



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

MEETING MINUTES
FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, 2026 at 9:00 AM

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 10:27 AM following the adjournment of the Workshop to Solicit Public Comments on Proposed Regulation.
 - Board members present: Jennifer Ross, Jenny Stepp, Lauri Perdue, Marta Wilson, John Nixon, Sheldon Jacobs, Steve Nicholas, Sara Pelton
 - Staff present: Joelle McNutt
 - Board Counsel present: Senior Deputy Attorney General Henna Rasul
 - Members of the public: Kimberly Landero, Nermeen Naguib, Abby Peddieson, Ashley Jacobson, Ashley Bloomberg, Cara Elliott, Nancy Hunterton, Kimberly Wood, Zanyaé Allen, Blaine Brixey, Bobbi Boyer, Carmen Neito, Christina Delosangeles, Courtney Lyons, Danielle Cady, Debbie Rasmussen, Diana Saunders, Elizabeth Dear, Emily James, Engelbert Mittermayr, Jamie Bartlett, Jana Wellman, Hilary Kolek, Janine Piller-Calhoun, Jennifer Vobis, Jessa Wagner, Jessica Miller, Jessica Goicoechea-Parise, Keyahnah Anderson, Kristin Kakiuchi, LaToya Wilkerson, Lori Kearse, Lourdes Calzada-Santacruz, Lydia Uren, Marci Hinchey, Michelle Blakeley, Charles Holt, Maria Mendez, Nancy Wilson, Nikita Noel-Smith, Brianna Marshall, Richard Vande Voort, Rita Hollinshed, Roberta Miranda, Robyn Davis, Sara Duerksen, Sharon Harris, Souneh Arevalo, Steven Barcia, Tabitha Johnson, Tamara Litinsky, Tamara Zenner, William Arndt, Youlanda Johnson, Toni Garguilo, Craig Merrill, Erik Schoen, Mailee Shaw, Ramona Beasley, Aaron Williams, Kimber Last, Kelilyn Waltenburg, Kendyll Farrington, Brittany Tuma, Charlotte Stephenson, Amanda Lyons, Irene Mascetti, Megan Evans,

Christopher Jones, Michael Esquejo, Jason Tonn, CASAT Learning, Elizabeth Carroll, Brandon Eddy, Carly Kramer

The Board welcomes public comment. 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. Consideration of Proposed Regulations Based Upon Comments Received at Public Workshop (For Possible Action)

- *The Board will consider additions, amendments, and/or repeal of regulations, taking into consideration comments from the public.*

- NAC 641A.178 paragraph 3 – addition that an approved supervisor must review or observe therapy sessions in addition to case presentation by an intern supervisee.
 - Jenny: I really appreciated all the public comments on this, and we got a lot. We all recognize that we did not put any specified amount of time on this. So, although there were some objections, I do think it's reasonable that we move forward with this. One thing I would consider is possibly considering this as a primary supervision tool. I feel like I could be flexible there, but again, that's coming from someone who is not a supervisor.
 - John: I wonder if one solution would be a minimum frequency per year, per quarter, something like that. So it doesn't become overwhelming.
 - Marta: I would support it being under the primary supervisor and not the secondary, as they are the ones holding the liability for the intern.
 - Jennifer: I'm comfortable with that. I think that is reasonable.
 - Steve: I'm comfortable with it being under the primary's responsibility. There was a note about potential fee increases, and that's not lost on me. There are supervisors out there that charge a lot of money, and I don't believe that is within this Board's realm of oversight to tell people how to run their business, as frown-worthy as it may or may not be. I think, at a bare minimum, primaries must be able to sign off and acknowledge that they have performed observations for supervisees. So I support that under the primary, and I'm definitely open to any language about frequency and duration.

