent out to anyone who has a Board order or a consent decree. It comes from me; I'm the Compliance Manager. I send an email outlining all the terms and conditions for them again and letting them know who they need to contact. So, this was sent to Ms. Jackson following the signing of her consent decree. That's two and three actually. Now number four is the supervision plan that was submitted. Now I'm going to have you jump to number five but go to the very end. The very last page is email conversations between myself and Morgan Underwood, who was the supervisor that was the signature on the supervision plan. So, I'll let you review the conversation that took place.
  - Jenny: I'll just kick off since I'm already talking to say that I believe we were reasonable in the consent decree and created a very clear path forward and an opportunity to remedy and correct problems. And it looks like this person didn't follow through and might've even been a little sneaky or deceptive in their documentation. And that doesn't leave me with a good feeling of goodwill. I think there need to be some consequences to that.
  - Stephanie: So, the intern was on the call and had the intention to make herself available for Board questions, which sometimes is important. She emailed and said that she had to drop the call. She was on a plane, and I asked her if it was okay if I shared the narrative that she sent by email. But the Board can make a decision, if you would like, to continue this until you can get her in front of you all to ask questions.
  - Jennifer: I see a supervision plan dated October 31, 2024, with an email exchange that said they hadn't met to discuss and agree upon a supervision relationship until November 6, 2024.

- Stephanie: When I read it the supervision plan, it didn't sit with me. It looked like a general supervision contract. I realized that the supervisor signing this was not her supervisor of record, so I reached out to her and her understanding of it was that they were going to enter into a supervisory relationship. So, this was presented as the supervisory plan, and it was really just general supervision.
  - Jennifer: Had she submitted dissolution paperwork for that supervisory relationship or was there a period of time where there was no supervisor of record?
  - Joelle: No dissolution paperwork was submitted. Ms. Jackson's internship license is expired now due to lack of primary supervision because of the email I received from her supervisor of record stating that the intern had not been supervised since last May.
  - Stephanie: The date on the new contract was added by Ms. Jackson. The new supervisor had no idea that the contract was going to be submitted to the Board.
  - Jennifer: I am just thinking about at the time that she was presented with this decree, she had not been supervised for three or four months, didn't have a supervisor to create a detailed plan with, and somehow that was not communicated. We didn't find out about that until now that she's trying to submit the paperwork required by that consent decree. So that seems very negligent to me as well.
  - Motion finding Terri Jackson, Case No. NV23CPC008, is in violation of the terms of her Consent Decree: 1<sup>st</sup> Steve, 2<sup>nd</sup> Marta: No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
  - The board has found Ms. Jackson in violation of her Consent Decree and if she wants to reapply then we will be seeing her in a meeting.
6. Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding review and approval of minutes from the November 15, 2024, meeting (For possible action)
- Motion to approve minutes from the November 15<sup>th</sup> meeting: 1st Lauri, 2nd Jennifer; Jenny and Sheldon abstain; Motion approved.
7. 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
<b>Randi Charbonnet</b>	Yes	N/A	N/A
<b>Joshua Kalsbeek</b>	Yes	N/A	N/A
<b>A’Jah Love</b>	Yes	N/A	N/A
<b>Lisa Toms</b>	Yes	N/A	N/A
<b>Robert Soucy</b>	Yes	N/A	N/A
<b>Kaleigh Mancha</b>	Yes	N/A	N/A
<b>Camilla Dorand</b>	N/A	Yes	Yes
<b>Rodney Johnson</b>	N/A	Yes	Yes
<b>Kimberly Wood</b>	N/A	Yes	Yes

Motion to approve Randi Charbonnet, Joshua Kalsbeek, A’Jah Love, Robert Soucy, Camilla Dorand, Rodney Johnson, Kimberly Wood as Primary Supervisors: 1<sup>st</sup> Marta, 2<sup>nd</sup> John; No abstentions; Motion approved.

- Motion to approve Lisa Toms as a Primary Supervisor: 1<sup>st</sup> Jenny, 2<sup>nd</sup> Jennifer; Sara abstains; Motion approved.
- Motion to approve Kaleigh Mantra as a Primary Supervisor: 1<sup>st</sup> Marta, 2<sup>nd</sup> Sara; Sheldon abstains; Motion approved.

