

**MEETING MINUTES FOR**  
**NEVADA STATE BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS**

**DATE OF MEETING:     Friday November 8, 2019**

**Time: 8:00 a.m.**

**University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 4505 S. Maryland Pkwy. System Computing Services, Room 102, Las Vegas, NV 89154  
and by video conference to University of Nevada, Reno System Computing Services room 5, Reno, Nevada 89557**

1. Call to order/roll call to determine the presence of a quorum.

Meeting called to order at 8:06 a.m.

In Reno:

Tony Papa, Board Secretary/ Treasurer

John Krogh, Board Member

Others Present:

Morgan Gleich, Executive Director

Brad Vincent, Executive Assistant

Neena Laxalt, Board Lobbyist

Sarah Bradley, DAG

In Las Vegas:

Whitney Owens, Board President

Michelle Paul, Board Member

Via Bluejeans:

Stephanie Holland, Board Member

Others Present:

Gary Lenkeit, Board Investigator

Adrianna Zimring

Amanda Devillez

Sean Dodge

Ed Guy

Yani Dickens

Sarah Ahmad

Matt Turner

Rachel Pinkerman

Christeen Silva

2. Public Comment.

No public Comment

3. Review, discuss, and possible approval of minutes from previous meetings: October 11, 2019

The Board reviewed the minutes as presented, Dr. Paul moved to approve minutes. Dr. Papa second. Board vote 5-0-0

4. Review, discuss, and possible approval of Treasurer's report for F/Y 2020 (July 1, 2019, through June 30, 2020);  
Review, discuss and update on a current biennial budget (July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2020).

Dr. Papa presented to the Board the updated Treasurer's Report, beginning by reviewing the expenses and income, as stated in the biennial budget. The Board operates on a biennial budget, and are about 68% through, and currently in good shape. While there are a few expenses that are over the budgeted amount, we are still within

our total budget. Dr. Papa stated that the Board conservatively predicted the income for the Board but have surpassed that goal.

In November, Dr. Papa and Director Gleich are going to evaluate the budget and the remainder of the biennium and see if any adjustments can be made. An updated report will be provided to the Board in December.

Dr. Owens, as the outgoing secretary/treasurer provide the Board with an update from Beth Farley, CPA of Eide Bailey regarding the Board's annual audit, stating that Ms. Farley noted there were some errors pointed out in the Balance Sheet, PERS calculation errors, and the need for proper training for both members and staff. Ms. Farley will attend the December meeting to provide an update and report to the Board.

Dr. Krogh moved to approve the treasurer's report. Dr. Paul, second. Board Vote 5-0-0.

- A. Recouping outstanding Legal Fees Owed to the Board from Disciplinary and Unlicensed Practice cases.

*Deferred until December meeting.*

**5. Review of consumer complaints pending.**

- A. Complaint #19-0514: Ms. Bradley is working with the attorney representing the psychologist in this matter. She has not sent an official letter, or settlement agreement as she tends to have informal agreements prior to the discussion of terms begins. Ms. Bradley will send a formal letter to the representing attorney for the complaint record.
- B. Complaint #19-0626: Dr. Young investigated the complaint and forwarded the report to the Board office and Ms. Bradley. Ms. Bradley provided the Board with the report. The investigation relates to Complaint #19-0709, but they are not explicitly connected. Dr. Young noted that the complaint is not retaliatory as it was filed with the Board first. Upon completion of the investigation, Dr. Young recommends forwarding the complaint to the Attorney General's office for further review, with her recommendations for action.

The Board was unable to vote, as Dr. Papa, Dr. Paul, and Dr. Holland had to recuse from the vote, eliminating the quorum of the Board. The Board office will present the information of the case at the December meeting, to continue this case.

- C. Complaint #19-0709: Dr. Young investigated the complaint and forwarded the report to the Board office and Ms. Bradley. Ms. Bradley provided the Board with the report. The investigation relates to Complaint #19-0626, but they are not explicitly connected. Dr. Young noted that the complaint is not retaliatory as it was filed with the Board prior to notification of complaint #19-0626. Upon completion of the investigation, Dr. Young recommends forwarding the complaint to the Attorney General's office for further review, with her recommendations for action.

Dr. Krogh moved to forward to Attorney General's office. Dr. Holland second. Board vote 3-0-2. Dr. Papa and Dr. Paul recused from the vote as they had knowledge of the facts of the complaint.