- Jennifer: I love the idea of being able to give some guidance there. What I wonder is how the Board then regulate that it's happening?
- Steve: I think that it could be added to the six-month reporting form. How do we quantify this? So many hours? Just check the box if it was done.
- Joelle: That's an idea. You could say that observation needs to be done twice per year, by March and September. That would be consistent with intern reporting.
- Steve: So, a simple checkbox acknowledgement that observation of the supervisee's work has taken place.
- John: I like that because it doesn't add a burden of another tracking system. It's already built into the six-month reporting, and so it allows it for a floor of twice a year, which is very minimal.
- Steve: I think there's another issue that was brought up, and that was essentially the ethics of retention and destruction of training videos if they're using technology, if it wasn't live, there are training programs at the university levels that already have a lot of experience with this. It's in informed consent, essentially video or audio consents, and it articulates how those recordings will be stored and when they will be destroyed. So that shouldn't be a big climb either.
- Sara: I just took a supervision ethics course last month, and my biggest concern with this is safely storing these videos. There was a horror story in my training about an intern using the same computer as her husband, and there was a divorce situation, and this video was out of everybody's hands. So if you're not comfortable with video security and storage, do live observation through a HIPAA platform, please. Or get some training on how to store video.
- Marta: Are we thinking that audio would be the same as "eyes on" if we had an audio recording of the session?
- Joelle: It says audiotapes in the language.
- Sara: If your intern is billing sessions for insurance, I think there could be a conflict between whether this is part of the medical record now or for training purposes. So I also recommend just doing a live observation if it's an insurance-based client we're talking about here, too.
- Jenny: It was part of AB 366, which was from a couple of years ago now, and it was 641A, section XXX. We have in here that all recordings may be maintained for a minimum of one year from the date they were recorded and we have specified that it is for training purposes and not part of the healthcare record. I just wanted to bring that up.

- Joelle: That's a great idea. We could add language to say, "as prescribed in XXX". We could refer to that subsection.
 - Jennifer: I always have interns delete it once we're done watching it; we don't need it anymore at that point.
 - Jenny: There was a comment about what if I can't find clients who are open to recordings? So I just want to address that. In my experience, I recall presenting myself in a way when I was going through informed consent to bring that into the discussion. I thought clients were actually more open to it than not, but I just want to address this because it came up.
 - Sara: I think this will force some of us to get really creative on how we approach this. Reflecting teams during supervision is something that came to my mind if that becomes an issue.
 - John: Students who did their practicum in a training clinic, where, by virtue of being at the clinic, everything is recorded. The clients don't have a choice. Whereas students who are not used to being recorded in practicum may not have experience with this. It's all in the way it is presented.
 - Sheldon: I do think it comes down to how it is presented.
 - Jennifer: The question also came up about interns who are working in settings where the setting itself won't allow the recording. I'm wondering what the Board's thoughts are about that, whether it's like a licensed person on site can be a proxy to observe, or does it sort of come down to if a site doesn't allow for proper supervision, then maybe they're not a great site for interns?
 - Steve: The primary supervisor is still the ultimate responsible party here. So that is an opportunity for the primary supervisor to either get creative or hold some standards that this is still a level of practice that we need to meet. So we'll either have to think outside of the box or make the box work.
 - Jennifer: Like co-therapy and, in turn, getting to sit in with the supervisor with one of their clients and work through a case together.
- Motion to approve proposed language in NAC 641A.178 paragraph three to add that an approved primary supervisor must review or observe therapy sessions, once per reporting period, in addition to case presentation by an intern supervisee: 1st Steve, 2nd John; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
- NAC 641A.182 paragraph 3, subsection (a) – addition that an approved supervisor must hold a current single-state license in good standing in Nevada. Clinical Professional Counselors granted a privilege to practice through the Counseling Compact are not eligible.
 - Steve: I don't think that we had any dissenting opinions on this.

