

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

---

**August 9, 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 Lorraine Benuto, PhD, at 8:02 a.m. on August 9, 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, Lorraine Benuto, Ph.D., Secretary/Treasurer Stephanie Woodard, Psy.D., members, Monique Abarca, LCSW; Soseh Esmaeili, Psy.D.; Stephanie Holland, Psy.D.; and Catherine Pearson, Ph.D. were present 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 and Dr. Whitney Owens; Executive Director Laura Arnold; Administrative Director Sarah Restori; members of the public: Legislative Expert Neena Laxalt, Donald Hoier, Jay Kolbet-Clausell, Dr. Claudia Mejia, Dr. Michelle Paul, Dr. Jodi Thomas, and Cody Wagner.

**2. Public Comment.** The Board wants to remind those who participate in public comment that you are limited to three minutes per person, and that public comment is reserved for comment only. It will not be used as a platform for questions and answers. If you have a statement that is longer than three minutes, please submit your statement in writing and the Board will include it in the written materials that are posted. If you have questions for which you would like answers, please email the Board office at [nbop@govmail.state.nv.us](mailto:nbop@govmail.state.nv.us).

There was no public comment.

**3. (For Possible Action) Workshop to Solicit Comments on a Proposed Regulation (See Public Notice – 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.**

Dr. Benuto informed that the proposed regulation is a resurrection of the Board’s national exam regulation, which was omitted from Chapter 641 when the LCB recently codified 13 approved regulation amendments. NAC 641.120 had been repealed in a different version, and then later appeared in a revised version in a later regulation

amendment, but it is unclear what happened between those two events. When the LCB codified the amendments, it determined that it had been the Board's intention to repeal that regulation. Based on the Board's continued citation to the revised version of NAC 641.120, it does not appear that the Board intended to repeal the regulation in the revised version. As a result, the Board decided to move forward with efforts to resurrect and re-establish NAC 641.120.

Dr. Benuto opened up the workshop for public comment. There was no public comment and Dr. Benuto closed the workshop.

*On motion by Catherine Pearson, second by Stephanie Holland, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved forwarding to a regulation hearing at a future Board meeting. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.*

#### **4. Minutes. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Approval of the Minutes of the State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners' July 12, 2024, Meeting.**

There were no comments or changes suggested for the minutes of the July 12, 2024, meeting.

*On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Catherine Pearson, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the meeting minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board held on July 12, 2024. Soseh Esmaeili approved the minutes as to form, but not content. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Monique Abarca, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.*

#### **5. Financials**

- (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Treasurer's Report for Fiscal Year 2025 (July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025).

The Executive Director presented the Treasurer's Report. She informed that as of July 31, 2024, the checking account balance was \$187,616.41. The Board is now in the first half of fiscal year 2025 and in the fourth biennium quarter. For the first half of the fiscal year/fourth biennium quarter, the Board is currently operating on the \$80,730.33 in net deferred revenue that was distributed to the fourth biennium quarter from the 2023-2024 biennium renewals, and the approximately \$38,300 from the other deferred revenue distributions that were allocated to this 4<sup>th</sup> biennium quarter and first half of the new fiscal year, such as late renewals, new licensures, and registrations. She also informed that during this final biennium quarter is the income from new licensures and

registrations that comes in during this quarter, but is no longer considered deferred income due to its receipt during the fourth biennium quarter.

The Executive Director went on to inform that the savings account balance, which is the Board's reserve account, was \$105,094.49. She stated that with the end of July being the first month of FY2025, the Board is at 7.75% of budgeted expenditures and 35.74% of expected revenue, most of that being from the deferred revenue allocated to this biennium quarter that was previously discussed.

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

*On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Catherine Pearson, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the Treasurer's Report for Fiscal Year 2025. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.*

## **6. Legislative/Regulation Update**

Neena Laxalt provided a brief update. She informed that one of the 15 BDR's that the Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services is presenting on has to do with the consolidation of mental health care boards. They are using a Utah model that consolidated different kinds of work forces. The BDR that has been presented requests that all the boards that fall under chapter 641 be under one consolidated board. She informed the Utah model has not always been popular in Nevada. She informed the Interim Committee will likely accept this draft since it is the governor's recommendation.

