

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

December 15, 2023

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

The meeting of the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners was called to order by President Whitney Owens, Psy.D., at 8:08 a.m. on December 15, 2023, online via "Zoom" and physically at the office of the Board of Psychological Examiners, 4600 Kietzke Lane, Ste. B-116, Reno, Nevada 89502.

Roll Call: Board President, Whitney Owens, Psy.D., and members Lorraine Benuto, Ph.D., Catherine Pearson, Ph.D., and Stephanie Woodard, Psy.D. were present at roll call. Board members Monique Abarca, LCSW, Soseh Esmaeili, Ph.D., and Stephanie Holland, Psy.D. were absent at roll call; Dr. Soseh Esmaeili joined the meeting at 8:33 a.m. Despite the three-member absence at roll call, there was a quorum of the Board members.

Also present were Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Harry Ward; Board Investigators Dr. Gary Lenkeit; Executive Director Laura Arnold; members of the public: David Hines, CPA and Kay See, CPA (Campbell Jones Cohen CPAs); Dr. Dylena Pierce; Dr. Jody Thomas (UNR Counseling Services, director of training), Dr. Mark Floyd, Sabrina Schnur (Belz & Case Government affairs), Donald Hoier (private citizen), Dr. Quinten Lynn, Dr. Danielle Moreggi, Dr. Bernadette Hinojos.

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

There was no public comment at this time.

DAG Ward stated that, as part of a new requirement in open meeting law, those who wish to comment may access this Zoom meeting with the number 84454559032. He said for some reason, the Board is required to announce to the public how they can attend, which is redundant because if you look at the agenda, they would already know. For the record, he made that announcement.

3. (For Possible Action) Workshop to Solicit Comments on a Proposed Regulation (See Attachment A); and Possible Action to Forward the Proposed Regulation to a Hearing at a Future Meeting of the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners in Accordance with NRS Chapter 233B.

- A. Requirements of supervision – revising and clarifying the requirements of supervision in NAC 641.152.

Dr. Owens opened the floor by taking public comment on the proposed changes for NAC 641.152. There was no public comment for the proposed changes. Dr. Owens moved into Board discussion. Dr. Benuto started the discussion by informing that she looked at another NAC that spells out what the minimal requirements are for supervision. Dr. Benuto first noted that she made edits to simplify the language as she felt it was overly complex. Dr. Benuto also made a recommendation that the second part (number 6) was redundant with the secondary revisions she made. Dr. Benuto explained that she clarified in the NAC revision for each level of supervisee - psychological trainee, intern, and psychological assistant, what the minimal amount of supervision is that would be expected.

Dr. Owens started by noting that the language does appear to have been cleaned up. In reading from the NAC 641.152 document, Dr. Owens explained that for a psychological trainee, they require 1 hour of supervision for every 10 hours of service delivery. Direct service hours count for both in-person and telehealth sessions. For a psychological intern, supervision should be no less than 4 hours per week, including but not less than 2 hours per week of face-to-face individual supervision. For psychological interns, 2 of those hours can be group supervision with another licensed mental health professional. For a psychological assistant, supervision should be at least 1 individual hour for each 40 hour work week. Dr. Benuto added that this can also be a proportional level of supervision for a part-time psychological assistant.

Moving on, Dr. Owens started to read from item number 6 but it appeared incomplete. Executive Director clarified that Dr. Benuto's comments did not make it into this NAC working document but the revisions made might actually be redundant to the passage before it and therefore not necessary to include. Dr. Benuto confirmed this, and informed that number 6 can be completely omitted as it is essentially a reiteration of 5. Dr. Owens agreed. Dr. Owens sought to clarify if it says "direct" supervision elsewhere but she does not believe there has to be "direct" supervision as "direct" supervision can

be interpreted as you have to be in the room with the trainee and the patient. Dr. Owens confirmed for the record that section 6 could be omitted, and the rest would stay and would make sure there is not use of the word "direct" in that other language in 5. The executive director performed a word doc search to ensure the word "direct" is not found in 5 as it relates to supervision. Dr. Benuto clarified that other instances of the word "direct" found in 5 are in relation to service-oriented activities.

Dr. Owens checked for any additional comments from the Board or public. Dr. Jodi Thomas started by adding comment on number 6. Dr. Thomas stated she does agree with taking out number 6 due to it being inconsistent with some wording in number 5 and that some statements are inadequate. Dr. Thomas shared a question regarding the wording in 5A related to supervision activities being at least 1-hour per week. Dr. Thomas questioned if this needs to be individual supervision or any type of supervision. Dr. Thomas went on to state she is hoping they can still include Supervision of Supervision under 5A, noting that it appears that part has been taken out. Dr. Benuto stated she believes "supervision activities" can be inclusive of Supervision of Supervision in that language. Dr. Thomas noted that several lines down in 5A, it states that at least half of the direct service-related activities shall be with the supervisor of record, a licensed psychologist, and believes this could mean by Supervision of Supervision. Dr. Owens agreed this language should be cleaned up so that is it not interpreted that supervision can be done by anyone other than a psychologist for a psychological trainee. Dr. Benuto sought clarification with Dr. Thomas regarding what Dr. Thomas wanted clarified in 5A. Dr. Thomas informed she is advocating that at least half of the direct supervision provided can be done under the Supervision of Supervision model with the licensed provider e.g., an intern supervising a psychological trainee, not an MFT. Dr. Owens recommends the wording is revised to: supervision must be at least 1-hour per week of individual supervision for every 10 hours of service delivery which equates to no less than 10% of the trainee's time spent in direct service-related activities at least half of which shall be with the supervisor of record and that one hour can be done by an intern or a psychological assistant. Dr. Thomas expressed this sounded better.

There were no public comments.

On motion by Catherine Pearson, second by Lorraine Benuto, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners to approve the revisions to NAC 641.152 (Item A) with the revisions discussed to be moved forward to a hearing. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard) Motion Carried: 5-0.