- D. Complaint #19-0826: Complaint dismissed at the previous Board meeting.
- E. Complaint #19-0923: Dr. Lenkeit is the reviewing investigator. In a review of the complaint, it was noted that the complaint was in multiple parts, and the psychologist had not responded to all parts. To complete the investigation, Dr. Lenkeit is requesting further information.
- F. Complaint #19-1011: Complaint incomplete, awaiting the response from the psychologist.
- G. Complaint #19-1023: Complaint incomplete, awaiting the response from the psychologist.

**6. Public Workshop regarding Language Development: 8:15 a.m.**

- a) Review of correspondence received regarding the language changes

The Board received written comment from two individuals, Amanda DeVillez submitted a letter explicitly noting that the Board shouldn't raise the Biennial fee, as compared to some of the 50 other states. The letter was also signed by 9 psychologists (Drs. Christine Moninghoff, Puja Jaitly, Leigh Kotkov, Carol Dubois-Chess, Paula Squitieri, Ampara Shannon, Jamie Lee-Farrimond, and Robert Kutner) and 1 psychological assistant, (Antrice Hronek).

Dr. Paul responded to the correspondence that compared the biennials of the other states. There are states like Oregon, New Mexico, and California; that are nearby with similar Biennial charges, \$780, \$600, and \$420, respectively. A similar review was completed by Director Gleich and presented to the sunset committee last year, whereupon review their recommendation was to raise the Board's fees to meet the needs of the licensees.

The Board received a written comment from Dr. Barbara Parry, stating that requiring a supervisee to be an employee could be detrimental to the private practice employee to provide supervision. Additionally, asking if the Board is going to demand a wage will the Board provide wage recommendations.

- b) Review and evaluate the next steps necessary in response to presented changes. The Board may choose to forward the suggested language changes forward to LCB for an r-number, forward to public hearing, or to hold for further changes and review.

- i. Increase of Biennial Fee

Dr. DeVillez noted that as stated in the treasurer's report, the Board finances are healthy and on track for improvement, what is the purpose of the increase.

Dr. Papa noted some of the income the Board is reporting currently shows some Behavior Analyst income, which he reminded the public was removed from the purview of the Board at the beginning of this year and placed under another Board. That with the loss of that income, the Board will not be in the same standing next cycle without adjustment.

Director Gleich continued that under the current budget, the Board is limited in what services and support it can provide without increased income, office staff, and Board programming are limited.

Dr. DeVillez continued by asking if the Board has evaluated other avenues of cutting costs and evaluating office procedural changes, i.e., reducing postage by no long utilizing snail mail and transitioning to email communications only, by modernizing the Board.

Dr. Owens noted that the Board is working to modernize the application process to limit some paper processes in the application process.

Dr. Krogh continued by noting there are some legal and procedural requirements for sending information via US Mail and certified mail over email.

Dr. Papa reminded the Board that online does not mean free, that even with the online application, there will be a hosting fee, and the expansion of Board emails has costs to the Board as well.

Dr. Paul continued by reminding the public that in developing the budget two- years ago in anticipation of the loss of the Behavior Analysts, the Board pulled back on many expenses. For the Board to run on a level that is necessary to serve the profession, i.e., review and evaluation of complaints, the Board currently employs two investigators who are paid at a reduced rate, to allow the complaint process to move much more efficiently and smoothly.

Additionally, the Board's expenses have increased over the years, with no raise in Biennial since 1997, working on a shoestring budget within a tight budget. While the law allows the fee to be raised to \$800, but that is to enable the Board to evaluate the needs and increase as necessary over the next 20 years. The Board is not interested in making money; however, they are interested in providing the service required to the licensees and in continuing to meet requirements of the state.

Dr. Paul reminded the Board that in states with lower fees like Utah and Colorado are under the auspices of an umbrella Board. By doing so sacrifices the independence of the profession, as well as the protection of the public.

Dr. Owens stated that as the Board is made up of psychologists, they will also be paying the increased Biennial costs, and are mindful of the increase as well. That with this requested increase, the Board is hoping to sustain off that for the foreseeable a future.

- ii. Introduction of registration fees for psychological trainee, psychological intern, and psychological assistant

The fees were introduced to the Board at the October meeting to be gradually increased as the registration levels become more independent and therefore make a more substantial stipend.

