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

DATE OF MEETING: Friday, July 10, 2026 Time: 8:00 a.m.

The meeting of the State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners (Board) will be conducted and may be attended through a remote technology system (video- or teleconference). To participate remotely, individuals are invited to enter the meeting from the Zoom website at https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87623021141. To access the meeting via audio only, dial 1-669-900-6833 and enter the meeting ID: **876 2302 1141.** (The Board office recommends that individuals unfamiliar with ZOOM visit the website in advance to familiarize themselves with the format by viewing the online tutorials and reading the FAQs. To learn more about Zoom, go to https://zoom.us.) The meeting may also be attended at the Board office, located at 3080 South Durango Drive, Suite 102, Las Vegas, NV 89117.

The Board will accept public comment via email. Those wishing to make public comment should email their public comments to the Board office at nbop.admin@govmail.state.nv.us. Written public comment must be received prior to the start of the meeting and will be forwarded to the Board for their consideration. Public comments will be included in the meeting's public record but will not necessarily be read aloud during the meeting. In compliance with Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) Chapter 241 (Open Meeting Law), the Board is precluded from taking action on items raised by public comment that are not already on the agenda.

The Board may take items out of order, combine items for consideration, and items may be pulled or removed from the agenda at any time. Public comment will be taken at the beginning and end of the meeting. The public may provide comment on any matter whether or not that matter is a specific topic on the agenda. However, prior to the commencement and conclusion of a contested case or quasi-judicial proceeding that may affect the due process rights of an individual, the Board may refuse to consider public comment on that item. (NRS 233B.126). Public comment that is willfully disruptive is prohibited, and individuals who willfully disrupt the meeting may be removed from the meeting. (NRS 241.030(5)(b)). The Board may convene in closed session to consider the character, alleged misconduct, professional competence or physical or mental health of a person (NRS 241.030). Once all items on the agenda are completed, the meeting will adjourn.

AGENDA

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

2. **Public Comment.** Note: The Board welcomes public comment, which may be limited to three (3) minutes per person at the Board President's discretion. 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; however, public comment will not be taken on complaints that are pending before the Board. No action will 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).

3. **Minutes. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Minutes of the State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners' April 17, 2026, Meeting.**

4. **Financials**

   A. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Final Treasurer's Report for Fiscal Year 2026 (July 1, 2025 - June 30, 2026).

   B. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2027.

   C. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Proposed Engagement Letter from Campbell Jones Cohen CPAs for the Fiscal Year 2026 Audit.

5. **Legislative/Regulation Update**

   - (For Possible Action) Report, Discussion and Possible Action on Regulation Activities and Legislative Activities, including the work of Interim Committees, 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.

6. **Report from the Nevada Psychological Association.**

7. **Board Office Operations.**

   A. Report from the Board Office on Operations

   B. Board Officer Voting

      i. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Select Officers for the State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners for a One-Year Term from July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027, from the Current Board Membership.

- Board President
- Secretary/Treasurer
- Continuing Education Review Officer
- Non-Resident Consultant Application Review Officer

ii. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Select the Membership of the Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee for a One year Term from July 1, 2026, through June 30, 2027, from the Current Board Membership.

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

A. Complaint #23-0918

B. Complaint #24-0730

C. Complaint #25-0110

D. Complaint #25-0410

E. Complaint #25-0812(2)

F. Complaint #25-0818(1)

G. Complaint #25-1117

H. Complaint #25-1231

I. Complaint #26-0114

J. Complaint #26-0120(1)

K. Complaint #26-0120(2)

L. Complaint #26-0202

M. Complaint #26-0213

N. Complaint #26-0402

O. Complaint #26-0420

P. Complaint #26-0520

Q. Complaint #26-0603

R. Complaint #26-0615

S. Complaint #26-0616

9. **(For Possible Action) Review and Possible Action on Applications for Licensure as a Psychologist or Registration as a Psychological Assistant, Intern, or Trainee. The Board May Convene in Closed Session to Receive Information Regarding Applicants, Which May Involve Considering the Character, Alleged Misconduct, Professional Competence or Physical or Mental Health of the Applicant (NRS 241.030). All Deliberation and Action Will Occur in an Open Session.** *Note: Applicant names are listed on the agenda to allow the Board to discuss applicants when necessary to move the applicant through the licensure process. The listing of an applicant's name on the agenda indicates only that an application for licensure/registration has been received. It does not mean that the application has been approved or that the applicant must appear at the meeting in order for the applicant's application to move forward through the licensure process. If an applicant needs to attend the meeting for the Board to take action, the applicant will be notified in writing prior to the meeting. Please, direct questions or comments regarding licensure applications to the Board office.*

PSYCHOLOGISTS

Kaitlyn Abrams
Andrew Ahrendt
Patrica Albrecht
Onyinyechi Anukem
Sara Arad
Katia Arroyo Carrion
Anna Arya
Meredith Avedon
Elsa Baena
Rachel Ballard
Rachel Bangit
Adam Barkey
Heidi Bausch-Ryan
Brian Benjamin
Monela Beroni
Debra Berry-Malmberg
Jennifer Blitz
Stacey Bona
Leah Bonilla
David Bridgett
David Brown
Hunter Brown
Keri Brown
Lauren Buchanan
Elizabeth Buckley
Brian Burgess
Ramona Burroughs
Dana Caggiano
Eileen Callahan
Jonathan Campos
Billie Carter
DeAnn Cary
Agnelica Castro Bueno
Jerry Chen
Brandi Chew
Christine Chew
Taylor Chille
Yu Wai Chiu
Alan Christensen
Chad Christensen
Tasman Cleaver
Brian Clemente
Alyssa Cohen
David Contreras
Wanda Crews
George Dabdoub
Amanda de Armas
Shannon Dillon
Elizabeth Dimovski-Jackson
Kristina Disney
Anna Dolatabadi
Christine Dozier
Alana Duschane
Ahmed Elsokkary
Barbara Endlich
Karla Felsky
Julian Filoteo
Glory Finnegan
John Firkus
Arianne Fisher
John Fite
Isaac Florez
Ross Flowers
Deborah Fraser
Sylva Frock
Brenda Frye
Vanessa Fuentes
Tyson Furr
Maiken Gale
Saacha Gates
Kylie Gelin
Teresa George
Carolyn Gibson
Brenda Gomez
Kimberly Gray
Rhonda Greenberg
Lisa Gunderson
Michelle Haines
Jennifer Harrison
Fredrica Hendrix
Alexandra Hershberger
Heather Holder
Sharon Howard
Chelsea Howe
Beverly Howze
Kelly Humphreys
Tiffany Hunter
Mark Ingram
Tina Jimenez
Scott Kopoian
Kristine Jacquin
Deborah Johnson
Natalie Jones
Kathi Jones-Lorenz
Jorge Juarez-Asturias
Robin Kay
Kristopher Kern
Thomas Kiely
Veronica King
Kele Kirschenbaum
Lucas Klein
Scott Kopoian
Laura Korkoian
Charalambos Kyriacou
Ari Lakritz
Joseph Latham
Sandra Lawrence-Clarke
Robert Leach
Andrew Leone
Angela Lewis
Daniel Lobel
Benjamin Loew
Chelsea Mackey
Holly Majszak
Heather Manor
William Martin
Keisha Mascal
Sarah Mauck
Michael McConnell
Marilyn McCune
Wendy McGowen
Katherine McKenzie
Paul McLaughlin
Carol McLean
Lorena Michel
Shantay Mines
Luzviminda Morrow
Tiffany Mosier-Hunter
Michellane Mouton
Missi Nadeau
Mary Nelson
Robert Nemerovski
Stephanie Northington
Judith Nurik
Lisa Orbe-Austin
Grady Osten-Garner

Mili Parikh
Beverly Paschal
Stephanie Phan
Renata Pleshchuk-Kowalski
Stephanie Procell
Patricia Pulido
Brian Raines
Maxwell Rappoport
Wendy Raskey
Lee Rather
Jason Richardson
Spring Richardson
Kristin Robinson
Olivia Rold
Jessica Roos
Jay Rosen
Eric Rosmith
Taraneh Rostami
Mary Ann Rowe
Benjamin Rubin
Mark Ryan
Judith Sachs
Barbod Salimi
Julie Sanchez
Daniel Schellenberg
Alexandra Schlager
Danielle Schlichter
Dianne Shumay
Laljit Sidhu
Edward Smith
Christie Stallard
Katelyn Steele
Willann Stone
Amy Swope
Tara Tanaka
Matthew Tatum
Michelle Tatum
Thao Taylor
Elazar Tehrani
Clary Tepper
Lee Underwood
Keith Valone
Cynthia Villaverde
Brittany Voelker
Ina Von Ber
Michelle Vorwerk
Allison Vreeland
Kristi Walter
Bethany Walters
Nelson Walters
Charlotte Watley
Paula Wilbourne
Christine Winter
Caedy Young
Gordon Zilberman
Amanda Zintsmaster

PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSISTANTS

Yashvi Aware
Rosalind Banks
Rachel Barry
Tracy Basile
Keerat Bhatti
Amira Blake
Judit Brissette
Bianca Broomfield
Candis Carswell Mitchell
Angelica Castro Bueno
Julia Catlin
Taylor Chille
Shantay Coleman
Mallory Constantine
Althea Cook
Jacqueline Eddy
Gianna Famolare
Ryan Fechner
Kylie Fraga
Paola Garcia Betencourt
Jaqueline Green
Melanie Griffin
Rebecca Hickey
Akiko Hinds
Chiante' Jemison
Jessica Jensen
Sara Kent
Brittannee Mahoney
Julia Maranville
Jessica Mills
Shantay Mines
Danielle Morabito
Tiffany Mosier-Hunter
Blake Oldfield
Dylena Pierce
Ashley Poston
Rosemary Pradell
Eric Prince
Stephanie Reyes
Dominic Roberts
Hannah Salanoa
Shweta Sharma
Sharon Simington
Mary Smirnova
Barbara Sommer
Zhipei Sun
Michelle Tatum
Madison Thomasson
Monica Zepeda Rojo

PSYCHOLOGICAL INTERNS

Lily Akana
Marissa Alvarez
Adaeze Chike-Okoli
Lallabrigida Cooper-Singleton
Jacqueline Eddy
Jacqueline Friar
Tatev Gaboyan
Edgar Garcia
Tiaira Green
Sandra Hanrahan
Ludyvina Hernandez
Chiante' Jemison
Benael John-Rose
Michael McNamara
Sara Moore
Alondra Nieves-Vargas
Bianca Reaves
Alexis Slay
Zarria Tolbert
Rachel Wiggins

PSYCHOLOGICAL TRAINEES

Hoor Ul Ain
Lily Akana
Marissa Alvarez
Vanni Jefferson Arcaina
Linnea Bacon
Kylie Baer
Ira Miguelle Bangawan
Nandita Banik
Nicole Barton
Zachary Bergman
Mary Ashby Boland
Glenn Blessington
Lilla Brody
Maayra Butt
Carter Causse
Kieffer Christianson
Delaney Collins
Regine Deguzman
Monica Done
Ashley Dorsey
Rachel Dugan
Erin Dunn
Randolph Dupont
Addison Duvall
Rosha Feizi Lighvan
Tatev Gaboyan
Tyler Gamlen
Sneha Gupta
Joyce Gurdock
Ariadna Gutierrez
Haleigh Harris
Andrea Hitz
Bianca Islas
Sierra Ann Jarvis
Edwin Jurado
Jordan Kaye
Sarah Lage
Elizabeth Lee
Poorvi Minns
Eibhlis Moriarty
Maegan Nation
Frank Nieblas
Grace Patrick
Ananda Peixoto-Couto
Mattea Pezza
Savannah Quach
Lauren Reyes
Shannon Sagert
Jennifer Truitt
Karen Valle Frias
Vaibhavi Venkataramanan
Teresa Walker
Alice Xie
Brenda Zavala

A. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on Psychological Assistant Dr. Jacquline Eddy's request for an exemption under NAC 641.080(2)(b)(2)(I) and (II).

10. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on Updates Regarding the Work of the 2025 SB165 Behavioral Health and Wellness Practitioner Advisory Group.

11. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on the Board's Residency Requirements for Applicants from Non-APA Accredited Doctoral Programs.

12. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Board Office Employees' Performance Evaluations.

13. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on Board Staff Vacation Request.

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

- The next regular meeting of the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners is currently scheduled for Friday, August 21, 2026, beginning at 8:00 a.m.

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

16. Public Comment – The Board welcomes public comment, which may be limited to three minutes per person at the Board President's discretion. 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; however, public comment will not be taken on complaints that are pending before the Board. 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)

17. (For Possible Action) Adjournment

The Board may recess for lunch for approximately one hour, at a time to be determined.

The Board is pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who are disabled and wish to participate in the meeting. If such arrangements are necessary, please contact the board office at (702) 276-0926 no later than 4 p.m. on Thursday, July 9, 2026.

For supporting materials, visit the Board's website at https://psyexam.nv.gov/ or contact the Board office by telephone (702-276-0926), e-mail (nbop.admin@govmail.state.nv.us), or in writing at Board of Psychological Examiners, 3080 South Durango Drive, Suite 102, Las Vegas, Nevada 89117.

In accordance with NRS 241.020, this public meeting notice was properly posted at or before 8 a.m. on Tuesday, July 7, 2026, at the following locations:

- Board office located at 3080 South Durango Drive, Suite 102, Las Vegas, NV 89117;
- Nevada Public Notice website: https://notice.nv.gov/; and
- Board's website at https://www.psyexam.nv.gov/meetings/2026-board--committee-meetings/

In addition, this public meeting notice has been sent to all persons on the Board's meeting notice list, pursuant to NRS 241.020(3)(c).

BRIEF SUMMARY OF WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT FOR JULY 10, 2026 MEETING MATERIALS AND MINUTES

Regarding: LCB File No. R089-26I: Criminal Conduct and Reporting Requirements
Submitted to: Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners (NBOPE)
Submitted by: Rebecca Savio
Date: July 2, 2026

I submit this brief summary to accompany my full written public comment and exhibits regarding LCB File No. R089-26I, the proposed regulation concerning criminal and other conduct not related to the practice of psychology as a basis for discipline and related licensee reporting requirements.

This brief summary is submitted as a shorter companion to my full written public comment also being submitted on this same date, and I have requested that the full written comment and exhibits be included in the July 10, 2026 meeting packet, meeting materials, regulation-hearing materials, and R089-26I rulemaking record.

I offer this comment in a spirit of cooperation and shared concern for public safety, public trust, due process, and a clear rulemaking record. I recognize that the Board, Board staff, and Board counsel must balance public protection, fairness to licensees, administrative practicality, confidentiality, and legal authority. My purpose is to help ensure that the final regulation and public record are clear, balanced, and protective.

Because my full written comment is lengthy, I do not ask that the full text be reproduced in the body of the minutes. I respectfully request that this brief summary be attached to, linked in, incorporated by reference in, or otherwise clearly identified in the meeting minutes for the July 10, 2026 Board meeting and in the record for any next noticed regulation hearing at which R089-26I is considered.

I also request that this brief summary, my full written comment, and exhibits be included in or appended to the July 10 meeting packet, supplemental meeting materials, regulation-hearing materials, complete R089-26I rulemaking record, and materials submitted to the Legislative Counsel Bureau as part of the regulation record, so that Board members and members of the public can locate the full submission from the public meeting materials.

For clarity, my full written public comment is submitted with supporting exhibits for inclusion in the meeting materials, regulation-hearing materials, LCB materials, and R089-26I rulemaking record. Those supporting materials include: Exhibit A, chronology and comparison chart; Exhibit B, April 17, 2026 written public comment excerpt or summary; Exhibit C, comparison of Nevada behavioral-health and healthcare reporting models and NBOPE's current reporting baseline; Exhibit D, summary of prior written public comments incorporated by reference; Exhibit E, the May 21, 2026 Board-provided Survey of Nevada Licensing Boards regarding criminal and/or other conduct and reporting requirements; and Exhibit F, relevant transcript and approved-minutes excerpts.

I request that the meeting minutes, meeting materials, and rulemaking record clearly identify where the full written comment and Exhibits A–F are located so members of the public can review the complete submission.

I also respectfully request that the Board make a verbal notation during the July 10 meeting, or as applicable, during the next meeting or hearing at which R089-26I is considered, stating that written public comment was received for LCB File No. R089-26I and included in the meeting packet or meeting materials. I request this so the meeting transcript and oral record clearly reflect that written public comment was received and linked to this specific LCB file and regulation topic.

In summary, my full 28-page written comment asks the Board to address four related issues before final action:

1. whether R089-26I should require earlier reporting of serious criminal charges and relevant filed civil actions, rather than requiring reporting only after conviction, plea, judgment, settlement, or other final adjudication;
2. where in the public record the adjudicated-only reporting model was discussed, explained, adopted, or otherwise selected;
3. whether, after proposed subsection 1(C), concerning "habitual or excessive use of alcohol or controlled substances," was struck, the substance-use-related impairment concern discussed in October 2025 was intentionally omitted, addressed through another remaining provision, reserved for future rulemaking, or already covered by existing authority; and
4. how written public comments and supporting materials will be clearly identified, preserved, and connected to the official minutes, meeting materials, and rulemaking record.

My central concern is that the current draft of R089-26I may leave the Board without timely notice of serious pending matters. As drafted, the proposed regulation appears to require reporting of criminal matters only after conviction or plea, and civil malpractice matters only after judgment or settlement. It does not appear to require reporting when a serious criminal charge is filed or when a relevant civil action is filed.

If serious pending charges are not self-reported, the Board may learn of them only through media coverage, a third-party complaint, another agency, internet or court-record searches, or chance discovery. That creates a public-protection notice gap. My full written comment also addresses related gaps in the Board's biennial renewal, reactivation, and reinstatement forms, including whether those forms clearly ask about arrests, pending criminal charges, criminal complaints, indictments, filed civil actions, convictions, pleas, judgments, or settlements.

I am not asking the Board to discipline licensees based on allegations, and I am not asking the Board to treat a criminal charge as proof of misconduct. I am asking for a reporting rule that provides timely notice to the Board so it can review serious pending matters on a case-by-case basis, with due process and appropriate safeguards, and determine whether no action, further inquiry, monitoring, interim protections, or other appropriate action is warranted. **Reporting is not discipline. Reporting is notice.**

My full written comment also addresses the development history of the proposed reporting language. Earlier Board discussions and staff materials appear to have involved broader concepts, including arrests, charges, convictions, civil actions, criminal conduct, other conduct, substance-use-related impairment, public protection, and reporting requirements. By March 6, 2026, however, the staff report and discussion presented adjudicated-only reporting as an already-existing Board preference. I have not located a public meeting record showing where or how that preference was discussed, explained, adopted, or otherwise selected.

