

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

April 12, 2024

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

The meeting of the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners was called to order by President Whitney Owens, Psy.D., at 8:04 a.m. on April 12, 2024 online via "Zoom" and physically at the office of the Board of Psychological Examiners, 3080 S. Durango Drive, Suite 102, Las Vegas, Nevada 89117.

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

Also present were Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Harry Ward; Kevin Doty; Board Investigators Dr. Gary Lenkeit and Dr. Sheila Young; Executive Director Laura Arnold; Administrative Director Sarah Restori; members of the public: Dr. Teri Belmont, Dr. Shera Bradley, Dr. Amanda DeVillez, Yvonne Fritz, Donald Hoier, Brian Joseph, Dr. Brian Lech, Sabrina Schnur, Dr. Jodi Thomas, Brent Vogel, Dr. Andre Wielemaker, and Dr. Marie Zayas. Board investigator Sheila Young and member of the public Dr. Brian Lech later joined the meeting.

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).

President Dr. Owens stated that those who would like to make public comment call 1-669-900-6833 and using the meeting ID number 872 8424 3088. She reminded those who participate in public comment are limited to three minutes per person, and the public comment is reserved for comment only. It will not be used as a platform for questions and answers. If members of the public have a statement that is longer than three minutes, she asked that they please submit a statement in writing and the Board will include it in the written materials that are posted. If the public has questions for which they would like answers, she asked that they please email the Board office at

nbop@govmail.state.nv.us.

Dr. Jodi Thomas provided comment regarding the increase in renewal fees that was to be addressed in Agenda Item 4 (Renewal Fee increase). She started by acknowledging the increase in operating costs everywhere. She wanted the Board to consider the increase in difficulty for those to get licensed in Nevada with the EPPP-2, and this fee increase adding an additional difficulty.

There was no other public comment.

3. (For Possible Action) Public Hearing to Solicit Comments on a Regulation Proposed for Adoption (Legislative Counsel Bureau File Numbers R095-23 and R002-24); Possible Action to make Revisions to and/or Forward any/all the Proposed Regulations to the Legislative Counsel Bureau in Accordance with NRS Chapter 233B. (See Public Notice for Information on the Draft Regulations – Attachment A)

- A. R095-23 – Responds to AB244 by providing definitions for psychological examinations, testing, and evaluation, as well as adding a provision to NAC 641.234 regarding the disclosure of psychological test material; Revises NAC 641.136 to comply with AB267’s cultural competency CE requirements.

Dr. Lenkeit thanked those that provided input toward making these changes. He said the goal was to be brief but specific so as to not delay this further by going back to LCB. He started by stating “protected psychological test data” has replaced what was there before which was just “test materials”. Next, there is a section that talks about the ethical principles and references the specific code number. It was pointed out to him that APA ethical codes change often and therefore their regulation would have to change based on that. They decided to put the code reference and not the specific code. With regard to test data being disclosed to a designated psychologist, to hold for the possibility of others who are not psychologists who might be involved in this process, he added NRS statues to include more specificity on who would need to be registered based on the NRS statues he included.

Dr. Shera Bradley started by asking if they were in the workshop period regarding this regulation. Dr. Owens confirmed this is a public hearing. Dr. Bradley went on to ask about test data and how this conflicts with NRS 629 and the client’s right to access their data. She went on to state the NAC is going to state you must release to a designated psychologist but that is not consistent with NRS 629. She stated it seems the Board is writing regulations that contradict the law.

Executive Director stated that these revisions are in response to AB244. Dr. Lenkeit responded by stating they are trying to be specific as to what is being released and to whom because test materials cannot be released to anyone because they are copyrighted materials. He stated, in terms of releasing materials as noted in NRS 629, that seems to

be a general statement that you have to release information. And the Board is trying to be specific on how and when.

Dr. Benuto stated it is important that they do not put their state in a position where there is a possibility of the release of test information as a mechanism to protect test security. Dr. Owens stated that is the intention of this.