4. Minutes. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Approval of the Minutes of the Regular and Strategic Planning Meetings of the State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners on November 3, 2023.

There were no comments or changes suggested for the minutes of the November 3, 2023, Regular and Strategic Planning Meetings of the State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners.

On motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Lorraine Benuto, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the meeting minutes of the Regular and Strategic Planning Meetings of the Board held on November 3, 2023. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 5-0.

5. Financials

- A. (For Possible Action) Presentation, discussion, and possible action to approve Campbell Jones Cohen CPAs' Audit Report for FY2023.

[This item was taken out of order]

David Hines, CPA presented the audit report for FY2023. Mr. Hines stated that the first item is management discussion and analysis, which was composed by the Board of Psychological Examiners and provides highlights and explanations of financial data in the audit report. He said that the CPA firm did assist a little with the management discussion and analysis to make sure that the numbers tie with the numbers in the financial statements themselves, and noted the summary of the statement of net position and a summary of statement activities included in that section of the report. There is also some discussion of economic conditions and expectations for next year.

Moving on, Mr. Hines stated that the CPA firm's audit report contains its opinion. The firm audited the Board's financial statements for the year ending June 30, 2023, and are issuing a clean audit opinion, meaning the financial statements present fairly in all material aspects the financial position of the Board as of June 30, 2023, and in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the U.S. Mr. Hines said that the CPA firm conducted the audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the U.S. and using standards applicable to financial audits which are contained in government auditing standards issued by the U.S. Comptroller General.

Mr. Hines stated that the CPA firm performed a number of procedures. It maintained professional skepticism when auditing the financial statements and exercised professional judgment in obtaining reasonable assurance that the financial statements are fairly stated in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. The firm also performed analytical procedures and developed expectations based on prior year financial information and what they know about the economy and current economic

conditions and analyzed financial ratios. They also examined the Board's supporting documents and obtained third party confirmations from, i.e., a bank or the AG's office, or obtained confirmation of what they received from the Board.

Mr. Hines explained that an audit of financial statements is undertaken to obtain reasonable assurance that the financials are fairly presented. There is not 100% certainty that the financials are free of fraud or error, but they test the financials to such a degree that they have reasonable assurance that the financials are not materially misstated.

Mr. Hines went on to address the governmental fund balance sheet and statement of net position. The Board's assets are summarized on the balance sheet, as are the liabilities and net position or fund balance of the Board. There are also adjustments that are necessary according to government accounting standards to adjust the financials to the government-wide presentation. Mr. Hines explained that these adjustments are mainly comprised of adjustments relating to the pension fund and the lease liabilities and lease assets according to government auditing standards. Mr. Hines highlighted the governmental fund revenue expenditures and changes in fund balance in the statement of activities. He said there are summaries of expenditures, program revenue, and net income to the Board for the year, and that there is positive net income which is generally a good thing. There is also a summary of the change in fund balance and net position.

Mr. Hines stated that there are notes to the financial statements, a summary of significant accounting policies included in note 1. He noted that it is extensive, describing the basis of presentation according to government auditing standards. The basis of accounting – the financials are on a modified accrual basis of accounting. There is also an explanation of the Board's budgeting process, policy for cash and cash-equivalents, what a capital asset is for the Board, how the licensing fees are accounted for. There is an explanation of how the pension fund and government accounting impacts the Board's financials. There are various other notes, including that the Board is complying with the Nevada Revised Statutes and the Nevada Administrative Code and what constitutes cash and cash equivalents – i.e. bank deposits, short term marketable securities, capital assets, and an explanation of the Board's leases (of which the Board has one in Reno). The longest note is the note on pension, which gives a lot of detail about the PERS system and liabilities and expenses of the Board in relation to that. There is also a little information on the conversion to government-wide financial statements. The books as they are seen in the Board's accounting system defer somewhat from how they have to be presented as part of the government-wide financial system, so adjustments to comply are explained. There is also some explanation about the recent government orders. There was some concern that Boards may be consolidated or eliminated. Mr. Hines said he does not see that for the Board in the foreseeable future. There's always a possibility of some consolidation with other professional licensing boards, but that is speculative at this point.

There is some supplemental information. In the past, the Board has created a biennial budget based on two fiscal years combined, though in recent years the budgeting process has been for one year. They combined the prior year's budget with the FY2023 budget to create a biennial budget to present this statement consistent with how it has been presented in the past. Revenue is a little greater than expected according to the biennial budget, and expenditures are less than expected, which is favorable. They have supplemental pension information, which is included because that is required. And, there is the report on internal control over financial reporting. They are not providing an opinion on the overall system of external control. They merely examine the internal controls to the extent it helps them have reasonable assurance that the financial statements are fairly stated. However, they will let the Board know of any findings as to significant deficiencies or material weaknesses in the system of internal controls.

As for the schedule of findings and responses, there are two findings relating to the system of internal control. First, the recording of revenue, they consider this to be a material weakness. The Board's policy for recording revenues was not followed exactly. Most of the problem was that an adjusting entry from last year's audit was input twice and that accounts for most of the error. The effect is that the liabilities are overstated – liabilities in the form of the deferred revenue account – and revenues were understated slightly. The firm recommends the Board provide training in the preparation of governmental financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and that management review and approve the recording of payments received from licensees. The Board agreed with that finding.

The second finding relates to the recording of the PERS pension expense. It is being recorded and a liability is created in the form of an account payable instead of eliminating the payable a new expense is being recorded, which duplicates the expense for PERS which causes it to be overstated and liabilities overstated. The recommendation is for the Board to implement procedures to train personnel how to record the PERS payment and that management review and approve those payments so that there is not a duplicate of that expense.