I also ask the Board to clarify the treatment of proposed subsection 1(C), which concerned “habitual or excessive use of alcohol or controlled substances.” The October 2025 discussion appears to have identified substance-use-related impairment, DUI-related conduct, assessment authority, remediation, and public protection as significant reasons for considering regulatory change. At the March 6, 2026 meeting, proposed subsection 1(C) was struck before the draft advanced to workshop. I understand the concerns raised about the terms “habitual” and “excessive,” and I am not asking the Board to adopt vague or overbroad language. My request is that the public rulemaking record clearly explain whether the Board intended to remove the substance-use-impairment concern entirely, address it through another remaining provision, revise it with clearer language, reserve it for future rulemaking, or rely on existing authority.

This issue matters because patient harm and professional impairment are not always confined to the formal therapy hour. A licensee’s impaired judgment, substance-use-related conduct, or inappropriate communication with a client outside a scheduled session may still arise from, affect, or undermine the professional relationship, even if it does not occur during the session itself. A regulation addressing impairment-related concerns can be protective and remedial, not merely punitive.

My full written comment also addresses written public comment and supporting materials. My December 12, 2025 and January 23, 2026 written public comments were included in meeting packets, but they were not clearly attached to, linked in, summarized in, or identified with the corresponding approved minutes. The December 12, 2025 approved minutes state that there was “no public comment,” even though my written public comment and reference list were included in the pre-meeting packet. I request that the Board make the connection clear in the public record and R089-26I rulemaking record so future reviewers can locate the written comments without reconstructing the history from separate packets, minutes, staff reports, recordings, and correspondence.

The full comment also addresses the Board-provided “Survey of Nevada Licensing Boards - Criminal and/or Other Conduct Not Related to the Profession as a Basis for Disciplinary Action and Reporting Requirements,” which was provided to me by Board staff as a courtesy on May 21, 2026. That survey appears relevant because it identifies multiple Nevada licensing boards that require reporting of criminal charges or other non-final criminal matters, and appears to identify the Board of Psychological Examiners as “No” for criminal and/or other conduct not related to the profession as a basis for discipline. I request that the survey and any related comparative materials used, reviewed, summarized, or relied on in developing R089-26I be included or clearly identified in the public rulemaking record.

Before final action, I respectfully request that the Board either revise R089-26I to require earlier reporting of at least serious pending criminal charges and relevant filed civil actions, or explain on the record why it rejects that approach despite comparable Nevada behavioral-health and healthcare reporting models. I also request that the Board clarify how it intends to address the substance-use-related impairment concern discussed at length during development of the proposed regulation, and how written public comments and supporting materials will be preserved and identified in the public record.

I also request that the Board follow through on its April 23, 2026 statement that my April 17, 2026 written public comment "will be included as an attachment to the April 17, 2026 meeting minutes once the minutes are finalized and approved by the Board." I further request that the December 12, 2025, January 23, 2026, April 17, 2026, and current July 10, 2026 written public comments, including this brief summary, be attached to, linked in, incorporated by reference in, or otherwise clearly identified in the R089-26I public record and rulemaking record.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Rebecca Savio
Rebecca Savio
Public comment contact: pinnaclelegalresearch@gmail.com

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR JULY 10, 2026 BOARD MEETING AND R089-26I RULEMAKING RECORD

Regarding: LCB File No. R089-26I: Criminal Conduct and Reporting Requirements
Submitted to: Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners (NBOPE)
Submitted by: Rebecca Savio
Date: July 2, 2026

Note: This submission is made in good faith as public comment and is intended for informational and educational purposes only. It is not legal advice.

Members of the Board:

I submit this fourth written public comment in good faith for the public record and for the benefit of the Board, LCB, the Legislative Commission or Subcommittee, licensees, patients, caregivers, and members of the public who may later review how R089-26I developed. My purpose is to help create a clear, transparent record showing what issues were raised, what materials appear to have informed the proposed regulation, how the reporting language changed over time, and what policy choices remain unclear before final action.

I appreciate the Board's time and the work involved in developing regulations. I also understand that Board staff and counsel may prepare draft language, organize materials, and perform ordinary administrative or legal drafting work between noticed meetings. My concern is not with ordinary preparation of draft language. My concern is that the public record should clearly reflect the Board's policy direction, the supporting materials considered or relied upon, and the rationale for the reporting model reflected in the proposed regulation before final action is taken.

I offer this comment in a spirit of cooperation and shared concern for public safety, public trust, and a clear rulemaking record. I recognize that the Board, Board staff, and Board counsel must balance public protection, due process, fairness to licensees, administrative practicality, confidentiality, and legal authority. My goal is not to assign fault, but to help ensure that the final regulation and public record are clear, balanced, and protective.

I. Request for Inclusion in Minutes and Rulemaking Record

I submit this fourth written public comment regarding LCB File No. R089-26I, the proposed regulation concerning criminal and other conduct not related to the practice of psychology as a basis for discipline and the related reporting requirements.

Pursuant to NRS 241.035, I request that this prepared written comment be accepted as written public comment for this meeting or hearing and preserved in the public record and rulemaking record for R089-26I. Because this comment is lengthy, I do not ask that the full text be reproduced in the body of the minutes unless the Board determines that doing so is appropriate. Instead, I respectfully request that the Board attach the brief summary submitted with this comment to the minutes, link it in the minutes, incorporate it by reference, or otherwise clearly identify it in the minutes, and state where the full written comment and exhibits are maintained or can be located. I also request that this full written comment, brief summary, and supporting exhibits be provided to each Board member before any further action is taken on the proposed regulation.

This comment is submitted regarding the proposed regulation and the public record for R089-26I. In summary, this comment asks the Board to address four related issues before final action: first, whether R089-26I should require earlier reporting of serious criminal charges and relevant filed civil actions; second, where in the public record the adjudicated-only reporting model was discussed, explained, adopted, or otherwise selected; third, whether the substance-use-related impairment concern discussed in October 2025 was intentionally omitted after proposed subsection 1(C) was stricken, addressed through another remaining provision, reserved for future rulemaking, or already covered by existing authority; and fourth, how written public comments and supporting materials will be clearly identified, preserved, and connected to the official minutes and rulemaking record.

In plain terms, my concern is that the proposed regulation may leave the Board without timely notice of serious pending matters, and the public record does not yet clearly show how the Board weighed that risk, what supporting materials it relied on, or how written public comments were preserved before the draft moved forward.

I support the Board's effort to move forward and strengthen its authority regarding criminal and other conduct that may bear on public protection, professional judgment, fitness to practice, and public trust. However, the current draft of R089-26I remains underinclusive because it appears to require reporting only after conviction, plea, judgment, settlement, or other adjudicated or final action, and does not require timely reporting when serious criminal charges or relevant civil actions are filed.

In practical terms, if serious pending charges are not self-reported, the Board may learn of them only through media coverage, a third-party complaint, another agency, internet or court-record searches, or chance discovery. That leaves a public-protection gap. The October 2025 discussion also appears to reflect concern that the ordinary complaint process may not be sufficient in some substance-use-related situations, because the Board may lack authority to require assessment or take meaningful action unless the conduct is tied directly to practice. But the professional relationship is not limited to the minutes of a therapy session. Substance-use-related impairment, impaired judgment, boundary violations, or inappropriate communications with a client outside a formal session may still affect patient safety, trust, informed consent, and fitness to practice. That concern supports the need for clear reporting and regulatory authority before the Board acts on R089-26I.

This is no longer a new concern. I have raised the same core issue in multiple timely submitted written public comments, yet those comments do not appear to be clearly identified in the corresponding meeting minutes. The Board has had repeated notice that excluding serious pending charges from routine reporting may leave a serious gap in public protection, informed consent, timely Board awareness, and public trust. Based on my review of the meeting materials and transcripts generated from Board-provided recordings, the proposed language appears to have moved from workshop toward a future regulation hearing without these record-clarity and reporting-gap concerns being fully addressed on the public record.

Reporting is not discipline. Reporting is notice. I am not asking the Board to discipline licensees based on allegations, nor am I asking the Board to treat a charge as proof of misconduct. I am asking for a regulation that gives the Board timely notice, preserves due process, protects patients, and supports public confidence and trust in Nevada's regulation of psychology.

II. Prior Written Comments, Minutes, and the Public Record

I renew and incorporate by reference my prior written public comments submitted on this regulation topic for the December 12, 2025, January 23, 2026, and April 17, 2026 Board meetings.

On May 5, 2026, Board staff instructed me: "To ensure your submission is included as public comment for the Board's next meeting, please resubmit (in a separate document) the specific written public comment you would like included. Please do not include written comments you have previously submitted, as those have already been included in prior meeting materials, which have been, and continue to be, publicly available." I understand this instruction to mean that I should submit this current public comment as its own document and should not resubmit my December 12, 2025 and January 23, 2026 written public comments as separate new public comments. I am attempting to respect that instruction. At the same time, inclusion in prior meeting packets or meeting materials is not the same as clear identification in the approved minutes or rulemaking record. Because the approved minutes for those meetings do not clearly identify, attach, link, summarize, or connect those written comments to the criminal-conduct/reporting regulation agenda item, I am incorporating them by reference and summarizing them here so that the Board, the public, LCB, the Legislative Commission, and any later reviewer can identify what was submitted before the proposed language moved forward.

I appreciate the Board's statement that written public comment will be included in the regulation packet submitted to the Legislative Counsel Bureau following any final regulation hearing. However, that future submission does not fully resolve the present public-record issue. The issue I am raising is whether the Board's meeting minutes and rulemaking record accurately show what written public comments were submitted during the development of R089-26I, when those comments were submitted, how they related to the criminal-conduct/reporting agenda item, and whether they were available before the proposed language moved forward. A later LCB submission cannot substitute for clear meeting records showing the public-comment history as the regulation was being developed.

For the December 12, 2025 and January 23, 2026 meetings, the Board's agenda language stated that written public comments submitted before the meeting would be forwarded to the Board and "included in the public record (meeting minutes)." I relied on that language when submitting my written public comments. I did not understand that any additional request or specific wording was necessary for timely submitted written public comments to be clearly reflected in, attached to, linked in, incorporated by reference in, or otherwise identifiable from the meeting minutes or public record.

On May 21, 2026, Board staff informed me: "Per Board counsel, when submitting written public comment, you may request that these be attached to the meeting minutes when submitting the written public comment." I appreciate that clarification and am making that request expressly here. For the four-page summary of this public comment, I respectfully request that it be included in all meeting materials, attached to or clearly identified in the minutes, and included in the R089-26I rulemaking record. For the full written comment and exhibits, I request that they be included in the pre-meeting packet and linked in the minutes, incorporated by reference in the minutes, or otherwise clearly identified in the minutes and R089-26I rulemaking record, including by identifying where the public can locate those materials. I also request that the prior written comments incorporated by reference here be clearly identified in the R089-26I rulemaking record because they were submitted during the development of the proposed regulation and relate directly to the criminal-conduct/reporting agenda item.

To help the Board, the public, the Legislative Counsel Bureau, the Legislative Commission, and any later reviewer follow the public-comment history, I summarize those prior submissions here:

December 12, 2025 submission: Addressed informed consent, transparency, patient safety, equity, public trust, Arizona's criminal-charge reporting framework, and the relevance of criminal conduct to a trust-based therapeutic profession.

January 23, 2026 submissions: Included a brief written public comment and a longer supplemental comment addressing children, vulnerable patients, caregiver informed consent, summary suspension, and the need for earlier Board awareness of serious criminal matters without predetermining discipline.

April 17, 2026 submission: Addressed the apparent adjudicated-only reporting preference reflected in the March 6 staff report, the concern that serious pending criminal charges may remain unreported while treatment continues, and the need for earlier reporting of at least certain serious pending criminal matters with safeguards for fairness and due process.

April 24, 2026 request: Requested comparative materials, investigator-provided information, current proposed language, and additional public discussion before any regulation hearing or final action.

The December 12, 2025 meeting packet included my written public comment and accompanying reference list, labeled under Item 2 but expressly titled "Agenda Item: Criminal Conduct & Discipline - Public Comment." The December transcript also reflects that written public comment was included in the meeting materials. However, the approved December minutes state under Item 2 only that "There was no public comment" and do not identify, summarize, attach, link, or otherwise connect that written comment to the criminal-conduct/reporting regulation discussion later addressed under Agenda Item 13. Because transcripts and recordings are lengthy, detailed, and not always readily available or easy for members of the public to locate and review, relying on the transcript alone does not provide the same public-record clarity as identifying the written comment in the approved minutes or rulemaking record.

Although my December 12, 2025 and January 23, 2026 written public comments were not clearly attached to, linked in, summarized in, or identified with the corresponding approved minutes, they can be found in the December 12, 2025 and January 23, 2026 meeting packets or meeting materials. I request that the Board make that connection clear in the public record and R089-26I rulemaking record so that future reviewers, including Board members, LCB, the Legislative Commission or Subcommittee, licensees, patients, caregivers, and members of the public, can locate the written comments without having to reconstruct the record across separate packets, minutes, staff reports, recordings, and correspondence. The Board's agendas stated that written public comments submitted before the meeting would be included in the public record, identified parenthetically as the meeting minutes, and I relied on that language when submitting comments for the December 12, 2025 and January 23, 2026 meetings. My concern is not to resubmit prior comments as new public comments. My concern is to ensure that the original meeting records clearly reflect the written comments submitted for those meetings and tie them to the criminal-conduct/reporting regulation agenda item. A later general notation that written public comment was received does not provide the same clarity as attaching, linking, incorporating by reference, or clearly identifying the comments in the corresponding meeting records and rulemaking record.

This written-public-comment concern does not appear limited to my own submissions. In reviewing the October 24, 2025 Board meeting records, I noticed that the meeting packet included written public comment from another member of the public. The October 24 agenda stated that written public comments submitted before the meeting would be included in the public record, identified parenthetically as the meeting minutes, although they would not necessarily be read aloud. The October 24 transcript also appears to reflect that, after an initial statement that there was no public comment in the Board office, Executive Director Laura Arnold clarified on the record that written public comment had been received and included in the meeting materials. However, the approved October 24 minutes state that there was no public comment and do not appear to acknowledge receipt of that written public comment, identify the commenter, or otherwise reflect the written comment included in the packet.

I raise this because it appears similar to the concerns I have raised regarding my own written public comments submitted for the December 12, 2025 and January 23, 2026 meetings. In those instances, my written comments were timely submitted and included in the meeting materials, but the approved minutes do not clearly identify, attach, link, summarize, or connect those written comments to the Board's discussion of this proposed regulation.

The April 17, 2026 workshop record appears to handle written public comment more clearly than the December and January records. During the April workshop, the Board expressly noted that written public comment had been submitted on that agenda item and that it followed the staff report in the meeting materials. By contrast, the December and January records do not similarly identify, summarize, or connect my written comments to the criminal-conduct/reporting regulation agenda item. That inconsistency contributes to the public-record ambiguity I am asking the Board to address before final action.

The March 6, 2026 minutes further show, in connection with the SB165 regulation workshop, that written public comments can be acknowledged, identified, and summarized in the minutes when the Board chooses to do so. By contrast, the December and January records do not clearly identify, summarize, or connect my written public comments to the criminal-conduct/reporting regulation agenda item.

This matters because written public comment is part of public participation in the regulatory process. When written comments are included only in meeting packets but are not acknowledged, attached, linked, incorporated by reference, or otherwise clearly reflected in the approved minutes or rulemaking record, it becomes difficult for the public, the Board, LCB, the Legislative Commission, and any reviewing body to determine what written comments were received, whether they were considered, and how they fit into the development of the regulation. The public, future Board members, and later reviewers should not have to reconstruct the regulatory history across scattered packets, minutes, staff reports, recordings, and correspondence to understand what comments were submitted, what policy issues were raised, what materials were considered, and when key decisions occurred.

On June 30, 2026, Board staff informed me that the Board does not intend to place my request for limited amendment, clarification, attachment, linking, incorporation by reference, or other record-identification measures on the July 10, 2026 agenda or address the issue at this time. However, I respectfully remain concerned that the Board's position does not fully resolve the record-clarity issue as the regulation moves forward, particularly where the agenda language represented that written comments would be included in the public record, identified parenthetically as meeting minutes, but the approved minutes do not clearly identify, attach, link, summarize, or connect those comments to the regulation agenda item. For that reason, I respectfully renew my request that the current public comment, attached exhibits, and prior comments incorporated by reference be clearly identified in the public record and R089-26I rulemaking record before final action.

The June 30 response also did not clearly confirm whether my June 24 request would be provided to the Board for consideration at the next available meeting, even though my request expressly asked for confirmation on that point if the item would not be placed on the July 10 agenda.

These record-clarity concerns are heightened where oral public-comment periods appear to be opened and closed very quickly in practice, because members of the public may not have a meaningful opportunity to speak unless they respond immediately. For example, during the April 17, 2026 meeting, after the Board voted to move the SB165/BHWP proposed regulatory language to a future regulation hearing, the transcript generated from the Board-provided recording appears to show that public comment was requested at approximately 50:05, and that the Board moved on from public comment at approximately 50:11, about six seconds later.

Similarly, during the criminal-conduct/reporting workshop, after the Board voted to move the proposed R089-26I language to a future regulation hearing, public comment was opened again at approximately 58:59, and the workshop appears to have closed between approximately 59:05 and 59:11. When oral public-comment opportunities are this brief in practice, and written public comments are not clearly identified in the minutes or rulemaking record, the public record may not accurately reflect the full scope of public participation or the issues raised before the Board.

For members of the public attending by phone, the unmuting process may require several seconds, including pressing *6 or otherwise preparing to unmute. For participants attending by Zoom or another electronic platform, locating the mute button, raising a hand, or otherwise signaling a desire to comment may also take several seconds. Members of the public may also reasonably hesitate to interrupt a formal public meeting unless they are clearly given enough time to unmute and indicate that they wish to comment. For that reason, I respectfully request that, when public comment is opened, the Board allow a brief pause of at least 10 to 12 seconds before closing public comment or moving to the next item, particularly after action is taken on a regulation item.

III. Summary of Position

R089-26I appears to add broad disciplinary language for violation of state or federal criminal law, but the proposed reporting requirement is much narrower. As currently drafted, the regulation would require a psychologist to report:

1. an action taken against a license in another jurisdiction;
2. a judgment or settlement on a malpractice claim; and
3. a conviction or plea for certain crimes.

The draft does not require reporting when a criminal charge is filed. It also does not require reporting when a civil action, including a malpractice action related to the practice of psychology, is filed.

This creates a timing gap. The Board may not receive notice of serious pending criminal charges or relevant civil actions until months or years later, if ever, unless the matter becomes public through media coverage, an employer, a complainant, another agency, or chance discovery. That gap is my central concern with the current draft.