Director Gleich noted that since we have the final language for I and ii in R057-19, and if the Board has no changes that we can move forward to a public hearing.

Dr. Papa moves to send R057-19 to Public hearing. Dr. Krogh seconds Board vote 5-0-0.

- iii. Changes to NAC 641.152: Clarifying the statement that a psychological assistant should be an employee of their supervisor.

This language change is to clarify that psychological assistants and psychological interns are employees of their supervisor, or of the same agency that their supervisor is employed by. The goal of this change is to guarantee that registrants aren't taken advantage of.

Dr. Paul moved to forward language to LCB. Dr. Krogh second Board Vote 5-0-0.

- iv. Changes to NAC 641.154: Clarifying the language relating to wage requirements for psychological assistants, interns and trainees.

Dr. Zimring mentioned the language presented did not match her notes from the discussion held regarding the language in September. Director Gleich said it is input into the full language incorporating the R074-18 changes, but also that she developed the language packet by reviewing the minutes, that change was not recorded in the minutes, but can be made prior to submitting the language to LCB.

Dr. Dodge requested information from the Board if the Board has researched if other states provide regulation to this stance, that by requiring a fixed wage, it may be limiting the ability of private practitioners from providing supervisory services. That his understanding of the post-doctoral year is to prepare recent graduates for independent practice. That he supports this regulation as it relates to trainees and interns but feels for psychological assistants, this may be a bit micro-managing, on behalf of the Board.

Director Gleich mentioned that the Board has researched how other states regulate supervision of post-doctoral students, and it was observed through the responses received via the ASPPB listserv that the way Nevada controlled psychological assistants, is unique to Nevada. While many states don't require a post-doc year, others require it and all the supervision to take place without Board supervision.

Dr. Paul responded that the Board is not wage-setting with this regulation but stating that the registrant should be able to rely on a standard fixed wage, and hours worked. However, Dr. Paul said that in this format, she does not feel like the language precludes supervisors or employers from offering Bonuses for completing extra hours worked or specific special projects.

Dr. Papa mentioned that this change was spurred by conversations with psychological assistants, who were unable to rely on a wage, or receive the hours promised to make money under their supervision agreement

There was a discussion held regarding the format of supervision in other states, as well as other professions. That the goal should be for the supervisor to provide proper oversight and training.

Through the goals of these changes, the Board is attempting to provide a minimum requirement for the supervisors to contribute to the supervisees. Through the growing community, there have been some practices that are offering subpar training options, and these changes in iii and iv are to protect the registrants and the safety of the community.

Dr. Holland mentioned that while she supports and understands the focus on wages, but she also noted that it is the one hour required in the post-doctoral year enough to the training experience. That the Board should review this requirement in upcoming regulations changes.

Dr. Paul mentioned that by bringing up that conversation, the Board could discuss the need for the post-doctoral year/supervision. That in the past, the Board has agreed that upon graduation a student is not prepared for safe, independent practice but still required an additional year of training. That the one hour a week of supervision does not have to be the only supervision and should be provided to the student as necessary.

Dr. Papa mentioned that a more in-depth conversation related to this requirement might be necessary.

Dr. Paul moved to forward language to LCB. Dr. Krogh second Board vote 5-0-0.

- v. Changes to NAC 641.080: clarifying language relating to obtaining supervision hours in the scope of teaching in an accredited university

The language change was introduced at the October meeting, where through discussion, it was determined a minimum of hours of direct client service should be required as well. Upon review of the suggested change, Dr. Papa mentioned that the 25% percent requirement for direct client services is an increase of requirement for faculty, then for other psychological assistants. Dr. Paul said there are different specialties that could benefit from minimum direct care.

Dr. Krogh noted that the idea of this change, as well as the "direct client service" requirement, was to allow faculty members, and those persons who complete psychological research, to

count that towards their supervision towards licensure. However, the terminology “direct client care” may be more restrictive than initially determined by the Board.

The Board discussed if the requirement should be expanded to all psychological assistants, not just those in the university setting. Dr. Papa is noting that requiring if for all the registrants, may limit an already limited supervision pool.

