

MINUTES OF A MEETING FOR
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS

DATE OF MEETING: Friday, June 14, 2019

Time: 8:00 a.m.

System Administration Building, Room 101, 555 E. Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, NV 89101 and by video conference to University of Nevada, Reno System Computing Services, Room 47, Reno, Nevada 89557 and via Zoom Video Conferencing.

1. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

In Las Vegas:

Michelle Paul, Ph.D., President

Whitney Owens, Ph.D., Secretary Treasurer

Others present:

Jeff Adamczk

Rosalie Bordelove, DAG Board Counsel

Brian Lech, Ph.D.

Gary Lenkeit, Ph.D., Board Investigator

John Paglini, Ph.D.

Richard Pratt, Ph.D.

Rita Pratt

Adrianna Zimring, Ph.D., Nevada Psychological Association

Via Zoom:

Stephanie Holland, Ph.D., Member

Igor Kowal

Bree Mullin, Psy.D.

Sheila Young, Ph.D., Board Investigator

In Reno:

Pam Becker, Member

John Krogh, Ph.D., Member

Others Present:

Sarah Bradley, Senior Deputy Attorney General

Jeff Dickerson, Counsel for Dr. Krumpe

Frank Evarts, Ph.D.

Morgan Gleich, Executive Director

Ellen Rahn, Executive Assistant

Laurie Urmston, Court Reporter

2. Public Comment.

Dr. Mullin informed Board members that she attended today's meeting in order to see the Board's processes and potentially apply to be a Board member when seats are vacated on July 1, 2019.

3. Review, discuss, and possible approval from previous meetings: May 10, 2019.

Dr. Owens noted a spelling error in Dr. Zimring's first name.

Ms. Becker motioned to approve with this edit; Dr. Owens seconded; Board 4-0-0

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

Director Gleich informed the Board that the PERS contribution rate was raised by .75. They have asked all entities to choose whether the increase will come from employee's current salary, or to increase their employees' salaries to the increase contribution rate. Dr. Owens noted that there is room in the budget to increase Director Gleich's salary.

Dr. Owens motioned to increase Director Gleich's salary by .75%.; Ms. Becker seconded; Board 4-0-0

A. Recouping outstanding Legal Fees Owed to the Board from Disciplinary and Unlicensed Practice cases.
No update.

5. Review of consumer complaints pending.

A. Complaint #18-0924B

Discussion deferred to the July 12, 2019 Board Meeting.

B. Complaint #18-1009

Discussion deferred to the July 12, 2019 Board Meeting.

C. Complaint #19-0418

Discussion deferred to the July 12, 2019 Board Meeting.

D. Complaint #18-0424

Discussion deferred to the July 12, 2019 Board Meeting.

E. Complaint #19-0506

Discussion deferred to the July 12, 2019 Board Meeting.

F. Complaint #18-0514

Discussion deferred to the July 12, 2019 Board Meeting.

G. Complaint #19-0603

Discussion deferred to the July 12, 2019 Board Meeting.

Scheduled for 8:15 am

6. *Question and Answers with the Board.*

A. Clarifications to the requirements made R074-18 regarding registration and supervision.

No discussion.

B. Clarification to the requirements made R171-18 regarding continuing education for renewal.

No discussion.

C. Other topics that may be of interest for the licensees and public.

No discussion

7. Disciplinary Hearing: Disciplinary Hearing: Case No. UL20150001, State of Nevada, Board of Psychological Examiners v. JoAnne Krumpke, Ph.D. Formal disciplinary hearing regarding the allegations contained in the Complaint and Notice of

Hearing filed in this matter. The Board may also hear and decide any pending motions filed by the parties in this matter.

To begin, Dr. Paul asked Board members to review Ms. Bradley's opposition to Mr. Dickson's, Dr. Krumpe's counsel, six motions. Mr. Dickerson was allowed approximately three minutes to present his motions and Ms. Bradley the same amount of time to respond.

Motion 1: Complaint and Notice of Hearing

Mr. Dickerson began with his presentation of Motion 1 by describing the issues surrounding notice of Dr. Krumpe and Mr. Dickerson, and insufficient information within the complaint specifying the conduct she needed to defend.

Ms. Bradley responded to Mr. Dickerson by allowing Board members to review the complaint itself wherein they could decide whether it had substantial information that would require Dr. Krumpe to defend herself. Ms. Bradley noted that the complaint contained evidence that Dr. Krumpe handwrote her title as "psychologist" in at least two places in the contract with DETR and presented herself as such.

Ms. Becker motioned to deny Mr. Dickerson's Motion 1; Dr. Owens seconded; Board 5-0-0

Motion 2: Licensure verification from the Board of Examiners for Marriage and Family Therapists and Clinical Professional Counselors

Mr. Dickerson began his presentation of Motion 2 by informing the Board that this motion was presented to the district court and their decision is pending. Mr. Dickerson noted that there are issues surrounding the constitutionality of the statute defining the practice of psychology as it is vague, ambiguous, and unclear.

Ms. Bradley responded to Mr. Dickerson by first noting that this motion is premature. As it is unknown what will occur during the meeting, Ms. Bradley observed that they could not assume there would be a constitutional violation. That being said, she submitted that as the definition was written and placed in NRS in 1995, if there was an unconstitutionality issue, it would have been discovered by now.

Dr. Owens motioned to deny Mr. Dickerson's Motion 2; Mr. Krogh seconded; Board 5-0-0

Motion 3: Licensure verification from the State of Nevada, Department of Education

Mr. Dickerson withdrew Motion 3. No Discussion.

Motion 4: Licensure verification from the Board of Examiners for Alcohol, Drug and Gambling Counselors

Mr. Dickerson began his presentation of Motion 4 by utilizing the doctrine of laches to show that the passage of time could create prejudice against Dr. Krumpe by the Board. As the conduct in question occurred in 2013, Mr. Dickerson contended that it is unfair to have Dr. Krumpe defend herself due to loss of memory that can be assumed to have occurred due to the gaps between when the conduct in the complaint occurred and this hearing.

Ms. Bradley responded to Mr. Dickerson by noting that the Board did not become aware of Dr. Krumpe's conduct until approximately February 2015 and there was a proceeding in 2017 that was remanded. However, Ms. Bradley indicated that the information being discussed in this hearing rely on documents that are dated in 2013. Further, in relation to doctrine of laches, NRS 641.2705 does not have a time period for when the Board must bring a case against a respondent. Ms. Bradley concluded that the delay prejudices Dr. Krumpe. As this hearing is occurring to ensure Dr. Krumpe's rights, she is not being prejudiced and, to Ms. Bradley's knowledge, that doctrine of laches has not been used to bar a case in Nevada.