A pending charge should not be treated as proof of misconduct. A filed civil action should not be treated as proof of malpractice. But timely reporting allows the Board to determine, through appropriate process, whether any inquiry, monitoring, interim safeguard, emergency review, patient-protection response, or no action is warranted.

A reporting requirement can protect patients while also preserving the licensee's due-process rights.

IV. The Public Record Appears to Show a Material Narrowing or Unexplained Transition

The Board's public materials initially framed this issue more broadly than the current draft.

At the October 24, 2025 meeting, the approved minutes reflect that the Executive Director reported on a disciplinary matter involving whether criminal conduct unrelated to professional practice can serve as grounds for discipline. The October minutes also reflect that comparative information from other boards was provided to assist the Board in determining whether it wished to expand its authority.

To be clear, I am not asserting that the Board formally adopted a charges-and-convictions reporting model at the October 24, 2025 meeting. The October discussion appears to have been exploratory. At that meeting, Dr. Pearson clarified that the question before the Board was whether the Board had an interest in pursuing regulatory language, "not necessarily fleshing out the language like charges versus convictions," and the response was yes. I understand that to mean key details, including charges versus convictions, had not yet been resolved.

My concern is that the October, December, and January discussions, staff materials, and comparative examples appear to have involved broader concepts such as arrests, charges, convictions, criminal conduct, other conduct, substance-use-related impairment, and reporting requirements. I have not located any public Board meeting in February. By March 6, 2026, however, the staff report and meeting discussion presented adjudicated-only reporting as an already-existing Board preference. I have not located a public meeting record showing **when or how that preference was developed or narrowed into the adjudicated-only reporting model.** Because this regulation concerns public safety and the protection of children, older adults, and other vulnerable populations, I respectfully ask that the Board identify the public record and supporting materials showing how the reporting model was selected before the proposed regulation moved forward.

Based on my review of the October 24, 2025 transcript, the approved minutes also appear to summarize Agenda Item 13 more narrowly than the discussion reflected in the recording. The minutes state that Board members "had suggested it be limited to just substance abuse." However, the transcript appears to reflect a broader and more divided discussion involving criminal conduct outside the practice of psychology, public protection, substance-use-related impairment, criminal justice fairness, moral turpitude, whether regulation or statutory change was the proper vehicle, and whether the Board had sufficient information to move forward. The transcript also appears to reflect that the Board had not yet resolved the precise scope of the proposed regulation, and the minutes state that the discussion was tabled for a future Board meeting. This matters because the October discussion was an early step in the development of R089-26I, and the public record should accurately reflect whether the Board was considering a narrow substance-use issue or a broader criminal-conduct and reporting framework.

I also specifically address the substance-use-impairment issue discussed during the October 24, 2025 meeting because that issue appears to have been significant to the Board's public-safety concerns, but it is not clearly carried forward in the later proposed language.

During the October 24 discussion, Dr. Lenkeit identified substance-use disorders as "one of the major areas to look at." He explained that if someone is arrested for drunk driving, that may suggest a substance-use issue, and stated that the Board "can't do anything really with that at this point," even though it may suggest a substance-use disorder that the Board would need to look into and possibly remediate. He further stated that, under his understanding of the statutes, the Board could only address a substance-use disorder if the licensee was abusing substances during the time they were seeing clients.

That distinction is important because patient harm and professional impairment are not always confined to the formal therapy hour. Substance-use-related impairment, impaired judgment, or inappropriate communication with a client outside a scheduled session may still affect the professional relationship, even if it does not occur during the session itself.

Dr. Lenkeit also connected the issue directly to impairment and the APA Ethics Code. He stated that if there is evidence of a substance-use disorder, it could carry over into a person's practice without the Board knowing, and that "it's an impairment for that individual." He further noted that one of the requirements of the APA Ethics Code is not to be impaired in practice. He stated that even if the Board could not show that a licensee was using substances immediately before or during a session, if there is substantial evidence of a substance-use disorder, "I think we need to look at it."

The discussion also addressed the Board's inability, under the current regulatory framework, to compel an assessment in that situation. Dr. Lenkeit stated that the Board might require a person to receive a substance-abuse assessment, but that the Board "can't even do that at this point" unless there is specific evidence that the person was using substances during a session. He further explained that, if new regulatory language were adopted, the Board could compel someone with a DUI to obtain an assessment to determine whether substance use is an issue.

Deputy Attorney General Harry Ward then confirmed that Dr. Lenkeit was correct. He stated that the prior case discussed by the Board could not be prosecuted because the DAG handling that matter did not have "law to stand on," whether by regulation or statute, for misdemeanors outside the scope of employment. He further stated that, even if a complaint had been filed regarding the same conduct, the Board still "would not have legs to stand on" as far as statutory or regulatory authority to pursue the matter.

Dr. Soseh Esmaeili also addressed the public-safety issue. She stated that, in order to make sure public safety is taken into consideration, it would be important to make the change, even if the result were simply to have someone assessed. She stated that the Board cannot assume substance-use conduct is not affecting the person's place of work, and that such an assumption "could be dangerous to the public." She further emphasized that the Board's main focus is to protect the public.

The approved minutes do not appear to capture this level of detail or the range of concerns reflected in the recording, including assessment authority, public-safety rationale, substance-use-related impairment, and the limits of the Board's existing statutory or regulatory authority.

I raise this because the October discussion appears to identify substance-use-related impairment, assessment authority, remediation, and public protection as significant reasons for considering regulatory change. By the March 6, 2026 meeting, the proposed language included subsection 1(C), concerning "habitual or excessive use of alcohol or controlled substances," and the March 6 minutes reflect that Board members raised concerns about the ambiguity and operational definition of the terms "habitual" and "excessive." The minutes reflect that the Board then approved moving the proposed regulatory language to workshop "with the revisions to the language as discussed." I understand those concerns and am not asking the Board to adopt vague or overbroad language. **However, after proposed subsection 1(C) was struck, the public record does not clearly explain whether the Board intended to remove the substance-use-impairment concern entirely, address it through another remaining provision, revise it with clearer language, reserve it for future rulemaking, or rely on the remaining criminal-conduct provisions and adjudicated-matter reporting requirements.**

That remains an important **public-safety question** because the earlier discussion appears to have involved not only discipline, but also the Board's ability to require **assessment, remediation, monitoring, or other appropriate intervention** when substance-use-related conduct may indicate impairment.

I also respectfully request clarification regarding the timeline and rulemaking record for the removal of proposed subsection 1(C). The timestamps in the Board-provided October 24, 2025 recording appear to show that substance-use-related impairment, DUI-related conduct, assessment authority, remediation, public protection, and fairness safeguards were not incidental issues; they were part of the Board's earlier discussion regarding why regulatory language might be needed.

For example, during the October 24, 2025 discussion, at approximately 50:20 through 52:17 of the transcript generated from the Board-provided recording, Board Consultant Dr. Lenkeit discussed a DUI-related situation and stated that regulatory language could allow the Board to require at least a substance-abuse assessment to determine whether substance use is an issue. Deputy Attorney General Harry Ward then stated that Dr. Lenkeit was correct and explained that, under the current statutory or regulatory framework, the Board may lack authority to pursue certain misdemeanor conduct outside the scope of professional practice.

Later in the October discussion, at approximately 1:10:17 through 1:12:03, Dr. Moering stated that the issue was worth looking at more deeply and suggested focusing on substance-use impairment. Dr. Lenkeit then explained that, if a complaint were filed and there was no statute or regulation allowing the Board to investigate or act, the complaint could go nowhere.

However, at the March 6, 2026 meeting, proposed subsection 1(C), concerning "habitual or excessive use of alcohol or controlled substances," was discussed and then struck before the draft moved forward to workshop. I understand the concerns raised during the March 6 discussion regarding the ambiguity and potential breadth of the terms "habitual" and "excessive." I am not asking the Board to adopt vague or overbroad language. But because substance-use-related impairment and related public-protection concerns appear to have been a significant part of the earlier discussion, I respectfully request that the public rulemaking record clarify whether the Board intended to remove that issue entirely as a separate regulatory basis, address it through another remaining provision, rely on existing authority, or reserve it for future rulemaking.

I raise this because the October, January, March, and April discussions appear to form the development history for R089-26I, and the striking of proposed subsection 1(C) may be important for LCB, the Legislative Commission or Subcommittee, licensees, patients, caregivers, and members of the public to understand the purpose and intended scope of the proposed regulation.

The January 23, 2026 staff report is especially important because it expressly framed the issue as involving licensees who are "charged with and/or been convicted of" criminal conduct beyond the practice of psychology, stated that NBOPE lacked a specific conduct-reporting requirement beyond its biennial renewal disciplinary/conduct reporting form, and identified other licensing-board models ranging from criminal charges and civil actions to convictions and judgments. Thus, the January materials appear to have placed both pre-adjudication and adjudicated-only models before the Board, while the later March materials presented adjudicated-only reporting as an already-existing Board preference.

The approved January 23, 2026 minutes and transcript further support the need for clarification. Both reflect that Ms. Arnold had provided links to other boards' publicly available regulations and statutes, reviewed publicly available information, and summarized that information for the Board. They also reflect that Dr. Woodard described the information provided by Board investigators as helpful in supporting development of regulatory language. This matters because those materials appear to have informed the Board's decision to move forward, but the public record does not clearly identify which comparative models were reviewed or how the later adjudicated-only reporting model was selected.

The January 23, 2026 transcript also shows that the issue was still being framed as whether the Board had an appetite to move forward and what the regulatory language might later look like. At approximately 1:09:44–1:10:26, Dr. Holland clarified that the question before the Board was whether there was an appetite to move forward with developing language, and Ms. Arnold confirmed that the Board could take the issue "step by step," further review the information, and later decide whether the language should be broad, specific, or somewhere in between. The approved January 23, 2026 minutes identify the next regular Board meeting as March 6, 2026, and I have not located any public Board meeting in February 2026 or between January 23 and March 6 where the Board publicly discussed, explained, or adopted an adjudicated-only reporting model. By March, however, the staff report and discussion presented adjudicated-only reporting as an already-existing Board preference.

The transcript then underscores the distinction between the discussion and the motion that was adopted. At approximately 1:14:15–1:14:33, Dr. Benuto summarized the discussion as reflecting consensus to move forward with drafting regulatory language that would allow disciplinary action based on criminal and other conduct not directly related to the practice of psychology and "to impose a reporting requirement." However, when the motion language was crafted at approximately 1:15:14–1:15:43, the motion was narrower: to approve moving forward with developing regulatory language regarding criminal and other conduct not related to the profession as a basis for disciplinary action. The motion accepted and adopted at approximately 1:15:46–1:15:55 did not expressly include a reporting requirement. I request that the Board clarify whether the January 23, 2026 motion was intended to authorize both disciplinary language and a reporting requirement, and if so, where the Board later discussed and selected the narrower adjudicated-only reporting model.

This distinction matters because the March 6, 2026 staff report and minutes later state that the Board had already indicated a preference for reporting only adjudicated administrative, civil, and criminal matters, as opposed to reporting both unadjudicated claims or charges and adjudicated matters. The April 17, 2026 workshop notice and staff report continued that narrowed framing, describing the proposal as involving reporting requirements for disciplinary actions, civil judgments or settlements, and criminal convictions. The April 17 staff report also stated that, during the January 23 meeting, the Board had taken action to approve language requiring licensees to report administrative, civil, and criminal actions that had been adjudicated. By the April 17 workshop, the draft reporting language required reporting of criminal convictions or pleas, but did not require reporting of criminal charges. I do not see in the January minutes, transcript, or adopted motion a clear public vote, discussion, or rationale selecting an adjudicated-only reporting model, nor do I see a clear public discussion rejecting reporting of criminal charges or serious pending criminal charges. I respectfully ask the Board to identify where in the public record that reporting model was discussed, selected, and approved.

The same unexplained transition appears in the civil-action reporting issue. The December and January materials referenced models involving civil actions and judgments, but the March and April draft language required reporting only of malpractice judgments or settlements, not civil actions when filed. My concern is not that staff drafted language between meetings. My concern is that the key policy narrowing, excluding criminal charges and filed civil actions from the reporting requirement, appears in the March and April materials without a clear public explanation of when, why, or based on what comparative information that narrowing occurred. At approximately 1:37:59–1:38:15 of the March 6 transcript, Ms. Arnold stated that the Board had indicated a preference for reporting only adjudicated administrative, civil, and/or criminal matters, as opposed to reporting unadjudicated claims or criminal charges that had not resulted in conviction. However, I have not located a prior public vote, discussion, or rationale showing where the Board selected that adjudicated-only reporting model or rejected reporting of criminal charges, serious pending criminal charges, or filed civil actions.

The March 6 transcript also appears more specific than the approved minutes regarding proposed subsection 1(C). At approximately 1:43:04–1:43:33, Dr. Woodard moved to strike the language in proposed subsection 1(C) and move the proposed regulation draft forward for workshop, and the motion passed. The approved March minutes state more generally that the Board approved moving the proposed regulatory language to workshop "with the revisions to the language as discussed." I raise this not to challenge that vote, but to emphasize that the record should clearly reflect what language was removed, what language remained, what reporting model was selected, and what action was actually approved before the regulation advanced.

V. Meaningful Public Comment Requires Access to the Information That Informed the Draft

The Board's minutes and staff reports repeatedly reference comparative information from other Nevada licensing boards. As of this submission, I have not located the full underlying comparative materials, links, surveys, charts, summaries, lists, or investigator-provided information referenced in the Board's minutes and staff reports in the public meeting packets or workshop materials.

Because those materials appear to have informed the development of R089-26I, including the proposed reporting language before the April 17 workshop, they should be made available to the public before final action. Without access to the information the Board reviewed, members of the public cannot fully evaluate the proposed language or provide informed comment on the policy choices reflected in the draft.

I respectfully ask the Board to ensure that the public record includes the materials that informed the Board's discussion and proposed language before this regulation moves forward. The December and January discussions appear to have included broader concepts, including arrests or convictions, examples from other boards, investigator-provided information, and a reporting requirement. By March, the staff report described adjudicated-only reporting as an already-existing Board preference. I have not yet been able to locate the survey, comparative licensing-board materials, investigator-provided information, summaries, links, charts, or other supporting materials that informed that narrowing. Because this regulation concerns public safety, public protection, and vulnerable populations, meaningful public comment requires access to the same core materials that informed the Board's consideration.

The March 6, 2026 meeting packet states that the proposed language was prepared based on the Board's preferences and examples from other licensing boards. That makes the absence of the complete comparative chart, or materially similar comparative materials, from the public meeting materials especially important. In the many months during which this regulation was explored, discussed, drafted, and moved forward, I did not see this comparative chart included in the public meeting materials. On May 21, 2026, after I requested it, Board staff provided me with a document titled "Survey of Nevada Licensing Boards - Criminal and/or Other Conduct Not Related to the Profession as a Basis for Disciplinary Action and Reporting Requirements." Board staff characterized the chart as a courtesy compilation of publicly available statutory and regulatory information. I also understand that the Board's position was that it was not required to provide this courtesy compilation. My concern, however, is not simply whether the Board was legally required to provide the chart to me upon request. My concern is whether comparative information that was documented, compiled, summarized, referenced, described, reviewed, or relied on during the Board's consideration of R089-26I informed the proposed regulatory language and should therefore be available or clearly identified in the public rulemaking record.

Meaningful public participation is difficult when the public does not have access to the same comparative context that appears to have informed the proposed language, especially where individual members of the public may not have the time, expertise, or practical ability to independently identify, compile, and compare reporting models across multiple Nevada licensing boards.

I understand that individual statutes and regulations may be publicly available elsewhere. I also understand the Board's May 5, 2026 statement that, with respect to the regulatory process, the Board complies with applicable legal requirements when submitting materials to the Legislative Counsel Bureau, and that opportunities for public comment will be provided when the regulation hearing is noticed. My concern, however, is not limited to whether the Board will later submit materials to LCB or provide comment opportunities at a noticed regulation hearing. My concern is whether the comparative information that was documented, compiled, summarized, referenced, described, or relied on during the Board's consideration of R089-26I informed the proposed regulatory language and should therefore be available or clearly identified in the public rulemaking record.

The May 21, 2026 survey does not show charge-reporting as an unusual or isolated regulatory approach. It identifies several Nevada licensing boards - including Accountancy, Applied Behavioral Analysis, MFT/CPC, Massage Therapy, Social Work, and Speech-Language Pathology/Audiology/Hearing Aid Dispensing - that require reporting of criminal charges or other non-final criminal matters. This makes the proposed Psychology Board draft's conviction-or-plea-only reporting model a narrower policy choice that should be explained in the public rulemaking record.

I also understand, based on written correspondence with General Counsel for the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners, that for purposes of that Board's criminal-action reporting process, "criminal action" includes arrests, indictments, criminal complaints, informations, and pending criminal charges, and that reported matters are reviewed case by case rather than treated as automatic discipline. I also independently confirmed with the MFT/CPC Board that the charge-reporting framework in NAC 641A.243 was already in place before Clinical Professional Counselors were added in 2008, and that the NAC history reflects the provision was originally added effective August 20, 2004, with later amendments. This suggests that Nevada's behavioral-health and healthcare licensing framework has included charge-reporting models for many years, and that such reporting is not a new or unusual regulatory concept.

If comparative licensing-board examples informed the Psychology Board's decision to move toward an adjudicated-only reporting model, that choice appears difficult to reconcile with the comparative information provided to me as a courtesy, unless the public record explains why the Board rejected or distinguished the charge-reporting models used by boards serving overlapping behavioral-health or healthcare populations. Because the survey appears directly relevant to the Board's consideration of disciplinary authority, reporting requirements, substance-use-related concerns, and the later adjudicated-only reporting model, I am attaching the May 21, 2026 chart as Exhibit E and respectfully request that the Board include it, or identify any earlier or materially similar comparative materials actually used, reviewed, summarized, or provided in developing the proposed language, in the public rulemaking record before final action.

The January 23, 2026 recording also appears to confirm that materials beyond the public discussion informed the Board's consideration. Ms. Arnold stated that she had provided links to other boards' regulations and statutes, and that she had reviewed publicly available information and summarized that information for the Board. Dr. Woodard also stated that "the summary from the Board investigators" was helpful and contributed to the Board's consideration of developing regulations on this topic. I have not located the investigator-provided summary, the comparative chart later provided to me as a courtesy, or materially similar supporting materials in the publicly posted meeting packets, minutes, agendas, workshop materials, or regulation materials.

I requested clarification and access to these supporting materials in my April 24, 2026 correspondence, my May 6, 2026 follow-up, my May 26, 2026 public-records request, my June 18, 2026 follow-up correspondence, and my June 24, 2026 agenda request.

