Joe Lombardo, ***Governor***

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, FEBRUARY 20, 2026, 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 9:00 AM.

    - Board members present: Jennifer Ross, Jenny Stepp, Lauri Perdue (arrived at 9:04 AM), 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: Stacey Youngblood, Danielle Cady, Emilia Grissette, Daniel Giudici (Summit Government Affairs), Jaime Clemens, Keyahnah Anderson, Ashley Jacobson, Jennifer Leach

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 comments 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. Legislative Updates (Advisement)

   - Daniel Giudici: On February 3rd we received the second reprint of the new regulations from Business & Industry. I will keep everyone posted on any updates.

4. Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding review and approval of minutes from the January 16, 2025, workshop (For possible action)

   - Motion to approve minutes from the January 16th workshop: 1st Jenny, 2nd Marta; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.

5. Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding review and approval of minutes from the January 16, 2025, meeting (For possible action)

   - Motion to approve minutes from the January 16th meeting: 1st Sheldon, 2nd John; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.

6. Discussion and possible action regarding granting authority to a Board Member to represent the Board in the Nevada Supreme Court Settlement Program negotiations regarding Case Nos. NV23MFT011 & NV23MFT012 (Docket 91814) (For discussion/possible action)

   - Motion to grant authority to Jenny Stepp to represent the Board in the Nevada Supreme Court Settlement Program negotiations regarding Case Nos. NV23MFT011 & NV23MFT012 (Docket 91814): 1st Steve, 2nd Sara; Jenny abstains; Motion approved.

7. Review, discussion, and possible action to approve the Summit Government Affairs, Ltd. legislative services contract (For discussion/possible action) – Joelle McNutt

   - Joelle: I know that the Board expressed that you would like to continue the contract for legislative services last year. Since then, the name of the company has changed, and I wanted a recent vote to reflect the changes. Daniel and Mendy are still our people.

   - Daniel Giudici: We definitely want to continue working with the Board. We have a great working relationship. We changed the name of the firm and waited until the session was over last year to officially do so.

   - Motion to approve the Summit Government Affairs, Ltd. legislative services contract: 1st Lauri, 2nd Sara: No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.

8. Review, discussion, and possible action regarding review of financial statements 2nd Quarter FY26 ending December 31, 2025 (For discussion/possible action) – Joelle McNutt

- Motion to approve the financial statements for 2nd Quarter FY26 ending December 31, 2025: 1st Lauri, 2nd Sheldon; No abstentions; Motion approved unanimously.

9. Review, discussion, and possible action regarding regulation change language, including, but not limited to: (For discussion/possible action)

    - NAC 641A.182

        - Steve: Does the current language still say, “currently holds an AAMFT or ACS”?

        - Joelle: Yes.

        - Steve: I believe that implies that people have to renew the credential, if it says currently holds.

        - John: Can we just add the word maintains?

        - Joelle: Yes, we could.

        - Steve: The original conversation pertaining to folks who get their supervisory qualification through graduate studies, because there is no maintenance involved with that. So, the three standards of AAMFT, ACS or graduate credit, two out of the three require currently hold and maintain. The educational course does not have any ability to maintain that because it's not exactly an AAMFT or ACS qualification.

        - Sara: I think the maintenance can be included as part of our required supervisor ethics. So maybe that could solve for that.

        - Jennifer: I think that there is a way to maintain the pathway while increasing the requirements so that the requirements are commensurate with the two national pathways without requiring people to then pay additional fees to an outside entity in order to become supervisors. So, for example, if we increased the 25 hours to 100 hours, that would bring them to what ACS requires, even though it's still shy of the 180 that AAMFT requires.

        - John: I agree. So those that have the education not through the national credential, and then we require a continuing education commensurate with the number of hours that NBCC or that AAMFT would require for maintenance of that credential. That's the equivalent. So, I think that would be equitable.

        - Marta: I think I need a little more clarification because when I take my AAMFT renewal for supervision, I'm taking that once every five years. And during that time, I may or may not be in a renewal cycle, but I still often need to take the two supervision CEUs. So, I'm really getting even more.