Dr. Holland agreed to have the requirement, but possibly lowering the percentage to 15%. Dr. Papa is concerned that requiring this direct client/face to face time in supervision, invalidate accepted practices of the profession, (i.e., testing and consultation, forensic, and research, etc.) Dr. Krogh and Dr. Holland highlighted that as we provide a general license, it is essential that during the training period that all aspects of the profession should be taught and observed.

It was determined to move 2, to 1, and change the requirement from 25% to 15% as with would be a required for everyone, and the faculty requirement down to 2. Change “direct client care” to “face to face,” which includes telehealth.

Dr. Paul moved to forward to LCB. Dr. Krogh second. Board vote 5-0-0.

- vi. Introduction of language relating to Foreign Applicants, regarding evaluation and processing of applicants from outside the USA and Canada.

The language was introduced by the Board earlier this year, in response to legislation introduced during the 80<sup>th</sup> legislative session, to give a pathway for foreign-educated and non-us citizens a pathway to licensure. It is all newly proposed language.

Dr. Paul moved to forward language to LCB. Dr. Krogh second. Board vote 5-0-0.

- vii. Introduction of transfer of Medical Records if a professional becomes incapable of maintaining them.

This language was introduced by the Board and moved forwarded to the workshop in September. There was discussion regarding if this language could be utilized from temporary to a permanent closure of a practice. As the current statement, “discontinuation of practice” implies permanent closure.

Dr. Owens noted that the spirit of this language change was to make the professional aware that a custodian of record is required. That if for any purpose, your practice was to cease that there would be a custodian of records. This would allow the Board to assist a person if they would be unable to receive their records.

Director Gleich noted adding “temporary or permanent” after discontinuation of practice, to cover those individuals who may be away from their office for a period that plan to return.

Dr. Paul noted that ASPPB recently sent out “guideline for closing a psychological practice,” That possibly reviewing these guidelines along with this language could be helpful in developing this language.

Dr. Owens recommended to hold off on this language change, to allow for a Board member to review the ASPPB document and to evaluate it as it pertains to this change. Dr. Krogh volunteered to assess the guideline and the language change and report back to the Board.

- viii. Introduction of language clarifying certain requirements concerning licensure of persons engaged in teaching of psychology in accredited universities.

This language was initially introduced as R131-15, recently the LCB closed the change due to exceeding the two-year limit. Director Gleich provided the most recent version, as developed by the Board, in 2017.

Upon review, it was noted to remove the requirements as related to Behavior Analysts, psychological intern, and the effective date. This change is to clarify an existing NRS requirement.

Dr. Papa moved to forward language change to LCB. Dr. Holland second. Board vote 5-0-0.

**ACTION ITEMS: Director Gleich will schedule a public hearing to hear R057-19.**

**Director Gleich will forward iii, iv, v, vi, and viii to LCB for the development of language.**

**Dr. Krogh will review the “Guidelines for Closing a Psychological Practice” and evaluate the language change present in vii and present any necessary changes to the Board at a future meeting.**

7. Discussion with Board Lobbyist, Neena Laxalt, regarding current landscape regarding interfacing with the Governor’s office and Legislators, for the betterment of the practice and regulation of psychology.

Ms. Laxalt provided the Board an update related to the current landscape facing the Boards of Nevada.

1. Response by Executive Branch Audit Committee to the Audits completed through committee.  
The Governor, through the Audits initially requested by Governor Sandoval, evaluated all the professional Boards and found some inconsistencies that Governor Sisolak was not happy with. In dealing with the Dental Board, information regarding their Board policies and procedures was found to be outside of the norm and possibly unethical. The Governor expressed strong disappointment directly with the Dental Board and requested operations to be stalled to allow the audit to be completed. There is some evidence that the actions of the Dental Board could negatively impact the other Boards.

Governor has general concerns regarding the structure of the Boards. There have not been clear outlines provided to the Boards on how to respond. A possible solution is to consolidate Boards under Business and Industry, and mirror models of Utah or Colorado; to facilitate investigations, legal and licensing duties. In Ms. Laxalt’s opinion, she has noted as she represents Boards as well as associations that work with Boards, there is often little consistencies amongst the business operations of the Boards. Additionally, she’s noted that many of the Board’s issues come down to a lack of resources. While the Governor appoints positions, most of the direction the Boards take comes directly from the legislature.

It was noted that while there are concerns regarding the Boards, there has been no attempt to sit down and discuss these issues directly with the Boards.