- Jennifer: Is there any additional discussion that we may have missed or any additional thoughts?
 - Joelle: I have a couple of additional thoughts because I answered questions about this. People are confused about what the term single-state meant.
 - Jenny: I like the statement in the description. People granted privilege to practice through the compact are not eligible.
 - Marta: I wonder if we should not identify the compact because if MFTs get a compact eventually, it might not be called a compact.
 - John: What if we say a Nevada-issued license?
 - Sara: What if we said that an approved supervisor must hold a Nevada license in good standing and then take out that last part issued by the Board?
- Motion to approve proposed language in NAC 641A.182 paragraph 3, subsection (a) to read that an approved supervisor must hold a Nevada license in good standing: 1st Sara, 2nd Lauri; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
 - NAC 641A.182 paragraph 3, subsection (b) – addition that an approved supervisor must be licensed for three years, in this state, or any state as a Marriage and Family Therapist or Clinical Professional Counselor.
 - Jennifer: The only changes from what we have is specifying the type of license.
 - Motion to approve proposed language in NAC 641A.182 paragraph 3, subsection (b) that an approved supervisor must be licensed for three years, in this state, or any state as a Marriage and Family Therapist or Clinical Professional Counselor: 1st Jenny, 2nd Sheldon; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
 - NAC 641A.182 paragraph 3, new subsection – addition that an approved supervisor must complete a jurisprudence examination.
 - Jenny: Can I speak to anybody out there who is really scared about more exams? What we chose was actually an open-book, open-notes format. The whole point was to get people's noses into our current statutes and to then demonstrate through a test that you cannot fail. That shows you are looking at our codes and you are familiarizing yourself, and hope you will be well-versed in them as you are supervising interns.
 - Marta: The exam is not more than an hour, right?
 - Joelle: I think the timeframe is going to be dependent on the person.
 - Steve: I believe it's an appropriate bar for new supervisors, especially in a world where we will have many potential supervisors outside of our state lines.

- Sheldon: Do you know when the construction of the exam will be complete?
 - Joelle: I did a final review of everything and sent it back to CCE earlier this month. The other consideration is that it would be \$75.00 to apply for primary supervision status, plus \$100.00 for the jurisprudence exam. So it becomes \$175.00 to become a primary supervisor.
- Motion to approve proposed language in NAC 641A.182 paragraph 3, adding a new subsection requiring that an approved supervisor must complete a jurisprudence examination: 1st Marta, 2nd Steve; Sara opposes, No abstentions; Motion approved.
 - NAC 641A.182 paragraph 4, subsection (a), number 1 – removes that a potential primary supervisor may complete training that consists of one graduate-level course relating to supervision.
 - Jennifer: If our concern was equity, then do we want to just create a pathway that has equity without doing away with the pathway? What I'm also hearing is that, we're requiring for me to keep my AAMFT designation, I have to maintain my membership with AAMFT, whether or not I'm getting other benefits from it. I don't know if that's still the case for the ACS certification.
 - John: You don't have to have an ACA membership maintained. You pay an annual maintenance fee to maintain the scores, and then every five years, provide your proof of continuing education. It's separate from membership in the professional organization.
 - Steve: To be a primary supervisor through those two roads, you have to do continuing education to recertify approximately every five years. If you take a graduate course and you get your supervisory qualification, there is no recertification requirement for that. So I believe this potential reg change intends to standardize the continual training of a supervisor. Somebody who gets their approval because they did a doctoral class or even a master's class, in some circumstances, there is no standard to maintain moving forward from that.
 - John: So, from an equivalence standpoint, then equanimity, we'd have to have track continue education ourselves for supervisors that is commensurate to what the equivalent of an ACS or AAMFT credential is, which can then be another nightmare. So if it's a true equivalent, then it has to meet the criteria without paying the maintenance fee, which is more of a burden on our part. One of the commenters said, "This is a freedom of association constitutional thing". I don't think that applies. It is a concern that you have to be a member of AAMFT in order to meet that.
 - Joelle: There have been MFTs who have an ACS certification.
 - John: So, given that there is that additional flexibility, I don't see any sort of conflict of forcing professional affiliation in order to have a professional credential.

