

STATE OF NEVADA BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS
MEETING MINUTES

August 13, 2021

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

Call to Order: The meeting of the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners was called to order by President Whitney Owens, PsyD, at 8:30 a.m. at the office of the Board of Psychological Examiners, 4600 Kietzke Lane, Ste B-116, Reno, Nevada 89502. Due to COVID-19 and Governor Sisolak's Emergency Mandate to Stay at Home for Nevada, this meeting was also conducted online via "Zoom."

Roll Call: Board President Whitney Owens, PsyD, Secretary/Treasurer Stephanie Woodard, Psy.D., and members Monique Abarca, LCSW, Stephanie Holland, PsyD, and Soseh Esmaeili, PsyD, were present.

Also present were Harry Ward, Deputy Attorney General, Dr. Gary Lenkeit, Board Investigator, Dr. Sheila Young, Board Investigator, Lisa Scurry, Executive Director, and members of the public: James Tenney, Brian Lech, Sara Hunt, and Andrew Hickman.

2. Public Comment

There was no public comment at this time. Lisa Scurry, Executive Director, stated no public comment had been received by the Board Office as of the start of the meeting.

3. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of the State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners from July 9, 2021.

There were no comments nor proposed changes to the minutes.

Member Dr. Woodard abstained from voting as she was not at the July meeting.

On motion by Monique Abarca, second by Soseh Esmaeili, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the meeting minutes from July 9, 2021. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, and Monique Abarca. Abstain: Stephanie Woodard) Motion Carries: 4-0

4. Financial Report

A. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Treasurer's Report for F/Y 2022 (July 1, 2021, Through June 30, 2022).

Secretary/Treasurer Stephanie Woodard explained that she had met with Director Scurry and received some training on how to read and understand the financials. Lisa Scurry, Executive Director, presented the financial report. She explained that there were few revenues and expenses to report as the new fiscal year had just begun in

July. Ms. Scurry added that some expenses that occurred in June, as part of Fiscal Year 2021, were showing as part of the July expenses. Two examples provided were June expenses in legal and payroll. She expected to have that corrected for the September meeting.

Dr. Woodard stated a budget reconciliation would be presented to the Board at a future meeting to more accurately reflect the final expenses for Fiscal Year 2021.

On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the treasurer's report for Fiscal Year 2022. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Stephanie Woodard, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, and Monique Abarca) Motion Carries: 5-0

B. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Provide approval to register any Board members or staff who wish to attend the ASPPB Annual meeting on October 15-16, 2021, at a cost of \$50 per person, not to exceed a total cost of \$600.

The ASPPB Annual meeting is scheduled for October 15-16, 2021. It will be a virtual meeting and the cost will be \$50 per person. Director Scurry asked the Board for approval of an expenditure of not more than \$600 in order to register any Board member or staff wishing to attend.

President Owens explained that the theme of the meeting will be proactive protection of the public, and ways to work with licensees before problems arise.

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Soseh Esmaeili, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved an expenditure of up to \$600 to register any board members or staff wishing to attend the ASPPB Annual Meeting on October 15-16, 2021. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Stephanie Woodard, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, and Monique Abarca) Motion Carries: 5-0

5. Board Needs and Operations

A. Update and Report from the Nevada Psychological Association

Sara Hunt presented an update on behalf of the Nevada Psychological Association (NPA). The NPA members were recently surveyed regarding upcoming CEU events and other activities, including whether or not to keep meetings virtual or move to a hybrid model.

B. Report From the Executive Director on Board Office Operations

Lisa Scurry, Executive Director, presented statistics of work occurring in the office including applications for licensure and registration, licenses and registrations issued, non-resident consultants, state examinations administered, and temporary registrations approved.

It was suggested that the number of complaints the office receives could be added to the list. Ms. Scurry stated that was a good statistic to monitor as not all phone calls or emails related to concerns become formal complaints.

6. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Provide Guidance on Matters Related to the Covid-19 Pandemic and Governor Sisolak's Directive 011. Discussion May Include Options for Temporary Licensure to Ensure Continuity of Care for Patients Being Seen by Out-Of-State Providers when the Provisions of Directive 011 Expire, Licensure Renewal, Continuing Education Credits, Supervision Concerns, Obtaining Clinical Hours for Licensure, and the Use of Telepsychology and Interjurisdictional Practice.

