

**PUBLIC NOTICE OF A MEETING FOR  
STATE OF NEVADA BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS  
MEETING MINUTES**

---

January 22, 2024

**1. Call To Order/Roll Call to Determine the Presence of a Quorum.**

The meeting of the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners was called to order by President Whitney Owens, Psy.D., at 12:02 p.m. on January 22, 2024, online via "Zoom" and physically at the office of the Board of Psychological Examiners, 4600 Kietzke Lane, Ste. B-116, Reno, Nevada 89502.

**Roll Call:** Board President, Whitney Owens, Psy.D., and members Monique Abarca, LCSW, Lorraine Benuto, Ph.D., Soseh Esmaeili, Psy.D., Stephanie Holland, Psy.D., and Stephanie Woodard, Psy.D. were present at roll call. Board members Catherine Pearson, Ph.D. was absent at roll call. There was a quorum of the Board members.

Also present were Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Harry Ward; Executive Director Laura Arnold; Donald Hoier (private citizen), Dr. Jennifer Grimes-Vawters, Brian Joseph, and Dr. Casha Kaufer.

- 2. Public Comment.** Note: Public comment is welcomed by the Board and may be limited to three minutes per person at the discretion of the Board President. Public comment will be allowed at the beginning and end of the meeting, as noted on the agenda. The Board President may allow additional time to be given a speaker as time allows and in their sole discretion. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint. No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken (NRS 241.020).

There was no public comment at this time.

DAG Ward states those who wish to comment may access this Zoom meeting with the number **882 1900 1830**.

### **3. Minutes. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners on December 15, 2023.**

There were no comments or changes suggested for the minutes of the December 15, 2023, Regular Meeting of the State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners.

*On motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Lorraine Benuto, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the meeting minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board held on December 15, 2023. Stephanie Holland, Stephanie Woodard, and Monique Abarca approved the minutes as to form, but not content. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.*

### **4. Financials**

#### **A. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Treasurer's Report for Fiscal Year 2024 (July 1, 2023, through June 30, 2024).**

The executive director stated that as of December 31, 2023, the checking account balance was \$323,134.92. She explained that December 2023 was the end of the second biennium quarter, and it was the last month on which the Board operated on the almost \$81,000.00 net revenue for the second biennium quarter deferred income distribution as well as about \$22,000.00 from the other deferred revenue distributions such as late renewal fees, new licensures, and registrations. She said that as of January 2024, the Board will be operating on the next \$81,000.00 net revenue and other deferred revenue that is allocated to the third biennium quarter (January – June 2024).

The executive director went on to state that the savings account balance, which is the Board's reserve account, was \$105,070.03. With the end of December 2023 marking the half-way point for both FY 2024 and the 2023-2024 biennium, she said that the Board is about 42% of budgeted expenditures and just over 51% of expected revenue – most of which is the deferred income allocated to this biennium quarter. The Board ended the first and second quarters of the 2023-2024 biennium with \$21,150 and almost \$26,500, respectively, of budgeted income that it did not use.

The executive director went on to state that something she has done for the treasurer's report this time is to have our bookkeeper, Michelle Fox, verify and validate the

information. She said Michelle's written validation is part of the meeting materials, and would be something she will be doing moving forward.

*On motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Stephanie Holland, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the treasurer's report for FY 2024. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.*

**B. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve revisions to the Budget for Fiscal Year 2024 (July 1, 2023, through June 30, 2024).**

The executive director started by stating that the end of December was halfway through fiscal year 2024 and half way through the current 2023-2024 biennium. With the first of January came the distribution of the deferred income going forward from a few sources. They are:

- the third distribution from the renewal fees received by December 31, 2022,
- the second distribution of the renewal fees received in January and February 28, 2023,
- the second distribution of the new licensure, registration, and reinstatements received during the first biennium quarter (January 1, 2023, through June 30, 2023), and
- the first distribution of the new licensure, registration, and reinstatement fees received during the second biennium quarter (July 1, 2023, through December 31, 2023).

The executive director noted that the amount the Board received in the last category of deferred revenue during the second biennium quarter (\$16,718.47) far exceeded the \$6,000 that was projected.