On motion by Lorraine Benuto, second by Stephanie Woodard, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners Campbell Jones Cohen CPAs' Audit Report for FY2023. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Lorraine Benuto, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 4-0.

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

The Executive Director gave the treasurer's report, stating that as of November 30, 2023, the checking account balance was \$337,122.98. She said that the Board continues to operate on the almost \$81,000.00 net revenue for the second biennium quarter deferred income distribution, which is the first half of the 2024 fiscal year, as well as about \$22,000.00 from the other deferred revenue distributions such as late renewal fees, new licensures, and registrations. She explained that, after December, the treasurer's report will include the next deferred income distributions for the third biennium quarter (January – June 2024), which is also the second half of FY 2024. Those distributions are from the 2023-2024 renewals and the other deferred revenue that has come in and gets cast across the biennium.

The executive director noted that the savings account balance was \$105,066.46, and stated that with the end of November being almost half way through the fiscal year, the Board is at about 34% of budgeted expenditures and just under 50% of expected revenue – most of which is the deferred income allocated to this biennium quarter.

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

The Executive Director went on to highlight a small adjustment to the budget. She said that at the beginning of the fiscal year, she had budgeted \$2,500 for office expenses. That amount, however, did not take into account that the office computers that were budgeted, approved and purchased during the last part of FY2023 were not actually paid for until the beginning of FY2024. As a result, the actual numbers for November brought the office expenses over \$2,500 (and over 100% of what was budgeted), so she adjusted that figure to \$4,000, which is probably more than what is needed, but the Board's budget had the room to do so based on the final balance, which is still comfortably in the black. The Executive Director said she also made those adjustments in the biennium and fiscal year breakdowns, and both final balances accommodated that adjustment as well.

On motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Catherine Pearson, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the Treasurer's report for FY2024 and the revision to the FY2024 Budget. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Holland.) Motion Carried: 5-0.

6. Legislative Update

- A. (For Possible Action) Report, Discussion and Possible Action on Legislative Activities, including the work of Interim Committees, of the Nevada Legislature, the Legislative Counsel Bureau, and any position or action the Board may take on or in response to Bills that have been signed into Law, Legislative Bills, and Bill Draft Requests that the Board is tracking, following, or that may impact the Board and its Operations.

The executive director updated the Board on some forward movement on the regulations front. She said there are two files that have LCB numbers now and for which the LCB are preparing drafts – those are the amendments the Board proposed in response to EO2023-003 (removal of all references to behavior analysts so that the Board’s regulations are streamlined for application only to Psychologists), and the other has the revision to NAC 641.136 (changes to the number of cultural competency CEs) and the regulation revisions that respond to AB 244. The executive director explained that those drafts are what the Board needs in order to bring those revisions to a hearing.

The executive director went on to state that in a recent dialog and discussion with the LCB regarding some questions they had on one of those files, she followed up on her previously unanswered inquiry about when the Board could expect the LCB to codify the thirteen approved amendments since 2017 so that our regulations were not so cumbersome to try to navigate. The LCB checked on that let the executive director know that the codification project was assigned to an attorney on November 30. The executive director did not know what that meant in terms of how long it will take to get done, but she hoped it is now more brightly on the LCB’s radar, and would keep the Board posted on any developments on that front.

7. Board Needs and Operations

- A. Report from the Nevada Psychological Association.

There was no report from the NPA.

- B. Report From the Executive Director on Board Office Operations.

The executive director stated that the office statistics for November were mostly pretty average, having issued 3 new licenses, but that there were more coming. She said there was also only 1 state exam administered, and that was because the Board office was closed for a lot of November while she was gone for a couple of weeks and

because of the Thanksgiving holiday weekend - there were not many days to be able to schedule them.

The executive director went on to state that as of the end of November, the board had 689 active licensees and 103 active licensee applications. She said that as for those the Board registers – the psychological assistants, psychological interns, and psychological trainees – there are a total of 86 that are registered and 23 active applications, the breakdown of those being provided under Current Applications and Registrations section of the Board Statistic spreadsheet.

There were no questions or comments on the Executive Director Report.

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

A. Complaint #19-0626

DAG Ward stated that he met with the investigators and Executive Director in regard to the complaints listed. DAG Ward shared that he gave opposing counseling an ultimatum to either resolve this complaint or not, and his client suggested we not resolve it, and therefore this matter will eventually be going to a hearing.

B. Complaint #22-0930

DAG Ward stated he is just waiting for paperwork to come back that shows this complaint has been resolved.

C. Complaint #23-0303

D. Complaint #23-0612

E. Complaint #23-0801

F. Complaint #23-0905

G. Complaint #23-0918

DAP Ward went on to comment on Complaints #23-0303, #23-0612, and #23-0801. DAG Ward informed that these complaints are called alleged violations under NRS 641.390 - representation or practice without a license. He explained many of these being advertisements on the internet explaining what they can and cannot do. DAG Ward informed that he has sent out cease and desist letters and he will be sending out

more cease and desist letters. Some of them are easily resolved by compliance by the alleged people that are violating the NRS 641.390. DAG Ward stated he has no other updates on the complaints listed.

Dr. Lenkeit shared that DAG Ward covered everything well. Dr. Lenkeit added that on Complaint #22-0930, he thinks the respondent just asked for some minor changes in the wording in the document and believes this complaint should be gone by the next meeting.

Dr. Owens checked with DAG Ward regarding a timeline for hearing for Complaint #19-0626. DAG Ward informed that timing all depends on opposing counsel. The complainant has filed a motion for a more definite statement and DAG Ward shared that he is going to accommodate it. DAG Ward informed he is reviewing the two depositions he took regarding this matter and he will be given a line-by-line accusation. Following this, DAG Ward anticipates the complainant will want to file more depositions. DAG Ward informed he is in the process of getting a hearing officer. DAG Ward shared he will be presenting a contract to the board for a hearing officer up to \$15,000 with hopes of getting that in January or February. With regards to a timeline, DAG Ward hopes that we would be within the statute of limitations within Nevada which would give him until February 3rd, 2026 to have this resolved.