Dr. Paul questioned when Dr. Krumpe become aware that the Board was investigating. Mr. Dickerson answered by noting that the complaint was issued on March 9, 2017 for a hearing on April 17, 2017 and that Dr. Krumpe did not receive notice of this, which is why it was remanded. Ms. Bradley explained that the order was sent July 2017, and Dr. Krumpe had to have received it as this was when the petition for judicial review was filed. Additionally, more letters were sent via Regular US Mail and were not returned.

Director Gleich questioned whether the Board is required to inform an individual that an investigation is open against them when it surrounds unlicensed activity. Ms. Bradley replied by saying that the Board is just required to follow the statute.

Ms. Bordelove aimed to clarify this motion for Board members saying that they need to decide whether the 2-year delay between the time the Board found out about the conduct to when they initiated action inequitably prejudiced Dr. Krumpke in being able to prepare a defense.

Dr. Owens motioned to deny Mr. Dickerson's Motion 4; Dr. Krogh seconded; Board 5-0-0

Motion 5: Civil Complaint filed by the Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation with contract between Respondent and DETR attached

Mr. Dickerson withdrew Motion 5

Motion 6: 39 Psychological evaluations conducted by Respondent pursuant to contract

Mr. Dickerson presented Motion 6 by asserting that since the Marriage and Family Board did not find that Dr. Krumpke violated their regulations, it shows that providing psychological services is not outside of her scope of practice and that deference should be given to the agency from which she is a licensee.

Ms. Bradley responded to Mr. Dickerson's by noting that it should be denied as the Board of Psychological Examiners has authority under NRS 641.2705 to investigate unlicensed activity complaints and have authority to take action against these individuals. She went on to say that while other Boards have jurisdiction of their licensees, as the legislature has given authority to this Board, it is imperative to investigate these complaints and not just defer decisions to other Boards.

Further, within the description of the practice of psychology in NRS 641.2705, it states that is the Board's responsibility to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public. This protection includes investigating complaints filed against individuals who may be unqualified to practice psychology; therefore, this Board is able to make their own decisions in regard to disciplinary actions against those who engage in unlicensed practice and other unlawful acts.

Ms. Becker motioned to deny Mr. Dickerson's Motion 6; Dr. Owens seconded; Board 5-0-0

Stipulated Settlement Agreement, Board v. Frank Evarts, Ph.D., License Number PY0044, Case No. 17-1214

Prior to opening statements, Ms. Bradley informed Board members that in review of Dr. Krumpke's responses to the allegations, she did admit to a couple of the allegations that were made: Dr. Krumpke admitted that she is not licensed by the Board as a psychologist. Mr. Dickerson agreed that as of the date of this hearing, that is still true. Dr. Krumpke admitted that she is licensed as a school psychologist by the State of Nevada Department of Education.

Ms. Bradley noted the necessity to change wording in the allegations from "upon information and belief" to "Respondent is licensed as a school psychologist by the State of Nevada, Department of Education". Further, striking "upon information and belief" in regards to Dr. Krumpke being a former intern or the State of Nevada Board of Examiners for Alcohol, Drug, and Gambling Counselors as well as an intern and licensee for the State of Nevada Board of Examiners for Marriage and Family Therapists and Clinical Professional Counselors as these are proven. Moreover, it is proven that Dr. Krumpke recovered the costs of legal services for the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR); Mr. Dickerson added that Dr. Krumpke filed a counterclaim contending that she was not practicing psychology.

Lastly, it is proven that the civil action for this matter is still pending in the Second Judicial District Court's Department 6. Upon moving forward with the hearing, Ms. Bradley began by asking Dr. Paul to review and admit the Exhibits 1 through 4 and 6. At this point, Mr. Dickerson removed his objection to Exhibit 5 and kept his objection to Exhibit 7, which Ms. Bradley previously removed.

Dr. Paul admitted Exhibits 1 through 6 and opening arguments began.

Ms. Bradley began with noting the importance of clarifying a petition for judicial review: in this case, the judge did an order of remand, meaning the court in Dr. Krumpke's order said that order was not valid, so it was sent back to the Board for further proceedings. As such, for this hearing there are no findings in place and this Board is seeing the evidence for this complaint as if it was never heard nor seen before. Ms. Bradley ensured concord with Mr. Dickerson who agreed to it being fair.

Ms. Bradley then continued with her opening arguments wherein she first noted her intent is to prove all the allegations contained in the Complaint and Notice of Hearing. First, in the beginning of the complaint, Ms. Bradley asserts that the Board has jurisdiction over Dr. Krumpke as, if proven, she engaged in the unlicensed practice of psychology, pursuant to NRS 641.2705. Ms. Bradley acknowledged that this statute is confusing as it

leads you to see if an individual violated NRS 641.390, which includes advertising yourself as a psychologist, both in the form of engaging and psychological services and utilizing the title sans degree. The Board would not create a case against an individual simply for calling themselves a psychologist. Cases are brought when there are more than that, such as a pattern of behavior of engaging in activities over a period of time. The issue in this case is that Dr. Krumpe was allegedly providing psychological evaluations while she worked for DETR.

Further, it is alleged that Dr. Krumpe presented herself as such when DETR began a contract, or as DETR calls it "Provider Document", of employment with her. This contract laid out the scope of services Dr. Krumpe would be doing as an employee of DETR, and Dr. Krumpe agreed to engage in these services by signing the document. This is something for Board members to review and decide whether or not those activities are appropriate for someone who is not licensed by this Board.

Lastly, Ms. Bradley informed Board members of upcoming witness testimonies regarding a review of the psychological evaluations provided by DETR completed by Dr. Krumpe. Subsequently, Mr. Dickerson reserved his opening argument and Ms. Bradley proceeded with her case against Dr. Krumpe.

To begin, Ms. Bradley called her first witness: Dr. Melvin Frank Evarts. Dr. Evarts was sworn in and Ms. Bradley began her direct examination. Dr. Evarts answered Ms. Bradley's questions and informed her and the Board that he has been licensed in Nevada since 1976 and knows Dr. Krumpe because they shared an office space at 1071 Haskell Street in Reno, Nevada. Ms. Bradley guided Dr. Evarts to open the binder containing the Exhibits and turn to Exhibit 7, which Dr. Evarts' confirmed was his Stipulated Settlement Agreement with the Board of psychology. Dr. Evarts explained that Dr. Krumpe had approached Dr. Evarts to sign her evaluations when DETR stopped paying when they "found out that she was not a licensed psychologist" and would be willing to accept the reports if they were countersigned by a licensed psychologist.