Lisa Scurry, Executive Director, stated that the application process for online temporary registration was implemented is being used for those who are licensed in another jurisdiction to practice via telehealth. The value of the online application is that it asks for additional information such as conduct and/or complaints against the applicant.

Member Stephanie Woodard provided an update on the public health emergency declaration stating there did not appear to be any plans by the State to end Directive 011 or to have Boards stop the temporary registration process. As a result, she suggested the Board office move forward with surveying those who have registered. The survey will gather information as to how the Directive has been used, if it was still being used, etc.

7. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Direct the Board's Exam Chair to Make Revision to the Nevada State Examination for Licensure as a Psychologist as Necessary to Comply with Changes to state laws and regulations

Lisa Scurry, Executive Director, asked for direction and authority from the Board for she and Dr. Holland, the Board's state exam coordinator, to conduct a review of the state examination question bank. The purpose of the review would be to identify the need for any potential revision to questions based on changes to state law and/or regulations. Non-substantive changes would be made without further action by the Board. Substantive changes would be brought back to the Board for review and approval.

President Owens suggested adding language related to an annual review of the questions bank to the state examination policy and procedures. Ms. Scurry stated that she and Dr. Holland have worked on such a policy and a re-write of the exam "Candidate Guide." Both of those documents will return at a future meeting for review by the Board.

On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Stephanie Woodard, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners directed the Exam Chair and Executive Director to conduct a review of the Nevada State Examination; authorized corrections to the state examination question bank based on adopted revisions of Nevada Revised Statutes and/or Nevada Administrative Code; and the state examination policy include a provision for the annual review of the question bank. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Stephanie Woodard, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, and Monique Abarca) Motion Carries: 5-0

8. (For Possible Action) Discussion, and Possible Action on Pending Consumer Complaints:

Harry Ward, Deputy Attorney General, gave an update on the complaints A-D. He also made general comment regarding the hearing and court process related to complaints, litigation, and the costs to the Board.

- A. Complaint #19-0626.** This matter is currently in litigation and final resolution remains pending.
- B. Complaint #19-0709.** This matter is currently in litigation and final resolution remains pending.
- C. Complaint #19-1106.** This matter is being monitored through 2021 and remains pending.
- D. Complaint #19-1223.** This matter is being monitored through 2021 and remains pending.
- E. Complaint #20-0501.** Resolution of this matter is pending.
- F. Complaint #20-0818.** Resolution of this matter is pending.
- G. Complaint #20-0819.** Resolution of this matter is pending.
- H. Complaint #21-0513.** Resolution of this matter is pending.
- I. Complaint #21-0524.** Resolution of this matter is pending.
- J. Complaint #21-0702.** Resolution of this matter is pending.

9. (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.

President Owens presented the following applicants for approval of licensure, contingent upon satisfactory completion of all licensure requirements: Brandon Chuman, Roman Dietrich, Lori Haggard, Brandon Henscheid, Andrew Hickman, Bernadette Hinojos, Elyse Kompaniez-Dunigan, Rory Newlands, Brian Olsen, Karima Shagaga, Shelly Sheinbein, Anya Verriden, Justine Weber, and Stephen Winston

Member Esmaeili stated she would abstain from the vote on Andrew Hickman due to a potential conflict.

On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the following applicants for approval of licensure, contingent upon satisfactory completion of all licensure requirements: Brandon Chuman, Roman Dietrich, Lori Haggard, Andrew Hickman, Brandon Henscheid, Bernadette Hinojos, Elyse Kompaniez-Dunigan, Rory Newlands, Brian Olsen, Karima Shagaga, Shelly Sheinbein, Anya Verriden, Justine Weber, and Stephen Winston. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Stephanie Woodard, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, and Monique Abarca) Motion Carries: 5-0

On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the following applicants for approval of licensure, contingent upon satisfactory completion of all licensure requirements: Andrew Hickman. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Stephanie Woodard, Stephanie Holland, and Monique Abarca. Abstain: Soseh Esmaeili) Motion Carries: 4-0

A. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Application for Reinstatement of Licensure as a Psychologist of Pak Yan Ngai

Dr. Pak Yan Ngai submitted an application for reinstatement, including copies of certificates documenting completion of the required continuing education credits.