The executive director went on to share that because of the next financial agenda item, she wanted to make some adjustments and revisions to the budget that reflect the income on which the Board is now operating and to tighten the budget up a bit based on real numbers from the first half of the biennium and first half of the fiscal year.

The executive director explained that the adjustments and revisions were all highlighted in yellow in the spreadsheet she shared, and were made as of January 1, 2024. She stated that at the top of the spreadsheet are the revised numbers that are the Board's current income from deferred revenue. She went on to explain that to the left side of

the black divider, which is the current fiscal year budget, there are a number of adjustments to the regular revenue and expenses based upon the first half of the fiscal year and the biennium. She said that while the percentages generally still reflect revenue that is above what is budgeted and expenses that are below what is budgeted, it tightens up the percentages she believed reflects what is more realistic.

The executive director continued by noting the columns to the right of the black divider, which depict the four biennium quarters and the two halves of FY2024. She said she put in the actual numbers for the first half of the fiscal year that is finished (the darker green), and then simply subtracted those actual numbers from the budgeted amount for the fiscal year (to the left) so that the information in the left and right related to the fiscal year matched up. Looking at the Board's actual financial performance in the last 2 biennium quarters, the executive director also made a few adjustments moving forward into the fourth biennium quarter – also reflected in yellow. She said the revisions at this point are primarily to reflect the deferred income projection based upon the revised distribution from the deferred revenue that actually came in during Q3 of the biennium, and there are some adjustments in the expenses that more closely reflect real numbers.

With the information from the proposed revised budget, and to also help conceptualize what we would be discussed in the next agenda item, the executive director shared that she wanted to simplify it by painting a picture of moving forward into the next two biennium quarters. In so doing, she stated that what has not been talked a lot about is the budgeted income and expenses in relation to the total amount of money the Board has, and she wanted to show the Board what this looks like (assuming the proposed revisions to the budget are approved).

The executive director stated that, as of January 1, 2024, the Board had a total of \$428,000. That is the checking and savings combined. She explained that the savings account is this Board's reserve account, the minimum of which should be 6 months of total expenses, calculated by averaging the last 3 quarters (or 18 months) of total expenses. She highlighted that the Board has the minimum required by the Board policy, as 6 months of expenses as calculated by an average of the last 3 biennium quarters (or 18 months) of expenses is \$102,000.

The executive director went on to show that the blue and red boxes in the visual she shared represent the budgeted income and expenses for the next two biennium quarters, both of which are less than the amount of money in the Board's checking account, that difference being \$63,000. To that end, she stated that the Board's budget is well within the amount of money it has overall. This is consistent with what Mr. Hines told the Board about its financial health and there being money left over after the last two fiscal years.

There were no questions regarding the proposed revisions to the budget moving forward.

*On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Stephanie Woodard, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the revisions to the budget for FY 2024. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaili, Stephanie Holland, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.*

### **C. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve:**

Executive Director started by sharing that during the Board's strategic planning meeting in November, one of the items the Board discussed was office staff development and the need for the Board office to have more than just one person staffing it. During that meeting, the executive director discussed her vision for having two primary, executive level roles, one that is generally administrative and the other the continues Board office oversight and is focused on legal and policy. She noted that the Board approved that strategic planning item during the December 15, 2023, meeting and said that she is ready to start making that happen.

The executive director shared graphs that helped paint a bigger picture for this new development. This graph generally depicted the number of new licensees for each biennium since 1993. The blue bars indicated the new licensees for each particular biennium, and the gray bars shown since 2013 depict attrition (those being expired and inactive licenses). Because the Board was only half way through the current biennium, the top section of the blue bar for the current biennium was the projection of new licensees for 2024, that projection being based on the new licensees the Board received in 2023 and the prior biennium.

The executive director highlighted a general pattern of increase, especially over the last 10 years, or 5 biennia, and that that the increase appeared to be at an increasing rate. Conversely, the attrition, while a bit up and down, was generally in a downward trend, and the attrition realized during renewal for the 2023-2024 biennium was lowest.