Mr. Dickerson objected to Exhibit 7's admission as it had no bearing upon the issues, as prescribed in NRS 233B.123, subsection 1, "Irrelevant, immaterial or unduly repetitious evidence must be excluded." Ms. Bradley responded to Mr. Dickerson's objection by noting Dr. Evarts' knowledge he had regarding what Dr. Krumpe did for DETR as well as her qualifications, skills, and whether she could do those things. Ms. Bradley went on to note that Exhibit 7 contained a couple statements Dr. Evarts made regarding this case that would be relevant for Board members to review. Upon hearing from both counsel, Dr. Paul found it to be relevant and admitted Exhibit 7.

Ms. Bradley began her review of Exhibit 7, beginning with Dr. Evarts reading a portion aloud to the Board, in particular where Dr. Evarts asserted that Dr. Krumpe had represented herself as a school psychologist and an educational psychologist and had the appropriate training to do the psychological evaluations in question. Dr. Evarts informed Ms. Bradley that he found the reports Dr. Krumpe had written, mostly intelligence and learning disability evaluations, to be professional, competent, and extremely detailed. Ms. Bradley concluded her questioning and Mr. Dickerson began his cross-examination of Dr. Evarts.

Mr. Dickerson asked Dr. Evarts whether he understand Dr. Krumpe was doing the evaluations as a psychologist or as a school or educational psychologist. Dr. Evarts responded that he believed she told him she was a school or educational psychologist and that she felt she was qualified and legally competent or able to do those reports.

As Board members had no further questions for Dr. Evarts, he was excused.

Ms. Bradley then called Dr. John Paglini as a witness. Dr. Paglini was sworn in and Ms. Bradley began her direct examination. Dr. Paglini answered Ms. Bradley's questions and informed her and the Board that he has been licensed in Nevada since 1991 and served on the Board from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018. Dr. Paglini answered in the affirmative that he was the investigating Board member in this case. As such, Dr. Paglini reviewed the complaint, filed March 13, 2015, that was provided to him by Director Gleich.

Prior to today's testimony, Dr. Paglini reviewed all documents associated with this case. To Dr. Paglini's remembrance, he reviewed Dr. Krumpe's evaluations, the complaint disposition form, records pertaining to Dr. Krumpe's licensure, his testimony from April 2017, Dr. Krumpe's provider agreement, and unspecified others Dr. Paglini could not recall at this time. In his review of Dr. Krumpe's evaluation, Dr. Paglini noted that of the 26 evaluations he reviewed, there were nine times Dr. Krumpe signed herself as a licensed psychologist, five of which overlap with Dr. Evarts' countersignature. Dr. Paglini categorized the nine evaluations where she signed herself as a licensed psychologist as cognitive testing, and noted that you need to be a licensed psychologist in the state you reside to complete these evaluations. Dr. Paglini believed that these evaluations were not

completed in a school district as a school or educational psychologist but were completed for DETR by Dr. Krumpe.

During Dr. Paglini's investigation, he found multiple instances of Dr. Krumpe presenting herself as and signing her evaluations as a licensed psychologist. Dr. Paglini concluded with his assertion that as Dr. Krumpe was not completing these evaluations in a school setting, and was not licensed by this Board, this is considered unlicensed activity. Ms. Bradley concluded her questioning and Mr. Dickerson began his cross-examination.

Mr. Dickerson began by asking Dr. Paglini what the practice of psychology entails. Dr. Paglini quoted NRS 641: "The practice of psychology as defined by NRS 641.025 is the observation, description, evaluation, interpretation or modification of human behavior by the application of psychological principles, methods or procedures to prevent or eliminate problematic, unhealthy or undesired behavior and to enhance personal relationships, behavior and mental health. The term includes, without limitation, such specialized areas of competence which include psychological testing, evaluation of personality, IQ testing, abilities, interests, aptitude, neuropsych[ological] functioning; additionally, counseling, psychoanalysis, therapy, hypnosis, biofeedback, analysis and therapy of behavior, diagnosis and treatment of mental disorders, alcoholism, substance abuse, psychological aspects of physiological injuries such as accidents and disabilities as well as evaluation, therapy, remediation and consultation related to the academic performance of a patient."

Mr. Dickerson continued his questioning of Dr. Paglini regarding receipt of the complaint. Dr. Paglini informed Mr. Dickerson he had received the complaint on March 13, 2015 from Director Gleich and was tasked with investigating the claim of unlicensed activity. Dr. Paglini's investigation took two years and he testified his findings to the Board in April 2017. Dr. Paglini was unsure about the number of hours worked on the case as it was start and stop based on what was going on. Further, that he only paid when he appeared before the Board and did not receive additional fees outside of those he usually got by the Board.

Mr. Dickerson continued his questioning of Dr. Paglini surrounding the investigation itself. During the course of his investigation, Dr. Paglini reviewed documents from both the Board office and evaluations from DETR. It was Dr. Paglini's understanding that it would have been appropriate for these evaluations to occur in a school setting, and while his investigation did not surround Dr. Krumpe's competency, it did bring in to question whether these assessments fell under the purview of this Board as they involved the practice of psychology. Dr. Paglini concluded that it is possible if these assessments occurred in an educational setting, they could have met a level of competency, but as they did not, Dr. Paglini could not say for certain that they did. Mr. Dickerson concluded his questioning and Dr. Paglini was excused from further questioning.

Ms. Bradley called her next witness: Dr. Gary Lenkeit. Dr. Lenkeit was sworn in and Ms. Bradley began her questioning. Dr. Lenkeit informed Ms. Bradley that he has been a psychologist in Nevada since 1992, served on the Board from 2008 to 2016, and is currently a part-time Board Investigator. Ms. Bradley then questioned Dr. Lenkeit's about his qualifications as an investigator. Dr. Lenkeit informed her that he had attended training given by the Board as well as training given by Council on Licensure, Enforcement, and Regulation (CLEAR) from which he was certified as an investigator. Also, Dr. Lenkeit had attended Association of Provincial Psychology Board (ASPPB) conferences wherein he received additional education of standards for the practice of psychology, including unlicensed practice.

Ms. Bradley then led Dr. Lenkeit to review Exhibit 5: the Provider Agreement between Dr. Krumpe and DETR. Dr. Lenkeit agreed in the affirmative that below Dr. Krumpe's signature on multiple pages was "psychologist", handwritten as her role. Dr. Lenkeit further agreed that based on this document, Dr. Krumpe portrayed herself as a psychologist and that it is unlawful to do so if you are not licensed in the state of Nevada.