- Jenny: I have been rethinking this. I was one of the people who thought maybe we don't need this pathway. There were some compelling arguments. I do appreciate that we have institutions of higher learning that have created training courses. So if we want to rethink this as an option, I think it would be very important that we add in a continuing education piece to the people who choose this route. That was the big issue for me: the people who go this route don't continue or aren't required to continue with their CEUs.
- Steve: CEUs beyond what is mandated by our Board for license renewal. So again, if somebody gets the college credit, they've got permanent permission to supervise moving forward. I think that's substandard and too loose. I think it was a really well-intended effort when this was first done, but after years of experience, I think that it's a slippery slope.
- Jennifer: This flows into the next item. I have never thought that 25 hours is sufficient. It doesn't even compare to what the other pathways are doing. For those of us who hold an AAMFT-approved supervisor status, or for those who are an approved clinical supervisor, how does the Board know if somebody allows their certification to lapse? If I didn't do my five-year renewal and just said, well, I'm an approved supervisor with Nevada, so I don't need that anymore. I know the regs say it, but I think that there is some confusion, and I imagine that there are a lot of folks out there who get it and then don't necessarily maintain it for whatever reason, cost probably being one of them.
- Steve: I think that they would be knowingly practicing negligently and that if they tripped up, if there was an ethical infraction, they would be found to be somewhat liable for that infraction.
- John: I think an easy way to do that is to add whatever documentation that supervisors maintain to Certemy or maybe indicate it on the six-month reporting form.
- Joelle: So I don't have a solution for that right now. I do know that there are people who have let things lapse, or what happens is they don't complete the candidacy. So they get approved as a Nevada primary supervisor, and they don't complete the mentorship to become an AAMFT-approved supervisor. Right now, it's the honor system.
- Steve: What we have in front of us right now is raising the bar because we have all these pathways, and the university class program doesn't meet that higher bar simply based on the continuing training or education. Once they're qualified, they're permanently qualified.
- Jennifer: The university class is your ticket into the ACS. That qualifies even though it doesn't for AAMFT.
- Sara: I just want to add, there is a doctoral program, pre-approved courses, route through AAMFT.

- Joelle: Do you want to mandate more hours of mentored supervision if it's the university route?
 - John: It's also just cleaner if we just go with the credentials of the ACS or the AAMFT approved, but also what we've been doing implicitly. I think trying to craft a single standard equivalent that's equivalent to each and pick one of the two can get a lot more complicated than we really want to get into.
 - Jennifer: I suspect that if this goes through, we will find that there are people who decided, whether intentionally or not, not maintain that credential. And so then do we have a path? Can we retain those supervisors in any other way or do we just lose a bunch of supervisors for a while because they have to go back through the processes prescribed by those two entities? Because then we've got a lot of primary interns who all of a sudden have lost their supervisor because they're no longer eligible through our regs. I think people may just choose to go a different route.
 - Steve: I think new supervisors would choose an alternative route. Now, back to the task at hand, one of those alternatives just qualifies through a university course without similar rigors or structures in place for mentorship, hours, and recertification.
 - Jennifer: It's the recertification that I think is the question, because we do have hours built in, not enough, I would argue, but the next one on the list is where the hours come in, right? So it's the university course plus the mentored supervision. So yeah, the certification process is where I think the equity question had come in from the beginning.
 - Steve: What's our opportunity to include something for the university folks, a recertification? Because again, I think it's problematic that once they're through, they're permanently through without any further work to do.
 - Joelle: We would have to pause this change, talk about what you all would like to see, and then do another workshop on that language.
 - Jennifer: AAMFT is six hours every five years, and then you pay to get the recertification.
 - John: I think for CCE, it is 20 hours every five years. We could do a hybrid between the two benchmarks or the lower of the two.
- Motion to deny proposed language in NAC 641A.182 paragraph 4, subsection (a), number 1, removing the requirement that a potential primary supervisor may complete training that consists of one graduate-level course relating to supervision: 1st Jenny, 2nd Lauri; Jennifer and John abstain; Motion approved.
- NAC 641A.182 paragraph 4, subsection (a), number 2 – removes that a potential primary supervisor must obtain at least 25 hours of mentored supervision.