Dr. Bradley stated her concern is that the language states the psychologist shall not release these items and as soon as you write on the materials, it turns it into test data and not releasing these things is in conflict with NRS 629 to not release test data. She stated if you follow what the Board is saying, you could be breaking the law. If you follow the law, the Board can bring you up against a complaint.

DAG Ward stated this is a gray area. He cannot recommend nor can the Board recommend to a licensee not to violate a statute or regulation and not to violate ethics.

Dr. Owens clarified that LCB looks to see if changes in regulations conflict with other regulations and law. DAG Ward stated yes, the burden is on LCB.

Dr. Brian Lech stated he liked the language in the earlier draft that made the distinction of the APA code. He stated he does not know what to tell them about test data and the release of test data, and the strong legislative preference to have people have the right to access their data.

Dr. Owens clarified that Dr. Lech's concern is about the word data and how that's being used in one context, versus another. Dr. Lech stated he is not sure what protected psychological data is at this point. Dr. Lenkeit stated this is just about testing, not progress notes and the intention is to not release test materials.

Dr. Belmont stated there is some source that talks about where test data becomes test material. Dr. Lenkeit stated that is APA ethics code 9.04.

Dr. Bradley asked what if a psychiatrist has training in testing and they are asking for it. Test publishers do not require psychologists as the only ones who can buy and use testing.

Dr. Woodard asked if DAG Ward would help distinguish the difference between statutory regulations as well as regulatory guidance because she believes in her experience that statutes will always supersede regulations and regulatory guidance. She stated she does not know if it is possible to capture all of the potential within regulatory language.

DAG Ward stated Dr. Woodard is correct, you cannot capture all the specifics in regulatory language. Statutes are the hierarchy, and there may be some conflicts and these are the gray areas.

Dr. Woodard stated she brings this up because they want to make sure that any regulation that is passed by this body would be able to be interpreted in a way the intention behind the regulation stated in record so one way to codify that so that future boards and board members have that information if a complaint should come before them as it relates to this regulation.

Dr. Pearson stated she feels there is more work that needs to be done since things can still feel less clear while also balancing the issue of getting this document out there for psychologists.

Dr. Woodard stated the issue they are running into is the specificity of the language. One of the solutions for the Board to consider is going back and moving towards less specific language, and where there is nuance, this could be relegated to regulatory guidance. She states part of her hesitation to move forward with the regulation, is that its clear that in the effort to find clarify, it has become more complicated. She stated one way to keep from trying to get it perfect, is to determine what belongs in regulation and what could go elsewhere so that they can provide clear guidance to the licensees as the intention behind this.

Dr. Owens suggested clarifying section 3 from psychological data to be replaced with "psychological test data" and match what is in item 6 and then in section 6 take out "to these terms in section 9.04 and section 9.11" and just reference the ethics code. She went on to suggest creating further guidelines that coincide with the code of conduct and ethics, and iron out the nuances but not in the regulations.

Dr. Benuto and Dr. Holland agreed with these changes and ideas. Dr. Woodard stated there is nothing that would prohibit the Board from bringing that policy back through the Board for review and approval. Dr. Lenkeit stated some decision should be made. Dr. Woodard stated she would like to move forward with a vote to move these changes to LCB.

There being no further comment, Dr. Owens closed the hearing.

On motion by Lorraine Benuto, second by Stephanie Woodard, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved adopting the changes and revisions to R095-23 and return to Legislative Counsel Bureau for further review and revision. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.

- B. R002-24 – Revises various NAC Chapter 641 provisions relating to Psychologists' supervision of Psychological Assistants, Psychological Interns, and Psychological Trainees.

Dr. DeVillez asked for clarification regarding the 15 hours of CEs. She wanted to know if that is during a specific time period or just as long as someone has been licensed.