Ms. Bradley then led Dr. Lenkeit to review Exhibit 6: Evaluations completed by Dr. Krumpe. Ms. Bradley asked Dr. Lenkeit the type of evaluations Dr. Krumpe completed and Dr. Lenkeit echoed Dr. Paglini's response that they were mostly cognitive and intelligence testing. Dr. Lenkeit agreed that it would be fair to say that the activities in which Dr. Krumpe engaged would require a license by this Board. Dr. Lenkeit also agreed that these evaluations did not occur in a school setting, precluding her from using her other licenses as a defense.

Ms. Bradley went on to question Dr. Lenkeit about how the Board has looked into allegations regarding unlicensed activity in the past and that while he could only remember two offhand, the results of the two, respectively, were that one individual reached a settlement with the Board and the second individual was stopped from practicing psychology in the state of Nevada. Ms. Bradley concluded her questioning of Dr. Lenkeit. Mr. Dickerson had no questions for Dr. Lenkeit.

Dr. Paul asked Dr. Lenkeit that when someone meets all the requirements for licensure, including education, supervisor pre- and post-degree training, and national and state exams, whether this establishes competency. Dr. Lenkeit agreed that when all requirements are met, they have established to the satisfaction of the Board and Nevada law that they are competent to practice as independent practitioners in psychology. Ms. Bradley excused Dr. Lenkeit from further questioning.

Ms. Bradley then called Executive Director Morgan Gleich to testify. Director Gleich was sworn in and Ms. Bradley began her questioning. Director Gleich began by informing Ms. Bradley and the Board that she has been employed by the Board for nearly 12 years, has been the Executive Director for 11 years, and was the Board's Executive Assistant for one year. Director Gleich informed Ms. Bradley that she first became aware of this complaint when DETR sent in a request to speak to herself and Ms. Bradley as they were concerned that Dr. Krumpe was using the title of psychologist inappropriately and engaging in work that required licensure.

Director Gleich went on to discuss the process this Board goes through when complaints such as this come through. Firstly, the licensing Boards with which an individual is licensed are contacted and their licenses are verified.

Ms. Bradley pointed Director Gleich to review Exhibit 2: verification of licensure from the Board of Examiners for Marriage and Family Therapists. Director Gleich summarized the information provided: that Dr. Krumpe was licensed as an intern on June 24, 2011, was granted licensure as a CPC June 8, 2015, and kept her license in good standing until October 3, 2018 when she placed her license on inactive status. From the timing of the reports, Dr. Krumpe's clinical professional counseling intern licensure was effective. Full licensure came about the time that the reports came to the Board.

Ms. Bradley then led Director Gleich to review Exhibit 3: verification of licensure from the State of Nevada Board of Education. Dr. Krumpe's endorsement issue date was April 20, 2003 and her license was issued February 5, 2014. Based on these dates, Dr. Krumpe's school psychologist license would not have been active at the time of the reports.

Ms. Bradley led Director Gleich to review Exhibit 4: verification of licensure from the State of Nevada Board of Alcohol, Drug, and Gambling Counselors that showed Dr. Krumpe was a certified clinical alcohol and drug counselor intern from May 2011 through July 2016, which Director Gleich confirmed was active during the time of the allegations.

Ms. Bradley then led Director Gleich to review Exhibit 6: evaluations completed by Dr. Krumpe. Director Gleich affirmed that she had seen the evaluations before as they had been provided by DETR to the Board office.

Lastly, Ms. Bradley led Director Gleich to review Exhibit 7: the Stipulated Settlement Agreement between Dr. Evarts and the Board. Director Gleich confirmed she had seen it before, that it a true and correct copy, and is part of the Board's records. To Director Gleich's knowledge, DETR did not file a written complaint and informed Ms. Bradley that if the Board office does not receive a written complaint, if the Board find reasonable action, the Board office can file a complaint.

Ms. Bradley moved on to clarify the salary of Board members. Director Gleich informed Ms. Bradley that each Board members receives \$150.00 total for each Board meeting attendance, not an hourly wage, and are eligible to receive mileage and incidentals. Board Investigators receive an hourly fee, which is \$150.00 for up to four hours a month. Ms. Bradley concluded her questioning of Director Gleich.

Mr. Dickerson began his cross-examination of Director Gleich. Mr. Dickerson wondered if Director Gleich urged DETR to make a complaint. Director Gleich informed Mr. Dickerson that she did not believe so and that with the information DETR provided, they could move forward without DETR filing a complaint, and that DETR never did. Director Gleich simply filed a disposition form on behalf of the Board office and reached out to Marriage and Family Therapy Board to see their disposition. The Executive Director at the time informed Director Gleich that Dr. Krumpe was a personal friend and could not see her partaking in these actions. It was then that the complaint was forwarded to Dr. Paglini for investigation. In March 2017, the formal complaint was issued in this case and the first hearing occurred in April 2017. Mr. Dickerson concluded his questioning of Director Gleich. Ms. Bradley nor Board members had additional questions for Director Gleich and she was dismissed from further questioning.

Motion A: Harlow report

Mr. Dickerson informed Board members of his intent to present Motion A. Ms. Bradley had no objections to its admission and review by the Board; however, she did object to the relevance in as much as Dr.

Harlow seemed to be talking about whether Dr. Krumpke was competent to do the testing and that he trained her. Further, that still does not mean she is licensed and able to do testing under the Nevada state law. She does not concede that his thought that she is trained allows her to engage in psychological testing legally. Lastly, Ms. Bradley wanted to inform Board members that Dr. Harlow is not a licensed psychologist in the state of Nevada. Mr. Dickerson waived his opening statement and proceeded to closing. Mr. Dickerson informed Board members that he believes this report speaks for itself and wanted to allow Board members to read it and determine what they want to take from it. He went on to note that Dr. Harlow ran the educational psychology program at the University of Nevada, Reno, as well as the educational psychology clinic, and that Dr. Krumpke was one of his mentees. Mr. Dickerson asked Dr. Harlow to review the evaluations and wanted the Board to see Dr. Harlow's opinions. After Board members reviewed Motion A, Mr. Dickerson rested his case.