- Motion to deny proposed language in NAC 641A.182 paragraph 4, subsection (a), number 2, removing the requirement that a potential primary supervisor must obtain at least 25 hours of mentored supervision: 1st Jenny, 2nd Sara; Jennifer and John abstain; Motion approved.
 - NAC 641A.182 paragraph 4, subsection (b), number 2 – removes National Board of Certified Counselors and adds the Center for Credentialing & Education, which is the correct certifying body.

- Motion to approve proposed language in NAC 641A.182 paragraph 4, subsection (b), number 2, removing National Board of Certified Counselors and adding the Center for Credentialing & Education, which is the correct certifying body: 1st Marta, 2nd John; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
 - NAC 641A.105 – addition of clarifying language regarding the collection of fees specifically for intern extensions, addition of the privilege to practice fee, decrease of the internship extension fee, increase of the license by endorsement application, and license issuance fees.
 - Joelle: I didn't see any written public comment on fees. One thing you might want to consider is the fee for an approved supervisor.
 - Sara: That is why I changed my vote. It is because of the fee for the jurisprudence exam and that they may have just paid \$600 to AAMFT to renew.
 - Steve: The \$100.00 goes straight to the testing place. \$75.00 according to our budget, we have the ability to reduce fees without really any problem. What does that do to that budget? Does it make too much of a dent in it? If we reduce that fee to \$50.00 or \$25.00.
 - Joelle: We could do that.
 - Steve: that is Board time that folks actually have to do stuff when somebody's putting in an application for that.
 - Sheldon: If you were to reduce the fee, what would that look like in terms of the budget? How much could we reduce where we would feel comfortable with the budget? Some of the discussion this morning was regarding the amount of fees and amount of money that interns and supervisors are paying. It's a lot. I agree with those sentiments, especially in the time where everything is expensive, everything has gone up. A lot of people are struggling, and here we are with the opportunity to maybe make things a little bit easier financially for many folks. I'm definitely in support of that.
 - Jennifer: I'm not opposed to reducing it. It's a one-time fee that covers essentially any work that the Board office does through the life of that status as opposed to for my LCADC supervisor, I have to pay for that every two

years to maintain it. So we're not asking our licensees to pay more than once for this. And so then I don't know if that weighs in at all to the work that you all are doing to monitor compliance. If we do introduce any sort of additional steps that would go to that accountability piece for supervisor status, I just want to make sure that the Board office has the support that they need for that.

- Sara: I have \$30.00 or \$50.00 in my head. Maybe \$40.00?
 - Jennifer: I also don't want to devalue what it means to become an approved supervisor.
 - Marta: I know that what Jen just said about \$75.00 for the life of that approval for that fee. I've used that \$75.00 up a long time ago as an approved supervisor calling the Board office and getting direction. I'm thinking I don't abuse the privilege of calling the Board office, but I definitely make use of it. So I'm not opposed to lowering it, but I think still \$75.00 is for the life of that approval.
 - Sara: I had no problem with the 75 until the addition of a hundred dollars for the jurisprudence exam.
- Motion to approve proposed language in NAC 641A.105 adding clarifying language regarding the collection of fees specifically for intern extensions, the addition of the privilege to practice fee, a decrease of the internship extension fee, increasing the fee for license by endorsement application, and license issuance fees: 1st Sheldon, 2nd Lauri; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
 - NAC 641A.105 new paragraph – addition of clarifying language regarding the collection of fees specifically for those affiliated with the military applying for privilege to practice through the Counseling Compact.
 - Motion to approve proposed language in NAC 641A.105 adding a new paragraph of clarifying language regarding the collection of fees specifically for those affiliated with the military applying for privilege to practice through the Counseling Compact: 1st Steve, 2nd Lauri; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
 - NAC 641A.131 paragraph 1, subsection (c) – modification of the number of continuing education hours related to cultural competency.
 - Jenny: As I recall, I think the opposition to this in written comment, I don't think they understood that we were just clarifying language.
 - Motion to approve proposed language in NAC 641A.131 paragraph 1, subsection (c) that modifies the number of continuing education hours related to cultural competency: 1st Jenny, 2nd Steve; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
 - NAC 641A.131 paragraph 2, subsections (a) through (c) – modification of the number of continuing education hours related to cultural competency.