On June 11, 2026, the Board provided a Google Drive link to recordings for the public Board meetings between October 2025 and April 2026. I appreciate receiving those recordings. However, that production does not appear to identify or provide any other meeting, staff discussion, investigator-provided summary, advisory discussion, comparative chart, or supporting material showing where the comparative materials were discussed or where the adjudicated-only reporting preference was developed.

On June 30, 2026, Board staff informed me that there are "no other public record documents responsive" to my requests. I understand that response to mean that, aside from the materials already provided or publicly posted, the Board is not identifying any additional public-record documents showing the underlying comparative materials, investigator-provided summaries, advisory materials, staff analysis, or other written support explaining where the adjudicated-only reporting preference was developed, discussed, or adopted. If that understanding is incorrect, I respectfully request clarification. If it is correct, then the public record should be clarified on the record before final action so that the Board, the public, LCB, the Legislative Commission or Subcommittee, and any later reviewer can understand how the proposed reporting model developed.

I request that the Board make available, or summarize on the record, the comparative materials and investigator-provided information that informed the proposed language, including:

1. which Nevada boards were reviewed;

2. which boards require reporting of arrests, charges, indictments, criminal actions, or pending criminal matters;

3. which boards require reporting only after conviction, plea, judgment, settlement, or final adjudication;

4. what information or analysis was provided by Board investigators;

5. whether the May 21, 2026 survey, or any earlier or materially similar version, was provided to Board members, staff, counsel, investigators, advisory-group members, or other participants;

6. why the draft reflects conviction-or-plea-only criminal reporting;

7. why reporting of criminal charges and civil actions when filed was excluded; and

8. where in the public record the adjudicated-only reporting preference was discussed, explained, and adopted.

I also request that any comparative materials used, reviewed, summarized, highlighted, or relied on in developing this proposed regulation be made available or clearly identified in the public rulemaking record. Because the March 6, 2026 staff report and approved minutes state that the Board had already indicated a preference for reporting only adjudicated administrative, civil, and/or criminal matters, the public record should clearly show what comparative materials were reviewed, when the adjudicated-only preference developed, and why the Board selected that narrower reporting model despite other Nevada boards appearing to require reporting of certain criminal charges or other non-final criminal matters.

VI. Existing Reporting Baseline and Current Notice Gap

I also request that the Board clarify the existing baseline reporting obligations under its biennial renewal disciplinary/conduct reporting form, including whether licensees are currently required to disclose arrests, pending criminal charges, criminal actions, convictions, pleas, civil actions, judgments, settlements, or disciplinary actions. That baseline matters because R089-26I would create a separate reporting requirement, and the public cannot evaluate whether the proposed regulation improves or preserves a notice gap without understanding what reporting is already required.

This distinction is important because the January 23, 2026 staff report refers to NBOPE's existing biennial renewal disciplinary/conduct reporting form, but the active renewal form for the period ending December 31, 2026 does not appear to contain a direct criminal-charge or pending-criminal-matter reporting question. The form appears to ask about criminal convictions or guilty/nolo contendere pleas generally, except minor traffic violations. It also asks about professional discipline, current professional proceedings or unresolved complaints/investigations, malpractice actions, impairment-related issues, substantiated abuse or neglect, and other fitness-related matters. But it does not appear to ask whether the licensee has been arrested, charged, indicted, named in a criminal complaint or information, or is currently facing a pending criminal matter. Because renewal is biennial, relying on renewal questions alone may leave a notice gap of up to nearly two years, and even then the renewal form may not capture pending criminal charges if the questions are limited to convictions or pleas.

The Board's reactivation and reinstatement applications appear to contain similar notice gaps. Their conduct-history sections ask broad suitability and fitness questions, including whether there are any other matters, events, or issues that might affect the applicant's suitability or ability to resume the practice of psychology in Nevada. However, they do not appear to directly ask about arrests, pending criminal charges, criminal complaints, indictments, convictions, pleas, filed civil actions, malpractice actions, judgments, or settlements. Broad affirmations that an applicant has disclosed matters relevant to the ability to practice psychology are not the same as clear, objective reporting questions requiring disclosure of arrests, charges, convictions, pleas, or other criminal or civil matters.

The contrast is reflected in Social Work renewal practice. I independently confirmed with the Nevada Board of Examiners for Social Workers that its licensees are asked annually at renewal whether they have been arrested, charged, or convicted, and that reported legal or sanction events are reviewed case by case rather than treated as automatic discipline. Where a renewal, reinstatement, or reactivation form does not expressly ask about arrests, pending criminal charges, criminal complaints, indictments, or other non-adjudicated criminal matters, a licensee may not understand that such information must be disclosed. A licensee also may not voluntarily supply information in response to questions that are not clearly asked. Broad suitability or fitness questions may not provide the same clear notice as a specific reporting rule.

As a result, serious pending criminal matters could remain unknown to the Board for months or years, particularly if the matter does not result in a conviction before the next renewal cycle or if the licensee does not view the matter as responsive to a general fitness question. This gap creates a public-protection and public-safety risk because the Board may lack timely notice of serious pending criminal matters involving licensed psychologists, including matters that may bear on patient safety, professional judgment, exploitation, violence, dishonesty, abuse, controlled substances, vulnerable persons, minors, or fitness to practice. If the Board's renewal, reinstatement, or reactivation forms do not expressly require disclosure of arrests, pending criminal charges, criminal complaints, indictments, or other non-adjudicated criminal matters, then the Board may not have enough information to evaluate whether the licensee's current suitability or fitness to practice requires review, monitoring, safeguards, or no action.

This concern is heightened because the Nevada Board, unlike some other states, may not receive automatic criminal-history updates for existing licensees.

Based on written correspondence I received from the Nevada Department of Public Safety's NCJIS Compliance Unit in May 2026, I understand that Nevada's State RapBack authority had not been approved for agencies other than schools at that time, and that broader State or Federal RapBack access for other interested agencies would require future legislative action. If the Board does not receive automatic RapBack or similar criminal-history update notifications for existing licensees, then the Board may need to rely on licensee self-reporting, complaints, third-party reports, court-record searches, media coverage, or chance discovery to learn of serious criminal charges before conviction. **That makes a clear 30-day reporting requirement especially important for**

Nevada, because without direct questions, automatic updates, or timely self-reporting, serious pending criminal matters may remain unknown to the Board for months or years.

The current draft of R089-26I would not close that gap because it would require criminal reporting only after conviction or plea. I request that the Board clarify on the record whether arrests, indictments, criminal complaints, or pending criminal charges are currently required to be disclosed through renewal, reactivation, reinstatement, or any other existing Board process, and whether the proposed regulation is intended to create earlier notice or instead continue a conviction-or-plea-only reporting model.

Reporting would not equal discipline. Reporting would provide timely notice so the Board can determine, on a case-by-case basis and with appropriate safeguards, whether any follow-up is warranted. A decision not to require reporting of criminal charges is itself an important policy result. It means the Board may not receive timely notice unless the matter becomes public through media coverage, a third-party complaint, another agency, court-record searches, or chance discovery. The Board should address that tradeoff openly before adoption, because patients, caregivers, licensees, and members of the public may reasonably expect the Board's reporting rules to provide timely notice of serious pending matters that could bear on patient safety, professional judgment, or fitness to practice.

VII. Timely Notice Is Necessary for Public Protection and Due Process

The Board has discussed summary suspension and other tools when serious conduct comes to its attention. Summary suspension, if available, is an emergency public-protection tool. It is not a notice mechanism. Summary suspension cannot protect the public from a serious pending matter that the Board does not know exists.

If criminal charges are excluded from self-reporting entirely, the Board may not learn about potentially urgent risks until much later - through media coverage, an employer, a complainant, another agency, internet searches, chance discovery, or only after a conviction or plea occurs. That creates a notice gap.

I fully understand and agree that a criminal charge is not a conviction. A pending charge should not, by itself, be treated as proof of misconduct, and I am not suggesting that licensees should be disciplined merely because they have been charged. I am also not suggesting that every allegation, arrest, or pending charge should automatically be treated as misconduct, automatically result in discipline, or automatically be disclosed publicly. Reporting to the Board is an intake and review mechanism; it is not a finding of misconduct, discipline, or public disclosure.

My concern, raised in my prior December 2025, January 23, 2026, and April 17, 2026 public comments, is narrower. Certain serious pending criminal charges, convictions, or other safety-relevant matters may bear on patient safety, trust, informed consent, professional judgment, exploitation, violence, dishonesty, abuse, controlled substances, vulnerable persons, minors, or fitness to practice. A reporting requirement would give the Board timely notice and the opportunity to evaluate the matter through appropriate process. It would not predetermine the outcome.

There is a reasonable middle ground that protects both due process and public safety. The Board could require reporting of criminal charges other than minor traffic violations, or at minimum a defined category of serious pending criminal charges, while making clear that a pending charge alone is not grounds for discipline unless the Board determines, through appropriate process, that further inquiry or action is warranted.

For example, if a psychologist were charged with a serious violent crime, the Board might learn about it through media coverage. But public protection should not depend on news coverage, hearsay, third-party complaints, internet searches, or chance discovery. The same issue applies to serious charges that may never receive public attention, including domestic violence, elder abuse, child exploitation, sexual offenses, fraud involving vulnerable people, exploitation, controlled-substance-related offenses, or other conduct that may bear on a psychologist's fitness, judgment, or safety to practice.

Timely notice also supports due process because it allows the Board to review the matter in a structured, case-by-case way rather than relying on emergency action, public rumor, or delayed discovery after circumstances have escalated. Earlier notice does not require automatic discipline. It allows the Board to decide whether inquiry, monitoring, interim safeguards, emergency review, patient-protection measures, or no action is appropriate. In a profession involving confidential one-on-one treatment relationships, including with children and other vulnerable patients, timely notice of serious pending matters is an important public-protection safeguard.

If the Board excludes criminal charges from the reporting requirement because of concerns about due process, administrative burden, stigma, fairness, overbreadth, or confidentiality, those reasons should be stated on the record. The public should understand why the Board believes conviction-or-plea-only reporting is sufficient, particularly if the Board also views emergency tools as available in serious circumstances.

VIII. Comparable Behavioral-Health and Healthcare Boards Use Broader Reporting Models

I ask the Board to consider the approach used by other Nevada behavioral-health boards serving overlapping populations.

NAC 641A.243 requires marriage and family therapists, clinical professional counselors, and interns to notify their board in writing within 10 days after a criminal charge is filed and again after conviction, with an exception for certain misdemeanor traffic offenses. It also requires reporting when certain civil actions are filed and when settlements or judgments are reached.

Nevada's Board of Examiners for Social Workers provides another relevant comparison. NAC 641B.200 requires social workers to notify the Board in writing within 30 days after certain events, including when the licensee is arrested for, charged with, or convicted of a criminal offense other than a misdemeanor traffic offense, including driving under the influence of alcohol or a controlled substance. It also requires reporting when a civil action, including malpractice, is filed against the licensee for an act relating to the practice of social work, and when a settlement or judgment is filed in such a civil action.

These comparison boards provide earlier notice than the current Psychology Board draft. The MFT/CPC rule uses a 10-day reporting model for criminal charges and filed civil actions. The Social Work rule uses a 30-day reporting model, but it is still broader than the current Psychology Board draft because it requires reporting of arrests, charges, convictions, and certain civil actions when filed.

By contrast, the current Psychology Board draft requires criminal reporting only after conviction or plea, and civil reporting only after a malpractice judgment or settlement. That means the Psychology Board draft delays notice in both criminal and civil contexts.

The Arizona psychology board also provides a useful example of how charge reporting can be structured without treating a charge as discipline. A.R.S. § 32-3208 requires a health professional to report felony charges and misdemeanor charges involving conduct that may affect patient safety within 10 working days after the charge is filed. The statute further provides that, upon receipt of the information, the regulatory board may conduct an investigation.

The Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners also provides a useful healthcare-board comparison. I understand that the Medical Board regulates physicians and other medical licensees, not psychologists, so I do not offer it as direct authority over NBOPE. I offer it as another Nevada healthcare licensing-board example showing that earlier criminal reporting can function as a notice and review mechanism rather than automatic discipline. NRS 630.306 requires a licensee or applicant to report in writing, within 30 days, any criminal action taken or conviction obtained, other than a minor traffic violation. The Medical Board's Criminal Action Report Form includes arrest and indictment information, charges, court case number, conviction information, and sentencing information. In response to my inquiry, Medical Board staff stated that "criminal action" includes the listed matters, whether expunged, dismissed, sealed, or otherwise disposed of, and that violations are reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the assigned investigative committee. This supports the point that Nevada already has healthcare-board models in which reporting is broader than final conviction, while discipline remains case-by-case and only formal discipline becomes public. If NBOPE chooses a narrower adjudicated-only model despite these Nevada healthcare-board examples, the Board should explain why psychologists should have a narrower reporting duty than other Nevada healthcare or behavioral-health licensees serving vulnerable populations.

These examples confirm the distinction I am asking the Board to recognize here: reporting gives the Board notice and the ability to evaluate; it does not predetermine discipline.

I am not suggesting that NBOPE must copy another board's language exactly. I am asking the Board to explain why conviction-or-plea-only reporting is sufficient to protect the public when comparable Nevada behavioral-health boards require earlier notice of charges and filed civil actions.

IX. Public Trust, Informed Consent, and Equity

This is not only an administrative issue. It is also an informed-consent and public-trust issue.

Psychology is a uniquely private, trust-based profession. Patients are not purchasing a product separate from the provider; the therapeutic relationship itself is central to care. Psychologists often serve children, trauma survivors, elderly patients, veterans, dependent adults, and other vulnerable individuals. The work may involve intense confidentiality, emotional vulnerability, and significant power imbalance.

When patients later discover serious criminal information through court records, news coverage, internet searches, or another outside source rather than through a reliable regulatory process, the result can be destabilizing. It can undermine informed consent, disrupt treatment, and damage confidence not only in the individual provider, but also in the Board's public-protection role.

The issue is not necessarily that every reported charge should be disclosed publicly or directly to patients. The issue is that if the Board itself does not receive timely notice, then there is no reliable regulatory process at all for evaluating whether any patient-safety, informed-consent, interim-safeguard, emergency-review, or no-action response is appropriate.

A reasonable parent, guardian, caregiver, patient, or referring organization may assume that a licensed psychologist is not facing serious unresolved criminal charges unless the licensing Board has a reliable way to receive and evaluate that information. A charge is not a conviction, and serious charges do not always result in immediate custody or immediate public awareness. Criminal cases may remain pending for months or years. If the Board does not receive timely notice, families may be left to rely on media coverage, internet searches, court-record searches, or chance discovery instead of a reliable regulatory process.

Limiting reporting only to adjudicated convictions may also unintentionally create reputational harm for Nevada psychologists as a profession. Most people assume that psychologists are ethical, careful, and deeply committed to patient welfare. But if Nevada's regulatory structure communicates that serious criminal charges need not be reported unless and until there is a final conviction or plea, the public may reasonably perceive Nevada psychology as less transparent and less protective than comparable health professions. That perception would not protect psychologists; it could stigmatize the profession by suggesting that Nevada's oversight standards are unusually limited. It could also create confusion for other boards, referral sources, patients, and caregivers about whether Nevada's psychology reporting standards provide timely notice of serious pending matters.

This concern is especially important for Black patients, Indigenous patients, rural patients, and other marginalized communities that may already approach healthcare and mental-health systems with justified mistrust because of longstanding inequities. The issue is not that these patients are inherently more sensitive. The issue is that nondisclosure and weak regulatory notice do not affect all communities equally. For patients who already face barriers to trust, access, and independent verification of provider safety, later discovering undisclosed serious charges or safety-relevant conduct can deepen mistrust and discourage continued care. Transparent reporting requirements can reduce that unequal burden and support, rather than weaken, equity.

I also understand and respect the equity concerns raised from the licensee side. People of color and other marginalized individuals may experience unfairness in the criminal justice system. That concern is real and should be addressed through careful procedures, case-by-case review, confidentiality where legally appropriate, and language clarifying that reporting a charge is not a disciplinary finding. But that concern does not justify eliminating notice of serious criminal charges altogether.

Due process for licensees is essential. Public protection is also essential. A carefully drafted reporting requirement can honor both.

X. Requested Amendment to the Reporting Requirement

I request that R089-26I be revised to require written notice within 10 days after:

1. any action is taken against any license, certification, registration, authorization, or other credential held by the psychologist in another jurisdiction;

2. a criminal charge is filed against the psychologist, except for a misdemeanor traffic offense that does not involve alcohol or controlled substances;

3. the psychologist is convicted of, pleads guilty to, pleads nolo contendere to, or otherwise enters a plea for any criminal offense other than a misdemeanor traffic offense that does not involve alcohol or controlled substances;

4. any final disposition occurs in a criminal matter previously reported to the Board, including dismissal, reduction of charges, diversion, deferred adjudication, acquittal, conviction, plea, sentencing, or entry of judgment;

5. a civil action, including malpractice, is filed against the psychologist for any act relating to the practice of psychology; or

6. a settlement or judgment is entered in any civil action, including malpractice, relating to the psychologist’s professional services.

At minimum, if the Board is unwilling to require reporting of all criminal charges, I request that the Board require reporting of filed felony charges and serious misdemeanor charges involving dishonesty, violence, exploitation, impaired judgment, abuse, fraud, controlled substances, vulnerable persons, minors, or conduct that may affect patient safety.

I also request that the regulation clarify that reporting a criminal charge, civil action, licensing action, settlement, judgment, or other matter does not, by itself, constitute a disciplinary finding or establish that the psychologist violated NRS Chapter 641, NAC Chapter 641, or any other law or regulation. The purpose of reporting is timely notice and public protection, not automatic discipline.

To address fairness and due-process concerns, the regulation could also clarify that reports of pending charges or filed civil actions are for Board intake, review, and public-protection evaluation only, and that such reports should be handled confidentially to the extent permitted by law unless and until the Board takes action that is required to be public. This would allow earlier notice without treating allegations as findings, predetermining discipline, or creating unnecessary public stigma.

If the Board prefers to keep a 30-day reporting period rather than a 10-day reporting period, I still request that the reporting categories be broadened to include criminal charges and filed civil actions. A 30-day charge-reporting model would still provide earlier notice than a conviction-or-plea-only model.

XI. Requested Board Action Before Final Adoption

It appears that the Board should not adopt R089-26I in its current form without first addressing the reporting gap and public-record concerns described in this comment.