Closing Statements

Ms. Bradley aimed to summarize the proceedings that the Board heard. Firstly, that they believe the allegations as contained in the Complaint and Notice of Hearing were true. Based off Dr. Paglini's testimony, Ms. Bradley noted changing the number of allegations from 29 alleged counts to 26 alleged counts. Further, they believe the Board has jurisdiction over this case pursuant to NRS 641.2705 which tells the Board to investigate unlicensed activity and to issue an order to cease and desist if the Board finds that the person is engaged in unlicensed activity. The Board is also allowed to assess fines and issue a citation.

Additionally, Ms. Bradley believes that they proved Dr. Krumpke has never been licensed by the Board as a psychologist, which was conceded to by Dr. Krumpke, and that based on testimony by witnesses and exhibits presented, it has been shown that Dr. Krumpke engaged in conduct that requires a license from this Board. This is specifically notable in the Provider Agreement Dr. Krumpke entered into where she indicated she was a psychologist four times. While there was not testimony regarding what Dr. Krumpke's signature looks like, in documents provided by DETR in a civil action, Ms. Bradley noted they have more likely than not proven there is Dr. Krumpke's handwritten signature with 'psychologist' written next to it.

Moreover, Ms. Bradley noted they proved Dr. Krumpke engaged in psychological testing, which is out of her scope of practice and did not occur in a school setting. Ms. Bradley noted, however, that even if it had occurred in a school setting, as prescribed in NRS 641.390, an individual is not allowed to call themselves a psychologist if they do not hold a valid license. Ms. Bradley also noted that the term "educational psychologist" does not exist in Nevada. Ms. Bradley withdrew allegations 19-21 as they pertained to a website that is no longer available. Ms. Bradley submitted that they had proven violations of law as alleged in the complaint; it is alleged that Dr. Krumpke engaged in the unlicensed practice of psychology as described in NRS 641.2705 and NRS 641.390 when she did these psychological evaluations for DETR, which have been amended to 26 counts.

Ms. Bradley continued by withdrawing their Second Claim for Relief as it had to do with advertising on a website that is no longer available. Ms. Bradley noted that the Third Claim for Relief had been proven that Dr. Krumpke engaged in a pattern of conduct by handwriting 'psychologist' on multiple documents provided by DETR, as prescribed in NRS 641.3790. Ms. Bradley rested her case.

Mr. Dickerson began his closing statement by expressing that the elements of the definition of the practice of psychology are not met by the preponderance of evidence. Mr. Dickerson asserted that Dr. Krumpke was not engaged in this work to prevent or eliminate behavior nor was she engaged as a behavioral clinical psychologist. She was simply trying to provide her opinion to DETR regarding individuals with intellectual disabilities and whether they were eligible for the program under vocational rehabilitation and what accommodations might be needed in order to accommodate whatever shortcomings she found people to have.

Further, that while she may not have had the proper licensure, she certainly had the competence to do so. She did not try to dupe Dr. Evarts into countersigning her reports, and as Dr. Evarts said, she felt that she was legally able to do those reports. Furthermore, based on the report from Dr. Harlow, it makes sense that she believed she could do this. Mr. Dickerson continued to note that this is the mitigating factor and what should be considered, as there is no evidence of an intent by Dr. Krumpke to evade this Board's jurisdiction. Dr. Krumpke came to the Board to present her case and this should determine any fines incurred. Mr. Dickerson once again asserted that the competence level is not an issue here, as supported by Dr. Evarts' and Dr. Paglini's testimonies.

Mr. Dickerson continued to note that in regards to the discipline for the complaint, the Board is allowed to cease and desist, but there is no evidence Dr. Krumpke will perform any more services for DETR, is unlikely to be hired by DETR again, and has not attempted to do this type of work in her practice since the work in 2013

that is at question. Mr. Dickerson urged the Board to group the counts in to one based on the nomenclature Dr. Krumpke used for her signature.

Ms. Bradley responded to Mr. Dickerson's closing statement by noting that while Dr. Krumpke may not have intended to do behavior modification or otherwise continue treatment with the individual, but to Ms. Bradley's knowledge, this why the reports in question are written: for the purpose of preventing or eliminating problematic, unhealthy or undesirable behavior and/or to enhance personal relationships and behavioral and mental health.

Ms. Bradley also noted that NRS 641.025(1) indicates "the term includes": the term, the practice of psychology, includes, without limitation, the specialized area of competence such as psychological testing and the evaluation of personal characteristics, including, without limitation, intelligence, personality, abilities, interests, aptitudes and neuropsychological functioning. Ms. Bradley went on to note that within the definition is analysis relating to behavior, which likely occurred, as well as, as Dr. Paglini testified, a diagnosis of posttraumatic stress disorder.

Further, psychological aspects of physical injury, illness, accident, or disability is related as Dr. Krumpke completed the evaluations for an agency that at least looks into disability issues. Lastly, evaluation, therapy, remediation and consultation relating to the academic performance may have been an element to these evaluation, as well. Ms. Bradley admitted that while it is a big definition, they believe that Dr. Krumpke's conduct fit within its bounds.

In response to Mr. Dickerson's comment about the Board's cease and desist policy, Ms. Bradley pointed Board members to look at NRS 641.390 wherein it says a person shall not represent himself or herself as a psychologist within the meaning of this chapter, so representing, or engage in the practice of psychology unless they are licensed. While it is really one or the other, Ms. Bradley asserted that they proved both. In relation to the holding out, to State of Nevada Board of Education stipulates that a licensee may use the title 'school psychologist' or 'certified school psychologist' and does not indicate use of 'educational psychologist'. As the Board's regulations go, an individual may not use any title that could be misleading and is not recognized by this Board.

Ms. Bradley noted that the Board is not conceding the competence issue. While the reports may be competent, Ms. Bradley recalled Dr. Lenkeit's testimony wherein he remarked that if you are not eligible for licensure, you do have competency to do psychological testing and reports; and Dr. Paglini's testimony wherein he noted that he was looking at practice by an unlicensed individual, not competency.

Ms. Bradley continued regarding the matter of the Board issuing a citation. Ms. Bradley noted there are fines based on the number of violations. She clarified that the Board is asking for attorney's fees and additional costs in bringing the case forward be reimbursed.

Dr. Paul questioned whether Dr. Krumpke was ever given an opportunity to enter into a settlement agreement with the Board. Ms. Bradley answered by noting that it is not talked about in hearings. Ms. Bordelove chimed in clarifying that settlement offers, discussions, or anything prior to a hearing is not admissible. Respondents are always given the option, but it is not included if a hearing occurs.

Board members began their deliberation based on what was presented.

Dr. Owens moved to find allegations 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, and 11 to be proven; Ms. Becker seconded; Board 4-0-0.