- Motion to approve proposed language in NAC 641A.131 paragraph 2, subsections (a) through (c), that modifies the number of continuing education hours related to cultural competency: 1st Lauri, 2nd Marta; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
 - NAC 641A.131 paragraph 6 – removes the required length of time a person is licensed to request a waiver of continuing education requirements.
- Motion to approve proposed language in NAC 641A.131 paragraph 6, removing the required length of time a person is licensed to request a waiver of continuing education requirements: 1st Steve, 2nd John; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
 - NAC 641A.146 paragraph 1, subsection (c) – replaces the word renewal with extension.
- Motion to approve proposed language in NAC 641A.146 paragraph 1, subsection (c), replacing the word renewal with extension: 1st Sara, 2nd Marta; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
 - NAC 641A.146 paragraph 4 – replaces the word renewal with extension.
- Motion to approved proposed language in NAC 641A.146 paragraph 4, replacing the word renewal with extension: 1st Lauri, 2nd Jenny; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
 - NAC 641A.146 paragraph 5, new subsection – addition of required training hours for interns specifically relating to ethics, suicide, cultural competency, or HIPAA to be completed in the first twelve months of internship.
 - Steve: I didn't hear or read any dissenting thoughts about this, especially because we're balancing out the hours for internship and I think that licensed folks and supervisors think it's a pretty good idea.
 - Jennifer: The note that I made was just, well obviously cost considerations, which I think there are some reasonable options, but also just some procedural questions about what interns would be submitting. Would it be certificates? Is that an easy way to just track it?
 - Joelle: I mean my thought process was to just put another line item on the reporting form that they just say it was done. For those people that are past the twelve-month mark, I could leave it on there but then say if over twelve months does not apply. Would that be fine?
 - Steve: So the supervisor would sign off on those reporting forms versus interns using Certemy to track it?
 - Joelle: I could do either or both. I could put a workflow in Certemy to have them upload certificates, whatever you guys want.
 - Sara: Does the supervisor have access to Certemy?
 - Joelle: No.

- Sara: I would imagine the supervisors would want to track that themselves before signing off on the hours?
 - Steve: I agree on both.
 - Jennifer: What happens if it doesn't get done?
 - Joelle: Operationally how I would do this, now that it's in this required section, so if at final hours, they wouldn't be granted their full license without it.
- Motion to approve proposed language in NAC 641A.146 paragraph 5, adding a new subsection requiring training hours for interns specifically relating to ethics, suicide, cultural competency, or HIPAA to be completed in the first twelve months of internship: 1st Jenny, 2nd Lauri; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
 - NAC 641A.146 paragraph 5, subsection (d) – decrease of hours related to the practice of marriage and family therapy or clinical professional counseling.
 - Motion to approve proposed language in NAC 641A.146 paragraph 5, subsection (d), decreasing hours related to the practice of marriage and family therapy or clinical professional counseling: 1st Steve, 2nd Sheldon; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
 - NAC 641A.146 paragraph 5, subsection (d), subsubsection 5 – decrease the number of training hours.
 - Motion to approve proposed language in NAC 641A.146 paragraph 5, subsection (d), subsubsection 5, decreasing the number of training hours: 1st Steve, 2nd Jenny; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
 - NAC 641A.243 paragraph 17, subsection (a) – addition of language to professional responsibility that includes reporting of action taken against a provider agreement with a state or federal healthcare program.
 - Motion to approve proposed language in NAC 641A.243 paragraph 17, subsection (a), adding language to professional responsibility that includes reporting of action taken against a provider agreement with a state or federal healthcare program: 1st Steve, 2nd John; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
 - NAC 641A.243 paragraph 17, subsection (e) – addition of language to professional responsibility that includes reporting of a sanction, state or federal action.
 - Motion to approve proposed language in NAC 641A.243 paragraph 17, subsection (e), adding language to professional responsibility that includes reporting of a sanction, state or federal action: 1st Steve, 2nd John; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
4. Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding review and approval of minutes from the November 21, 2025, meeting (For possible action)