The Executive Director provided updates on some regulations. She informed that the three regulations that had previously been pending, R095-23, R002-24, and R084-24, were approved by the Board during the June meeting and she has submitted the regulation packets for all three regulations to the LCB, and stated the Legislative Commission meeting for these three regulations is scheduled for September 13, 2024. If the Legislative Commission approves them, she will then be able to publish them on the Board's website.

The Executive Director went on to share that Bill Draft Requests are coming in and she is keeping her eye open for any that look like they will or may possibly affect the Board, its licensees, and/or the practice of Psychology. She shared that she currently has 70 of the 339 BDRs that have been posted so far she will be following as they do or do not make their way through the legislative process.

## **7. Board Needs and Operations**

- a. Report from the Nevada Psychological Association.

There were no updates from the Nevada Psychological Association.

b. Report From the Board Office on Operations.

The Administrative Director presented the Board's office statistic spreadsheet. She informed that in July, the Board licensed 10 new Psychologists, and they had higher than usual activity in licensure applications, Psychological assistant applications, continuing education program applications, and state exams administered.

She went on to share that the Board currently has 720 active licensees and 140 active applications for licensure. As for those we register – the psychological assistants, psychological interns, and psychological trainees – there are a total of 67 that are registered and 30 active applications.

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

A. Complaint #19-0626

DAG Ward and opposing counsel have agreed on a hearing officer. DAG Ward is in the process of drafting a contract for the hearing officer to hear the matter.

B. Complaint #23-0612

DAG Ward informed they are still reviewing the documents to make sure the respondent has complied with removing the language which was found offensive.

C. Complaint #23-0801

DAG informed that Dr. Young is continuing to monitor websites to ensure the respondent is complying with the cease-and-desist letter.

D. Complaint #23-0918

DAG Ward informed that a complaint has been drafted and reviewed and they are in the process of filing a notice of hearing and hoping to have this served in the next coming weeks.

E. Complaint #24-0103

DAG Ward informed they have agreed on a hearing officer and both matters will be heard by the one hearing officer.

F. Complaint #24-0312(1)

DAG Ward informed this matter has been referred to the MFT Board and he is in the process of preparing a cease-and-desist letter. The New York and the California Boards will be copied on the cease-and-desist letter with the possibility of contacting the Department of Justice for wire fraud.

G. Complaint #24-0312(2)

DAG Ward informed he is drafting a complaint that is getting revised. This complaint will result in a complaint and notice of hearing.

H. Complaint #24-0313

DAG Ward informed that this investigation is ongoing and Dr. Lenkeit has requested an additional 30 days for investigation. The complainant has not replied to Dr. Lenkeit's request for additional information and Dr. Lenkeit is requesting additional time to get this information.

***On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved extending the investigation deadline in Complaint #24-0313. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.***

I. Complaint #24-0605

DAG Ward informed this complaint was received regarding misrepresentation of credentials and practicing without a license. The Board investigators are continuing to review additional information and the investigation is still ongoing.

J. Complaint #24-0607

DAG Ward informed this was a self-report from a licensee regarding two recent misdemeanor convictions. Additional information has been requested. Respondent is represented by counsel. No action is being taken until the board receives a response from counsel representing the licensee.

K. Complaint #24-0614

DAG Ward informed the complaint was forwarded to the respondent and the respondent responded to the investigator. The investigator corresponded with the respondent. The investigator recommends dismissal.

***On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Stephanie Woodard, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved dismissing Complaint #24-0614. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.***

L. Complaints #24-0711  
#24-0719  
#24-0726

DAG Ward informed these three complaints are against the same psychologist. All three complaints were forwarded to the Office of Inspector General which were forwarded back to the Board informing they do not have jurisdiction in reference to this matter. The Board then forwarded the complaints to the respondent for his response due on 8/28/24 and forwarded them to appropriate federal agencies. He will also follow up as to where else to forward these complaints.

M. Complaint #24-0730

DAG Ward informed this was received and forwarded to an investigator for review. It is anticipated that a cease-and-desist letter be issued in this matter. There is an ongoing investigation in this case.

**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.**

The following applicants are recommended for approval of licensure contingent upon completion of licensure requirements: Serina Hoover, Tera Robison, Joseph Salerno, Robert Leach, Leilani Puentes, Lauren Buchanan, Jessica Roos, Keith Valone, Stacey Mizokawa, Lee Rather, Kelly Humphries, Marijo Villano, Shaina Shepherd, Michelle Vorwerk, Thuy-Phuong Do, Liya Levanda, Anneli Rismaa, and Laljit Sidhu.