Dr. Owens moved to find that factual allegation 1 was proven; Dr. Krogh seconded; Board 4-0-0.

Dr. Krogh moved to find that factual allegation 3 was proven; Ms. Becker seconded; Board 4-0-0.

Dr. Owens noted that it might be beneficial to change the wording of allegation 8 from "received a complaint" to "received information"; Ms. Becker preferred "received an inquiry"; Board members agreed to change the wording of allegation 8.

Ms. Becker moved to find that allegation 8, with edit, was proven; Dr. Owens seconded; Board 4-0-0.

Dr. Owens moved to find allegations 9 and 12 to be proven; Ms. Becker seconded; Board 4-0-0.

Dr. Krogh moved to find allegations 13 and 14 to be proven; Dr. Owens seconded; Board 4-0-0.

Ms. Becker moved to find allegation 15 to be proven; Dr. Krogh seconded; Board 4-0-0.

Dr. Krogh moved to find allegation 16 and 17 as proven; Dr. Owens seconded; Board 4-0-0.

Dr. Owens noted that the reports were completed in 2013, before Dr. Krumpe was issued her school psychologist license. Dr. Paul suggested striking “as a licensed school psychologist”.

Dr. Owens moved to find allegation 18, with edit, as proven; Ms. Becker seconded; Board 4-0-0.

Ms. Becker moved for find allegations 22, 23, and 24 as proven; Dr. Owens seconded; Board 4-0-0.

Ms. Becker noted that to her recollection, no additional complaints were filed with the Board office against Dr. Krumpe. Dr. Paul and Dr. Krogh agreed with Ms. Becker’s assertion.

Ms. Becker moved to find allegation 25 as not proven; Dr. Krogh seconded; Board 0-4-0.

Ms. Becker found issue with allegation 26 being proven. President Paul responded that she believed it was proven that a school psychologist may not work outside of their scope within schools. Ms. Becker agreed to allegation 26 being proven by fact, as a licensed school psychologist, Respondent may not lawfully conduct psychological evaluations outside the jurisdiction of a school district or the Department of Education.

Ms. Becker moved to find allegation 26, with edits, as proven; Dr. Krogh seconded; Board 4-0-0.

Ms. Becker moved to find allegation 27 as proven; Dr. Krogh seconded; Board 4-0-0.

Ms. Becker moved to find allegation 28 as proven; Dr. Owens seconded; Board 4-0-0.

Board members moved on to discuss the First Claim for Relief, which includes 26 counts. Ms. Bordelove clarified that it is up to the Board to determine how many of the evaluations did Dr. Krumpe misrepresent herself. Dr. Owens reiterated that at the time the reports were written, Dr. Krumpe was not a licensed school psychologist, which would lead her to find all 26 reports as proven. Ms. Becker noted that her focus was on the instances where Dr. Krumpe wrote her title as “licensed psychologist” and within each evaluation is 4 sections that are validated by her signature. In Ms. Becker’s mind, those were the ones she had issues with. Ms. Becker continued to remark that to have someone state they are something they are not is egregious.

As Board members clarified exactly how many instances Dr. Krumpe utilized the title “licensed psychologist”, Dr. Paul noted the use of the term “educational psychologist” is misleading as well. All of titles are misleading and are not within her scope. Dr. Krogh added it is been established Dr. Krumpe used the title multiple times despite not having proper licensing, and no matter where she was doing psychological testing, she was doing so without a license. Regardless of using “psychologist”, Dr. Krumpe should not have engaged in this behavior.

Dr. Paul took the time to remind Board members that Mr. Dickerson had asked the Board to consider some leniency, as for each count there is a fine. As it is \$500 for the first, \$1,000 for the second, and \$1,500 for the third and subsequent, Dr. Krumpe’s max fine would total \$37,500 for 26 counts. Dr. Owens noted the highness of that number and Dr. Paul remarked it is meant to be punitive. Ms. Bordelove reminded Board members that it was up to them to interpret their statutes and that this case of unlicensed activity could create a precedence. Dr. Paul commented that while she appreciated that Dr. Krumpe may have been ignorant and did not do this willfully, it seemed that Dr. Krumpe was not

willing to admit that she was out of her bounds. Dr. Owens echoed Ms. Bordelove's advisement regarding this case setting a precedence and leniency could cause individuals to hedge their bets if a case such as this is brought before the Board in the future. Ms. Bordelove advised the Board that they have authority to change decisions at a later date.

Dr. Krogh moved to find the First Claim for Relief of 26 counts as proven; Dr. Owens seconded; Board 4-0-0.

Ms. Becker moved to find the Third Claim for Relief as proven; Dr. Krogh seconded; Board 4-0-0.

Board members then moved on to discuss penalties for Dr. Krumpe. Based on the 27 violations, Dr. Paul assessed Dr. Krumpe's fine to be \$39,000 and added that this does not prevent Dr. Krumpe from coming back to the Board and asking for some reduction in those fines at a future date.

Dr. Owens motioned to assess a fine totaling \$39,000; Dr. Krogh seconded; Board 4-0-0.

Ms. Bradley requested that even though Dr. Krumpe is not engaging in this behavior, they would like to request a cease and desist be ordered.

Ms. Becker moved to send Dr. Krumpe a letter to cease and desist the practice of psychology; Dr. Owens seconded; Board 4-0-0.

Ms. Bradley assessed the total hours worked for this case to be 21.7, and the rate per hour being \$154.36 makes the total amount of attorney's fees for this case \$3,349.61. Additional costs included the fee for the court reporter, which would not be more than \$1,500, and the cost for two Board investigators, \$150 each, totaling \$1,800. Mr. Dickerson agreed that the costs seemed reasonable.

Dr. Owens moved to approve the assessed attorney's fees of \$3,349.61 and additional costs of \$1,800; Dr. Krogh seconded; Board 4-0-0.

Proceedings concluded at 3:53 p.m.

8. Update regarding Board Office Operations

a. Review and update of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners Strategic Plan

Discussion deferred to the July 12, 2019 Board Meeting.

b. Executive Director Report

1. Update regarding Board settlements and disciplinary orders.

Discussion deferred to the July 12, 2019 Board Meeting.

2. Update regarding Executive Director's Professional Development Plan.

Discussion deferred to the July 12, 2019 Board Meeting.

3. Discussion and update regarding Employee Handbook development.

Discussion deferred to the July 12, 2019 Board Meeting.

4. Update regarding PSYPACT commission

Discussion deferred to the July 12, 2019 Board Meeting.