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.

Dr. Owens stated that the following applicants are recommended for approval of licensure contingent upon completion of licensure requirements: Shannon Dillon, Taraneh Rostami, Tricia Steeves, Serena Mazzola, Mary Schuberg, Katelyn Steele, Karen West, Robert Burr, and Teresa George.

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Soseh Esmaeili, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the following applicants for licensure contingent upon completion of licensure requirements: Shannon Dillon, Taraneh Rostami, Tricia Steeves, Serena Mazzola, Mary Schuberg, Katelyn Steele, Karen West, Robert Burr, and Teresa George. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 5-0.

[Items 9A-9D were taken out of order]

- A. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on Dr. Mark Floyd's application to Reactivate his inactive license.

Dr. Owens stated that Dr. Mark Floyd has submitted an application to reactivate his currently inactive license. Dr. Floyd was licensed in Nevada in 2000 and remained an active licensee in good standing until he renewed as inactive for the 2021-2022 biennium, and again renewed his inactive status for the 2023-2024 biennium.

Included with Dr. Floyd's application are the certificates of the continuing education courses he identifies on his application and has taken in order to satisfy the requirements of reactivation. According to the application and the supporting certificates, Dr. Floyd completed 30 Continuing Education hours. 15 hours were live, 9 were in ethics, 3 were in suicide prevention and awareness, and 6 were in cultural diversity.

If approved, Dr. Floyd is prepared to pay the prorated licensure fees for what remains of the biennium (through 2024).

On motion by Catherine Pearson, second by Stephanie Woodard, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved Dr. Mark Floyd's application to Reactivate his inactive license. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Lorraine Benuto, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 4-0.

- B. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on Dr. Dylena Pierce's application to extend her Psychological Assistant registration for an additional year.

Dr. Owens stated that Dr. Dylena Pierce is registered with this Board as a Psychological Assistant, initially registered in December 2020. That registration was extended for another year in December 2021 and again in December 2022. Because the current extension request would cause Dr. Pierce to be registered as a Psychological Assistant for more than 3 years, she requires Board approval.

Dr. Owens said that Dr. Pierce is requesting this extension so that she can retake the EPPP-1 a third time, as she did not pass on her first and second attempts. If approved, Dr. Pierce is prepared to pay the \$150 registration extension fee.

According to Dr. Owens the Board has historically extended Psychological Assistant Registrations for up to 4 years, and said she did not have any concerns with this application.

On motion by Lorraine Benuto, second by Catherine Pearson, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved Dr. Dylena Pierce's application to extend her Psychological Assistant registration for an additional year. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 5-0.

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

Dr. Owens stated that Dr. Jodi Lovejoy is an applicant for licensure, whose application went before the ATEAM during 2022 for an equivalency review. While Dr. Lovejoy's training hours had been approved at an ATEAM meeting earlier in 2022, during the December 16, 2022, ATEAM meeting, which Dr. Lovejoy attended, the ATEAM committee members and Dr. Lovejoy had a question and answer session regarding Dr. Lovejoy's coursework – Dr. Lovejoy having provided transcripts and associated documents relating to her education. As a result of that dialog, the ATEAM recommended that Dr. Lovejoy take the EPPP-1 as a measure of competency in knowledge and stated that, if she passes the EPPP-1, her application was to return to the ATEAM for further review and determination. Dr. Owens said it should be noted that Dr. Lovejoy took and passed the Nevada State Exam in September 2021.

Dr. Owens explained that Dr. Lovejoy has submitted an application to retake the EPPP a fourth time, having not passed the exam in her first three attempts. She said Dr. Lovejoy's application explains how she is approaching her study schedule and program, the practice tests she intends to take, the fact that she now has a private coach, the study groups with which she intends to engage, the areas in which she intends to focus, and additional information regarding the test accommodations that this Board previously approved for her during its December 2, 2022, meeting. She also noted that Dr. Lovejoy has paid a \$150 application extension fee, which allows her application to remain active until April 2024.

Dr. Owens asked if someone from the ATEAM could speak to using the EPPP-1 as a competency measure and what the deficiencies in her application were. The executive director interjected and stated that, from the meeting minutes from that ATEAM meeting, Dr. Holland was the one who took on most of the conversation and recommended the EPPP-1 as a measure of competence. She said she did not see a lot of information in those minutes that would answer that question, and Dr. Holland was not present to speak to it. She inquired with Dr. Esmaeili or Dr. Pearson might have some insight. Dr. Pearson stated that she does not believe she was on the ATEAM at the time that application was reviewed. Dr. Esmaeili did not recall if they talked in depth about that. Dr. Owens suggested tabling this item until January, when Dr. Holland may be able to offer her insight. Dr. Owens stated that she just wanted to be able to understand it a little better before the Board made a determination.

This item was tabled until the January Board meeting.

- D. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on approving Dr. Bernadette Hinojos's application to extend their registration as a Psychological Assistant.

Dr. Owens stated that Dr. Hinojos has requested that their registration as a Psychological Assistant be extended. Dr. Hinojos was originally approved as Psychological Assistant in October 2017. In July 2019, Dr. Hinojos was issued a certificate of registration as a Psychological Assistant (PA019) under Dr. Wright's supervision that was valid through November 27, 2021. In July 2021, that registration was extended through July 8, 2022. At that point, Dr. Hinojos was under Dr. Lynn's supervision.

Dr. Owens said that in September 2022, the Board approved another registration extension request through September 8, 2023. Dr. Hinojos continued to be under Dr. Lynn's supervision.