Another concern of the Governor's was why do Boards have a need for a lobbyist. The need for a lobbyist for a Board is necessary for multiple reasons; the first being the speed at which the legislature moves, with the limited resources of the Board requesting an employee sit in the halls of the legislature to track changes and responses is nearly impossible. As well, often time the professions themselves disagree with one another and require additional assistance in responding to the testimony and concerns of the other Boards.

There will be another EBAC meeting in June, hopefully with an update on the cost of the transition, and who would be responsible for paying for the development.

2. SCR6, Senate Concurrent Resolution; from the 80<sup>th</sup> legislative session, establishing more consistency between the Boards.

This resolution was developed to evaluate the processes of all the Boards. To see where processes can be unified, as well as assessing what can be consolidated. Many of the things they are looking at are regarding the administrative abilities of the Board; Hearing officer operations are different amongst Boards, Board member Training is different, How they handle contracts, and employees, and Duplications of expenditures (legal, lobbying and IT), processing licensing applications, evaluating embezzlement and Fraud, evaluating fees. Items will be reviewed and

The issue regarding this evaluation was begun as specific Boards come to the Legislature and present that they are self-funded and should be allowed to be self-supervised. Which has caused concern for the legislatures on how other boards are acting.

Ms. Laxalt recommended what resources could be consolidated to allow you to save time and focus on completing the primary tasks of the Board.

3. Sunset Committee, the first meeting to be held for the committee, is January 2020. The sunset committee will be responsible for completing the evaluation of SCR6.

Dr. Owens requested how quickly will this begin to affect the Board's directly, and how will the Board need to react. Ms. Laxalt noted that to evaluate the Dental Board Audit and respond to inquiries as quickly as possible to be as transparent as possible. Additionally, she recommended focusing on Board member training and making sure that it is sufficient for protecting the public. Ms. Bradley noted that the Accountant's Board has offered to have a few of their members come to a training to show non-accountant Boards how to evaluate a financial statement and read them for the proper information, and why. Additionally, Ms. Bradley recommended requesting the Nevada Commission on Ethics present to the Board, on a Board Specific training.

Ms. Laxalt feels that through proper communication, these issues can be evaluated and responded to in a reasonable fashion.

#### 8. Update regarding Board Office Operations

- a. Review and update of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners Strategic Plan  
*Discussion deferred until December 13<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting.*

- b. Executive Director Report

*Discussion deferred until December 13<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting.*

1. Update regarding Board settlements and disciplinary orders.
2. Report regarding Board office operations
3. Update regarding Executive Director Professional Development.
4. Update regarding PSYPACT Commission
5. Status of request for Attorney General Opinion regarding NRS 641.390.

9. Update regarding the status of regulations submitted to LCB for changes to NAC 641.

- a) R133-17: Revises various provisions relating to the powers and duties of the Board; Discipline filings and Non-Resident Consultant: *Discussion deferred until December 13<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting.*
- b) R057-19: Fees: Moved under item 6 to send to Public Hearing
- c) R085-19: Endorsement Language: *Discussion deferred until December 13<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting.*

**10. Discussion of EPPP2.**

- a) Update regarding the status of implementation of EPPP2.

Dr. Matt Turner, Director of Examination Services for ASPPB, was able to provide the Board and the public with an overview of the history and purpose of the introduction of EPPP2 into the licensing requirements for the psychology profession. The EPPP1 is a knowledge-based exam, while EPPP2 will test knowledge or competencies. Ideally, establishing a universal standard of competence.

Dr. Turner continued laying out the plan for the implementation of the EPPP2. The Beta-testing period will be from January 1- May 31. There will be a blackout period to allow for the evaluation of the items and scoring of the exams. Testing will resume in June 2020.

- b) Discussion of how the implementation of EPPP2 will affect the Board office's current policies and procedures.

The Board decided last year to become an early adopter of the EPPP2. This means that with the opening of beta testing, the Board will require the exam for all new licensees that apply after January 1, 2020.

The Board discussed the options for how to handle the three types of licensee applications the Board will face in the upcoming year.