9. Review and discuss the proposed discipline policies, as drafted by Dr. Lenkeit.

a. Review and Discussion regarding the investigation process, and changes that may streamline and assist the Board in the clarity of requests regarding responses to complaints.

Discussion deferred to the July 12, 2019 Board Meeting

10. Vote on Board Positions; elected annually, to serve for one year.

a. Board President

Dr. Krogh nominated Dr. Owens for Board President; Ms. Becker seconded; Board 4-0-0

b. Secretary/Treasurer

Dr. Krogh nominated Dr. Papa for Secretary/Treasurer; Ms. Becker seconded; Board 4-0-0

c. CE Committee Chair

Dr. Krogh nominated himself for CE Committee Chair; Ms. Becker seconded; Board 4-0-0

d. Exam Chair

Dr. Krogh nominated Dr. Holland for Exam Chair; Ms. Becker seconded; Board 4-0-0

e. ATEAM membership

A Board member will be nominated upon arrival of new Board members.

f. Recognition for previous positions

Director Gleich and Dr. Owens presented a plaque of recognition to both Dr. Paul and Ms. Becker to thank them for their 8 years of service to the Board.

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

Future meetings are scheduled for:

July 12, 2019

August 9, 2019,

September 13, 2019,

October 11, 2019,

November 8, 2019,

December 13, 2019

All meetings will be held by video conference at 9:00 a.m. unless otherwise noted.

A stake holders meeting will be held via zoom July 1 at 5:00 p.m., a public workshop will be scheduled for July 12th Board meeting.

12. Board needs, operations, and schedules.

a. Policy regarding applicants seeking licensing examination accommodations. The Board may discuss, review, and possibly approve a policy for applicants seeking licensing examination accommodations.

Dr. Paul will provide the Board an updated accommodation application, after her term as a board member is over.

b. Update/Report from Nevada Psychological Association Representative.

Dr. Zimring updated the Board on what issues within the legislature the Association is still following, particularly in relation to the 2020 legislative session. She noted her appreciation to this Board for their continued open availability and willingness to listen and strategize when issues that require discussion arise.

c. Utilizing ASANA, to assist in project management for Board activities.

Dr. Owens informed the Board of the utility of ASANA and noted that it might be useful for the Board to use in the future. She recommended to the Board that the program should be utilized for future projects.

d. Future Board meeting agenda items.

Discussion deferred to the July 12, 2019 Board Meeting.

11. PSYCHOLOGISTS/PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSISTANTS/PSYCHOLOGICAL INTERNS

Irina Abramians - No discussion warranted at this time.

Danielle Agnello - No discussion warranted at this time.

Zyra Alandy-dy - No discussion warranted at this time.

Britney Alford - No discussion warranted at this time.

Carolina Alicea-Morales - No discussion warranted at this time.

Carol Anderson - No discussion warranted at this time.

Julie Armstrong - No discussion warranted at this time.

Lauren Bennett - No discussion warranted at this time.

Natalie Bennett - No discussion warranted at this time.

Monela Beroni - No discussion warranted at this time.

Erin Bigler - **Dr. Krogh motioned to approve for licensure contingent on passing score on State Exam and EPPP;**

Dr. Owens seconded; Board 4-0-0

Jeremy Bissram - No discussion warranted at this time.

Amelia K. Black - No discussion warranted at this time.

Michael Browning - No discussion warranted at this time.

Hanna Brunet - No discussion warranted at this time.

Cynthia Cameron - No discussion warranted at this time.

Lucille Carriere - **Dr. Owens motioned to approve for licensure through endorsement contingent on file completion and approval; Dr. Krogh seconded; Board 4-0-0**

Claudia Capizzi-Gay - No discussion warranted at this time.

Leandrea Caver - No discussion warranted at this time.

Lauren Chapple - No discussion warranted at this time.

Christine Curtis - No discussion warranted at this time.

Sarah Damas - No discussion warranted at this time.

Emily Daniel - **Dr. Owens motioned to approve for licensure through endorsement contingent on file completion and approval; Dr. Krogh seconded; Board 4-0-0**

Melissa Depa - No discussion warranted at this time.

Nicole Dionsio - No discussion warranted at this time.

Scott Fidler - No discussion warranted at this time.

Suzana Flores - No discussion warranted at this time.

Daphne Fowler - No discussion warranted at this time.

Donna Greifer - No discussion warranted at this time.

Jennifer Grimes-Vawters - No discussion warranted at this time.

Christopher Guthrey - No discussion warranted at this time.

Jennifer Guttman - No discussion warranted at this time.

Lindsey Hailston - No discussion warranted at this time.

Kristin Hambidge - No discussion warranted at this time.

Laurie Harris - No discussion warranted at this time.

Centina Hernandez - No discussion warranted at this time.

Bernadette Hinojos - No discussion warranted at this time.

Lana Holmes - No discussion warranted at this time.

Antrice Hronek - No discussion warranted at this time.

Helena Huckabee - No discussion warranted at this time.

Josette Iribarne-Lazcano - No discussion warranted at this time.

Katherine Isaza - No discussion warranted at this time.

Helen Jackson - No discussion warranted at this time.

Leah Jacobs - No discussion warranted at this time.

Dasa Jenrusakova - No discussion warranted at this time.

Lidany Jimenez-Viloria - No discussion warranted at this time.

Casha Kaufer - No discussion warranted at this time.

Durriyah Khorakiwala - No discussion warranted at this time.

Shane Kraus - No discussion warranted at this time.

Dorota Krotkiewicz - No discussion warranted at this time.

Kimberley Lakes - **Dr. Owens motioned to approve for licensure through endorsement contingent on file completion and approval; Dr. Krogh seconded; Board 4-0-0**

Cynthia Lancaster - No discussion warranted at this time.

Merry Larson - No discussion warranted at this time.

Melissa LaVan - No discussion warranted at this time.

Crystal Lee - No discussion warranted at this time.

Anayansi Lombardero - **Dr. Krogh motioned to approve for licensure contingent on passing score on State Exam and EPPP; Dr. Owens seconded; Board 4-0-0**

Vanessa Ma - No discussion warranted at this time.

Debbie Maddox - No discussion warranted at this time.

Isra Malik - No discussion warranted at this time.

Camille Malcherzyk - No discussion warranted at this time

Gayle Mann - No discussion warranted at this time.

Marc McLaughlin - **Dr. Owens motioned to approve for licensure through endorsement contingent on file completion and approval; Dr. Krogh seconded; Board 4-0-0**

Candis R. Mitchell - No discussion warranted at this time.