8. Disciplinary Matter – Recommendation for Dismissal (For possible action)

- a. Case No. NV21CPC005
- b. Case No. NV21MFT006

- Motion to dismiss case numbers NV21CPC005 and NV21MFT006: 1<sup>st</sup> Jenny, 2<sup>nd</sup> John: No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.

9. Review, discussion, and possible action for approval of the Numbers, Inc. Bookkeeping contract (For discussion/possible action) – Joelle McNutt

- Joelle: This is a renewal of Carol’s contract. She has been our bookkeeper since 2021. She is increasing our fees monthly, which is about \$1000.00 per year. We can handle that cost.
- Motion to approve the Numbers, Inc. bookkeeping contract: 1<sup>st</sup> Marta, 2<sup>nd</sup> Sheldon: No abstentions; Motion approved.

10. 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

- Joelle: We had no material weaknesses, no findings. It was just great. We had a great audit.
- Motion to approve the audited financial statements for the fiscal year-end June 30, 2024: 1<sup>st</sup> Lauri, 2<sup>nd</sup> Sara: No abstentions; Motion approved.

11. Review, discussion, and possible action for the approval of a salary increase of 1.75% for Joelle McNutt to cover an increase in PERS contribution rates (For discussion/possible action) – Joelle McNutt
- Motion to approve a salary increase of 1.75% for Joelle McNutt to cover an increase in PERS contribution rates: 1<sup>st</sup> Lauri, 2<sup>nd</sup> John: No abstentions; Motion approved.
12. Review, discussion, and possible action to grant authority to the Executive Director to administratively approve Primary Supervisor applications (For discussion/possible action) – Sara Pelton
- Sara: I think it would be good for continuity of care. I've mentioned that earlier today that that's really important. A lot of our licensees graduate around December, so if we were able to grant Joelle administrative approval, I think that would get clients in the door a lot quicker and licenses issued.
  - Marta: I totally agree.
  - Motion to grant authority to the Executive Director to administratively approve Primary Supervisor applications: 1<sup>st</sup> Sara, 2<sup>nd</sup> Lauri: No abstentions; Motion approved.
13. Legislative Updates (Advisement)
- Joelle: I am happy to report that the CPCs will get a position on the proposed composite Board. The language wasn't published at the last meeting so I'm glad to give you an update on that. It was the right thing to do and I'm glad they understood where I was coming from with that.
14. Report from President (Advisement)
- Jennifer: I had an opportunity on December 4th to meet with Nikki and Kris along with the Board Chairs of the Drug and Alcohol Board, and the Nursing Board. They gave us an opportunity to ask some questions. They say no changes to the current scope of the Boards and no changes to licensing requirements. However, they don't have any ideas about what the backend process of that is going to look like. They did say that current Board members can apply to sit on the new Board. It will still be a Governor appointed position, and any of us who are still within our current term limit would be eligible to apply to be on that Board. So that was our meeting in a nutshell.
15. Report from Treasurer (Advisement)
- Lauri: Everything is checking out great. Of course, Joelle is keeping amazing books and there's nothing new to report. She's eased into our new rent, and we've changed all the forms to include powers now included in rent, things like that. So, I think we're on track. I'm proud to say that Joelle pulled the trigger and got them out of Y2K computers, and they should be processing things at light speed now. Lightning speed.
16. Report from Executive Director (Advisement)
- Joelle: Fiscal notes will go to the Office of Boards, Commissions and Councils Standards. We all, as individual Executive Directors, have been removed from that system. I am still waiting for the approval of our lobbyist contract through the Governor's Finance Office. I made some changes to the productivity spreadsheet to include delineations between interns whose applications don't go through because academics versus people where the Board decides not to move their application through. I'm really proud of the of my team and the Board staff.

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

- Henna: No report.

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

- Jennifer: The Nevada Heal program helps with tuition reimbursement and student loan forgiveness for health professionals. MFTs were not included in the definitions of the bill.
- Sara: I would like us to start reviewing our fees and see if we can make some reductions.
- Joelle: Friday, February 28, 2025, for our next meeting and hearings.

19. Board member comments

- Marta: I did see that MFTs were left off the list for the NV Heal program.

20. 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.

21. Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 4:43 PM.