Dr. Owens started by saying public comment is for comments and not questions, but her question will be clarified as they go through the provisions. She stated LCB captured what they were recommending, which is in order to supervise students who either have 15 hours of CEs, a semester or equivalent determined by the board of supervised supervisory experience as a psychological assistant, intern, or trainee, formal graduate level course in supervision, or any combination thereof that can be evaluated by the Board. She explained that the 15 hours of continuing education could be over any period of time as long as you have 15 continue education credits related to supervision. It did not need to be contained in any one period of time.

Dr. Owens went on to address subsection 3 of the revision. The Board had written a supervisor of record may employ a nested supervision model, which is supervision of a non-licensed psychological trainee or psychological intern by an unlicensed psychological intern or psychological assistant not to exceed a total of four full time equivalent supervisees up to 40 hours in a work week. She stated the intention of this was to create some language that would help supervisees have some flexibility in how many trainees they are able to supervise using a typical 40 hour work week. She went on to state that, the way LCB wrote it, it says a supervisor shall not use a nested model of supervision described in subsection 3 for the supervision of more than 4 psychological interns or psychological trainees in total or authorize a psychological assistant or psychological intern under his or her supervision to supervise the psychological intern or psychological training for more than 40 hours in a week. Dr. Owens states that was not the intention of what the Board is trying to write.

Dr. Woodard suggested adding a period after the psychological assistant and just split the two parts up and make them two separate statements to help clarify. DAG Ward informed that the Board does have the authority to punctuate it or add or delete language for clarification. Dr. Woodard added that it could be helpful to break specific sections or regulatory language with the model language and also underneath in plain language to explain what the intent is so that the drafters can take that intent into consideration.

Dr. Owens suggested the following recommended changes to subsection 5 and NAC 641.161: A., a supervisor of record may employ a nested supervision model, and B. a supervisor of record employing a nested supervision model shall not exceed the equivalent of a total of four full time equivalent supervisees, and C., full time equivalent is defined as a 40-hour work week. The Board agreed with these changes.

Dr. Owens suggested the following changes to subsection 4, stating a supervisor who uses a nested model of supervision described in subsection 3 shall at least once each week provide supervision to a psychological assistant or psychological intern, providing supervision pursuant to paragraph A or B, subsection 3 as applicable.

Dr. Owens noted that the language in subsection 2B and 2C is fine. She said

subsection A would be changed to state that a psychologist shall not supervise more than the equivalent of a total of 4 full time supervisees. In Subsection B, full-time is defined as 40 hours in a work week. She also stated that the LCB also made revisions to the instance of the absence of a supervisor of record – that there is a policy and procedure in place to create a designee – and she stated she believes LCB did capture that.

Executive Director clarified that they are going to be revising section 4 of their draft. She also stated the Board's efforts to remove the binary language were rejected. She added that she and Dr. Kinsora were trying to clarify the term psychometrist. They would have to revise the statute first and then circle back to that definition.

There being no further comment, Dr. Owens closed the hearing.

On motion by Lorraine Benuto, second by Stephanie Woodard, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved adopting R002-24 with the recommended changes and to return those changes to the Legislative Counsel Bureau for further review. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.

4. (For Possible Action) Workshop to Solicit Comments on a Proposed Regulation (See Public Notice – Attachment B); 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.

- Renewal Fees - revising NAC 641.019 to increase biennial renewal fees from \$600 to \$650.

Other than Dr. Jodi Thomas's public comment during Agenda item 2, there was no further comment. Dr. Owens closed the workshop.

On motion by Lorraine Benuto, second by Stephanie Woodard, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved forwarding the proposed renewal fees revising NAC 641.019 to a hearing at a future meeting of the Board. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.

5. Minutes. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Approval of the Minutes of the State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners' March 8, 2024, Meeting.

On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Catherine Pearson, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved the minutes of the Board's

meeting on March 8, 2024. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.

6. Financials

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

The Executive Director presented the Treasurer's report. As of March 31, 2024, the checking account balance was \$272,142.25. The Board continues to operate on the \$161,500.00 in net revenue from the first and second biennium quarter deferred income distributions, and the nearly \$52,500.00 from other deferred revenue distributions such as late renewals, new licensures, and registrations that are allocated to the third biennium quarter (January – June 2024).