Samuel Montano - No discussion warranted at this time.

Tracy Moore - No discussion warranted at this time.

Michael Moradshahi - No discussion warranted at this time.

Luzviminda Morrow - No discussion warranted at this time.

Amy Mouanoutoua - No discussion warranted at this time.

Jayne Neiman-Kimel - No discussion warranted at this time.

Kelly Nelson - No discussion warranted at this time.

Kellie Nesto - No discussion warranted at this time.

Pak Yan Ngai - No discussion warranted at this time.

Lyle Noisy Hawk Jr. - No discussion warranted at this time.

Michael Pauldine - No discussion warranted at this time.

Dorothy Parriott - No discussion warranted at this time.

Carolina Perez - No discussion warranted at this time.

Anthony Petruzzello - No discussion warranted at this time.

Rachel Pinkerman - No discussion warranted at this time.

Richard Pratt - No discussion warranted at this time.

Elizabeth Pritchard - No discussion warranted at this time.

Ashleigh Rankin - **Dr. Owens motioned to close, by applicants request; Dr. Krogh seconded; Board 4-0-0**

Howard Reid - No discussion warranted at this time.

Rosalinda Reyes - **Dr. Owens motioned to approve for licensure through endorsement contingent on file completion and approval; Dr. Krogh seconded; Board 4-0-0**

Samantha Schilling - No discussion warranted at this time.

Dana Schmidt - No discussion warranted at this time.

Christopher Shewbarran - No discussion warranted at this time.

David Shoemaker - No discussion warranted at this time.

Sharon Simington - No discussion warranted at this time.

Cassandra Snipes - No discussion warranted at this time.

Ralph Turner - No discussion warranted at this time.

Kristine Turner-Sherman - No discussion warranted at this time.

Lennon Tyler - No discussion warranted at this time.

Joyce Ulofoshio - No discussion warranted at this time.

Alexandro Velez - No discussion warranted at this time.

Brent Venters - No discussion warranted at this time.

Michael Villanueva - No discussion warranted at this time.

Lipika Wadhwa - No discussion warranted at this time.

Barbara Wells - No discussion warranted at this time.

Sharon West - No discussion warranted at this time.

Stephen Willis - No discussion warranted at this time.

Christina Wong - **Dr. Owens motioned to approve for licensure through endorsement contingent on file completion and approval; Dr. Krogh seconded; Board 4-0-0**

Jaime Wong - No discussion warranted at this time.

Donald Yorgason - No discussion warranted at this time.

Qingqing Zhu - No discussion warranted at this time.

Kseniya Zhuzha - No discussion warranted at this time.

Michelle Zochowski - No discussion warranted at this time.

Todd Zwahlen - No discussion warranted at this time.

Simon Zysman - No discussion warranted at this time.

14. Richard Pratt, Ph.D., Pending Application for Licensure as a Psychologist. The Board will review, discuss, and possibly decide Dr. Pratt's pending licensure application. The Board may grant or deny Dr. Pratt's application or grant licensure to Dr. Pratt under the terms and conditions specified at the meeting. If Dr. Pratt is present at the meeting, the Board may ask questions of him, and Dr. Pratt will have an opportunity to address the Board regarding his licensure application.

Ms. Bradley reminded the Board that the ATEAM had previously reviewed Dr. Pratt's education and training and has provided further recommendations to the Board. Additionally, Dr. Pratt should complete the remaining portions of the settlement agreement, prior to regaining licensure.

First, it was noted that Dr. Pratt did not complete a post-doctoral supervision year, as is required under current rules and regulations. It was recommended the Dr. Pratt register as a psychological assistant, with licensed psychologist supervisor.

To remediate the lack of intervention coursework, the ATEAM recommended 45 hours of Continuing Education Units. These courses should be within the scope of practice of Dr. Pratt's supervisor, to guarantee that Dr. Pratt receives training that aligns with the training of his supervisor. Further, in order to make up for the gap in professional ethics, the ATEAM recommended for Dr. Pratt to complete the EBAS exam, that was required in the earlier settlement agreement.

Dr. Paul reminded the Board of Dr. Pratt's diligence in completing the PLUS application and other requests, as his circumstances are unique.

Ms. Becker motioned for approval of Dr. Pratt's application, contingent on completion of ATEAM's recommendations and review of his Supervision Practice Plan; Dr. Krogh seconded; Dr. Owens abstained; Board 3-1-0

15. Update regarding the 80th session of the Nevada Legislature. The Board will receive updates regarding the status of bills and BDRS that will have an effect on the Board and psychological licensing community.

a. Legislative Issues that require top attention from the Board.

SB037 - No update.

AB453 - The bill was passed, and regulation changes will need to take place to enforce the increased renewal fees, as well as the other changes that were made. Additionally, the 7th member position will be open on July 1, 2019 and will hopefully be placed at the same time as the other two open positions.

AB285 - No update.

b. Legislative Actions that may affect the Board.

AB070 AB274 AB275 AB300 AB319 AB329 AB371 SB014 SB128 SB171 SB183 SB219 SB234 SB245 SB323 SB388 SB424 SCR06 BDR115 BDR309 BDR602 BDR751 BDR848 BDR1123 BDR1150 BDR1221 BDR1222

No update.

c. The Board's response to legislative session, and necessary actions.

No discussion.

16. Approval of testing accommodations

a. Britney Alford

Ms. Becker motioned to approve Dr. Alford's request for testing accommodations; Dr. Owens seconded; Board 4-0-0

17. Approval of reactivation from inactive to active status.

a. Carol Randall

Dr. Owens motioned to approve, pending application completion; Dr. Krogh seconded; Board 4-0-0

b. William C. Follette

Dr. Owens motioned to approve, pending application completion; Dr. Krogh seconded; Board 4-0-0

18. Correspondence

a. Corey Coleman, of INSPIR3, requesting support from the Board regarding a pilot program INSPIR3 is proposing.

Dr. Paul remarked that the Board is not in the position to approve individual agencies. The purview of the Board is to assess applicants as they come through. Dr. Owens remarked perhaps redirecting Mr. Coleman to the Nevada Psychological Association may provide him with resources he may be seeking. However, Dr. Zimring noted that she is unsure of what the Association would be do for Mr. Coleman, either. Dr. Paul tasked Director Gleich with drafting a response letter outlining what this Board does and what is not within our purview.

19. Public Comment

No public comment.

20. ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Owens motioned to adjourn. Ms. Becker second. Board vote 4-0-0. Meeting adjourned 4:02 p.m.