There were no questions or concerns expressed.

On motion by Monique Abarca, second by Soseh Esmaeili, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the license reinstatement of Dr. Pak Yan Ngai, contingent upon payment of licensure fees. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Stephanie Woodard, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, and Monique Abarca) Motion Carries: 5-0

B. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve or Provide Recommendations on the Application for Licensure of Timothy Law for Licensure as a Psychologist

Lisa Scurry, Executive Director, presented the application of Dr. Timothy Law. Dr. Law was licensed in California for more than 20 years, until about 1998. At that time his license expired and he has not been licensed in the United States since then. From that time until or about 2012, he worked in Hong Kong but he was not licensed as, according to Dr. Law, psychologists are not licensed in Hong Kong. His records did not indicate he was practicing specifically as a psychologist during that time.

Dr. Law's application was previously reviewed by the Board's Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee. The Committee referred his application to the full Board and recommended it be considered using the same criteria as an applicant for re-instatement of a license, including proof of ongoing continuing education. Dr. Law was asked to provide information such as his intent once he is licensed, where he intends to practice, etc., but the information had not been received by the Board office prior to the meeting.

President Owens queried the members about past practice when the applicant does not have an active license, has been out of the country, etc. Dr. Young suggested the whole packet be reviewed, adding that if he graduated in the 1970's, he may not meet many of the state's criteria. Dr. Lenkeit agreed that the additional information requested of Dr. Law would be helpful.

President Owens asked Dr. Brian Lech, a past Board member who was attending the meeting as a member of the public, if he had thoughts as to how the Board should proceed. Dr. Lech responded that he concurred with Dr. Lenkeit in that the application packet should be reviewed including education, past licensure, etc.

There was discussion about the education and training requirements under which Dr. Law was licensed in the 1970's versus those same criteria today. Concern was expressed that, based on the number of years since initial licensure, it could be difficult to establish equivalency. Options discussed included sending the applicant through ASPPB's credentials verification process and requiring continuing education hours.

Dr. Holland stated that knowing his intent once licensed was important information for the Board to have as there would be a difference between his practicing in a private capacity versus in a setting with other licensed mental health professionals.

President Owens expressed concern that Dr. Law had not been licensed in more than 20 years and agreed that equivalency review of education and training would be important. The way in which that would be accomplished was discussed. That included potentially obtaining a reference from Hong Kong to show the work being done over those 20 years was substantially equivalent to the work of a licensed psychologist in Nevada.

Dr. Lenkeit volunteered to conduct a review of the application and associated materials. The members agreed.

On motion by Monique Abarca, second by Soseh Esmaeili, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners charged Board Investigator, Dr. Gary Lenkeit, with the review of Dr. Timothy Law's application and to make recommendations to the Board. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Stephanie Woodard, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, and Monique Abarca) Motion Carries: 5-0

C. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Issue a License to Practice Psychology to Applicant Deva Dorris Under the Supervision of a Licensed Psychologist Until she obtains a passing score on the EPPP Part-2 and contingent upon completion of all other licensure requirements

There was no discussion or action on this item.

D. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Determine if Applicant Andrew Hickman is Required to take the EPPP Part-2 as part of licensure

(This item was taken out of order.)

Lisa Scurry, Executive Director, presented a request by Dr. Andrew Hickman for an exception of the requirement that he pass the EPPP Part-2 as a condition for licensure. She explained that Dr. Hickman is currently a registered psychological assistant. When he recently applied for licensure, he stated that he had been eligible to apply in the Fall of 2020. Had he done so, he would have been exempt from the EPPP Part-2 requirement.

Dr. Hickman stated that he misunderstood the requirements for applying for licensure, including completion of the actual application. Since that time, he has completed most requirements, including the PLUS application and Nevada state exam. He added that he is concerned that he could lose a potential employment opportunity if he is not licensed in a timely manner.