*On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the following applicants for licensure contingent upon completion of licensure requirements: Serina Hoover, Tera Robison, Joseph Salerno, Robert Leach, Leilani Puentes, Lauren Buchanan, Jessica Roos, Keith Valone, Stacey Mizokawa, Lee Rather, Kelly Humphries, Marijo Villano, Shaina Shepherd, Michelle Vorwerk, Thuy-Phuong Do, Liya Levanda, Anneli Rismaa, and Laljit Sidhu. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.*

**10. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Renew Dr. Gary Lenkeit as the Nevada PsyPact Commissioner for a One-Year Term Beginning July 1, 2024, and Ending June 30, 2025; or Announce the Position as Open to the Licensed Psychologists in the State of Nevada for Selection by the Board at a Future Meeting**

The Executive Director informed that the Board needs to approve renewing Dr. Lenkeit as the Nevada PsyPact commissioner for fiscal year 2024.

Dr. Lenkeit indicated that he would like to continue in this position.

*On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved Dr. Gary Lenkeit as the PsyPact Commissioner for an additional one year term from July 1, 2024*

*through June 30, 2025. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.*

**11. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action regarding potential credentialing for Child Behavioral Health Interventionists.**

Dr. Michelle Paul presented on the possible credentialing of bachelor level Child Behavioral Health Interventionists. She informed that over the past 10 months, the Children's Advocacy Alliance has been working on initiatives to address children's mental health in Nevada. One of the initiatives is bachelor's level mental health clinicians. Dr. Tara Raines of the Children's Advocacy Alliance invited representatives from The Ballmer Institute to share this model with all levels of NSHE representatives and other stakeholders. She shared that UNLV and others have stepped up to work on developing a bachelor's degree that develops knowledge and skills and to practice. She shared that the Children's Behavioral Health Interventionists was on the list of BDR's that came out of the Interim Health and Human Services committee. It is unclear if the Interim Health and Human Services committee will move this forward.

**12. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action regarding the supervision of Community Health Workers by Psychologists.**

Jay Kolbet-Clausell with the Nevada Community Health Workers Association presented information about Community Health Workers in Nevada. He informed that Community Health Care workers are frontline public health workers and have a close understanding of the community served. He shared that CHW's have a broad level of education from high school education to doctorate degrees. He shared that they can serve many roles and these include patient advocates, cultural liaisons, and resource coordination. For behavioral health, he informed CHW's can do assessments for brief crisis intervention and/or basic skills services such as referrals for food, clothing, shelter or mental health referrals. He shared that licensed professionals oversee community healthcare workers.

**13. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on an Inquiry Regarding the Required Qualifications for a Secondary Supervisor.**

The Executive Director shared that Dr. Holland is requesting the Board consider approving a limited scope secondary supervisor for an individual who is licensed in Colorado and not Nevada, and who is PsyPact certified. The question pertains to a psychologist who is proposed to be a secondary supervisor for a Nevada-registered Psychological Intern. The supervisor would be secondary to a Nevada licensed psychologist as the primary supervisor. She went on to inform that NAC 641.1519 states a psychologist who wishes to serve as a supervisor must, except as otherwise approved by the Board, be licensed by the Board to practice psychology. She noted that the supervised practice plan form cites both NAC 641.1519 and NAC 641.152.

Dr. Holland informed that she has a predoctoral intern that applied to her training program last year and was accepted and they are registered with the Board as an intern. She informed that one of her supervisors is now limited with regards to practicing and supervising due to medical issues and can no longer supervise this intern. Dr. Holland has been looking for a secondary supervisor. She stated the request is for the Board to approve a limited scope license in Nevada specifically for supervision after this provider takes the Nevada state exam. This provider is not able to get licensed in Nevada because she has not taken the EPPP-2. This provider informed the time and cost just to provide supervision is not something she is able to do in the time frame.

Dr. Lenkeit reminded the Board that PsyPact APIT is an authorization and is not a license. Dr. Lenkeit assumed she would be practicing under her APIT and suggested looking under the regulations that PsyPact has for APIT holders as this is what the supervisor would be functioning under. He does not believe this falls under the Board's authority. He recommended the Board look at the APIT regulations before making any decisions.