1. An application for licensure, by an individual who does not hold a license in another jurisdiction nor, has passed EPPP1.: It was determined this type of applicant would be required to take the EPPP2 to qualify for licensure in the state of Nevada.
2. An Application for licensure, by an individual who does not hold a license in another jurisdiction but has passed EPPP1: Director Gleich noted that ASPPB's current recommendation is to waive the requirement for EPPP2 for individuals who've passed the exam prior to December 31, 2019. Dr. Turner mentioned that this recommendation stems from the thought that the EPPP1 would be the final requirement for licensure in most jurisdictions.

Dr. Papa noted that if they are not licensed in another jurisdiction nor have, they made an application to by Board to apply for licensure before January 1, 2020, they should be required to complete the EPPP2.

3. An application for licensure, by an individual who has completed the EPPP1 and is licensed for less than 1 year in another jurisdiction. It was determined that no matter how long the person had been licensed in another jurisdiction, whether it be 10 days or 355 days, they would not be required to complete the EPPP2, by this Board.

- c) Necessary changes to Board office policy, procedures, and operations necessary prior to the implementation, during, and after the EPPP2 start date.

The Board discussed that through the introduction of EPPP2, the need for the state exam could be changed and streamlined to just a jurisprudence (law and ethics) exam. Additionally, during the Beta testing window, the Board has granted ASPPB the right to simplify the process and approve candidates for EPPP2 upon passage of EPPP1. This will cut out at least a week in the testing turnaround.

Additionally, Dr. Paul requested how the Board plans to handle the transferring of approval of EPPP1 to those individuals who are enrolled in a Nevada Doctoral program for early attempt, Director Gleich clarified with Dr. Papa and Dr. Paul, that it may be helpful to receive recommendations directly from the DCTs of each degree program for those individuals who will be ready to attempt the EPPP1.

**ACTION ITEMS:** Director Gleich will develop a statement that will be emailed to Licensees regarding the EPPP2 requirement for new licensees, to be shared with their supervisees. Dr. Papa will review prior to disbursement.

**11.** Schedule of a future Board meetings, hearings, and workshops. The Board may discuss and decide a future meeting dates, hearing dates, and workshop dates.

a) Schedule of New Board Member Training

**12.** Board needs, operations, and schedules.

a. Update/Report from Nevada Psychological Association Representative.

Discussion deferred until December 13<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting.

b. Update regarding Board membership

Discussion deferred until December 13<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting.

c. Review NAC/NRS in accordance to ASPPB Model Act

Discussion deferred until December 13<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting.

d. Need to begin utilizing NPDB query in Board office operations.

Discussion deferred until December 13<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting.

e. A future Board meeting agenda items

Discussion regarding the continued need for registering psychological assistants and requiring a post-doctoral year.

**13.** Review/decision upon applications for licensure or registration.

## **PSYCHOLOGISTS**

Carol Anderson: Discussion deferred until a a future meeting.

Julie Armstrong: Discussion deferred until a a future meeting.

Nora Baladerian: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

Beverly Barclay: Dr. Paul moved to approve for licensure, contingent on file completion and approval. Dr. Krogh second. Board Vote 5-0-0.

John Barona: Discussion deferred until a a future meeting.

Mary-Jo Bautista-Bohall: Discussion deferred until a a future meeting.

Monela Beroni: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

Erin Bigler: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

Cynthia Cameron: Discussion deferred until a a future meeting.

Sylvia Chang: Discussion deferred until a a future meeting.

Stacey Cherup-Leslie: Discussion deferred until a a future meeting.

Oral Custer: Discussion deferred until a a future meeting.

John Drozd: Dr. Paul moved to approve for licensure, contingent on file completion and approval. Dr. Krogh second. Board Vote 5-0-0.