Before final action, I respectfully request that the Board do one or more of the following:

1. hold an additional workshop, continue the hearing, or otherwise provide a specific public discussion focused on the reporting requirement;

2. make available, or summarize on the record, the comparative materials, links, summaries, surveys, charts, lists, and investigator-provided information that informed the proposed language;

3. provide the most current version of the proposed regulation language before the next hearing or meeting at which R089-26I is considered;

4. clarify the existing reporting baseline under the Board's biennial renewal disciplinary or conduct reporting form, reactivation application, reinstatement application, and any other existing Board process;

5. identify where in the public record the Board expressly approved a reporting requirement and where it discussed, explained, and adopted the narrower adjudicated-only reporting model;

6. explain on the record when and why the Board selected an adjudicated-matters-only reporting model;

7. clarify how the Board expects to learn of pending criminal charges if licensees are not required to report them through renewal, reactivation, reinstatement, or any other existing Board process;

8. consider adding a reporting requirement for criminal charges, not only convictions or pleas;

9. consider adding reporting when civil actions, including malpractice actions relating to the practice of psychology, are filed;

10. at minimum, consider adding a limited reporting requirement for defined serious pending criminal charges;

11. clarify whether the substance-use-related impairment concern discussed at the October 24, 2025 meeting was intentionally omitted after proposed subsection 1(C) was stricken, addressed through another remaining provision, reserved for future rulemaking, or already covered by existing authority, and include that clarification in the public rulemaking record for R089-26I;

12. if the Board chooses not to include charge reporting, civil-action filing reporting, or substance-use-impairment language, explain why it believes conviction-or-plea-only and judgment-or-settlement-only reporting is sufficient to protect the public;

13. clarify its procedure for receiving, distributing, acknowledging, preserving, attaching, summarizing, identifying, or including timely submitted written public comment in meeting materials, minutes, public records, and regulation records; and

14. correct, supplement, link, or clarify the rulemaking record so that the December 2025, January 2026, April 2026, and current July 2026 written public comments on this regulation are clearly identified in connection with the relevant meeting minutes, agenda items, meeting materials, and R089-26I rulemaking record.

If the Board does not intend to amend prior approved minutes, I respectfully request that the Board at minimum attach, link, incorporate by reference, or otherwise clearly identify the written comments in the R089-26I rulemaking record and in any current meeting materials related to R089-26I, and state where those comments and related supporting materials are maintained or can be located by Board members, LCB, the Legislative Commission or Subcommittee, licensees, patients, caregivers, and members of the public.

For the July 10, 2026 Board meeting, and for any next noticed regulation hearing or meeting at which R089-26I is considered, I request that this full written public comment and supporting exhibits be included in the meeting packet, supplemental meeting materials, regulation-hearing materials, and R089-26I rulemaking record. Because the full written comment is lengthy, I do not ask that the full text be reproduced in the body of the minutes unless the Board determines that doing so is appropriate. Instead, I respectfully request that the Board attach the brief summary submitted with this comment to the minutes, link it in the minutes, incorporate it by reference, or otherwise clearly identify it in the minutes, and state during the meeting and in the minutes where the full written comment and exhibits are maintained or can be located.

I further request that the already-submitted April 17, 2026 written public comment, incorporated by reference here, be clearly identified, linked, attached, or otherwise associated with the April 17, 2026 minutes and the R089-26I rulemaking record, without being treated as a separate new public comment for the July 10, 2026 meeting.

On June 24, 2026, I submitted a written agenda request asking that the Board place on the July 10, 2026 agenda, or the next available Board meeting agenda, discussion and possible action to amend or clarify the approved minutes for the October 24, 2025, December 12, 2025, January 23, 2026, and March 6, 2026 meetings. That request addressed written-public-comment record clarity, the October 24, 2025 discussion of substance-use-related impairment, assessment authority, remediation, public protection, and fairness concerns, the March 6, 2026 action striking proposed subsection 1(C), and the supporting survey/chart provided to me by the Board Office on May 21, 2026. I also requested that the June 24 agenda request be associated with the regulation record for LCB File No. R089-26I, if appropriate.

On June 30, 2026, Board staff informed me that the Board does not intend to place my June 24, 2026 agenda request on the July 10, 2026 agenda or address the minutes issue at this time. I therefore renew the record-clarity requests in this written public comment and respectfully request that this comment, its attached exhibits, and the prior comments incorporated by reference be clearly identified in the public record and R089-26I rulemaking record before final action.

A later general notation that written public comment was received would not be sufficient if the written comments are not attached, linked, incorporated by reference, or clearly identified in connection with the relevant minutes and regulation agenda item. The key issue is whether the Board, the public, LCB, the Legislative Commission, and any later reviewer can understand, by looking at the minutes and rulemaking record, what written public comment was submitted, when it was submitted, how it related to R089-26I, and whether it was available before the reporting language narrowed.

XII. Possible Reporting-Language Concepts for the Board's Consideration

I recognize that final regulatory language should be drafted by Board counsel and LCB. I offer the following concepts only to show that there are reasonable middle-ground options between conviction-or-plea-only reporting and automatic discipline. My purpose is not to propose discipline based on pending charges, but to suggest a notice framework that would allow the Board to review serious safety-relevant matters on a case-by-case basis.

The Board's April 17, 2026 draft contains two related but distinct concepts: prohibited conduct and reporting. The proposed revision to NAC 641.245(1) would identify certain conduct that may serve as a basis for discipline. The proposed new reporting section would identify what events must be reported to the Board within 30 days.

My concern is primarily with the reporting section. A reporting requirement is not the same as a disciplinary finding. A pending charge should not, by itself, establish that a psychologist violated criminal law. However, a serious pending charge may still be important notice information for the Board to review on a case-by-case basis. For that reason, the Board could preserve due process while also requiring timely reporting of serious formal criminal charges and safety-relevant civil actions.

The reporting concepts below are informed by existing charge-reporting and civil-action-reporting models used by Nevada behavioral-health licensing boards and the Arizona Board of Psychologist Examiners. Nevada's MFT/CPC regulation requires written notice when a criminal charge is filed, when a conviction occurs, when a civil action is filed, and when certain civil settlements or judgments occur. Nevada Social Work's reporting framework likewise reflects a broader notice model than the current Psychology Board draft because it includes arrests, charges, convictions, and certain filed civil actions.

Arizona law for certain health professionals appears to require written notice when an applicant or licensee is charged with a felony or a misdemeanor involving conduct that may affect patient safety. These examples show that earlier reporting can be structured as notice and review, not automatic discipline.

I also understand from attending the board meetings that the Board may be concerned about stigma, embarrassment, unfair assumptions, or reputational harm to licensees who are required to report pending charges. Those concerns are real and should be addressed directly. But the answer to stigma is not necessarily to eliminate notice of serious pending matters altogether. A more balanced approach would be to require confidential reporting to the Board, clarify that a report is not a finding of misconduct, and allow the Board to review the matter case by case under applicable confidentiality and due-process protections. That approach protects licensees from automatic assumptions while still protecting the public from avoidable notice gaps.

I also recognize that Board members raised fairness, embarrassment, and humiliation concerns during the October 24, 2025 discussion. At approximately 52:26–53:21 of the transcript, Dr. Benuto discussed a prior applicant or licensee who appeared before the Board after a background check reflected a prior DUI conviction or similar matter, and stated that she experienced that process as "very humiliating" for the person. Dr. Benuto also expressed concern that the issue could open a "big can of worms" for a singular DUI or minor matter if the conduct did not raise concerns related to the practice of psychology. I understand that concern. It supports careful drafting, confidentiality protections, clear reporting thresholds, and case-by-case review. But it does not necessarily support excluding serious pending criminal charges from reporting altogether. A reporting requirement can be structured so that notice to the Board does not automatically result in discipline, unnecessary public disclosure, or a personal appearance before the Board, while still complying with applicable confidentiality, public-record, and due-process requirements.

That balance should be guided by the Board's public-protection mission. The Board's stated mission is to protect consumers of psychological services by regulating the practice of psychology, setting standards for professional behavior, and reviewing professional conduct to promote competent practice and public welfare. I understand that embarrassment, humiliation, stigma, and reputational harm to licensees are legitimate concerns when reporting requirements are drafted too broadly or handled without safeguards. But those concerns should be addressed through clear thresholds, confidentiality protections, case-by-case review, and language stating that reporting is not discipline. They should not prevent the Board from receiving timely notice of serious pending criminal or civil matters that may bear on patient safety, professional judgment, exploitation, violence, dishonesty, abuse, controlled substances, vulnerable persons, minors, or fitness to practice.

This balance is also consistent with the APA Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct. The APA's General Principle A, Beneficence and Nonmaleficence, emphasizes avoiding harm and safeguarding the welfare and rights of those with whom psychologists work, while also recognizing that psychologists should be aware of how personal, physical, mental-health, social, organizational, or other factors may affect their professional judgment and influence. I understand that APA General Principles are aspirational and are not, by themselves, sanctioning rules. However, they are relevant to the policy balance here because they reinforce that public welfare, patient safety, competent practice, and prevention of harm are central professional values. APA Ethical Standard 2.06 also recognizes that personal problems may interfere with work-related duties and may require appropriate measures, including consultation, assistance, or limiting work-related duties. A confidential reporting-and-review framework for serious safety-relevant matters is consistent with those ethical values because it allows the Board to assess potential risk without treating a report as automatic discipline.

For the Board's consideration, one possible revision to the proposed reporting section would be:

NAC 641.___ Reporting Requirements.

1. Within 30 days after the occurrence, a psychologist shall report to the Board, in writing:
   (a) Any action taken against the psychologist's license, certificate, registration, or authority to practice in any other jurisdiction, including any limitation, restriction, suspension, revocation, probation, reprimand, consent order, settlement agreement, or other disciplinary or remedial action;
   (b) The filing of any civil action against the psychologist involving malpractice, professional negligence, abuse, exploitation, fraud, breach of fiduciary duty, breach of confidentiality, sexual misconduct, violence, or other conduct that may bear on patient safety, professional judgment, trustworthiness, or fitness to practice psychology; and any judgment entered or settlement reached in a civil action or claim involving malpractice, professional negligence, or other conduct that may bear on patient safety, professional judgment, trustworthiness, or fitness to practice psychology;
   (c) Any formal criminal charge, indictment, information, or criminal complaint filed against the psychologist for a felony, gross misdemeanor, or offense involving violence, abuse, exploitation, neglect, dishonesty, fraud, theft, sexual misconduct, controlled substances, driving under the influence, alcohol- or controlled-substance-related conduct, vulnerable persons, minors, elderly persons, dependent adults, or other conduct that may reasonably bear on patient safety, professional judgment, trustworthiness, or fitness to practice psychology; and
   (d) The conviction of, entry of a guilty plea, entry of a nolo contendere plea, or other final adjudication for any crime other than a misdemeanor traffic violation that does not involve alcohol or controlled substances.

2. Reporting under this section is a notice requirement only. A report made under this section does not, by itself, constitute an admission, a finding of misconduct, public discipline, or grounds for discipline. A pending criminal charge alone does not establish that a psychologist violated state or federal criminal law for purposes of NAC 641.245. The Board shall review reported matters on a case-by-case basis, consistent with applicable confidentiality requirements, due process, and public-protection obligations, and may determine whether further inquiry, monitoring, interim safeguards, referral, investigation, no action, or other appropriate action is warranted.

3. A psychologist who fails to report a matter required under this section may be subject to disciplinary action.

This type of language would not require discipline based on a pending charge. It would simply provide timely notice of serious safety-relevant matters. The Board could then determine, through its existing processes and appropriate safeguards, whether the matter warrants no action, confidential review, monitoring, further inquiry, emergency review, or other appropriate action.

XIII. Conclusion

The Board has been on notice of these issues since at least December 2025. The record still does not clearly explain why the proposed reporting requirement moved to adjudicated-only criminal reporting and judgment-or-settlement-only civil reporting. The current draft therefore leaves unresolved both a public-safety concern and a public-record concern.

The record also does not clearly explain whether the substance-use-related impairment concern discussed in October 2025 was intentionally removed after proposed subsection 1(C) was stricken, addressed through another remaining provision, reserved for future rulemaking, or considered already covered by existing authority. Again, I am not asking the Board to discipline licensees based on allegations. I am asking the Board to preserve timely notice, transparency, public protection, and due process in a way that is consistent with the purpose of this regulation.

I do not oppose strengthening the Board's authority through R089-26I. I support the Board moving forward with a strong regulation. But the Board should not adopt an underinclusive reporting rule that leaves serious pending criminal charges and relevant filed civil actions outside the Board's routine notice process. This is especially important where the Board's renewal, reactivation, and reinstatement forms do not appear to directly require disclosure of arrests, pending criminal charges, criminal complaints, indictments, or filed civil actions. If the Board chooses that narrower approach, it should clearly explain that choice to the public before adoption. The Board can protect licensees from unfair assumptions while also protecting patients from avoidable notice gaps. It can require reporting without predetermining discipline. It can preserve due process while ensuring timely awareness. It can strengthen public trust by making clear that Nevada psychologists are subject to transparent, balanced, and credible oversight standards.

For these reasons, I request that the Board revise R089-26I before adoption, or explain on the record why it rejects earlier reporting of criminal charges and filed civil actions despite comparable Nevada behavioral-health boards using broader notice models, and clarify how it intends to address the substance-use-related impairment concern discussed during the development of the proposed regulation. If the Board nevertheless moves forward without adopting the reporting-language concepts or record-clarity requests raised here, I respectfully request that the Board's informational statement and rulemaking record identify this written public comment and summarize the principal reasons for and against the reporting model selected, including the decision not to require reporting of serious pending criminal charges or filed civil actions. To the extent the Board adopts R089-26I without addressing these concerns, I request, before adoption and pursuant to NRS 233B.064, a concise statement of the principal reasons for and against adoption and the Board's reasons for overruling the considerations urged against adoption in this comment.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Rebecca Savio

Rebecca Savio
Public comment contact: pinnaclelegalresearch@gmail.com

Attached Exhibits and Supporting Materials

Exhibit A: Chronology and Comparison Chart Showing the Development of the Criminal-Conduct and Reporting Language

Exhibit B: April 17, 2026 Written Public Comment Excerpt or Summary Identifying the Adjudicated-Only Reporting Gap

Exhibit C: Comparison of Nevada Behavioral-Health and Healthcare Reporting Models and NBOPE Current Reporting Baseline

Exhibit D: Summary of Prior Written Public Comments Incorporated by Reference

Exhibit E: May 21, 2026 Survey of Nevada Licensing Boards Provided by NBOPE Board Staff Regarding Criminal and/or Other Conduct Not Related to the Profession and Reporting Requirements

Exhibit F: Relevant Transcript and Approved-Minutes Excerpts Regarding the October 24, 2025, December 12, 2025, January 23, 2026, March 6, 2026, and April 17, 2026 Discussions

Exhibits A-D and F

Supporting Materials for Written Public Comment re: LCB File No. R089-26I

Criminal Conduct and Reporting Requirements

Prepared for the July 10, 2026 Board Meeting

Prepared by Rebecca Savio

Packet note: This combined packet contains Exhibits A, B, C, D, and F. Exhibit E is intended to be attached separately in the form provided by NBOPE Board staff, with the exhibit designation reflected in the filename and exhibit list.

Purpose: These exhibits are intended to help the Board, the public, LCB, the Legislative Commission or Subcommittee, licensees, patients, caregivers, and later reviewers follow the public record and development history of R089-26I. They are offered as supporting materials for the July 10, 2026 written public comment and are not intended to resubmit prior comments as separate new public comments.

Good-faith public-comment note: This exhibit packet is submitted in good faith as public comment and is for informational and educational purposes only. It is not legal advice.

Contents

Exhibit A

Chronology and Comparison Chart Showing the Development of the Criminal-Conduct and Reporting Language

Purpose: This chronology summarizes the development path reflected in the meeting materials, minutes, transcripts, and workshop materials reviewed for R089-26I. It is intended to show where the public record appears to move from broader comparative models, including criminal charges and civil actions, to a narrower adjudicated-only reporting model.

Caution: This chart is a summary aid. It should be read together with the official agenda packets, approved minutes, transcripts/recordings, workshop notices, and proposed regulatory language.

Date	Record / Event	What the Record Appears to Show	Public-Record Issue
May 9, 2025	Public meeting minutes / prior disciplinary matter discussed in public session	The public meeting minutes identify a prior disciplinary matter discussed in public session as a self-report from a licensee regarding two misdemeanor convictions. The matter was still pending at that time, with a draft consent decree forwarded to counsel for respondent.	This appears to be part of the factual background for the later discussion regarding criminal conduct not related to the practice of psychology.
May 9, 2025	Agenda Item 12	The Board listed for possible action: “Discussion and Possible Action on Whether a Licensee’s Criminal Conduct not related to the Practice of Psychology Should be a Basis for Discipline.” The item was tabled for a future Board meeting.	This appears to be an early public agenda placement of the criminal-conduct issue, but not a substantive public discussion or decision.
Oct. 24, 2025	Substantive Board discussion / issue framed	The Board discussed whether criminal and other conduct not directly related to the practice of psychology should be addressed as a basis for discipline. The discussion appears to have been exploratory, including whether the Board had interest in pursuing the issue, not finalizing details such as charges versus convictions.	Supports the need to identify where later reporting details were selected.
Dec. 12, 2025	Staff report and discussion	Materials referenced the concern that NBOPE did not provide discipline for a licensee who had been charged with and/or convicted of criminal conduct beyond the practice of psychology. Materials also referenced other board models involving charges/civil actions and convictions/judgments.	Broader comparative approaches appear to have remained on the table.
Jan. 23, 2026	Staff report, minutes, and transcript	The staff report asked whether the Board wanted to impose a reporting requirement and described other board approaches ranging from criminal charges/civil actions to convictions/judgments. The transcript reflects a step-by-step approach and references links, summaries, and information from Board investigators. Discussion referenced a reporting requirement, but the adopted motion appears narrower and focused on developing disciplinary-language authority.	The public record should identify where the Board expressly approved a reporting requirement and selected adjudicated-only reporting.

Mar. 6, 2026	Staff report, minutes, and transcript	The March materials presented adjudicated-only reporting as an already-indicated Board preference: reporting only adjudicated administrative, civil, and/or criminal matters rather than unadjudicated claims or criminal charges. Discussion focused largely on the reporting deadline and removal of proposed subsection 1(C), concerning habitual or excessive use of alcohol or controlled substances.	This is the apparent transition point, but the public record does not clearly show when, why, or based on what comparative information the adjudicated-only model was selected.
Apr. 17, 2026	Workshop notice, staff report, and transcript	The workshop materials described reporting requirements for disciplinary actions, civil judgments or settlements, and criminal convictions. The draft reporting language required reporting of criminal convictions or pleas and malpractice judgments or settlements, but not criminal charges or civil actions when filed.	The narrowed reporting model was presented for workshop and moved toward hearing, leaving the earlier policy bridge unclear.
May 21, 2026	Board-provided survey/chart	Board staff provided a survey of Nevada licensing boards regarding criminal and/or other conduct not related to the profession and reporting requirements. The survey identifies multiple Nevada boards with charge-reporting or other non-final-matter reporting models.	The survey appears relevant to understanding why NBOPE selected a narrower conviction-or-plea-only criminal reporting model and judgment-or-settlement-only civil reporting model.