Dr. Esmaeili spoke in support of Dr. Hickman, as his current supervisor. She confirmed that he may have a position with her practice once he is licensed.

Ms. Scurry stated that the EPPP Part-2 would go live for appointments as of August 15, 2021. However, appointments were already booked through mid-September. She added that, to date, Dr. Hickman's background check had not been received by the Board office. He could not be licensed until the background check is received.

President Owens reminded the members and the public the reasons why the EPPP Part-2 was adopted as a licensure requirement as one way of ensuring public safety. She added that they were intentional in their deliberation, accepted public comment, and attempted to notify those who would be impacted.

Member Dr. Woodard agreed that the Board worked conscientiously as a Board to establish dates and deadlines when adopting the EPPP Part-2. She added that a precedent would be set by allowing the waiver for one applicant.

Member Dr. Holland inquired about the timeline for completing other licensure requirements and how that would impact the potential for a provisional licensure pending completion of the exam requirement.

Member Mrs. Abarca agreed with the concern regarding setting a precedent.

Dr. Hickman inquired about the potential for receiving a provisional licensure to practice pending completion of the EPPP Part-2.

Director Scurry explained that over the past few months, provisional licenses have been issued for other applicants that had met all other licensure requirements but were not yet able to take and/or pass Part 2 of the exam. Those individuals were provided a provisional license but remain under supervision until such time as they complete the EPPP Part-2. She added that if such an individual fails the exam the Board will be notified at the next meeting. The Board has provided that the requirement be met within a year.

Dr. Holland asked if waiting for the September meeting would cause any concerns for Dr. Hickman's potential employment. Dr. Esmaeili stated that waiting until the September meeting would not create a problem for his employment.

It was decided to bring discussion about a provisional license to the next meeting of the Board as additional information should be received by the Board office by that time.

Member Dr. Esmaeili stated she would abstain from any vote due to a potential conflict.

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners denied the request of Dr. Andrew Hickman for waiver of the EPPP Part-2 as a requirement for licensure. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Stephanie Woodard, Stephanie Holland and Monique Abarca. Abstain: Soseh Esmaeili) Motion Carries: 4-0

10. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Adopt Procedures Related to Registration and Supervision of Psychological Assistants in accordance with Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) Chapter 641

Lisa Scurry, Executive Director, presented the latest version of the draft procedures related to registration and supervision of psychological assistants (PA). In the last meeting, there was discussion about when registration can be assigned to a psychological assistant – upon application, upon completion of all steps, or somewhere in between. The revised language would allow for registration to be issued upon completion of all documentation except for the PLUS report and final background check. Upon receipt of those items, if any issues are found, registration could be suspended

until the issues were addressed. It was also recommended that registration not be issued when it is known that the applicant will be referred to the Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee. For example, if the applicant attended a school that was not accredited by the American Psychological Association (APA). In that case, registration would be delayed pending the equivalency review.

Director Scurry recommended that the initial application be revised to ask for additional information, such as the name of the university and internship information, rather than waiting for the PLUS report. The purpose would be to allow for an initial informal review in hopes of identifying potential concerns before issuing registration. Otherwise, a psychological assistant could potentially be registered and then lose the registration if it is later learned that the education was not equivalent or the required internship hours were not obtained.

Member Dr. Holland agreed that it would be better to acquire information at the beginning of the process, potentially removing many of the delays.

Director Scurry reviewed additional revised sections. The first would allow the executive director to approve a change in supervisor in most cases without bringing the request to the Board. The policy stated that such requests may be referred to the Board at the discretion of the executive director.

Language was added to clarify that the term "supervisor" includes both primary and secondary supervisors. This ensures that the limits set for the number of supervisees is the same whether serving as the primary or secondary supervisor.

The section related to the expiration or withdrawal of an application or registration was revised to allow the executive director to approve an extension of the registration for a second or third year of registration. The section provides information as to the process for requesting an additional year of registration including Board approval.

President Owens asked under what conditions a request for a new supervisor or the extension of registration would come to the Board. Ms. Scurry provided some examples including: a psychological assistant who has completed two years and is changing supervisors, or a psychological assistant coming from out of state and wanting to register while completing the requirement for licensure.