- Motion to approve minutes from the November 21st meeting: 1st Sheldon, 2nd Lauri; Sara abstains; Motion approved.
5. Board consideration of Consent Decree in the matter of Danna Fisher, Case No. NV21CPC002 (For discussion/possible action)
- Motion to approve the Consent Decree in the matter of Danna Fisher, Case No. NV21CPC002 as written: 1st Jenny, 2nd Lauri; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
6. Disciplinary Matter – Recommendation for Dismissal (For possible action)
- a. Case No. NV22MFT002
 - b. Case No. NV22CPC004
- Motion to dismiss Case Nos. NV22MFT002 & NV22CPC004: 1st Steve, 2nd Sheldon; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
7. Review/Decision regarding the following applicants who have petitioned the Board for approval of prior experience hours: (For possible action)

Applicant	Total Number of Hours	Prior Experience Form	State Verified Hours	Letter from Previous Supervisor
Christina Delosangeles	900	Yes	Yes	No

- Motion to approve prior experience hours for Christina Delosangeles: 1st Steve, 2nd Lauri; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
8. Review, discussion, and possible action for the approval of the audited financial statements for the fiscal year-end June 30, 2025 (For discussion/possible action) – Joelle McNutt
- Motion to approve the audited financial statements for the fiscal year end June 30, 2025: 1st Sara, 2nd Lauri; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.
9. Review, discussion, and possible action regarding review of financial statements 1st Quarter FY26 ending November 30, 2025 (For discussion/possible action) – Joelle McNutt
- This agenda item was stricken.
10. Report from President (Advisement)
- Jennifer: No report.
11. Report from Treasurer (Advisement)
- Lauri: We will go through and work those numbers for the primary supervisor applications for our next meeting.
12. Report from Executive Director (Advisement)
- Joelle: Renewal season just ended. We did hit budget. We had 2,993 people renew. We have:
 - 1,701 MFT

- 1,292 CPC
- 440 MFT-Intern
- 490 CPC-Intern
- 422 fully licensed people in expired status
- 80 fully licensed people in inactive status

I still have to reallocate funds in the budget so I will put that on the agenda for next month. If you look at the productivity spreadsheet, this is the highest number of applications that the office has processed. I'm also seeing a decrease in the number of academic reviews I have to do because both Grand Canyon University and University of Phoenix both received CACREP accreditation.

- Sheldon: I wanted to know if there is a way to quantify the demographics of the folks that are passing the exam versus those who are not.
- Joelle: I will check with AMFTRB on the data you are requesting.
- Steve: I'd be very interested in the pass/fail rates for both exams and the University programs they came from.
- Joelle: I can follow up on that as well.

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

- Henna: No report.

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

- Steve: We want to talk about supervisory training through university systems and the mentorship hours.
- Joelle: We will talk about supervisor application fees.
- Lauri: Joelle and I will do a thorough run-through of the budget to get that on record.
- Jenny: Confirming the next Board meeting is on February 20, 2026.

15. Board member comments

- No further comments.

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)

- Lori Kearse: I had some comments on the recording of sessions for supervision. There may be some difficulty in getting clients to agree to any type of video, especially in agencies with a large Hispanic population. I was also wondering why you have to be licensed for three years to become a supervisor. Where did that come from? In some other states, CEUs in confidentiality and ethics are required at the time of application for internship. I have some comments about passing the exam. For those groups that have a lower percentage of passing, I think there should be a decreased fee to re-take the exam.

- Richard Vande Voort: I just want to say how proud I am of the Board and of your dedication. I appreciate all of you.
- Aaron Williams: I just wanted to comment on the exam. It's not just academic, there are also things like dealing with emotions, anxiety and the way the exam is given. I offered a workshop on how to take the exam because I'm aware of those issues.
- Souneh Arevalo: I am in agreement with the jurisprudence exam. I think it really does make sure we stay current and aware.

17. Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned at 1:54 PM.