Comparison of Reporting Model Shift

Issue	Earlier Framing	Later Draft / Action	Clarification Requested
Criminal reporting	December/January materials referenced models involving criminal charges and/or convictions and asked whether a reporting requirement should be imposed.	March/April draft moved to reporting criminal convictions or pleas, not charges.	The public record should explain why criminal charges or serious pending criminal charges were excluded.
Civil reporting	December/January materials referenced civil actions and judgments as part of other boards' models.	March/April draft moved to reporting malpractice judgments or settlements, not civil actions when filed.	The public record should explain why filed civil actions, including malpractice actions, were excluded.
Substance-use-related language	Earlier discussion included substance-use-related public-protection concerns and examples from other boards.	March discussion removed proposed subsection 1(C), concerning habitual or excessive use of alcohol or controlled substances.	The public record should clarify whether the Board intended to remove the issue entirely, address it through another provision, rely on existing authority, or reserve it for future rulemaking.

Exhibit B

April 17, 2026 Written Public Comment Excerpt or Summary Identifying the Adjudicated-Only Reporting Gap

Purpose: This exhibit preserves the principal issue raised in the April 17, 2026 written public comment concerning the adjudicated-only reporting gap. It is a summary for record clarity and is not intended to resubmit the April 17 comment as a separate new public comment.

Summary of the Issue Raised

- R089-26I appears to add broad disciplinary authority for criminal and other conduct not directly related to the practice of psychology, but the reporting requirement in the draft is much narrower.
- As drafted for the April workshop, the regulation required reporting of another-jurisdiction licensing action, a malpractice judgment or settlement, and a criminal conviction or plea.
- The draft did not require reporting when a criminal charge was filed, even if the charge was serious and potentially relevant to patient safety, professional judgment, exploitation, violence, dishonesty, abuse, controlled substances, vulnerable persons, minors, or fitness to practice.
- The draft also did not require reporting when a civil action, including a malpractice action related to the practice of psychology, was filed; it required reporting only after judgment or settlement.
- This creates a timing gap because criminal cases and civil actions can remain pending for months or years, and the Board may not learn of them until conviction, plea, judgment, settlement, media coverage, a complaint, another agency, or chance discovery.
- The April comment emphasized that reporting is not discipline. Reporting provides notice so the Board can decide, case by case and with appropriate safeguards, whether any inquiry, monitoring, interim safeguard, emergency review, or no action is appropriate.
- The requested correction was not automatic discipline based on allegations. The requested correction was earlier notice, with due-process safeguards, or a clear public explanation of why the Board rejected earlier reporting of serious pending criminal charges and filed civil actions.

Core Record-Clarity Request Preserved by This Exhibit

Before final adoption, the Board should either revise R089-26I to require earlier reporting of defined serious pending criminal charges and relevant filed civil actions, or explain on the record why conviction-or-plea-only criminal reporting and judgment-or-settlement-only civil reporting are sufficient despite broader reporting models used by other Nevada licensing boards.

Exhibit C

Comparison of Nevada Behavioral-Health and Healthcare Reporting Models and NBOPE Current Reporting Baseline

Purpose: This exhibit summarizes the current NBOPE reporting baseline and selected Nevada behavioral-health or healthcare comparison points discussed in the written public comment. It is intended to show that earlier reporting can function as notice and case-by-case review, not automatic discipline.

Caution: This exhibit is a summary aid based on public materials, forms, the Board-provided survey, and correspondence described in the public comment. Governing statutes, regulations, forms, and board interpretations should control.

Source / Model	What It Appears to Require or Capture	Difference From NBOPE Draft / Current Baseline	Why It Matters
NBOPE active renewal form	Appears to ask about convictions or guilty/nolo contendere pleas, professional discipline, current professional proceedings or unresolved complaints/investigations, malpractice actions, impairment-related issues, substantiated abuse or neglect, and other fitness-related matters.	Does not appear to ask directly whether a licensee has been arrested, charged, indicted, named in a criminal complaint or information, or is facing a pending criminal matter.	This creates a potential notice gap for serious pending criminal matters if no separate self-reporting rule applies.
NBOPE reactivation / reinstatement forms	Appear to include broad suitability and fitness questions.	Do not appear to contain the same kind of direct, objective question requiring disclosure of arrests, pending criminal charges, criminal complaints, indictments, convictions, pleas, civil actions, judgments, or settlements.	Broad suitability questions may not provide the same clear notice as a specific reporting rule.
NBOPE proposed R089-26I draft	Would require reporting of licensing action in another jurisdiction, malpractice judgment or settlement, and conviction or plea for certain crimes.	Does not require reporting of criminal charges or filed civil actions.	The draft narrows criminal reporting to conviction/plea and civil reporting to judgment/settlement.
Nevada Board of Examiners for Social Workers	I independently confirmed that renewal asks whether the licensee has been arrested, charged, or convicted during the prior year, with reported legal or sanction events reviewed case by case.	Broader than the current NBOPE draft because it captures arrests/charges as well as convictions.	Shows that charge/arrest reporting can be handled as notice and review rather than automatic discipline.
MFT/CPC Board	NAC 641A.243 has long included charge-reporting concepts; I independently confirmed the charge-reporting framework was in place before Clinical Professional Counselors were added in 2008, with NAC history reflecting original adoption effective August 20, 2004 and later amendments.	Broader than conviction-only reporting.	Shows Nevada behavioral-health licensing has included charge-reporting models for many years.
Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners	I understand from written correspondence with General Counsel that "criminal action" reporting includes arrests, indictments, criminal complaints, informations, and pending criminal charges, with case-by-case review.	Broader than conviction-only reporting, while formal discipline remains a separate issue.	Provides a Nevada healthcare-board example of earlier reporting functioning as notice rather than automatic discipline.
DPS / RapBack correspondence	I understand from May 2026 correspondence with the NCJIS Compliance Unit that Nevada State RapBack authority had not been approved for agencies other than schools at that time, and broader State or Federal RapBack access would require future legislative action.	If the Board does not receive automatic criminal-history updates for existing licensees, self-reporting becomes more important.	Without direct questions, automatic updates, or timely reporting, serious pending matters may remain unknown for months or years.

Key Point

The central distinction is between reporting and discipline. A reporting rule gives the Board notice and allows case-by-case review; it does not predetermine misconduct, discipline, or public disclosure. If NBOPE chooses a narrower model than comparable Nevada boards, the public record should explain why that narrower model is sufficient for public protection and due process.

Exhibit D

Summary of Prior Written Public Comments Incorporated by Reference

Purpose: This exhibit summarizes prior written public comments incorporated by reference in the July 10, 2026 written public comment. It is intended to preserve the public-comment history without resubmitting prior comments as separate new public comments for this meeting.

Prior Submission / Correspondence	Primary Issues Raised	Why It Matters to R089-26I Record
December 12, 2025 written public comment	Addressed informed consent, transparency, patient safety, equity, public trust, Arizona's criminal-charge reporting framework, and the relevance of criminal conduct to a private, trust-based therapeutic profession.	The December meeting packet included written public comment and a reference list, but the approved December minutes state that there was no public comment. The comment should be clearly identified in the public record and rulemaking history.
January 23, 2026 brief written comment and supplemental comment	Addressed children, vulnerable patients, caregiver informed consent, summary suspension, and the need for earlier Board awareness of serious criminal matters without treating allegations as discipline.	The January materials and discussion reflected broader questions about criminal/other conduct and reporting, but the later record does not clearly show where adjudicated-only reporting was selected.
April 17, 2026 written public comment	Addressed the apparent adjudicated-only reporting preference reflected in the March 6 materials, the concern that serious pending criminal charges may remain unreported while treatment continues, and the need for earlier reporting of at least certain serious pending criminal matters with fairness and due-process safeguards.	The April workshop materials identified written public comment more clearly than earlier records, but the underlying reporting-model bridge remained unresolved.
April 24, 2026 request / related correspondence	Requested comparative materials, investigator-provided information, current proposed language, and additional public discussion before any regulation hearing or final action.	Not listed here as a separate public comment; included only to show the ongoing request for record clarity and access to supporting materials.

Record request: The prior written comments should be attached, linked, incorporated by reference, or otherwise clearly identified in the R089-26I public meeting and rulemaking record so that later reviewers can understand what was submitted, when it was submitted, and how it relates to the development of the proposed regulation.

Exhibit F

Relevant Transcript and Approved-Minutes Excerpts Regarding the October 24, 2025, December 12, 2025, January 23, 2026, March 6, 2026, and April 17, 2026 Discussions

Purpose: This exhibit collects key excerpts and record references relevant to the development of R089-26I. The excerpts are included to show why the public record should clearly identify the materials reviewed, the reporting model selected, and the action taken before the draft moved forward.

Note: Transcript excerpts are based on the available transcript text/recording time stamps reviewed for this comment. Minor transcription variations may exist. Official recordings and approved minutes should control.

A. October 24, 2025 discussion

Relevant point: The October discussion appears exploratory. Around 55:20, a Board member asked whether the issue was only whether the Board had interest in pursuing the topic, not fleshing out details such as "charges versus convictions," and the response was yes. This supports the point that the October meeting did not appear to decide the later reporting model.

Record issue: If the Board later selected conviction-or-plea-only reporting, the public record should identify where that selection was discussed, explained, and adopted.

B. December 12, 2025 materials and minutes

Relevant point: The December staff materials and discussion continued to frame the issue around whether criminal and other conduct not directly related to practice could become a basis for discipline and whether the Board wanted to pursue regulatory language. The materials referenced other boards and the need for further information.

Record issue: The December approved minutes state that there was no public comment, although written public comment was included in the meeting packet. This creates public-record ambiguity about what written comments were submitted and available when the issue returned in January.

C. January 23, 2026 staff report and transcript

Staff report: The January staff report stated that NBOPE was unlike many other Nevada licensing boards because it did not provide for disciplinary action against a licensee who was "charged with and/or been convicted of" criminal conduct beyond the practice of psychology. It also stated that NBOPE did not have a specific conduct reporting requirement beyond its biennial renewal disciplinary/conduct reporting form.

Staff report: The January staff report described other licensing-board approaches as ranging from criminal charges/civil actions and convictions/judgments to criminal convictions and/or civil judgments only. It also stated that, if NBOPE decided to proceed, it would need to determine the scope and extent of the regulatory language and reporting requirements.

Transcript, approximately 1:07:36-1:08:23: Ms. Arnold stated that she had provided links to other boards' regulations and statutes, had reviewed publicly available information, and had summarized that information for the Board.

Transcript, approximately 1:09:44-1:10:08: Dr. Holland clarified that the question before the Board was whether there was appetite to move forward with developing language. Ms. Arnold confirmed that the Board could take the issue "step by step," determine whether there was appetite, and later review or dive deeper into the information.

Transcript/minutes, approximately 1:14:15-1:15:55: The discussion included a reporting requirement, but the adopted motion appears narrower. The motion approved moving forward with developing regulatory language regarding criminal and other conduct not related to the profession as a basis for disciplinary action. The adopted motion did not expressly state the adjudicated-only reporting model.

Record issue: The January materials appear to have placed both pre-adjudication and adjudicated-only models before the Board. The public record should identify where the adjudicated-only preference was later discussed, explained, and adopted.

D. March 6, 2026 minutes and transcript

Minutes / transcript, approximately 1:37:59-1:38:15: Ms. Arnold stated that the Board had indicated a preference for reporting only adjudicated administrative, civil, and/or criminal matters, as opposed to reporting unadjudicated claims or criminal charges that had not resulted in conviction.

Minutes / discussion: The March discussion appears to focus primarily on the reporting deadline and proposed subsection 1(C), concerning habitual or excessive use of alcohol or controlled substances. The discussion does not appear to explain why criminal charges or serious pending criminal charges were excluded from reporting.

Transcript, approximately 1:43:04-1:43:33: Dr. Woodard moved to strike the language in 1(C) and move the regulation draft forward for workshop, and the motion passed.

Approved minutes: The approved March minutes state more generally that the Board approved moving the proposed regulatory language to workshop “with the revisions to the language as discussed.”

Record issue: The transcript is more specific than the approved minutes about the 1(C) removal, and the broader adjudicated-only reporting bridge remains unclear.

E. April 17, 2026 workshop materials and transcript

Workshop notice/staff materials: The April workshop materials described the proposed regulation as including criminal conduct not related to the practice of psychology as a basis for discipline, and reporting requirements for disciplinary actions, civil judgments or settlements, and criminal convictions. The notice stated that language had been developed outside of the workshop and would be discussed during the workshop.

Draft result: By the April workshop, the reporting language required criminal reporting only after conviction or plea and civil reporting only after malpractice judgment or settlement. It did not require reporting of criminal charges or filed civil actions.

Transcript, approximately 58:34-58:59: The Board voted to move the proposed regulatory language to a future regulation hearing. Public comment was requested again immediately afterward, and the workshop was closed shortly after no comment was heard.

Record issue: The April materials show the narrowed reporting model moving toward hearing, but do not appear to provide the missing public explanation for why criminal charges and filed civil actions were excluded.

Overall Record-Clarity Request

The public record should clearly show what comparative materials were reviewed, what reporting models were considered, when the adjudicated-only reporting preference developed, why criminal charges and filed civil actions were not included in the proposed language, why proposed subsection 1(C), concerning “habitual or excessive use of alcohol or controlled substances,” was removed or not carried forward, and what action the Board actually approved before the proposed regulation advanced.

Survey of Nevada Licensing Boards

Criminal and/or Other Conduct Not Related to the Profession as a Basis for Disciplinary Action and Reporting Requirements

Board	Criminal and/or Other Conduct not related to the profession as a Basis for disciplinary action?	Type	Description
The Nevada State Board of Accountancy	Yes	Statutory – NRS 628.390(1)(f) & (j) Regulatory – NAC 628.520(4)	Conviction of a crime involving dishonesty or fraud, or involving moral turpitude, or conduct that is discreditable to the profession 30 day reporting requirement for being charged with, being convicted of, or pleading to any criminal offense other than a minor traffic offense, and any crime involving dishonesty, fraud, or moral turpitude
Board of Examiners for Alcohol, Drug and Gambling Counselors	Yes	Statutory - NRS 641C.700(1)(b)	Offense involving moral turpitude and a violation of any law regulating controlled substances or dangerous drugs

The Board of Applied Behavioral Analysis	Yes	Regulatory - NAC 641D.600(1), (2) & (3) Regulatory - NAC 641D.600(3)	Conviction of various different crimes and permitting the Board to automatically suspend the license or registration of someone who is charged with certain crimes. 24 hour reporting requirement when charged with a crime identified in bases for discipline.
The State Board of Architecture, Interior Design and Residential Design	Yes	Statutory - NRS 623.270(1)(b) Regulatory - NAC 623.875(1)(a)	Conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude Knowingly violating any state or federal criminal law
The Nevada State Board of Athletic Trainers	Yes	Statutory - NRS 640B.700(1)(c)&(d)	Conviction of a felony, a crime related to a controlled substance, a crime involving moral turpitude, or for having an alcohol or other substance use disorder
The Barbers Health and Sanitation Board	Yes	Statutory – NRS 643.185	Having an alcohol or other substance use disorder

Certified Court Reporters Board of Nevada	Yes	Statutory - NRS 656.240(4)	Conviction of any offense involving moral turpitude
Chiropractic Physicians Board of Nevada	Yes	Statutory - NRS 634.018(6), (8) & (9) Regulatory - NAC 634.425	Any offense involving moral turpitude or the conviction of a felony, a conviction or violation of any law relating to controlled substances, and habitual or excessive use of alcohol or controlled substances. 15 day reporting requirement for criminal convictions (other than traffic violations)
The State Contractors Board	Yes	Statutory - NRS 624.3016(2) Statutory – NRS 624.266(1)	Conviction of an offense involving moral turpitude. 30 day reporting requirement for the conviction of certain crimes
The State Board of Cosmetology	No		

The Board of Dental Examiners of Nevada	Yes	Statutory – NRS 631.350(2)(b), NRS 631.3475(7) Regulatory – NAC 631.155(4)	Gross immorality that tends to bring reproach on the dental profession (included in the definition of unprofessional conduct, which is a basis for disciplinary action). 30 day reporting requirement for, among other things, conviction of a felony or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude
The Board of Dispensing Opticians	Yes	Statutory - NRS 637.150(2) & (6)(a)	Conviction of any crime involving moral turpitude (contained in the definition of unprofessional conduct).
The Board of Environmental Health Specialists	Yes	Statutory - NRS 625A.160(2)	An offense involving moral turpitude
The Nevada Funeral and Cemetery Services Board	Yes	Statutory - NRS 642.5175(1)	Conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude

The Nevada Board of Homeopathic Medical Examiners	Yes	Statutory - NRS 630A.340(2) Regulatory - NAC 630A.560(9)	Various criminal convictions, including a conviction related to controlled substances and any offense involving moral turpitude). Conviction of a felony or any offense involving moral turpitude
The State Board of Landscape Architecture	No		
The Board of Examiners for Marriage and Family Therapist and Clinical Professional Counselors	Yes	Statutory - NRS 641A.310 Regulatory – NAC 641A.243(17)	Conviction of any offense involving moral turpitude 10 day reporting requirement for criminal charges and convictions

The Board of Massage Therapy	Yes	Statutory - NRS 640C.700(3), (4), & (5) Regulatory - NAC 640C.090	Conviction of various listed crimes and other conduct, including a crime involving moral turpitude, engaging in sexual activity during the practice of massage, or having an alcohol or other substance use disorder. 10 day reporting requirement for criminal charges and convictions (except misdemeanor traffic offenses)
The Board of Medical Examiners	Yes	Statutory - NRS 630.301(11) Regulatory - NAC 630.540(11) & (21)	Numerous and various listed crimes in addition to an offense involving moral turpitude For practitioners of respiratory care, the conviction of a felony, any offense involving moral turpitude, or the violation of law regulating the prescription, possession, distribution, or use of a controlled substance
The State Board of Nursing	Yes	Statutory - NRS 632.347(1)(b)	Statutory – guilty of an offense involving moral turpitude

The Board of Occupational Therapy	Yes	Statutory - NRS 640A.200(1) & (4)(b)	Crimes involving moral turpitude (contained in the definition of unprofessional conduct)
The Nevada State Board of Optometry	Yes	Statutory - NRS 636.295(1) & (3)	Conviction of a gross misdemeanor involving moral turpitude or an alcohol or other substance use disorder
The State Board of Oriental Medicine	Yes	Statutory - NRS 634A.170(1)(a) & (c)	Conviction of any offense involving moral turpitude or a violation of any law regulating the possession, distribution or use of any controlled substance
The State Board of Osteopathic Medicine	Yes	Statutory - NRS 633.511(1)(b) Regulatory - NAC 633.287(1)(f)	Various criminal convictions, including a conviction related to controlled substances and any offense involving moral turpitude For Physician Assistants, the same criminal conduct stated in statute.