        - Steve: I think for the maintenance of currently holding the qualification, there is a minimum standard, and ACS has the highest standard so far out of the three. But because of our Nevada Board regulations, all three have a basic standard of equivalency, of maintaining the qualification. In my opinion right now, we don't need

to touch the recertification hours because they're embedded in our law even for the graduate courses. And they just happened to hit it with the other two licenses as well. What I think we currently have a discrepancy between the three pathways is the mentorship hours. Those could be vastly different. What does anybody else see for the work here?

    - Sara: Just to clarify, Steve, so you're not recommending increasing state CEUs to maintain supervision?
    - Steve: I don't think we need to. I think that the same standard of two every renewal period applies to all three pathways. But now we're left with a discrepancy in the mentorship hours that are required for the three pathways.
    - Jennifer: I appreciate the spirit from which that particular regulation came from. I think that 25 hours is egregiously low.
    - Steve: What is the mentorship requirement for ACS?
    - Jennifer: 100 hours.
    - Steve: What are the thoughts about bringing the graduate course requirement up to 100 from 25?
    - Jennifer: I think that is appropriate.
    - Sheldon: I agree.

- NAC 641A.105
    - Jennifer: We are moving on to application fees for supervisors.
    - Sara: Can you remind me how much the exam is going to be?
    - Joelle: $100.00 that goes to the testing company.
    - Marta: We are really getting a good deal from our Board office. Thank you, Joelle and the staff, because I know how much time you guys put into the primary and secondary supervisors.
    - Steve: Is that a one-time fee or is it every two years?
    - Joelle: It’s a one-time fee.
    - Jennifer: I am curious if there is any appetite at all with the Board as we move into future legislative sessions looking at creating a supervision license.
    - Steve: So, we currently have the authority and scope to revoke a supervisory status, correct?

- Joelle: Yes. NAC 641A.182 (5) says the Board may periodically review the qualifications or performance of an approved supervisor for compliance with the provisions of this section and the standards of supervision set forth in the publications adopted by reference. If a person is not adhering to the ethical standards of supervision, then it is a complaint against both clinical license and their supervisory status.

- Jennifer: I am wondering what are the pros and cons and is there more than just a financial gain or benefit to having it be its own credential? It sounds like it really is just money at that point because if we revoke somebody's supervision status, it's still an infraction on the license. It would still go into the national reporting database. So, all of that. So, I think what I'm hearing is it's just an additional fee to do that.

- Sara: There's always going to be cracks in my opinion, but I think Joelle gave us a number on the discipline of interns, which really puts me at peace. She told us it was less than 1%. I think we all are doing a really great job and I'm glad for us closing any loopholes that we can think of, but they'll always be cracks. If I could talk more about the fee part for the application for the supervisors, it really is less fact and numbers than feeling because we're adding a hundred dollars. I know the Board doesn't get that money. That's for jurisprudence. But the feeling is I think supervisors are talking among themselves about no longer supervising because of increased regulation. And we have plenty of supervisors right now. I don't want to lose any, I want to make sure that they know that we still appreciate them. I'm thinking we should still reduce that application fee maybe even by $25.

- Jennifer: What you're saying makes a lot of sense to me. And also on the intern side, it's like supervisor shopping season. We can't regulate the charges, but it's very cheap to become a supervisor. We have supervisors who are making gobs of money off of the supervision that they're providing. I know that doesn't apply to everybody, but we have some supervisors who are making very good money off of their interns. So, I can see reducing the fee, and I can also see paying for the privilege to do the work. So, as I'm understanding it, is it truly the difference of a one-time $25 that is stopping people from wanting to be a supervisor?

- Sara: I want to make sure we keep our available supervisor numbers up for those options.

- Marta: I am very comfortable keeping it at $75.00.

- Lauri: It seems like $75.00 is very reasonable.

- Sheldon: I have a lot of feelings around what I am hearing in terms of what supervisors are charging. It's not right. I'm fine with keeping the application fee the same.

- NAC 641A.131

  - Jennifer: We started talking about do we want to touch the supervisory CEUs for people who took a course approval? So, Dr. Nicholas, you made the point that folks

who were coming in through other routes are sort of naturally going to meet the minimum requirement because they're doing what they need to do for their national certification. What happens, for example, if I got my AAMFT approval in 2014. I've been supervising for over 10 years. I have a doctorate degree in counselor education and supervision. Then I decide that I don't want to be friends with AAMFT anymore, if we change the language to obtain and maintain, then do I not get to be a supervisor anymore or do I have to reapply under another pathway?