Dr. Owens shared her concerns around making an exception to the rule, as the NAC pertaining to this is typically for more specialty kinds of supervision. She informed one of the challenges she thinks the Board will face will be opening up the possibility of individuals who do not hold a substantially equivalent license to supervise and this could weaken the argument towards Nevada holding these standards for its licensees.

Dr. Benuto noted a distinction that this request is for a secondary supervisor and there would be oversight from a Nevada licensed psychologist.

No action taken. The APIT regulations would be reviewed for the purposes requested.

#### **14. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on the Inclusion of Continuing Professional Development in Continuing Education Requirements.**

President Dr. Benuto shared that during its June 7, 2024, meeting, the Board approved beginning a process of including Continuing Professional Development in continuing education requirements. The proposal was to shift into a model that would provide more allowance for additional credits obtained by licensees that would include a range of activities and would also reduce the financial burden on the licensees to obtain CE credits.

She went on to share that during the July 12, 2024, meeting, the Board discussed proposed language and ideas around what continuing professional development might look like, limitations that may apply, and breaking down the proposed categories a little differently in developing regulation language. During that meeting, the Board also

heard from Vanessa Aponte from the Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada. Ms. Aponte proposed offering CE credits in exchange for pro bono services, and gave a presentation that showed, among other things, the need for services and how it could be reported. She also offered proposed regulation language related to her concept. At the end of the discussion on this topic, the Board approved moving forward in developing regulation language, working out what the limitations might look like, and categorizing what else they might add.

Dr. Owens stated this idea came out of the annual ASPPB meeting and these details could be worked out in a separate workshop. She informed that ASPPB will be putting out a White Paper and publishing its recommendations for CPD credits, and the Board should consult with these as a framework moving forward.

This item was tabled for the next Board meeting.

**15. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Appoint a representative from the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners to the Health Care Workforce Working Group (HCWWG).**

The Executive Director informed that the Board office received an email from the Public Health Infrastructure Manager from the Department of Health and Human Services' Division of Public and Behavioral Health regarding the Health Care Workforce Working Group (HCWWG). The HCWWG is a result of SB379, which passed during the 2021 Legislative Session. She stated that the Public Health Infrastructure Manager that emailed the Board office stated that the effort was started over a year ago, but was not completed, and that he is being tasked with reviving the HCWWG, and of the members of that working group, they need a representative from the Psychology Board which can be a member of the Board or a designated executive board staff member.

The Executive Director informed that the role, described in NRS Chapter 439A, would entail the effort to collect information relating to providers of health care, address the membership and meetings of the HCWWG (the membership being composed of a variety of members including members of professional licensing boards) and lists the duties, which are primarily related to reporting the findings from the data collected as required by the chapter, and making recommendations to DHHS, Department of Education, the board of Regents in the University System, the legislature, and the licensing boards.

She informed that the Public Health Infrastructure Program would be responsible for the meeting processes (agenda, open meeting law, minutes, etc.), and they hope to have the first meeting soon, possibly September. It is before the Board to take action to appoint a representative of the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners to be a member of the HCWWG. She informed that a board member can take the role if they're interested. Otherwise, this would be a great opportunity for Sarah to take on in her role

with the Board, especially considering that the data and information that is being sought is more under her charge.

No other Board members expressed desire for this role.

*On motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Catherine Pearson, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved appointing Sarah Restori to be the representative from Board to sit on the Health Care Workforce Working Group. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.*

#### **16. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve Revisions to the Board’s Renewal Policy and to the Application for Reinstatement.**

The Executive Director informed that she has drafted and has proposed revisions to the Board’s renewal policy which include the reactivation/reinstatement application process, and some revisions to the renewal process.