The State Board of Pharmacy	Yes	Statutory – NRS 639.210(2) Regulatory – NAC 639.229	Guilty of habitual intemperance, guilty of conduct contrary to the public interest, has a substance use disorder, conviction of violations related to controlled substances and dangerous/other drugs, convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, dishonesty or corruption. 30 day reporting requirement of any criminal conviction or plea other than a misdemeanor traffic violation that does not involve alcohol or a controlled substance.
The Nevada Physical Therapy Board	Yes	Statutory - NRS 640.160(2)(a), (b), & (d)	An alcohol or substance use disorder, conviction of violating controlled substance laws, and conviction of any crime of moral turpitude
The State Board of Podiatry	Yes	Statutory - NRS 635.130(2)(d)&(e)	Having an alcohol or substance use disorder and a conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude

The State Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors	Yes	Statutory – NRS 625.410(4)	Conviction or entry of a plea to a crime involving dishonesty
The Board of Psychological Examiners	No		
Private Investigators Licensing Board	Yes	Statutory - NRS 648.150(1)	Offense involving moral turpitude
The Board of Examiners for Social Workers	Yes	Statutory - NRS 641B.400(2) Regulatory - NAC 641B.220(2) & (4) Regulatory - NAC 641B.200(21)	Any offense involving moral turpitude and a violation of any law regulating controlled substances or dangerous drugs A determination during an investigation that the licensee has violated state or federal law 30 day reporting requirement for criminal charges and convictions (except minor traffic violations that do not involve alcohol or a controlled substance)

Speech-Language Pathology, Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensing Board	Yes	Statutory - NRS 637B.250(1) Regulatory - NAC 637B.042(15)	Violation of any law regarding controlled substances or dangerous drugs and any offense involving moral turpitude 10 day reporting requirement for criminal charges or criminal convictions (other than a traffic misdemeanor that does not involve alcohol or controlled substance)
The Nevada State Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners	Yes	Regulatory - NAC 638.560(2), (3), and (5)	Habitual drunkenness, addiction to a controlled substance, and conviction of a violation of law regarding controlled substances or dangerous drugs

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

April 17, 2026

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

Board President Lorraine Benuto, PhD, called to order the meeting of the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners at 8:02 a.m. on April 17, 2026, 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, PhD, Secretary/Treasurer, Stephanie Woodard, PsyD, and members, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, PsyD, and Stephanie Holland, PsyD, were present at roll call. Robert Moering, PhD, and Catherine Pearson, PhD were absent. There was a quorum of the Board members.

Also present were Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Harry Ward; Board Investigator Dr. Sheila Young; Board Consultant, Dr. Gary Lenkeit; Executive Director, Sarah Restori, and Board Staff, Laura Arnold. Members of the public who were present were: Althea Cook, Brian Lech, Andrew Perrin, Beth Scott, Carla Franich, Claudia Mejia (NPA), Edward De Anda, James Tenney, Jodi Thomas, Leah Cartwright (Cartwright Government affairs), Sabrina Petrel (Cartwright Government Affairs), Lindsey Bondiek, Michelle Paul, Sara Hunt, Tara Raines, Roberta Miranda-Alfonzo (BeHere NV), Becky Savio, Tatsiana Razzhavaikina, and Jamie Ross.

2. **Public Comment.** Note: The Board welcomes public comment, which may be limited to three (3) minutes per person at the Board President's discretion. 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; however, public comment will not be taken on complaints that are pending before the Board. No action will 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. Benuto reminded members of the public that general public comment is reserved for comment only, and that comments longer than three minutes should be submitted in writing to the board office to be included in the meeting materials.

DAG Ward requested that members of the public not comment on complaints pending before the Board.

Dr. Benuto stated that members of the public who were there for the regulation workshop section of the meeting should reserve comment until the regulation workshop, when there would be a separate opportunity to provide public comment.

There was no general public comment.

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

Dr. Benuto stated that there were two items to be considered during the regulation workshop, one being the SB165 regulations, and the other being the criminal conduct and reporting regulations.

A. Revisions to NAC Chapter 641 to comply with Section 13(1) of 2025 SB165, which requires that the Board adopt regulations as it deems necessary to carry out the provisions of sections 13 to 18 of 2025 SB165 (establishing a new licensure designation and practice – Behavioral Health and Wellness Practitioners and the Practice of Behavioral Health Promotion and Prevention – to be regulated by the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners).

In advance of opening public comment for the continued workshop on the SB165 regulations, Dr. Benuto deferred to Dr. Michelle Paul to provide introductory information regarding the proposed regulations.

Dr. Paul, who chairs the Behavioral Health and Wellness Practitioner (BHWP) Advisory Group, stated that the Advisory Group appreciated the public comment received during the Board's March 6, 2026, regulation workshop and that the Advisory Group met twice since then to incorporate / address the public comment received. She explained that she would be reviewing the major changes that were made based on that public comment, and that Dr. Tara Raines (an Advisory Group member) would be providing a couple of vignettes to illustrate how the BHWP is conceptualized.

Dr. Benuto opened the SB165 regulation workshop up to public comment. There was no public comment specific to the SB165 regulations.

Dr. Benuto deferred to Dr. Paul to go through the revisions to the proposed regulations based upon public comment that had previously been received during and for the March 6, 2026, regulation workshop. Dr. Paul began by explaining that the Advisory Group's guiding priorities were to clarify the scope of the Behavioral Health and Wellness Practitioner (BHWP) and protecting existing work force roles while avoiding unintended restrictions, as well as ensuring the competence of the BHWPs through structure, training and supervision. Dr. Paul noted that Behavioral Health Promotion and Prevention (BHPP) profession is an entry level supervised profession and that BHWPs are not independent clinicians. Dr. Paul emphasized that SB165 is intended to expand, not restrict, work force capacity.

Dr. Paul went on to highlight some small changes made to the regulation provision regarding the issuance of a license, making allowance for flexibility when applicants present with, for instance, a criminal history or having previously been denied licensure by the Board but are eligible for BHWP licensure. She further explained that the larger revision in reference to the definition of a BHWP was to be explicit about what a BHWP did not include, which are outlined in that section and that are activities in which non-licensed individuals can continue. Dr. Paul stated that this was based on feedback that was received from individuals from universities and community organizations, and that the intention was to distinguish between general outreach and structured behavioral health services to avoid unintended regulation of existing work.

Dr. Paul stated that the revisions also included strengthening the BHWP scope of practice and prohibited activities. In response to the Social Work Board's concern about scope ambiguity, and instead of putting that language under the definition of BHPP, the language clarifies that prohibited activities exist in its own section.

In reference to the revisions made in response to the concerns that had been expressed around addition prevention, the intent of the revisions was to focus on competency without restricting the BHWPs and to clarify that the work of the BHWP falls under the scope of their supervisors. To that end, the regulation language states that the BHWP's supervisor's competencies and scope is what guides the BHWP's practice, and made room for consultation with those who work in specialized domains, including specific reference to substance use disorder prevention. The targets of the regulation language was supervision quality, not practice exclusion.

Under the education standards section, Dr. Paul stated that there remains the organized program requirements, which do not allow for piecemeal coursework to satisfy the educational requirements. She noted that there were some questions from the public around practicum requirements, in response to which the regulatory language was revised to strengthen the practicum requirements by increasing the direct client contact hours to 25% of the total practicum hours, and to better defined what counts as direct client service. Those revisions were intended to address the feedback that what had been initially required was too little real world experience while keeping the requirement appropriate for a supervised, entry level role.

Dr. Paul explained that the revisions to the supervision requirements concerned capacity plus accountability. In the initial regulation language, there had been a hard cap of 3 supervisees. That was increased to 6 supervisees and included an expectation that a supervisor would demonstrate their capacity to have more than 6 supervisees – i.e., demonstrated capacity within an organization to manage the work of more than 6 BHWPs. The revision was intended to address the concerns around work force scalability and a supervisor bottleneck by moving away from arbitrary limits to a performance based supervision capacity.

Dr. Paul stated that there were concerns about competency evaluation, and explained that there is currently a national exam process underway, and that the Board has experience in developing valid, reliable, and legally defensible examinations using APA-guided best practices. She said there is expected to be a national and state examination by 2028, and noted that there remains flexibility within the regulations that allows for the Board to review portfolios/credentials. Dr. Paul explained that the Board has well defined policies and procedures for reviewing applications to determine equivalency against the required standards.

Dr. Paul stated that, with respect to education and training, revisions were made to ensure that post-graduate training programs could count as meeting requirements, and explained that practicum hours obtained in either a concurrent or previous degree program would have to align with the competencies required for BHWPs. Dr. Paul said that there were some other minor revisions to make sure the language aligned with scope and removed the use of the word "clinical" to avoid scope creep or misinterpretation.

Dr. Paul summed up the proposed revisions by explaining that the intent was to clarify boundaries, preserve existing workforce rules, strengthen training, emphasize the role of the supervisor, and enable workforce expansion safely. Dr. Paul then deferred to Dr. Tara Raines to provide some vignettes that would show how the BHWP is envisioned to be used in the stepped-care model.

Dr. Raines stated that, to give context, her team reached out to some practicum supervisors in Oregon to provide a "day in the life" list of what the practicum students are doing, as they are training to do what would be aligned with what the BHWPs will be doing. The first example Dr. Raines provided was in the community health setting. She explained that the individual would be meeting with youth and families to get started with services; helping with intakes; getting background information; doing basic screening before being assigned to a provider; helping to establish goals that can be transferred over to the primary clinician; providing one-on-one support such as skill building and explaining what the behavioral health process looks like; and working as part of the care team by meeting with their supervisor and other licensed providers on the care team. Dr. Raines explained the students on which the examples are based are given a very small case load of children and families who are experiencing low levels of distress and work with them in a time-bound and specific intervention that spans 5-7 sessions. If the family is not ready to exit with the skills they have learned in that time, they will be referred up to a licensed provider for more intensive treatment and services. It helps families get timely skills and get off of waitlists, and allows the licensed providers to focus on more complex cases.

Another setting example Dr. Raines provided was a youth psychiatric hospital, and stated that the students on whom the example was based works in a different context. This individual would support morning and community meetings with patients and their clinicians; help in the classroom with positive behavior support work and helping students with schoolwork during their hospital stay; lead and co-lead group sessions for life skills and behavioral regulation skills; help with transition planning for post-discharge; and work as part of the care team.

With those two examples, Dr. Raines stated that, upon completing the educational requirements, the BHWP can be immediately available in supporting some of the lower-level needs in behavioral health settings.

Dr. Paul asked if there were any questions, feedback or comment for the Advisory Group, and Dr. Benuto stated that it was a good time for public comment as well.

Dr. Paul offered another example of how BHWPs can be utilized would be in a Boys and Girls Club that has numerous clubs and many children being served everyday, and having a licensed provider working alongside the staff to support the behavioral health needs of the children and families. Examples of the assistance the BHWP could provide in that setting would be low level workshops across multiple clubs, as well as evidence-based screening practices where children are in a multi-tiered program of support to identify children who may be experiencing a higher level of distress and needing a higher level of services.

Dr. Raines stated that school settings are another place where BHWPs can be utilized, where BHWPs can be checking in with students, doing behavioral regulation interventions, and working with and supporting teachers and the school's mental health professionals. She said that pediatric integration is another area being explored – having mental health services in pediatric settings.

Dr. Benuto clarified that the BHWPs are not prohibited from engaging in a workshop, they are just being regulated if they have this license. Dr. Paul confirmed that clarification and referred to the section that explicitly states what Dr. Benuto confirmed.

Member of the public Dr. Tatsiana Razzhavaikina asked how the distinction between low level and high level services is made and who makes that determination. Dr. Raines explained that the vast majority of the population that the BHWPs would be working with are pre-diagnostic. For instance, if someone is in extreme distress and needs intensive ongoing treatment, they are not who are seen by a BHWP. Dr. Raines said that the low – high distinction is something that the BHWP's supervisor determines. Based on the BHWP scope of practice, the licensees who supervise the BHWPs should be thoughtful and intentional about who the BHWPs are seeing. Dr. Paul added that this work is grounded in prevention science and prevention literature, and concerns evidence-based screening practices that provides a sense of standardized measures when people are mild to moderate levels of distress. They are pre-diagnostic, but still need support to get back on track, and gave examples of that in the context of multi-level tiers of support and when a referral for a higher or specialized level of care is appropriate. Dr. Razzhavaikina inquired as to whether it is in the regulations that it is the supervisor that defines the scope of work, to which Dr. Paul said it is in the regulations in multiple places.

Member of the public Dr. Jamie Ross with the Nevada Statewide Coalition Partnership stated that they care about utilizing substance use prevention in the best way possible, and asked Dr. Paul if she would expand more on the programming in the examples she gave so there is clarity as to the line between what the BHWPs do and what prevention specialists do, and whether and how they can work in concert with each other. Dr. Paul explained that the key was the consultation/collaboration, and offered an explanation of how that would work. Dr. Raines made clear that BHWPs will only be functioning under the expertise of their supervisor. If the supervisor does not have expertise in substance use prevention, they would be reaching out to those who do for an individual who is identified as needing such services.

Member of the public Dr. Jodi Thomas stated that, as part of their outreach on campus, they provide individual drop in consultation services and wondered if that would be under what is allowable under the BHWP regulations. Dr. Paul stated that would be allowable, and that the regulations are not meant to restrict activities that are already authorized and appropriate. She explained that this an additional organized profession at the bachelor’s level that works under supervision.

Dr. Holland asked if the services the BHWPs will be providing will be reimbursed. Dr. Paul said the bill has provisions for reimbursement by Medicaid, and the Nevada Health Authority is working to establish the rules around that in addition to existing codes that align with the BHWPs. She also said that there are those at the bachelor’s level that are already being hired, but that there is a lot of variability in those individuals, and that the BHWPs will come from a specialized educational program. Dr. Paul stated that the bigger goal for the BHWPs is to fill out the behavioral health workforce in a way that does not exist by better defining and emphasizing the competencies at the prevention level.

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved moving the SB165 proposed regulations to a Regulation Hearing. *(Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, and Stephanie Holland). Motion Carried: 5-0.*

Dr. Benuto again opened the regulation workshop on the SB165 regulations for public comment. There was no further public comment.

Dr. Benuto asked if Dr. Raines would be able to provide a one-page outline that describes the BHWP profession so that the Board office can provide that information to those who are forwarding questions about BHWPs to the Board office. Dr. Raines said that she would work on that and provide an outline of that information to the Board office.

B. Revisions to NAC Chapter 641 to include:

- **criminal conduct not related to the practice of psychology as a basis for discipline; and**
- **reporting requirements for disciplinary actions, civil judgments or settlements, and criminal convictions.**

Ms. Arnold stated that during the January 23, 2026, meeting, the Board took action to approve moving forward with developing regulatory language that would allow disciplinary action based on criminal conduct not directly related to the practice of Psychology, and that requires licensees to report to the Board administrative, civil, and criminal actions that have been adjudicated. Based on the language preferences the Board addressed during the January 23, 2026, Board meeting, proposed regulatory language was prepared, discussed, and settled on during the Board's March 6, 2026, meeting for purposes of moving forward with a regulation workshop.

Dr. Benuto opened the workshop to public comment, and noted there was written comment that had been provided to the Board and was included in the published meeting materials under this agenda item (attached to these minutes by request). Dr. Thomas wondered what steps are taken when a conviction is reported to the Board and whether it is considered on a case-by-case basis as it relates to disciplinary actions. Dr. Thomas reiterated her concern about blanket statements around criminal activity and as they can relate to the political climate and used for purposes of oppression. Dr. Benuto thanked Dr. Thomas for her comment and also noted similar concerns. Dr. Benuto deferred to the Board office to provide additional information regarding the process by which criminal convictions would be considered. Executive Director Sarah Restori explained how the Board's conduct review panel process works when a background check or license renewal application reveals criminal conduct, and Ms. Arnold affirmed that all conduct reviews are considered on a case-by-case basis, and often include consideration of the applicant's or licensee's explanation of any criminal or other conduct revealed. DAG Ward agreed that each situation is taken on a case-by-case basis, often with the input from Board counsel, and offered an example of a situation with another Board as it related to the arrest of a licensee that was not reported as required but that was also dismissed, and why case-by-case consideration was important for those circumstances.

The Board had no questions or comments.

On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Stephanie Woodard the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved moving the Regulation Revisions regarding Criminal Conduct and Reporting to a Regulation Hearing. *(Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, and Stephanie Holland). Motion Carried: 5-0.*

Dr. Benuto again opened the workshop to public comment. There was no further public comment.

4. Minutes. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Minutes of the State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners' March 6, 2026, Meeting.

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved the meeting minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board held on March 6, 2026. *Dr. Soseh Esmaeili approved as to form, not content. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, and Stephanie Holland). Motion Carried: 5-0.*

5. Financials

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

Ms. Arnold stated that as of March 31, 2026, the Board had a combined total of about $285,000 in checking and savings. She stated that the Board is currently at just about 83% of its budgeted expenses, and 95% of its budgeted income, most of which is the deferred income allocated to the second and third 2025-26 biennium quarters. Ms. Arnold further said that she was waiting to make any budget revisions until closer to the end of the fiscal year, and will offer a closing budget to actual analysis that tightens up the Board's finances and gets the Board better set up for the FY2027 budget. Ms. Arnold also explained that the Board had some fiscal surprises during the fiscal year, mostly in the form of increased state agency fees that were not announced ahead of the fiscal year, and that, as a result, the budget is tighter than originally budgeted. The Board's bookkeeper's verifications for February and March were included in the meeting materials.

On motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved the Treasurer's Report for Fiscal Year 2026*. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, and Stephanie Holland). Motion Carried: 5-0.*

B. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Contract for a New Bookkeeper Fiscal Year 2027.

Ms. Arnold explained that the Board's bookkeeper now has a full time job, and because her contract will end at the end of June 2026, the Board office recommends that the contract not be renewed in favor of approving a contract with a new bookkeeper who provided her proposal to the Board office beginning FY2027.

Dr. Woodard inquired as to whether the new bookkeeper rate will be more or less than the current bookkeeper's rate. Ms. Arnold confirmed it will be less.