The executive director went on to state that this growth in new licensees biennium over biennium and the rate at which it appears to be increasing puts significant increased demand on the Board office. The scope of what is required and requested of the Board office is very broad. The executive director stated that, while she had prepared a list of examples of what the role requires, she elected not to include that list in the interest of time for the abbreviated meeting, but emphasized the nature and scope of what is currently required of the Board office's sole staff member. She went on to state that

the nature and scope of the role does not include unexpected tasks, such as what the Governor required of this Board early last year or that the Board is now in a renewal year and facing that process at the end of the year. She went on to share that the work she does for the Board meets what she wanted in seeking out this role, which was to make a career shift and do something different and meaningful and shared that in that sense, it does not disappoint. She went on to explain, however, that the demand on the Board office is just way too much for one person, and requires a lot more than the 40 hour work week the job contemplates. For that reason, it is a recipe for burnout for the one person trying to do it all, shared that feelings of burnout are creeping in.

The executive director went on to state that as discussed during the strategic planning meeting in November, there is a need for two somewhat parallel executive roles. As a starting point, she stated that her vision is for those two roles to be the Executive Director role and an Administrative Director role. The Executive Director's role would be to maintain oversight of the Board office while bringing on and training an Administrative Director to take on the Board office's substantive and many administrative tasks, and to primarily staff the Board office. She shared that her focus, in addition to Board office oversight, would shift to this Board's legal and policy work, the complaints process, and maintaining its budget and finances.

The executive director stated that she has been lucky enough to have had a phenomenal candidate for the proposed new Administrative Director role recommended to her and that the Board office is in financial position to add another full time role. To that end, she shared the budget spreadsheet with the adjustments the Board just approved incorporated, and now with the additional adjustments for the new role and moving the Board office. Executive Director showed where she added the new role and the expenses associated with it, which are benefits through the Public Employees Benefit Program and PERS. The adjustments that go along with it are zeroing out, for now, what was budgeted for the part time role and adjusting for rent to make the transition to Las Vegas. She further explained that what the rent adjustment will require is a one-time situation in which it will need to pay double rent for a month or two while one office is closed down and the other gets set up. Under this scenario, the Board will need to pay its current rent in Reno on a month-to-month basis after January, and will likely be charged an additional 25% to do so. The executive director stated that she also added to the miscellaneous expenses for some expenses regarding moving the Board office to Las Vegas.

The executive director showed that what is proposed results in a negative balance for Q3 and Q4 of this biennium. However, by adjusting those negative amounts with the budgeted money the Board did not use during Q1 and Q2, there is more than enough

to absorb the expense, and allows for the budget for the biennium to continue to be balanced along the biennium.

The executive director went on to state that the Board is able to use money that is carrying over to invest in its Board office, and still have money left over. What this scenario represents is getting the Board through the end of this year and through the regular renewal period (October through December 2024). She also noted that the Board's Reserve Policy, which is included in the meeting materials, permits the Board to use money that is in the Board's reserves to, for instance, invest in Board office staff and/or infrastructure. Under the Board's current budget for this biennium, the Board does not have to do that. It can use money it has that was not previously used and still have a cushion between the budget and the reserves. The executive director stated that going back to the graph that shows the rate of new licensee growth, the Board can expect in this biennium to exceed the number of new licenses that were issued during the prior biennium.

The executive director went on to share another graph depicting renewal projections. She explained that the bar on the left on the visual is the revenue from renewals that the board received for this biennium. The amount includes active and inactive renewals, but identifies the number of active renewals. She stated that the bar on the right is the projection of active renewals based upon the projected number of new licensees this biennium minus the approximate attrition identified in the new licensee chart. The difference at the current renewal rate of \$600 is an additional \$50,000 for the next biennium, or \$12,500 each 2025-2026 biennium quarter. The executive director stated that if the Board would consider raising renewal fees to \$650, that would bring an additional \$35,000, for a total of \$85,000, or just over \$21,000 per 2025-2026 biennium quarter, which completely absorbs the cost to the Board of the new Administrative Director role.

The executive director stated those numbers are just revenue from renewals and it does not include the Board's additional income from late fees received during the January and February that follows the renewal period, or the application, registration, state exam, new licensure, and other fees the Board receives throughout the biennium. She said that for this biennium, the board received \$3,600 in late fees, and is expected to realize a total of about \$115,000 in those other fees. Assuming the Board would realize at least the same income from those fees in the next biennium, that would provide about an additional \$29,000 cushion per biennium quarter that would allow the Board office to continue to grow with the continuing increase of new licensees and the demand that puts on the Board office, and to do what may be required to maintain and/or attract qualified and dedicated professional staff to serve the Board's needs.