This Board first considered Dr. Hinojos's current extension request during its November 3, 2023, Board meeting. The basis on which Dr. Hinojos had made their request to extend their registration was so that they could apply for and complete the requirements for licensure. Given the length of time Dr. Hinojos has been registered as a Psychological Assistant and the previous extensions they have been given, the Board postponed further consideration of the request until today's meeting so that Dr. Hinojos could provide additional information and appear at the meeting to answer any questions the Board may have.

Since the last meeting, the Board office has gathered additional information for the Board's consideration of Dr. Hinojos's request, as follows:

- Dr. Hinojos took and passed the state exam in August 2020.
- Dr. Hinojos took the EPPP-1 four times between June 2021 and September 2022 and did not pass.
- Dr. Hinojos's registration was extended in September 2022 to permit them to retake the EPPP-1, which is when they took the EPPP-1 for the fourth time.
- Based on the September 28, 2022, date of the 4th EPPP-1 retake, Board policy would make Dr. Hinojos eligible to take the exam again after March 28, 2024 (18 months after the 4th time not passing the exam).

Dr. Hinojos has also provided a more detailed statement and the steps they intend to take in preparing for the EPPP-1 and in support of their extension request, which is available in the meeting materials.

If Dr. Hinojos's extension request is approved, the Board office will request that they pay the \$150 registration extension fee.

Dr. Owens noted that both Dr. Hinojos and Dr. Lynn were present, and opened the floor for questions and discussion from the Board. Dr. Benuto asked whether there was precedent for this type of extension. Dr. Owens did not recall someone taking the EPPP-1 for a fifth time during her time on the Board, and deferred to Dr. Lenkeit. Dr. Lenkeit stated that he does not recall anyone taking the exam a fifth time, and added that one of the reasons the Board put limits on extending Psychological Assistants' registrations is because years ago when he was first on the Board, there were no limits. People were basically making a career of 20 years of being a Psychological Assistant. That is why the Board started putting time limits on it.

Dr. Owens clarified that Dr. Hinojos's registration expired on September 8, 2023, which the executive director confirmed. Dr. Owens stated that the request is for Dr. Hinojos to continue to work under Dr. Lynn while they are studying for the EPPP-1 for the fifth time. Dr. Owens stated that her concerns from the last meeting were that it sounded like Dr. Hinojos was continuing to practice while not registered with the Board due to their registration having expired September 8.

Dr. Lenkeit added to what he said before stating that the limits they put on Psychological Assistant registration was not to limit the number of times someone took the EPPP-1, but to ensure that people were taking the exam. What happened previously was that people were extending Psychological Assistant registrations and not taking the exams. He did not believe there was any intent in stopping someone from being able to take the exam as many times as they want.

Dr. Owens said she would be in favor of allowing Dr. Hinojos another opportunity to take the exam if they have a solid study plan. Her concern was their working and continuing to practice past their registration expiration date.

Dr. Pearson wanted to clarify that the last time they took the EPPP-1 was in September 2022, and because that was their fourth time taking it, they could not take the EPPP-1 again prior to the expiration of their registration because they need 18 months before they can take it again. Dr. Owens confirmed that was correct, and that is by regulation.

Dr. Benuto asked if Dr. Hinojos is currently practicing. Dr. Lynn stated that they are not currently practicing – they are not seeing clients at this time, but focusing on their studies for the EPPP-1 and trying to get the extension for the Psychological Assistant registration.

Dr. Owens asked if someone has to be registered in order to be able to take the EPPP-1. The executive director said essentially yes, that they need to be active with the

Board in some capacity, whether registered as a Psychological Assistant or an applicant for licensure. The Board office gives them quite a long time to be able to schedule when they take the EPPP-1. For instance, once someone registers to be able to take the EPPP-1, the executive director might give them 6 months to be able to schedule it, and some of that time may fall outside of the registration or application period, but the applicant would have been active with the Board at the time they registered to take it.

Dr. Woodard summarized for purposes of understanding. She said Dr. Hinojos's registration with the Board expired so they are no longer registered with the Board and the question before the Board today is to allow them to register again so they can take the EPPP-1 for the fifth time. Dr. Owens confirmed. Dr. Woodard noted that Dr. Lenkeit had stated that the parameters that had been previously set by the Board were to ensure that people were actively working toward passing the EPPP and not remaining a Psychological Assistant into perpetuity. It appeared to Dr. Woodard that there has been an earnest effort to continue to take in an effort to pass the EPPP. For her, the question is whether the Board should grant the allowance for Dr. Hinojos's re-registration as a Psychological Assistant. Dr. Woodard said she sees the study plan, and asked what the timeline is for the plan to retake the exam and how quickly can the Board review the results of that test.

Dr. Owens stated that the earliest Dr. Hinojos can retake the exam is March 2024, and asked Dr. Lynn when Dr. Hinojos was planning to take it. Dr. Lynn stated that Dr. Hinojos would like to take the exam as soon as possible and as soon as the Board will allow them to as it relates to the 18 month requirement.

Dr. Hinojos reiterated what Dr. Lynn stated. In response to some of the Board's concerns, Dr. Lynn assured the Board that Dr. Hinojos is actively trying to become licensed and their efforts in taking the EPPP 4 times demonstrates that. He said that their results on the EPPP do not reflect their abilities as a clinician, it only shows their ability to pass an exam, and that is an important distinction. Dr. Hinojos is not just sitting in Psych Assistant land now and forever. Dr. Lynn stated that they want to be licensed and the people they serve really benefit from the services they provide.

Dr. Owens inquired with Dr. Lynn regarding whether Dr. Hinojos would return to practice if re-registered. Dr. Lynn said that is the hope, and their clients hope that as well, and as soon as possible. Once re-registered, Dr. Hinojos wants to see clients and study for the EPPP and hopefully be as ready as they can be in March.