Sarah Damas: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
James English: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Marie Ehrler Dr. Paul moved to approve for licensure, contingent on file completion and approval. Dr. Krogh second.  
Board Vote 5-0-0.  
Matthew Fanetti: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Suzana Flores: Dr. Holland moves to close the application at the applicant's request. Dr. Papa second Board vote 5-0-0  
Donna Greifer: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Kevin Greve: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Lindsey Hailston: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Helen Jackson: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Leah Jacobs: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Durrayah Khorakiwala: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Merry Larson: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Debbie Maddox: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
David McIntyre: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Marc McLaughlin: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Laura Neilsen: Dr. Paul moved to approve for licensure, contingent on file completion and approval. Dr. Krogh second.  
Board Vote 5-0-0.  
Pak Yan Ngai: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Anthony Petruzzello: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Erica Phillips: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Howard Reid: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Rosalinda Reyes: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Ronald Roberts: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Gabriella Santacruz: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Michael Scolatti: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
David Shoemaker: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Anne Stegenga: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Kristine Turner-Sherman: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Michael Villanueva: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Joyce Ulofoshio: Dr. Paul moved to approve for licensure, contingent on file completion and approval. Dr. Krogh second.  
Board Vote 5-0-0.  
Joshua Weiberg: Dr. Paul moved to approve for licensure, contingent on file completion and approval. Dr. Krogh second.  
Board Vote 5-0-0.  
Barbara Wells: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Sharon West: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Stephen Willis: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Donald Yorgason: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

### **PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSISTANTS**

Irina Abramians: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Danielle Agnello: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Zyra Alandy-dy: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Jose Arauz: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Carolina Alicea-Morales: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Heywood Barash: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Kathleen Beckman: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Natalie Bennett: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Andrea Bevan: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Jeremy Bissram: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

Jonathan Campos: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Leandrea Caver: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Lauren Chapple: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Melissa Depa: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Nicole Dionsio: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Alicia Doman: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Daphne Fowler: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Jennifer Grimes Vawters: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Centina Hernandez: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Andrew Hickman: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Bernadette Hinojos: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Antrice Hronek: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Katherine Isaza: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Sharlene Jeffers: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Casha Kaufer: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Corey Kuhn: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Cynthia Lancaster: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Patrice Leverett: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Candis R. Mitchell: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Valerie Modirpour: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Tracy Moore: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Luzviminda Morrow: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Lyle Noisy Hawk Jr.: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Dorothy Parriott: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Carolina Perez: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Rachel Pinkerman: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Richard Pratt: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Elizabeth Pritchard: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Mary Pulido Banner: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Samantha Schiling: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Christopher Shewbarran: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Christeen Silva: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Lennon Tyler: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Lipika Wadhwa: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Jaime Wong: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

#### **PSYCHOLOGICAL INTERNS**

Luke Allen: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Jessica Crellin: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Deva Dorris: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Bryon Gallant: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Jennifer Guttman: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Laurie Harris: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Joseph Henrich: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Monica Jackson: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Dorota Krotkiewicz: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Vanessa Ma: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Isra Malik: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.  
Desiree Misanko-Louvat: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

Kelly Nelson: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

Kellie Nesto: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

Jeffery Newell: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

David Robinson: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

Dana Schmidt: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

Sharon Simgton: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

Alexandro Velez: Dr. Holland moved to close the application, as the Board was notified of ceasing supervision. Dr. Krogh second. Board vote 5-0-0

Qingqing Zhu: Discussion deferred until a future meetings.

Michelle Zochowski: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

## **PSYCHOLOGICAL TRAINEES**

Cody Kaneshiro: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

Alek Krumm: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

Nina Paul: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

Samantha Sherwood: Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

Holly Summers: Discussion deferred until a a future meeting.

**14.** Discussion of language development to cover the differences between APA Ethic Code and ASPPB Code of Conduct. With Recommendations from APA Ethics Code to be placed in NAC 641.

*Discussion deferred until December 13<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting.*

**15.** Discuss and evaluate the options and opportunities in the a future offerings for the Nevada Licensing Exam

*Discussion deferred until December 13<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting.*

- a. With the implementation of EPPP2, should an alternative to online examination be offered to mirror the testing of current applicants.
- b. Necessary steps of Board members and Board office to facilitate the changes of State Exam

**16.** Review and possibly approve the Disciplinary Policies and Procedure Manual.

Ms. Bradley, along with Dr. Lenkeit, developed a thorough review of policies and procedures regarding the investigation and disposition of complaints ad completed by the Board.

The new policies include a review of the complaint by an investigator prior to noticing the psychologist evaluate if the claim is frivolous or not.

Additionally, the manual lays out the procedures to be followed by the Board related to communication and recording of the complaint if a settlement agreement is signed or the psychologist is found guilty in a public hearing.

Dr. Paul noted it might be necessary to include the article regarding competency-based remediation as a reminder that settlements should be based on correcting the issue found in the investigation, and not just a blanket punishment.