Member Dr. Holland inquired about including the definition of supervisor to the policy and whether it should be in an alternative policy instead. President Owens suggested that while the definition could be in another document, having it in the assistant policy added clarity for those serving as supervisors. She added that, in her opinion, a secondary supervisor should not be supervising more than the designated number of trainees, interns, and assistants.

Director Scurry suggested that the presented document be revised to add language that if it is believed at the outset that the application will require referral to the ATEAM, registration will not be granted until that review occurs.

Member Dr. Woodard left the meeting at 10:15 a.m.

(Note: As a quorum was not present at the conclusion of the discussion, the item was tabled until a vote could occur later in the meeting.)

On motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the adoption of the "Registration and Supervision of Psychological Assistants" Policy with the noted revision related to referral to ATEAM. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Stephanie Holland, Monique Abarca, and Soseh Esmaeili. Not Present at Vote: Stephanie Woodard) Motion Carries: 4-0

11. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Recognize Canadian Psychological Association (CPA) Accredited Programs as Equivalent to American Psychological Association (APA) Accredited Programs

Lisa Scurry, Executive Director, presented the First Street Accord for consideration of recognition by the Board that a program accredited by the Canadian Psychological Association (CPA) would be considered equivalent to American Psychological Association (APA) accredited programs. The accord, signed by both the CPA and the APA in 2017, is a mutual recognition of accreditation and quality assurance for psychology doctoral and internship programs

She explained that the office recently received an internship application from an individual from Canada. As foreign applicants are generally referred to the National Register for review of their education, there was some question about how a Canadian education was reviewed. The Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) indicated they recognize CPA programs as equivalent but that it would be up to the individual jurisdictions.

Member Dr. Holland inquired if the issue had ever come to the Board previously. Dr. Young, Board investigator, responded that during her years on the Board, she could not recall a similar situation where a Canadian applicant wanted to come to Nevada to complete an internship.

On motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners recognized the First Street Accord which deemed programs accredited by the Canadian Psychological Association (CPA) as Equivalent to American Psychological Association (APA) Accredited Programs. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Stephanie Holland, Monique Abarca, and Soseh Esmaeili. Not Present at Vote: Stephanie Woodard) Motion Carries: 4-0

12. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on Regulations Proposing Changes to Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) Chapter 641 in Accordance with Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) Chapter 233B Based on Legislation Passed During the 2021 Session of the Nevada Legislature

A. Assembly Bill 327 (2021) regarding Continuing Education Credits concerning cultural competency and diversity, equity and inclusion.

As the draft language related to Assembly Bill 327 was reviewed at a previous meeting, there was no further discussion on this item. It will be scheduled for a public workshop at a future meeting.

B. Assembly Bill 366 (2021) regarding recordings of certain training activities.

President Owens reviewed the draft language for the purpose of implementing a regulation for Assembly Bill 366 regarding recordings of certain training activities. The draft regulation defined the terms "recording" and "training activity," created requirements governing the provision of informed written consent, and defined some parameters related to retention and destruction of such recordings.

The draft definition of a recording was presented. Dr. Owens explained that she included psychologists in the list for whom the definition applies. The draft language read, "A recording is defined as an audio or video taped accounting of the practice of psychology as defined by NRS 641.025 for the purpose of a training activity, including education, consultation and/or supervision of psychologists, psychological trainees, psychological interns, and psychological assistants."

Related to informed consent, the draft language stated that written informed consent must include the following information: how the recording would be made, who would have access to the recording, how the recording would be confidentiality stored, and when/how the recording would be destroyed.

The regulation proposed language related to the retention and destruction of recordings. The draft read, "Audio and video recordings must be kept in accordance with NAC 641.224. Upon completion of review of the recording by the supervisor, or 30 days following the delivery of the psychological services by a psychological trainee, psychological intern, or psychological assistant, whichever comes first, the recording shall be destroyed."