Dr. Benuto asked if it is possible to provide a time-limited Psych Assistant registration, such as several months to get them to the March threshold, but then noted that they then will also need to take the EPPP-2. The executive director stated that it was her understanding that Dr. Hinojos is planning to apply for licensure in the near future, and explained that generally when they extend a registration, it is for one year, so this one would be until next September. That would give Dr. Hinojos time from March 29, when

they can take it again, to take the exam, and retake again if need be. Dr. Benuto asked if the Board would hold the expectation that they also take the EPPP-2 in that time frame so that all licensure requirements are met by that time. The executive director did not think they could register to take the EPPP-2 until after they complete their postdoc work, so that would be more part of her licensure application.

DAG Ward reminded those speaking during the meeting to state their name for the record.

Dr. Owens stated that, during the registration time frame, Dr. Hinojos would be able to take the EPPP-2 after passing the EPPP-1. She did not think they would have to wait until the end of that time. Dr. Owens said she keeps coming back to Dr. Hinojos's registration expiring on September 8 and there was no communication with the Board to extend at that time, which is a violation of the Board's rules. Dr. Owens explained that she has a lot of empathy for keeping up with all of the moving parts of being a licensed professional in Nevada and stated that it is a professional responsibility to do so. She said she is grappling with that most of all. The rest feels doable, and asked if Dr. Lenkeit had any thoughts or suggestions based upon his time on the Board.

Dr. Lenkeit said that would technically be a violation, but what he is hearing is that they are not continuing to practice at this point, so he doesn't know if there is enough information to know whether there is a violation. If they are not practicing, then it is just expired. Dr. Lenkeit does not know if the Board would be extending the registration for a year because that would be retroactive, or if the Board is approving a new registration for a year from this point.

Dr. Benuto asked whether she could ask whether they were practicing after the September registration expiration. Dr. Lenkeit thought that would be admitting to a violation ahead of time and would advise against that. DAG Ward added that if they do ask them, he would also let them know they have a right to consult an attorney before answering because they could be incriminating themselves. He said he would not want to prosecute a state where they gave a voluntary statement without giving them informed rights even though this is a civil matter.

Dr. Owens agreed with Dr. Lenkeit and DAG Ward. She did not want to ask that question, but thought that in an effort to move forward with the intention of the rule, as Dr. Lenkeit stated – that being the intention of the limitations on registration as a Psychological Assistant was to prevent registrants from being registered as Psychological Assistants in perpetuity, which is not what Dr. Hinojos appears to be doing by trying to pass the exam and trying to become licensed – she suggests approving Dr. Hinojos's request to register, and that the registration be from December 15, 2023 to December 15, 2024, with the generous assumption that they were not practicing after their registration expired on September 8 and the understanding that

the Board would have to review that extension next December and determine if the Board would continue to extend at that time if necessary.

Dr. Pearson stated that Dr. Hinojos's wanting to go back to seeing clients was a concern in reference to the hours per week they would be practicing. She said she appreciates the information about the current study plan and what Dr. Hinojos will be doing, but one of the concerns identified in the prior attempts at the EPPP was that they were spending a lot of time completing their hours as a Psychological Assistant. Dr. Pearson inquired about how many hours they were intending to work and how that would impact their studying.

Dr. Hinojos stated that they want to focus on studying so that they can take the exam in March. They said they intend to limit their case load to focus and to participate in study groups and meet with their study coach. Dr. Pearson asked how many hours they intended to work in comparison to how many hours they had previously been working when taking the exams and whether there would be a decrease in hours. Dr. Hinojos said that their goal is to decrease hours so there is more time to study. Before they saw more than 20 clients a week, which made it hard to balance and they were too tired at the end of the day to study. Dr. Benuto asked, as part of their study plan, how many clients they would be planning to see. Dr. Hinojos said that, at the most, 16-18 clients so that she could devote the other hours to studying and group session. Dr. Pearson asked if what Dr. Hinojos means is that they would see 16-18 clients versus 20 clients per week or whether it would be a decrease of 16-18 hours. Dr. Hinojos answered that they would see 16-18 clients whereas they previously saw 20+, depending on the week.

Dr. Woodard stated that she appreciated the line of questions by the Board members in their expressed concern about the realistic expectations of managing a significant client load while also trying to take and pass the EPPP again considering the intensity of the study plan Dr. Hinojos has presented. Dr. Woodard asked if it is possible to request a written plan signed off by the supervisor and Dr. Hinojos to present a supporting comprehensive plan for the Board's understanding. Dr. Woodard explained that it is not that the Board is getting into the business of dictating what happens with client loads and the like, but that the Board wants to make sure Dr. Hinojos is set up for success. Dr. Benuto said she was thinking along the same lines.

Dr. Owens note that the Board is charged with protecting the public, first and foremost. She agreed with Dr. Woodard that it behooves the Board to set up registrants and licensees for success, but worries a little about being overly prescriptive and overly intrusive into making those decisions for Dr. Lynn and Dr. Hinojos. She said she hears that the Board members want to set Dr. Hinojos up for success and ensure that they have the best outcome possible, especially given the extension, but worries about being overly prescriptive. Dr. Woodard said she was coming the same conclusion even

though she was making her recommendation. She thought it was sufficient to say the Board has expressed some concern, and that will be clearly documented in the minutes.

Dr. Owens stated that they have limited additional registration less than a year before and she's aware that, given the fact that Dr. Hinojos cannot take the exam until after March 28, she would be concerned about limiting that year, especially because they have to take the EPPP-2. Dr. Owens suggested re-registering Dr. Hinojos as of December 15, 2023, with a year's registration as a Psychological Assistant until December 15, 2024, and in that time, allowing them to apply for licensure and retake the EPPP-1 and any other requirements for licensure.

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Soseh Esmaeili, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved re-registering Dr. Bernadette Hinojos as a Psychological Assistant from December 15, 2023, to December 15, 2024 to allow them to apply for licensure, retake the EPPP-1, and satisfy other requirements for licensure. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 5-0.

10. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on the Board's Disciplinary and Complaints Policy and Regulations.

A. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on proposed revisions to the Board's Complaints and Disciplinary Policy.

Dr. Owens stated she has not had a chance to review and accommodate for some of the public comment that were made during the last meeting, and therefore is requesting to table this matter until the meeting in January. The executive director agreed with pushing this discussion to January. The executive director further stated that Dr. Owens had a question for Dr. Young about the proposed appendix C and suggested to possibly wait till Dr. Young is at the next meeting to discuss this together. Dr. Lenkeit went on to share that he had discussed this with Dr. Young and asked if Dr. Owens has a specific question. Dr. Owens informed she does not have a specific question, but rather she just hasn't had a chance to review the public comments yet and wants to feel confident when making any decisions. Dr. Lenkeit stated he was not aware that any public comments were made, asking if they are in a separate document somewhere so he can review them. DAG Ward informed that this information should be contained in the Meeting Minutes from November board meeting. Dr. Lenkeit stated he would review these minutes. Dr. Owens suggested joining the next Investigators and Attorney meeting after she's reviewed everything. DAG Ward shared that the Investigators and Attorney meeting is not a public meeting and is excluded from Open Meeting law and that President Dr. Owens is welcome to attend.

There were no further questions.

11. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on revising the Board's Application for Licensure and approving a proposed optional pre-licensure demographic survey.

The executive director started by informing that while she and Dr. Owens were at the ASPPB conference a few months ago, there was a discussion about demographic data that caught their attention and got them thinking about what the board does and does not collect through the application and licensure process. Based on what Dr. Owens and Executive Director discussed, the executive director went through the Board's licensure application and began making some adjustments regarding demographic information and to some other items on the application based on questions and issues the Board office has encountered in processing applications. Dr. Owens and the executive director also talked about creating a pre-licensure optional demographic survey as a way to try to collect demographic information about the Board's licensees.

The executive director started by going through the application, addressing some of the changes and adjustments she is proposing and explained why. She informed she first added an initials line next to the acknowledgement. She said she thinks this is an important statement and wanted to lead with applicants having to initial it as the first thing they do in filling out the application.

Moving on to the second change, the executive director shared that based on some recent application reviews of those who came from a program other than clinical, counseling, or school psychology and the difficulties they posed during equivalency reviews, she emphasized as an initial screening information noting the degree and program, and noted that those who are not from one of those three programs may be subject to an equivalency evaluation. Having this information from the applicants from the get-go rather than waiting to review the PLUS report, which often does not get to the Board office until after applicants have invested time and effort in satisfying other licensure requirements, the board can let applicants know in the initial letter to them that their application may or will require the additional equivalency review. That way, if they want, they can wait for that determination prior to making the investment in moving forward with their licensure requirements. Dr. Owens acknowledges that getting this information helps to screen those who are not likely going to be license eligible and therefore can prevent those applicants from having to pay those fees upfront.

The executive director moved on to the third proposed change. She informed she changed the gender inquiry (which everyone answers as either male or female) to preferred pronouns, which may be a more appropriate query. Sex and gender identity are demographic queries she included in the proposed optional pre-license survey which she informed she will discuss next. There were no questions regarding this change.

Moving on to the fourth change, under the EPPP section, Executive Director added "if known" next to the EPPP-1 score and noted the Board's policy regarding the EPPP-2. She informs the reason she added "if known" next to the EPPP-1 is because it is a common query from applicants who have been licensed for many years and are licensed elsewhere what they are supposed to do in that section if they do not remember their EPPP score. The fact that they are licensed elsewhere is evidence that they have passed the EPPP-1, and because passing is the criteria, the score doesn't really matter, so saying "if known" gives them the option to state they do not know.

Dr. Benuto asked if it was possible to collect race data on the application. The executive director said they are not collecting that information on this application, but are going to seek to collect it on the optional pre-license survey.

The fifth change – under APA-Accreditation, which is another section the Board uses as initial screening information – the executive director proposed asking the applicant to provide some additional information. This section has been just a "yes" or "no" to the question of whether their education was APA-accredited, and we have had applicants check "yes", believing that to be true, when it turns out that the PLUS report reveals that it was not. She explained that the Board recently had an applicant who graduated from a well-known university that had APA accreditation, but from a program in that school that was not, and the application was ultimately denied, but not until after a lot of effort had been put into satisfying the requirements for licensure. That was because the application stated "yes" to the question of whether the university was APA accredited, and it was not until further into the process when the Board office received the PLUS report that the graduate program was identified and it was determined that the program was not APA- accredited, and was found to be not substantially equivalent. With this information provided and checked up front, the Board office can advise the applicant from the outset that their application may have to undergo an equivalency evaluation and that applicant can decide how much they want to put into satisfying licensure requirements before that is done.

Moving to the sixth change, under employment history, the executive director proposed removing the question about whether there was access to a licensed professional with 3 or more years' experience. That question seems to go to supervised experience, which by this point, the application has already been asked and presumably answered. She said it seems that this section of the application goes to employment history that proceeds the pre- and post-doctoral experience, and it is not clear what value that question has under this part of the application. Dr. Owens shared that the employment history question might have been there to help inform where the applicant was previously practicing, such as rural locations where this is little access to consultation, etc. Dr. Owens agrees, though, that this information is not useful but just informative.

If the Board approves these revisions to the application that applicants can download from our website, the executive director said she will mirror these changes to the online application for which the Board's website provides a link and is done through a different platform. There were no questions regarding these proposed changes.

The executive director moved on to the optional pre-licensure survey. She shared that the optional pre-licensure demographic survey is pretty straightforward asking about age, race, and ethnicity. She informed the Board can let her know if there are other demographic categories it wants to include. Dr. Owens added that the current recommendation on gender identity recommend a blank line for individuals to enter their identity themselves. Dr. Owens shared that not collecting this data at the point of application can help reduce discrimination, but collecting the information is still valuable and the survey would be optional.