The savings account balance, which is the Board's reserve account, was \$105,080.48. With the end of March 2024 being three quarters of the way through FY 2024, the Board is just under 69% of budgeted expenditures and a little over 98% of expected revenue – most of which is the deferred income allocated to this biennium quarter.

The Board's bookkeeper, Michelle Fox, verified and validated the information being provided in this Treasurer's report.

No questions or comments were presented by the Board.

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Stephanie Holland, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved the Treasurer's Report for Fiscal Year 2024. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.

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

The Executive Director presented the Budget Revisions report. She stated that despite overall expenditures being under budget, there are a few line items that are a little over budget. Those were primarily payroll taxes with the new role, the office move and some furniture needs, and fees we pay to the LCB for the regulations work they have been doing. As a result, she made some adjustments to expenditures that are far under budget to distribute to and bring those over-budget items within what has been budgeted. The items highlighted in orange were decreased and distributed to items highlighted in green. Overall, the budget is in good shape – overperforming all around.

On motion by Lorraine Benuto, second by Stephanie Woodard, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved the Budget Revisions for Fiscal

Year 2024. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.

- C. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve payment of the Board's ASPPB Dues in the Amount of \$2,429.00.

The ASPPB annual membership dues are due. While the invoice is dated January 18, 2024, the Board office had not received that invoice and, realizing that in early April, the executive director reached out the ASPPB to inquire about our invoice. In response, the ASPPB forwarded the Nevada Board's invoice on April 8, 2024, and the Board office has advised the ASPPB it would submit payment after receiving Board approval during this meeting.

The cost is \$350 + \$3.00 for each licensee. At the time the ASPPB generated the invoice, the Board had 693 licensees.

On motion by Lorraine Benuto, second by Catherine Pearson, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved payment of \$2,429 for the Board's ASPPB Membership Dues. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.

- D. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve payment for Dr. Whitney Owens' CLEAR (Council on Licensure, Enforcement, and Regulation) training.

Dr. Owens stated that the Board hired her to become an investigator once her role as Board President ends. To become an investigator, she has to take the CLEAR training which should not be more than \$700. Dr. Lenkeit shared that the CLEAR training is a two-day training that gives training on how to do investigations from top to bottom. Dr. Young shared that a deeper understanding of administrative law that you get from the CLEAR training is very valuable.

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Lorraine Benuto, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved payment not more than \$700 for Dr. Whitney Owens' CLEAR (Council on Licensure, Enforcement, and Regulation) training. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.

- E. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve a Contract for a Hearing Officer for Complaint #19-0626 and Complaint #24-0103 in an amount not to exceed \$10,000.

DAG Ward informed he cannot advise the Board and reminded that the Board has recused itself from this matter. DAG Ward has not reviewed the contract since he

cannot advise the Board, and Senior Kevin Doty is available for any questions from the Board regarding this contract.

Dr. Owens clarified that the goal is to approve the monies for a hearing officer to resolve this case, and the actual hearing officer will be determined by the attorney and DAG Ward. DAG Ward confirmed this. DAG Ward went on to state this is approving a generic contract where there is no hearing officer named. Opposing counseling has referred two additional hearing officers and the DAG's office is going through them, but a hearing officer has not yet been chosen.

There were no questions for Mr. Doty regarding the contract.

On motion by Monique Abarca, second by Stephanie Holland, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved a Contract for a Hearing Officer for Complaint #19-0626 and Complaint #24-0103 in an amount not to exceed \$10,000. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.

7. Legislative Update

(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 shared the following Legislative Updates. She informed that R051-23 is the Board's response to Executive Order 2023-23, and as indicated in her table, she had submitted the approved draft to the LCB with all of the documentation that the LCB required. After she updated and included this table in the meeting materials, she received word that R051-23 will be included in the Legislative Commission's April 18, 2024, meeting. She informed she will be available during that meeting in the event the Commission has any questions about it.