Dr. Papa moved to accept the manual with the suggested changes. Dr. Krogh second. Board vote 5-0-0.

Dr. Owens thanked Ms. Bradley and Dr. Lenkeit for the hard work in the development of the manual. She requested Director Gleich to place the completed manual on the Board website for review by the public, for full transparency.

Dr. Lenkeit noted that the manual should be reviewed and evaluated on a regular basis.

**ACTION ITEM:** Director Gleich will post the manual to the Board's website upon receipt of the final draft from Ms. Bradley.

**17.** Review and discussion of information received during the attendance of ASPPB Annual Meeting in Minneapolis, Minnesota, October 17-20, 2019.

*Discussion deferred until December 13<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting.*

**18. Correspondence:** *Discussion deferred until December 13<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting.*

- a. **Cynthia Lancaster:** Request for Board approval
- b. **Anonymous request to evaluate past criminal history**

**19. Request for Approval of testing accommodations.**

a. **Rachael Pinkerman:** The Board reviewed the provided evaluation form; it was found that the information met the requirement and Dr. Pinkerman's request for accommodation.

Dr. Papa moved to approve for accommodation. Dr. Krogh second. Board vote 3-0-2: Dr. Paul and Dr. Holland recuse as they are past and current supervisors.

**ACTION ITEM:** The ATEAM will be tasked with thoroughly evaluating the accommodation request procedure.

**20.** Discussion of policy regarding video recorded counseling session of trainees for supervision, and the disposal of them once they are no longer needed. Are the recorded sessions part of the client's record and necessary to be retained with other patient's records?

Dr. Dickens, as the Training Director at the University of Nevada, Reno counseling center, forwarded a question to the Board office, related to the training recordings of interns and the counseling sessions they provide. The current informed consent policy is to destroy recordings of sessions of psychological trainees, interns and psychological assistants after it is used in supervision, as is customary in supervision of psychological trainees.

Recently, the University's Medical school Counsel recommended that the recordings be retained the same length as other health service records. This recommendation came with the transfer of the recordings to the Medical School's secure server. While the counseling center, has begun retaining the videos, their informed consent remains that they will dispose of the recordings. The Counseling Center was directed to contact the Board regarding direction. They have verified that other university counseling centers continue to destroy recordings similar to the former method.

Ms. Bradley noted that the University Counsel may be interpreting NRS 629.021 "Health care records" means any reports, notes, orders, photographs, X-rays or **other recorded data or information** whether maintained in written, electronic or other form which is received or produced by a provider of health care, or any person employed by a provider of health care, and contains information relating to the medical history, examination, diagnosis or treatment of the patient." Dr. Paul noted that the recording is for the purpose of training, not for the patient record, and should not be considered part of the patient record and exempt.

Director Gleich, recommends reaching out to the other professions affected by NRS 629, to see if they would be comfortable with adding an exception to training materials. Dr. Paul agrees as this would put a real hamper on workforce development. Dr. Owens decided and stated that this could put a hamper on the public seeking treatment.

Ms. Bradley will discuss with the University's counsel on interpretations. Director Gleich will connect Dr. Dickens and Ms. Bradley for further conversation.

**21.** In-office sharing opportunities, is it ethical/legal for client voicemails to be left for two different clinicians on the same message line if two clinicians can access the messages? If the informed consent and intake paperwork has all the clinician's names at the top of the document indicating that the client/patient is being informed that they are seeing providers within Clinic.

Director Gleich noted that this question was received in the Board office, and Ms. Bradley recommended it be reviewed by the Board. Upon discussion with the Board, it was noted that the shared voicemail could be mentioned in the informed consent form, as well as on the voicemail message itself that the message was not confidential and could be heard by another practitioner.

Finally, after extensive discussion, it was noted to contact the APA trust for their input on the situation and to report back to the Board for a future reference.

**22.** Public Comment.

Director Gleich noted that after 12 years of services to the Board and the Attorney General's office that Ms. Bradley was moving on to a new opportunity. She wanted to take a moment to thank Ms. Bradley for the constant advice and many questions she's answered in her service to the Board. To say thank you, Director Gleich gave Ms. Bradley an orchid for her new office.

**23.** ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Papa moved to adjourn. Dr. Paul seconded Board vote 5-0-0. Meeting adjourned at 12:35 p.m. with a short break at 10:35am.