The definition of "training activity" was drafted to read, "A training activity is defined as a supervised activity conducted by a student in the context of a formal professional training program for the purposes of professional competency development including psychotherapy, consultation, psychological assessment, and psychological evaluation of an individual, family, couple, or group. This may include licensed psychologists engaging in re-specialization, ongoing professional consultation, and/or supervision mandated by the Board." President Owens explained that the definition is essentially

the same as that used by ASPPB. The last sentence was added to include licensed psychologists who are undergoing training.

There were no questions nor suggested changes to the proposed draft.

On motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved forwarding the recommended draft language of NAC Chapter 641 as required through Assembly Bill 366 (2021) to a future Public Workshop. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Stephanie Holland, Monique Abarca, and Soseh Esmaeili. Not Present at Vote: Stephanie Woodard) Motion Carries: 4-0

C. Senate Bill 44 (2021) regarding submission of transcripts, remote supervision

Lisa Scurry, Executive Director, presented the proposed language to implement Senate Bill 44, relative to NAC Chapter 641.

Section 2 of that bill would require the Board to accept an alternative means from official transcripts in certain circumstances. Ms. Scurry explained that NAC 641.061 and 641.062 already allow for the submission of alternative evidence of compliance with educational requirements.

Section 2.5 required adoption of uniform standards authorizing remote supervision of supervisees. Ms. Scurry explained that the Board adopted a regulation in 2019 that had not been codified in NAC yet. The new provision provided for various methods of supervision included the availability of the supervisor by telephone. The proposed change to comply with SB 44 was drafted to read, "Availability of the supervisor by remote means, including use of a remote technology system which uses electronic, digital, or other similar technology, including the telephone, to enable a person from a remote location to attend and participate in a meeting;"

The final relevant section of the bill dealt with licensure by endorsement and would specifically provide that "if an active member of, or the spouse of an active member of, the Armed Forces of the United States, a veteran or the surviving spouse of a veteran submits an application for a license by endorsement pursuant to NRS 641.196, the Board shall collect not more than one-half of the fee set forth in subsection 1 for the initial issuance of the license by endorsement." Director Scurry suggested adding the language to NAC 641.019, Fees. She added that the language may be added to a regulation that is already with the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

Regarding the reference to supervision by remote means, Member Dr. Holland suggested revising the phrase "... to enable a person from a remote location to attend and participate in a meeting" by replacing "participate in a meeting" with "participate in supervision." Dr. Holland also suggested that supervision by telephone should be a last resort and not a primary means of conducting supervision.

There was discussion regarding supervision by telephone and the difference between a supervisor being available to a supervisee who is conducting psychological services versus weekly supervisory meetings being conducted by telephone. While, the former is appropriate and acceptable, conducting the weekly supervisory meetings is not generally preferred or recommended.

President Owens suggested changing that phrase by removing reference to the telephone. The new language would read, "Availability of the supervisor by remote means, including use of a remote technology system which uses electronic, digital, or other similar technology;"

On motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the recommended forwarding draft language of NAC Chapter 641 as required through Senate Bill 44 (2021) to a future public workshop. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Stephanie Holland, Monique Abarca, and Soseh Esmaeili. Not Present at Vote: Stephanie Woodard) Motion Carries: 4-0

13. (For Possible Action) Discussion of U.S. District Court Case 2:20-Cv-00651-Kjd-Vcf Where the State of Nevada Board Psychological Examiners is a Named Defendant.

Harry Ward, Deputy Attorney General, provided an update on the status of the case. The Plaintiff has added additional parties as Defendants in the matter. Mr. Ward explained the process he uses in filing responses in order to keep costs / billable hours at a minimum.

The matter remains pending.

14. (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

There were no questions or concerns with any of the following dates/times.

- A. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners is Friday, September 10, 2021, at 8:30 a.m.
- B. The Strategic Planning Work Session is tentatively scheduled for Friday, October 8 and Friday, November 12 following the regularly scheduled Board meetings on those dates.
- C. The ASPPB 61st Annual Meeting of Delegates "Public Protection Through Prevention" is scheduled for October 15 – 16, 2021. This will be a virtual meeting.

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

There were no suggested items for future Board meetings.

16. Public Comment

There was no public comment at this time.

17. (For Possible Action) Adjournment

There being no further business before the Board, President Owens adjourned the meeting at 11:28 a.m.