- Steve: I think you wouldn't be maintaining it through AAMFT, but you would be maintaining it based on the CEU requirement for the state of Nevada, which is two every renewal period and therefore I think you're in compliance. You would meet the minimum standard. So, I think if we make a minimum standard of maintaining CEU requirement that's already met through ACS, it's mostly met through AAMFT and anybody who's not affiliating with AAMFT or ACS still has to hit the CE requirement.

- Jennifer: So, I think that defeats the purpose of requiring somebody to maintain their national certification.

- Steve: It does. They don't have to.

- Joelle: If we say maintain, then that means if they had it at the time of application, they no longer qualify. Right?

- Steve: But could they still qualify through the state of Nevada because they're hitting the minimum standards that are equivalent to people that didn't go through those associations. So, we need to write in what are the minimum standards to maintain once they've achieved it.

- John: So come in through the gateway that is credentialed, that requires a complete package that includes their work and they received supervision of supervision, the whole thing. And then from a maintenance standpoint then they have more options. That seems reasonable.

- Marta: Aspirationally, we would want people to maintain that professional credential but this way, everybody coming in would have a path and then with this, we maintain it all the same.

- John: We articulate those requirements because I think it also demonstrates our independence as a Board that we're not also supporting professional associations.

- Joelle: We could say, the minimum standard to maintain supervisory approval with the Board is completion of your mandated CEUs per NAC 641A.131. How does that sound?

- Steve: Sounds good to me.

10. Report from President (Advisement)

- Jennifer: No report.

11. Report from Treasurer (Advisement)

- Lauri: We are in a strong financial position as of today. We have three years in operating reserves, so we’ve got some flexibility and stability there.

- Steve: Does the state have any concerns about us carrying reserves?

- Lauri: There is no stipulated policy on what reserves should be and we are going to look into that.

- Steve: We essentially have been managed so well. Congratulations, you guys. It's amazing that perhaps the Board deserves the opportunity to improve upon any things or services that we have because we have the money to pay for it.

- John: So, in the past we've talked about the need to have certain reserves with regard to litigation, attorney fees, and disciplinary processes. One example of that is these consent decrees that were challenged and that are being forwarded. So, we need to have reserves sufficient for those kinds of things.

- Lauri: I think it's a great point, and I don't think we're egregiously over in reserves, but I do think we are well enough over that in good governance we should have some boundaries. So, I'll commit to working on that and doing some research with and bring some proposals back.

- Joelle: I guess since we're talking about it now, I think I'd like to put more money into travel. For example, AMFTRB does not offer a virtual option to attend their yearly state meeting. We pay membership dues to AMFTRB. AASCB has a conference and with the Counseling Compact, I would like the opportunity to attend those events.

- Sheldon: I have a couple of suggestions. The first is could we do a Board-sponsored workshop for the exam since we know that so many people are having a hard time passing. The other thing I wanted to propose was a Board retreat.

- Lauri: The last thing I wanted to add just for the group, we don't have to answer today though, is succession planning.

- Jenny: It sounds like you guys are talking about the MFT exam, and we are a Board that oversees MFTs and CPCs. I just want to think about equity. And then in the larger question, what is the Board's role in exam prep and passing? I hear all the concerns, and this comes up from interns, and I want to be sensitive to it. What's our jurisdiction? What's our role in that? So, I just want to put that out there for some brainstorming or discussion.

- John: On that issue too, we want to be careful in terms of a potential regulatory conflict of interest.

12. Report from Executive Director (Advisement)

- Joelle: Business & Industry sent a notification that our website needs to be migrated to a new platform, so I am working with the Governor’s Technology Office to coordinate that. I did update the phone system to include an option for questions about the Counseling Compact.

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

- Henna: No report.

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

- March 27, 2026, disciplinary hearing & regulation workshop
- May 22, 2026, potential regulation hearing & disciplinary hearing
- June 26, 2026, Board officer nominations & ED performance review

15. Board member comments

- No Board member 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)

- No public comment.

17. Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 11:23 AM.