There were no additional questions or revision suggestions from the board.

On motion by Lorraine Benuto, second by Catherine Pearson, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved revising the Board's Application for Licensure and approving a proposed optional pre-licensure demographic survey. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaili, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 5-0.

12. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on approving the Board's proposed Testing Accommodations Policy.

Dr. Owens shared that during a recent board meeting, the Board approved drafting a test accommodations policy that permits review of a testing accommodations request by a panel similar to how background and conduct reviews are conducted. That panel consists of the Board President, a Board Investigator, and the Executive Director. What is provided in the meeting materials is the proposed policy the Executive Director has drafted.

Executive Director shared that the Accommodations Policy closely mirrors the process that was made for background checks that show criminal history and personal conduct which all goes through the review panel. The review panel allows applicants to submit their accommodations request instead of making this request during a public board meeting. Then the Executive Director would send the request to the Board President and Board Investigator. Following a consensus, the Executive Director would facilitate those accommodations. If there is not a consensus, the accommodation request would then need to go before the Board.

There were no questions or concerns.

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Lorraine Benuto, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the Board's proposed Testing Accommodations Policy. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 5-0

13. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on approving the Board's proposed Records Retention Policy, contingent on the approval of the Retention Policy by the Committee to Approve Schedules for the Retention and Disposition of Official State Records.

The executive director stated that the Board office has numerous boxes that are marked to be purged years ago but have not been purged, and in looking through the drawers of the numerous file cabinets in the Board office, there appear to be many files and documents that are old and well beyond what is required for records retention. The executive director went on to share that in reviewing the applicable provisions of NRS Chapter 239, which generally concerns public records, the Board is required to have a records retention schedule that is approved by the Committee to Approve Schedules for the Retention and Disposition of Official State Records. The executive director said that she could not find a records retention policy that has been approved by the Board. As a result, Kelly, the Board office part time staff, prepared a research memo on record retention requirements, and Executive Director consulted the most recent version of the General Retention Schedule that the Nevada State Library, Archives, and Public Records, Records Management Program makes available. From that research memo and the General Retention schedule, the executive director pulled what she thought were the most relevant items for the Board office. She shared that this proposed record retention policy still needs to be submitted for approval by the Committee to Approve Schedules for the Retention and Disposition of Official State Records, but she wanted to submit it to that Committee with this Board's approval contingent on the Committee's approval. Once the Committee approves the schedule, the board can begin the process of clearing the Board office of documents and information that are beyond, and sometimes well beyond, the retention schedule and requirements. Those documents will be placed in the bin that the Board office has for the shredding company to pick up to be securely destroyed.

There were no questions regarding the proposed records retention policy.

On motion by Lorraine Benuto, second by Soseh Esmaeili, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the proposed Records Retention Policy contingent on that policy being approved by the Committee to Approve

Schedules for the Retention and Disposition of Official State Records. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 5-0

14. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action approving the Goals and Objectives of the Board as identified during the November 3, 2023, Strategic Planning Meeting.

The executive director shared that during the November 3, 2023, work session meeting, the Board requested a list of the items identified during that meeting for approval. Executive Director shared that list for the Board. Dr. Owens shared that some of these items are in motion such as the retention policy, continuing education policy, and office staff development.

There were no questions from the Board.

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Soseh Esmaeili, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the list of items identified and discussed during the Board's November 3, 2023, strategic planning work session. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 5-0.

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

- The next regular meeting of the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners is currently scheduled for Friday, January 12, 2024, beginning at 8:00 a.m.

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

No requests for future board meeting agenda items.

17. Public Comment - Public comment is welcomed by the Board and may be limited to three minutes per person at the discretion of the Board President. Public comment will be allowed at the beginning and end of the meeting, as noted on the agenda. The Board President may allow additional time to be given a speaker as time allows and in his sole discretion. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint. No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the

agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken (NRS 241.020)

Dr. Danielle Moreggi added a general comment she wanted to board to consider. Dr. Moreggi shared that it is clear we have a population of psychological assistants that are having difficulty passing the EPPP, and so as a supervisor, she supports everyone to become fully licensed especially when they know the quality of the psychological assistant. She goes on to state, with the EPPP-2, there are a lot of people trying to argue how difficult it is. Dr. Moreggi asked if the board has ever provided any guidance on what these psychological assistants should do, particularly if they're having trouble passing this test. Dr. Moreggi went on to state that if we have this population of psychological assistants that are having difficulty taking this exam, and the licensing body never takes a look at what that difficulty is, or the licensing body examined what materials are out there for assistance, we could be perpetuating a problem of these test extensions.

Dr. Owens shared that ASPPB has done some research on EPPP-1 pass rates and they have shown that students that take the test as close to the time of completion of their graduate program, the better they tend to do. Dr. Owens stated that one thing to board has done, is allow those that have completed the core requirements in their graduate program to take the EPPP-1 right before or during their internship. Dr. Owens goes on to share that in many of these programs, there is less coaching or mentorship in helping these students do this so we want to make sure that those supervising interns or postdocs know is that these students do have that option to take the exam before they have completed their postdoc requirements.

Dr. Owens went on to address assessing study materials for the EPPP. She states that ASPPB has changed the requirements to allow taking the EPPP-1 closer to completion of their graduate program, to try and eliminate the need of some of those testing materials. In terms of the board evaluating the testing materials, Dr. Owens stated she believes that is out of the purview of the Board. Dr. Owens said she can check with the ASPPB and see if they have ever done an assessment of the available testing preparation materials.

Dr. Moreggi added that she feels the Board is very supportive of its applicants.

There were no further public comments.

18. (For Possible Action) Adjournment

There being no further business before the Board, President Dr. Owens adjourned the meeting at 10:30am.