She shared that under the current renewal policy, the Board defines “reactivation” as the process for reactivating a license that is not currently active due to being inactive, expired, suspended or revoked, and states that the process for reactivation differs related to the reason for its not being active. She stated in providing for the reactivation process, the Renewal Policy only provides for the Reactivation of a license from Inactive Status and outlines the process as stated in NRS 641.133(4). She stated it appeared that the terms reinstatement and reactivation were being used interchangeably

She informed that she looked to the NRS and NAC to see what clarity they provide for restoring an expired, suspended, or revoked license to active status. She stated NAC 641.133(4) outlines the process for restoring an inactive license to active status. NRS 641.222(1) states that that the license of those who fail to renew their license within 60 days after the date it is due is automatically suspended (which, per policy the Board deems “expired”), and that the Board may reinstate a license that was not renewed, but if it is not reinstated within 2 years, the Board may only reinstate a license if it also determines the holder of that license is competent to practice psychology. She distinguished between reactivation and reinstatement, and defined them according to Merriam-Webster, stating that reactivation is the act or process of making something active again or becoming active again, and reinstatement, to place again, to restore to a previous effective state.

She proposed revisions to the renewal policy to distinguish when a license holder seeks to reactivate an inactive license versus when that license holder seeks to reinstate an expired license.

She informed she distinguished between reactivation and reinstatement on the first page, and added a definition of a suspended or revoked license to distinguish it from how the Board defines an expired license. She then informed she distinguished the processes for the reactivation of an inactive license and reinstating an expired license. Another proposed change she made to the reactivation process was to delegate to the Board office a determination on that application if it is made within 2 years of the licensee having placed the license on inactive status.

The Executive Director went on to share another proposed change to the application for reinstatement of an expired license. She informed that she added the question for applicants regarding why they let their license lapse directly on the reinstatement application.

The Executive Director informed that she and the Administrative Director, Sarah, are preparing for renewals. She stated that she's updated the database online renewal form with the new licensee fees, has renewal stickers, and has updated the hardcopy renewal application form. Given the renewal volume, she informed she would prefer not to condense the renewals into the end of the biennium quarter. She proposed the revision to the renewal policy that states that the renewal period is to be open during the 4<sup>th</sup> biennium quarter, and not later than October 1.

*On motion by Catherine Pearson, second by Stephanie Woodard the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the proposed revisions to the Board's renewal policy and to the Application for Reinstatement. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.*

#### **17. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Discontinue Requiring Notarized Signatures on Professional Reference Forms submitted for Applicants.**

The Executive Director informed that as the Board office continues to review the Board's regulations, policies, and practices for inefficiencies, the requirement to have professional reference signatures notarized is one practice that unnecessarily creates inconvenience for their applicants. She also shared that the Board office often receives pushback for this requirement and had an applicant withdraw his application due to this requirement.

The regulations and Board policy require that applicants for licensure and registration provide three professional references. She informed that she did not find anything in the regulations or the board's policy that requires the signatures of those references be notarized. She went on to state that requiring notarization of signatures is an antiquated practice in this context and in the day and age of digital signature identity

for e-signatures and simply providing sufficient attestation language to which professional references are signing.

Both the Administrative Director and Executive Director want to propose that the Board take action to discontinue the requirement that the required professional references have notarized signatures. The Executive Director informed that she revised the professional reference form with digital signatures for those who complete the form electronically, and strengthened the attestation language that their signature follows for those that print and fill out the form.

DAG Ward informed a lot of the courts are moving away from notarized forms and just requested an attestation clause or declaration.

Dr. Owens wanted to encourage the Board to continue to keep their regulatory hats on as they consider removing inefficiencies and staying mindful of protecting the public first and foremost.

*On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved discontinuing the requirement that professional reference forms be notarized. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 6-0.*

**18. (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, September 13, 2024, beginning at 8:00 a.m.

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

There were no requests for future agenda items.

**20. Public Comment.** The Board wants to remind those who participate in public comment that you are limited to three minutes per person, and that public comment is reserved for comment only. It will not be used as a platform for questions and answers. If you have a statement that is longer than three minutes, please submit your statement in writing and the Board will include it in the written materials that are posted. If you have questions for which you would like answers, please email the Board office at [nbop@govmail.state.nv.us](mailto:nbop@govmail.state.nv.us).

Dr. Michelle Paul wanted to clarify the proposed changes for EPPP language in the NAC. She stated that the national exam is a two-part exam. She stated the only part that the ASPPB is recommending could be taken upon completion of coursework, is Part 1 (knowledge) of the exam. She stated the wording of the proposed changes suggests that somebody could potentially take the entire exam (both parts) after completing coursework.

There was no further public comment.

## **21. (For Possible Action) Adjournment**

There being no further business before the Board, President Dr. Benuto adjourned the meeting at 10:16 a.m.