Moving on to R095-23, which is the response to AB244, the Board had a hearing on that draft during its March meeting and again earlier during this meeting. The Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services included R095-23 during its March 11, 2024, meeting, which she attended in the event they had any questions, which they did not.

Finally, the Board's proposed revisions to some of its supervision regulations and its effort to address the definition of a psychometrist is R002-24, on which the Board just held a hearing, and which the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services included during its April 8, 2024, meeting. The Executive Director attended

that meeting in the event the committee had any questions, which they did not.

8. 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 presented the Board's office statistic spreadsheet. She informed that the Board licensed 4 new Psychologists in March and received 13 applications for licensure, making March the busiest month of the fiscal year so far for applications. The Board received 3 applications for Psychological Assistant registration, and 2 applications for Psychological Trainee registration.

She went on to state that at the end of March, the Board had 702 active licensees and 111 active applications. As for those they register – the psychological assistants, psychological interns, and psychological trainees – there are a total of 75 that are registered and 29 active applications, the breakdown of those being provided under Current Applications and Registrations.

She shared that she revised a prior visual she created related to the Board's licensees to show the growth in the number of licensees biennium over biennium. She has updated that visual to show the number of new licensees to date this biennium, and also to provide some additional data that compares our application and licensure pace this fiscal year compared to FY23.

As of April 10, 2024, the Board has 703 active licensees, and 118 active applications.

In FY23, the Board received a total of 86 applications. The applications received so far in FY24 (so far being as of April 10, 2024) is 77. In FY23, the Board issued 49 new licenses. As of April 10, 2024, the Board has issued 40 new licenses in FY24. Based on those numbers, the Board can expect to exceed in FY24 both the number of applications it received and new licenses issued in FY23.

The Administrative Director, Ms. Restori, provided an update. She stated the Board is fully settled into the Las Vegas Board office and things are running smoothly there. Since moving in, the Board office has already had several prospective licensees stop by the office inquiring about the licensure process. One of the larger projects that she has been working on has involved carefully going through all of the boards many files and banker boxes, such as board meeting files, closed application files, expired files, and many other misc. loose documents, and determining what can be marked for purging based on the Boards records retention policy.

Dr. Owens shared when she joined the Board 8 years ago, there was a lot of confusion about the application process, the time from application to licensure was long and the Board office had a lot of complaints at that time. She stated based on the data that the Executive Director shared, the time from application to licensure has dramatically decreased, and licensees have increased. She stated the Board is doing a very good job at reducing barriers to licensure and creating a smoother process which can be seen from the data the Executive Director prepares.

9. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on Pending Consumer Complaint.

DAG Ward started by sharing that once a month he meets with the Board Investigators and the executive director and reviews the complaints that are listed on the agenda. He stated these meetings are not bound by the open meeting law. He stated the public can ask questions and he can try to address these.

A. Complaint #19-0626

DAG Ward informed that the Board has approved a contract for a hearing officer.

B. Complaint #23-0612

DAG Ward stated he will be sending a follow-up letter regarding language on a website.

C. Complaint #23-0801

DAG Ward stated that Dr. Young will continue to monitor language used on the respondent's website.

D. Complaint #23-0905

DAG Ward stated that this matter has been referred to the MFT Board and they may have to do some additional monitoring or may be suggesting to the Board to have this matter dismissed.

E. Complaint #23-0918

DAG Ward informed this is an ongoing and continued investigation. DAG Ward stated he may draft a complaint and notice of hearing in the matter which may be reviewed by DAG's colleagues before it is sent out.

F. Complaint #24-0103

DAG Ward stated he is seeking a hearing officer and this Board has approved a generic contract for a hearing officer.

G. Complaint #24-0312(1)

DAG Ward stated that Dr. Lenkeit received a referral from the MFT Board and this matter is under investigation.

H. Complaint #24-0312(2)

DAG Ward reminded that the Board received two complaints in one day and this is why the two complaints are labeled in such a way. He went on to say he is waiting for a response from the respondent.