The executive director stated the Board is in a position during this biennium quarter to add the Administrative Director position and move the Board office with the ability to evaluate and make adjustments as may be necessary after renewals for the 2025-2026 biennium are complete and that revenue is known.

Dr. Woodard shared that having served as Treasurer for the Board, this presentation has been very thorough. She went on to share that it has been historically hard to recruit personnel for the Board office from Northern Nevada, and that it seems there is greater opportunity to recruit from Las Vegas and move the office there.

The executive director shared that having had the concept of this role for the Board office for some time, she has had her feelers out to her professional and administrative contacts for recommendations of someone with the professional qualifications she thinks are appropriate for the role. She went on to share that those efforts were to no avail, the general feedback being that she would probably struggle to find who she was looking for in the current labor market and for what the Board could offer.

The executive director went on to share that having no luck with that effort, she spoke with Dr. Owens about it to pivot her search focus to contacts she may have. President Dr. Owens provided a potential candidate for the role, an administrative professional she knows who would probably be willing to come on under the Board's part time framework and transition to the full time role, once approved. Her name is Sarah Restori, and she has been an administrative professional in the psychology profession for a decade. She shared that she has met with Sarah in person and on Zoom, and being in a career transition herself, she is very excited about this opportunity and was willing to come on part time. The executive director shared she went on to hire Sarah for the part time role, and that Sarah is not only excited about the proposed administrative director role, she is very enthusiastic about staffing the board office and providing the level of service that she has tried to make this Board's brand. The executive director stated that Sarah is perfectly on-brand, she has impressive and meaningful initiative, and that Dr. Owens recommended her could not be a better source. To that end, the executive director asked that this Board approve the creation of the Administrative Director role.

There were no questions from the Board regarding the creation of the Administrative Director position and moving the Board office to Las Vegas.

***On motion by Lorraine Benuto, second by Stephanie Holland, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the creation of an Administrative Director role that reports to the Executive Director. (Yea:***

*Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, and Stephanie Woodard.) Dr. Whitney Owens abstained from the vote. Motion Carried: 5-0.*

*On motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Stephanie Woodard, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the Board office's move to Las Vegas and giving the Executive Director the authority to secure office space when a suitable location is found. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.*

**5. (For Possible Action) Review and Possible Action on Applications for Licensure as a Psychologist or Registration as a Psychological Assistant, Intern or Trainee. The Board May Convene in Closed Session to Receive Information Regarding Applicants, Which May Involve Considering the Character, Alleged Misconduct, Professional Competence or Physical or Mental Health of the Applicant (NRS 241.030). All Deliberation and Action Will Occur in an Open Session.** *Note: Applicant names are listed on the agenda to allow the Board to discuss applicants when necessary to move the applicant through the licensure process. The listing of an applicant's name on the agenda indicates only that an application for licensure/registration has been received. It does not mean that the application has been approved or that the applicant must appear at the meeting in order for the applicant's application to move forward through the licensure process. If an applicant needs to attend the meeting for the Board to take action, the applicant will be notified in writing prior to the meeting. Please, direct questions or comments regarding licensure applications to the Board office.*

The following applicants are recommended for approval of licensure contingent upon completion of licensure requirements: Cortney Beasley, Andre Wielemaker, Jessica McClintock, Robert Bilder, Kendra Devor, Holly Summers, Chia-Chi Hu, Paul McLaughlin.

*On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the following applicants for licensure contingent upon completion of licensure requirements: Cortney Beasley, Andre Wielemaker, Jessica McClintock, Robert Bilder, Kendra Devor, Holly Summers, Chia-Chi Hu, Paul McLaughlin. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.*

**A. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on the ATEAM's recommendation to approve Paola Garcia Betancourt's application**

**to register as a Psychological Intern, retroactive to December 4, 2023.**

The executive director stated that Paola Garcia Betancourt has applied with the Board to register as a Psychological Intern. According to her PLUS report, she is attending Walden University's clinical psychology program, which is not APA-accredited. Ms. Garcia Betancourt was previously registered with the Board as a Psychological Trainee (PT042) under Dr. Sarah Ahmad's supervision.

The executive director went on to share that Ms. Garcia Betancourt has submitted documentation required for registration, including the form from her director of clinical training and her supervised practice plan. She said that she is being supervised by Dr. Sarah Ahmad (PY0700), her secondary supervisor being Dr. Dallas Boyce (PY1157). Because the Board office did not receive the required documentation prior to the ATEAM's October 13, 2023, meeting, and because the November 3, 2023, meeting was a special meeting specific to one applicant, Ms. Garcia Betancourt's application could not be brought before the ATEAM until the December 15, 2023, meeting. However, in anticipation of being approved, Ms. Garcia Betancourt's employment began on December 4, 2023. With that, Ms. Garcia Betancourt requested that, should her application be recommended for approval, the approval be retroactive to December 4, 2023.

During its December 15, 2023, meeting, the ATEAM recommended that Ms. Garcia Betancourt's application to register as a psychological intern be approved retroactive to December 4, 2023.

There were no questions or comments regarding Ms. Garcia Betancourt's application.

*On motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Stephanie Woodard, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved Paola Garcia Betancourt's application to register as a Psychological Intern, and that her registration be retroactive to December 4, 2023. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, and Stephanie Woodard.) Dr. Stephanie Holland abstained from the vote. Motion Carried: 5-0.*

**B. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on the ATEAM's recommendation to approve Dr. Jennifer Grimes-Vawters' application to register as a Psychological Assistant.**

The executive director stated Dr. Grimes-Vawters' application was initially brought for the ATEAM's review during the July 14, 2023, ATEAM meeting, but due to there being too many questions relating to the PLUS report and Dr. Grimes-Vawters not being at

the meeting to answer them, the ATEAM postponed further consideration until its next meeting so that Dr. Grimes-Vawters could be available to answer the ATEAM's questions.

The executive director went on to state that the next time Dr. Grimes-Vawters's application came before the ATEAM was during the September 8, 2023, ATEAM meeting, at which Dr. Vawters appeared and participated. During that meeting, the ATEAM stated that her coursework was fine, but noted that there was a significant amount of information in Dr. Grimes-Vawters' PLUS report that was not applicable to her application and created a lot of confusion and "noise" for the ATEAM in its efforts to try to work through it. As a result, the ATEAM requested that Dr. Grimes-Vawters clean up her PLUS report by removing any internship hours and other employment information that is not specific to her predoctoral Psychology internship experience, and to provide consistent reference to her degree program (being in counseling, not clinical, psychology).

The executive director further stated that after Dr. Grimes-Vawters was able to clear up and revise her PLUS report with updated, verified internship information that reflected what the ATEAM requested and worked with the ASPPB to correctly identify her degree program (counseling psychology not previously being an option to choose on the PLUS application), her application went before the ATEAM again on December 15, 2023. After its review of Dr. Grimes-Vawters' revised PLUS report and confirming that her coursework and internship are appropriate for a determination that they are equivalent and that her transcripts confirmed the residency requirement, the ATEAM recommended that her application to register as a Psychological Assistant be approved.

There were no questions or comments regarding Dr. Grimes-Vawters' application.

*On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Soseh Esmaeili, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved Dr. Jennifer Grimes-Vawters' application to register as a Psychological Assistant. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.*

### **C. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on Dr. Jodi Lovejoy's request to retake the EPPP a fourth time.**

This agenda item was tabled from the prior month's meeting. To recap, Dr. Jodi Lovejoy is an applicant for licensure, whose application went before the ATEAM during 2022 for an equivalency review. While Dr. Lovejoy's training hours had been approved at an ATEAM meeting earlier in 2022, during the December 16, 2022, ATEAM meeting,

which Dr. Lovejoy attended, the ATEAM committee members and Dr. Lovejoy had a question and answer session regarding Dr. Lovejoy's coursework – Dr. Lovejoy having provided transcripts and associated documents relating to her education. As a result of that dialog, the ATEAM recommended that Dr. Lovejoy take the EPPP-1 as a measure of competency in knowledge and stated that, if she passes the EPPP-1, her application was to return to the ATEAM for further review and determination.

It was noted that noted that Dr. Lovejoy took and passed the Nevada State Exam in September 2021.

Dr. Lovejoy has submitted an application to retake the EPPP a fourth time, having not passed the exam in her first three attempts.