I. Complaint #24-0313

DAG Ward stated this is an ongoing investigation by Dr. Lenkeit.

10. (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.

The following applicants were recommended for approval of licensure contingent upon completion of licensure requirements: Rachelle Rene, Kilynda Ray, Gratia Foerster, Mary Nelson, Gina Gallivan, Cheryl Malinowski, David Contreras, Robert Stephenson, Cheryl Arutt, Amy Swope, Lisa Gunderson, Riddhi Sandil, Lauren Schwarz, DeAnn Cary, Angela Lewis, Matthew Tatum, Jonine Nazar-Biesman, Tina Jimenez, Christine Vaughan, and Leah Bonilla.

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Lorraine Benuto, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved the following applicants for licensure contingent upon completion of licensure requirements: Rachelle Rene, Kilynda Ray, Gratia Foerster, Mary Nelson, Gina Gallivan, Cheryl Malinowski, David Contreras, Robert Stephenson, Cheryl Arutt, Amy Swope, Lisa Gunderson, Riddhi Sandil, Lauren Schwarz, DeAnn Cary, Angela Lewis, Matthew Tatum, Jonine Nazar-Biesman, Tina Jimenez, Christine Vaughan, and Leah Bonilla. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.

A. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on Dr. Andre Wielemaker's Application to Retake the EPPP-2.

Dr. Owens stated that Dr. Wielemaker has applied to retake the EPPP-2 a fourth time. She noted that he passed the EPPP-1 in October 2023 and the Nevada State Exam on January 5th, and that all three of his attempts at the EPPP-2 were very close to passing. Dr. Owens stated that Dr. Wielemaker's application to retake the EPPP2 includes his explanation of how he intends to approach his scheduled study program, practice test, coaching, study groups, and areas of focus. She said that Dr. Wielemaker is very clear on what he needs to do to study and how he needs to study, and it appears that he has a solid plan. There being no questions or concerns for Dr. Wielemaker, Dr. Owens asked for a motion to approve Dr. Wielemaker's application.

On motion by Lorrain Benuto, second by Catherine Pearson, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved Dr. Andre Wielemaker's Application to Retake the EPPP-2. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.

11. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve revisions to the Board's Policies and Procedures for Psychological Assistant, Psychological Intern, and Psychological Trainee Application and Registration.

The Executive Director presented the Board's Policy and Procedure for this item. She stated as part of the Board's ongoing effort to keep policies up to date with regulation and practice, she reviewed the policies and procedures for applications for the registration of psychological assistants, psychological interns, and psychological trainees. The various revisions noted throughout the policies:

- Added NAC and/or NRS citations where appropriate
- Created more active, less passive, language, to help with better readability
- Provided various points of clarity
- Ensured consistency in references to applicants / registered throughout
- Aligned with practice or suggested revisions for efficiency –
- Otherwise created consistency in and eliminated discrepancies from the various portions of the 3 policies that overlap with each other

The executive director went on to state she intends to re-review these policies once R002-24 is approved by the Board and then by the LCB, as there will be some changes in reference to, for example, supervisor qualifications. At that time, the Board can also move forward in creating the supervisor handbook, which the Board previously approved her being able to do, to align with the R002-24 and the updated policies.

Dr. Owens requested that those applicants who have been approved through the ATEAM not have to then be approved through the Board. She requested this item be on the next month's Board meeting agenda. DAG Ward stated the Board can delegate this authority as long as its all done in open meeting law.

The Board postponed further action on the proposed revisions to the policies and procedures for registering Psychological Assistants, Psychological Interns, and Psychological Trainees until the Board takes action to approve the ATEAM's authority to approve applicants.

12. (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, May 10, 2024, beginning at 8:00 a.m.

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

There were no requests for future Board Meeting agenda items.

14. 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 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.

15. (For Possible Action) Adjournment

There being no further business before the Board, President Dr. Owens adjourned the meeting at 10:47 a.m.