Dr. Lovejoy's application explained how she is approaching her study schedule and program, the practice tests she intends to take, the fact that she now has a private coach, the study groups with which she intends to engage, the areas in which she intends to focus, and additional information regarding the test accommodations that this Board previously approved for her during its December 2, 2022, meeting.

Dr. Lovejoy has paid a \$150 application extension fee, which allows her application to remain active until April 2024 (an additional year beyond when it expired in April 2023).

Dr. Lovejoy's application was tabled from last month's meeting to this meeting because of questions the Board had about using the EPPP-1 as a measure of competency in knowledge, and because one of the ATEAM members who participated in the December 2022 ATEAM meeting was not present during the December 15, 2023, Board meeting to provide additional information and help answer the Board's questions.

President Dr. Owens started by sharing that the ATEAM was established around 2018 and the purpose of that committee was to help provide a pathway to licensure for those applicants that do not meet the requirements set by NRS and NAC. Dr. Owens went on to on to state that while she was reviewing Dr. Lovejoy's application, it appeared that Dr. Lovejoy was applying based on the success of a previous applicant that had the same credentials as Dr. Lovejoy. Dr. Owens stated that upon her review, it did not appear that Dr. Lovejoy meets the educational requirements for Nevada. Following this, President Dr. Owens opened the floor to the ATEAM to discuss.

Dr. Esmaeili shared that this case was initially confusing with the educational requirements being the most concerning. Dr. Esmaeili went on to share that most of the ATEAM's questions regarding her application had been answered.

Dr. Holland recalls the conversation around whether or not Dr. Lovejoy's educational requirements would suffice.

President Dr. Owens stated that if Dr. Lovejoy's educational requirements are not equivalent, then it doesn't make sense to take the EPPP a fourth time. Thus, her recommendation would be to deny the request to take the EPPP a fourth time.

Dr. Benuto shared that she agreed with President Dr. Owens and agreed with Dr. Owens' assessment and does not have a dissenting opinion.

Dr. Holland asked to clarify if Dr. Lovejoy was denied the request to take the EPPP a fourth time, could she go back and take the courses that she's missing and thus gain the competency in the educational requirement area and then she could request to take the EPPP a fourth time? To this, President Dr. Owens stated an applicant could go back and attain the educational requirements and then come back and make a new application to the Board to determine if they're applicable for licensure. Dr. Owens went on to state if the Board denies Dr. Lovejoy's request to take the EPPP a fourth time, the Board is essentially denying the application based on the fact that she does not have equivalent coursework.

Dr. Holland informed she did not have a dissenting opinion.

Dr. Woodard asked if it is the opinion of the ATEAM that she does not meet substantial equivalency or that she would need someone else to complete an educational equivalency review. To this, President Dr. Owens stated that is something the Board could offer, though she has already reviewed the coursework and there are too many holes and her educational equivalency is not close enough to equivalency where it makes sense to offer that. Dr. Holland shared that there were significant gaps when she reviewed her educational requirements, and that she did share this option of a formal educational equivalency review with Dr. Lovejoy.

***On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Lorraine Benuto, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners denied Dr. Lovejoy's application to retake the EPPP-1 a fourth time [and that Dr. Lovejoy's application return to the ATEAM for further consideration].***

*(Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.*

## **6. (For Possible Action) Schedule of Future Board Meetings, Hearings, and Workshops. The Board May Discuss and Decide Future Meeting Dates, Hearing Dates, and Workshop Dates.**

The next regular meeting of the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners is currently scheduled for Friday, February 9, 2024, beginning at 8:00 a.m.

**7. Requests for Future Board Meeting Agenda Items (No Discussion Among the Members will Take Place on this Item)**

There were no requests for future Board Meeting agenda items.

**8. Public Comment** - Public comment is welcomed by the Board and may be limited to three minutes per person at the discretion of the Board President. Public comment will be allowed at the beginning and end of the meeting, as noted on the agenda. The Board President may allow additional time to be given a speaker as time allows and in his sole discretion. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint. No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken (NRS 241.020)

There was no public comment at this time.

**9. (For Possible Action) Adjournment**

There being no further business before the Board, President Dr. Owens adjourned the meeting at 12:56 p.m.