On motion by Monique Abarca, second by Stephanie Woodard, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved the Contract for a new bookkeeper beginning FY2027*. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, and Stephanie Holland). Motion Carried: 5-0.*

6. Legislative/Regulation Update

There were no updates beyond the regulations workshop that occurred during the meeting.

7. Report from the Nevada Psychological Association.

Dr. Claudia Mejia stated that the NPA has a new executive director, Mallory Gott, who has taken over based on Wendi O'Conner's retirement. She also stated that the NPA's annual conference will be held at UNLV and Dr. Arthur Evans, APA CEO, will be in attendance and giving a keynote address and attending various meet and greet events.

Dr. Esmaeili asked if there would be opportunity for a live/virtual for the conference. Dr. Mejia said they would be live streaming for some events, but not all of them.

8. Board Office Operations.

Executive Director Sarah Restori provided an update on the Board's licensure, applicant, state exam, and provisional licensure/registrant statistics for March 2026. She stated that the Board licensed 6 psychologists and administered 4 state exams, and March had the highest number of licensure applications so far in this fiscal year. She further stated that the Board currently has 148 open applications for licensure, which confirms the high volume of incoming applications. Ms. Restori said the Board currently has 766 licensed psychologists, 38 provisionally licensed psychological assistants and psychological interns, and 39 registered psychological trainees.

Ms. Restori also gave an update on the Healthcare workforce working group, on which she sits, and which was statutorily established to provide a statewide healthcare database. She said the group has made progress and is finalizing a survey that will be distributed through licensing boards to collect workforce data for the upcoming legislative session, and the expectation is that Boards will be asked to send it out to all of its licensees to complete by incorporating into renewals.

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

DAG Ward stated that he would be asking for action on two complaints – one for approval of a consent agreement and the other for dismissal.

- Complaint #25-0715. DAG Ward stated that this is a complaint alleging negligence. The respondent submitted an answer to the complaint and relevant records, which were forwarded to the Board investigator assigned to the complaint for review and consideration. The investigator made a recommendation for a stipulated consent agreement, to which the respondent agreed, and the signed agreement was before the Board for its approval. DAG requested that the Board take action to approve the stipulated consent agreement in Complaint #25-0715.

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the Stipulated Consent Agreement in Complaint #25-0715. *(Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, and Stephanie Holland.) Motion Carried: 5-0.*

Dr. Stephanie Holland left the meeting at 9:15 a.m., after action was taken on #25-0715, and prior to DAG Ward's request on #25-0302.

- Complaint #25-0302 – DAG Ward stated that this complaint alleges misrepresentation of credentials and unlicensed practice. The complaint was forwarded to the respondent, who responded to the complaint. Based upon their review of the complaint and response, the Board investigator assigned to this complaint recommended dismissal. Based on the Board investigator's recommendation, DAG Ward requested that the Board take action to dismiss the complaint.

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners dismissed Complaint #25-0302. *(Yea:*

Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, and Soseh Esmaeili.) Motion Carried: 4-0.

DAG Ward reminded the Board and the public that a written update for all complaints is provided in the meeting materials.

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.

This item was taken out of order after Item 3.

The following applicants were recommended for approval of licensure contingent upon completion of licensure requirements: **Tiffany Mosier-Hunter, Aaron Smith, Mark Ryan, Edward Selby, Irena Leigh, Keisha Mascal, Stacey Bona, Karla Felske, Danielle Schlichter, La Tanya Takla, Scott Kopoian, Angelica Castro Bueno, Barbara Endlich, Amelia Evans, Daniel Lobel, Heather Holder, William Martin, Patricia Pulido, and Wendy McGowan.**

On motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the following applicants for licensure contingent upon completion of licensure requirements: Tiffany Mosier-Hunter, Aaron Smith, Mark Ryan, Edward Selby, Irena Leigh, Keisha Mascal, Stacey Bona, Karla Felske, Danielle Schlichter, La Tanya Takla, Scott Kopoian, Angelica Castro Bueno, Barbara Endlich, Amelia Evans, Daniel Lobel, Heather Holder, William Martin, Patricia Pulido, and Wendy McGowan. *(Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, and Stephanie Holland.) Motion Carried: 5-0.*

- **Dr. Althea Cook's request for an Extension of Their Provisional License as a Psychological Assistant for a Fifth Year.**

Dr. Benuto stated that Dr. Althea Cook has requested that her provisional license as a psychological assistant be extended for a fifth year, and that Dr. Cook's explanation in support of her request was included in the meeting materials provided to the Board. The Board did not have any questions for Dr. Cook or comments on the request.

On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Stephanie Woodard, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved Dr. Althea Cook's Request for the Provisional License extension for a Fifth Year. *(Yea: Lorraine Benuto,* *Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, and Stephanie Holland.) Motion Carried: 5-0.*

11. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on Updates Regarding the Work of the 2025 SB165 Behavioral Health and Wellness Practitioner Advisory Group.

This item was taken out of order and at the end of Item 3A.

Dr. Benuto inquired as to whether there were any updates from the BHWP Advisory Group regarding the efforts to obtain funding for the Board office. Dr. Paul stated that a grant application was submitted, but was not sure when there would be a determination as to whether the grant would be awarded.

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.

Dr. Benuto stated that the next regular meeting of the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners is scheduled for Friday, May 29, 2026, beginning at 8:00 a.m. The Board did not indicate any conflicts with that date.

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 - The Board welcomes public comment, which may be limited to three minutes per person at the Board President's discretion. 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; however, public comment will not be taken on complaints that are pending before the Board. 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).

Members of the public were reminded that they were not permitted to comment on pending complaints before the Board.

There was no public comment.

Dr. Benuto noted that today would have been Dr. Pearson's last meeting, and thanked Dr. Pearson for her service to the Board.

15. (For Possible Action) Adjournment

There being no further business before the Board, President Dr. Benuto adjourned the meeting at 9:18 a.m.

Public Comment for April 17, 2026 Regulation Workshop
Criminal Conduct and Reporting

Dear Members of the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit additional public comment regarding the proposed regulatory language addressing criminal and other conduct not related to the practice of psychology and related reporting requirements.

I respectfully offer this comment as a continuation of my prior written submissions for the December 12, 2025 and January 23, 2026 meetings. I am grateful for the Board's time, care, and thoughtful attention to a difficult issue that involves both public protection and fairness to licensees.

I respectfully write to raise one remaining concern: whether the apparent preference, reflected in the March 6, 2026 Board Meeting Staff Report included in the March 6, 2026 meeting packet, to require reporting only of adjudicated administrative, civil, and/or criminal matters may still leave an important gap for informed consent and for the protection of children, elderly patients, and other vulnerable individuals.

From the perspective of parents, guardians, and caregivers, it is concerning to think that a child, elderly parent, dependent adult, or other vulnerable loved one could remain in treatment with a psychologist who may be facing a serious unresolved criminal charge involving violence, abuse, exploitation, or significant dishonesty, while the matter remains unknown to the Board and unknown to those responsible for the patient's care.

For example, if a psychologist is charged with elder abuse, robbery, domestic violence, financial exploitation, or another serious offense involving violence, abuse, exploitation, or substantial dishonesty, that matter may remain pending for a substantial period before it is resolved. National state-court research has reported an average felony time to disposition of 256 days, with only 83% of felony cases resolved within 365 days, suggesting that some serious matters can remain unresolved well beyond a year (State Justice Institute, summarizing National Center for State Courts research).

If the Board ultimately requires reporting only of adjudicated matters, I would also respectfully ask it to consider whether a reporting period shorter than 30 days would better support timely Board awareness and patient protection. By way of example, Arizona requires health professionals to notify their regulatory board in writing within ten working days after certain criminal charges are filed, and again after final disposition. See A.R.S. § 32-3208. That example suggests that requiring notice of certain unadjudicated criminal charges, in addition to final disposition, may be administratively workable while still preserving due process.

In the meantime, the psychologist may continue treating children, elderly patients, and other vulnerable individuals in private, trust-based, and often unsupervised clinical settings.

I fully recognize that a criminal charge is not proof of wrongdoing, and I am not suggesting that the filing of a charge should automatically result in discipline. My concern is simply that, if reporting is required only after conviction, plea, judgment, or settlement, the Board may receive no notice during the very period in which interim review may be most important. That appears to be the remaining gap reflected in the March 6, 2026 Board Meeting Staff Report: serious pending matters may go unreported until final adjudication, even though treatment may continue in the meantime. This concern may be heightened by the fact that Board notice does not necessarily result in immediate interruption of practice. If a matter must still proceed through investigation or formal disciplinary steps unless emergency action is taken, then delay in reporting may further reduce the Board's ability to respond in a timely way.

Nevada law already recognizes that abuse, neglect, exploitation, and similar harms involving vulnerable people warrant heightened protection and prompt reporting. Nevada's elder- and vulnerable-person statutes address abuse, neglect, exploitation, isolation, and abandonment. Nevada also requires certain professionals, including psychologists, to make mandatory reports when, in their professional capacity, they know or have reasonable cause to believe that an older person or vulnerable person has been abused, neglected, exploited, isolated, or abandoned. Nevada likewise requires mandatory reporting of suspected child abuse or neglect. In light of that broader policy framework, I respectfully ask the Board to consider whether it should also receive timely notice when a psychologist is charged with serious abuse, exploitation, or similarly relevant criminal conduct.

From a public-health standpoint, professional regulation is one of the state's primary tools for protecting the health, safety, and welfare of the public when a practitioner's fitness to practice may reasonably come into question. In behavioral health care, where treatment depends heavily on trust, safety, and informed participation, delayed reporting may reduce the Board's ability to assess risk and respond proportionately before avoidable harm occurs.

As I noted in my earlier comments, informed consent is an ongoing process, not a one-time event. Patients and caregivers cannot make meaningful decisions about care when information that may be highly relevant to trust and safety is delayed, unavailable, or effectively left for families to discover on their own. I also understand this concern to be generally in keeping with the APA Ethics Code's emphasis on informed consent and on giving patients information relevant to treatment decisions as circumstances evolve. While the APA Ethics Code does not itself establish Nevada reporting requirements, it seems to reflect the broader principle that meaningful consent depends on timely, material information.

I also respectfully note one additional concern. The proposed language, as I understand it, appears to focus on reporting to the Board. I do not see any provision addressing how reported information would be communicated, if at all, to current patients, parents, guardians, or caregivers.

If that understanding is correct, I would be grateful for clarification as to how informed consent is intended to function in practice. If information is reported only to the Board, but not communicated in some accessible way to those making treatment decisions, it is difficult to see how patients or caregivers would be able to act on that information in a timely way.

For that reason, I respectfully ask the Board to consider whether the proposed language should be strengthened in two limited ways: first, by considering earlier reporting of at least certain categories of serious pending criminal matters, with appropriate safeguards for fairness and due process; and second, by considering how material information, once reported, will actually be communicated in a way that supports informed consent for patients and caregivers.

I offer these comments with appreciation for the Board's service and with respect for the care the Board has already devoted to this issue. My intent is not to repeat prior submissions, but to highlight what appears to be a remaining concern: how children, elderly patients, vulnerable adults, and their caregivers are to be protected when serious matters may remain pending for substantial periods while treatment continues.

Thank you again for your time, your service, and your commitment to protecting Nevada patients and families.

Respectfully,

Rebecca S.
Nevada Citizen, Parent, and Caregiver

Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners
Board Meeting Staff Report

DATE: July 10, 2026

ITEM:

4A - (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Final Treasurer's Report for Fiscal Year 2026 (July 1, 2025, through June 30, 2026).

SUMMARY:

As of June 30, 2026, the Board had a combined total of about $214,000 in checking and savings. With all of the distributions being made for the third biennium quarter, which was the second half of FY2026, the Board is ending the fiscal year with a deficit of about $17,420. That deficit was due to a number of unexpected fiscal impacts to the Board, including:

- a 40% increase in the fees that the Attorney General's office charges the Board, which was not announced until November 2025 and was made retroactive to July 1, 2025;

- a 75% increase in the IT fees that the State charges the Board, which were not known until the middle of the fiscal year and applied retroactively to July 1, 2025;

- The State's requirement that the Board have their worker's compensation insurance through the State rather than less expensive private worker's compensation insurance, which cost the Board approximately 3-4 times more than it had been paying in previous years; and

- The cost of a November 2025 disciplinary hearing that exceeded what had been expected and requested;

Despite the deficit, the Board continues to have sufficient funds, and with Fiscal Year 2027 including the Board's renewal biennium quarter (July 1, 2026 – December 31, 2026) and the Board's continued growth in licensees, it is expected that the FY27 budget will be able to absorb the FY26 deficit.

NV State Board of Psychological Examiners
Budget to Actual - Fiscal Year 2026

6/30/26

		FY26 Budgeted Amount	FY26 Actual	% actual to budget
INCOME				
Cash (Checking) as of 7/1/2025		64,395.70	64,395.70	
Deferred Revenue				
2600	Renewals - 7/1/24 and 1/1/25	**202,646.74**	**202,646.74**	100.00%
2600	Late Renewals - 1Q 25-26	**17,990.30**	**17,990.30**	100.00%
40201 40281-3 40203	New Licensure, Registrations, Reinstatements	**27,750.00**	**27,777.60**	100.10%
Total Deferred Income		**248,387.04**	**248,414.64**	100.01%
	Deferred PP fees	800.00	956.33	119.54%
	Total NET Deferred Income	**247,587.04**	**247,458.31**	99.95%
Regular Revenue	25-26 Biennium Q4 New Licensure and Registrations			

Item 4A

	Applications			
40100	Psychologist Application	20,000.00	**18,010.80**	90.05%
40101	PA Application	3,970.00	**3,971.05**	100.03%
40102	Intern Application	1,700.00	**1,706.40**	100.38%
40103	Trainee Application	3,100.00	**3,107.55**	100.24%
4010	Reinstatement/Reactivation	100.00	**103.00**	103.00%
4015	Psychologist State Exam	14,800.00	**14,820.00**	100.14%
4030	Non-Resident Consultant	400.00	**400.00**	100.00%
4040	CE App Fee	1,300.00	**1,323.01**	101.77%
	Other			
4025/4050	Late and License Restoration Fees	250.00	**250.00**	100.00%
40251/40252	New and Duplicate License	1,800.00	**1,818.69**	101.04%
4045	Verification of Licensure	425.00	**429.10**	100.96%
4075/4078	Cost/Fines Recovered (Disciplinary)	4,725.00	**4,742.00**	100.36%
4999	Interest, Misc	18.50	**18.71**	101.14%
Total Regular Revenue		**52,588.50**	**50,700.31**	96.41%
Total Revenue + Cash		**$364,571.24**	**$362,554.32**	**99.45%**

Payroll Expenses		**FY25 Budgeted Amount**	**FY25 Actual**	**% actual to budget**
5100	Board Salary/Per Diem	4,100.00	4,050.00	98.78%
2700	Executive Director (net)	55,000.00	54,840.77	99.71%
2700	Administrative Director (net)	25,000.00	24,858.19	99.43%
2700	Board Staff (Flex/full time)	26,675.00	26,674.55	100.00%

2700	Staff Salary (Part-Time)	1,825.00	1,821.02	100.22%
9110	Staff Benefits	30,000.00	30,228.58	100.76%
2700	Investigator/Consultant Salary	23,500.00	25,875.97	110.11%
5250	Workers Compensation	3,600.00	3,603.26	100.09%
2108/5300	PERS	57,000.00	56,994.22	99.99%
2100	Federal Payroll Taxes	23,750.00	23,570.96	99.25%
9100	Other Payroll Expenses	950.00	946.00	99.58%
	Total Payroll	**251,400.00**	**253,463.52**	**100.82%**

Operating Expenses		**FY25 Budgeted Amount**	**FY25 Actual**	**% actual to budget**
6100	Out of State	2,160.00	2,159.03	99.96%
6200	In-State Travel	365.00	362.70	99.37%
7015	Office Supplies/furniture	405.00	404.41	99.85%
	Office expenses:			
7040	- Print-Copy	50.00	49.52	99.04%
7050	- Rent	19,150.00	19,125.10	99.87%
7100	- Postage	175.00	175.34	100.19%
7210	- DoIt Web SV	1,625.00	1,623.24	99.89%
7290/72902 7200	- Telephone/Internet & Utilities	1,400.00	1,401.95	100.14%
7500	- Copy Lease	1,250.00	1,247.92	99.83%
7020	- Water/Misc	1,625.00	1,626.92	100.12%
7770/7777	Software & Database	5,250.00	5,234.37	99.70%
8000/8010	Legal & Professional Fees	47,500.00	60,862.97	128.13%
8015	Tort Claim	1,510.00	1,507.00	99.80%
8050/8055	Professional Services (Auditor, Bookkeeper, Lobbyist)	18,850.00	18,832.25	99.91%

Item 4A

8250	Dues & Reg (ASPPB, Conf, Continuing Ed)	9,375.00	9,389.00	100.15%
8520	Admin Services (LCB)	750.00	750.00	100.00%
9001/9002	Banking Fees	38.00	38.00	100.00%
	PayPal Fees (against regular revenue)	1,500.00	1,722.23	114.82%
90100	Miscellaneous Expense	0.00		
	Uncategorized Expense	0.00		
	Total Expenses	**$112,978.00**	**$126,511.95**	**111.98%**
Total Expenses + Payroll		**$364,378.00**	**$379,975.47**	**104.28%**
Total Income + Cash		**$ 364,571.24**	**$362,554.32**	**99.45%**
Final Balance		**$193.24**	**-$17,421.15**	

Item 4A

NV State Board of Psychological Examiners

Statement of Activity

July 1, 2025-June 30, 2026

	TOTAL
Revenue	
4010 Psychologist Application	
40100 Psychologist Application	18,010.80
40101 PA Application	3,971.05
40102 Intern Application	1,706.40
40103 Trainee Application	3,107.55
Total for 4010 Psychologist Application	**$26,795.80**
4015 Psychologist State Exam	14,820.00
4020 Psych Biennial	$227,099.68
40201 Prorated Psych Biennial	23,570.66
40203 Reinstament of Psych	117.04
Total for 4020 Psych Biennial	**$250,787.38**
4025 Psychologist Licensing Fee	$250.00
40251 New License	1,550.00
40252 Change/Duplicate/Reinstatement	268.69
Total for 4025 Psychologist Licensing Fee	**$2,068.69**
4028 Registration Fee	
40281 Psych Asst fee	3,490.50
40282 Psych Intern Fee	232.88
40283 Psych Trainee	366.52
Total for 4028 Registration Fee	**$4,089.90**
4030 Non-Resident Consultant	400.00
4040 CE App Fee	1,323.01
4045 Verification of Licensure	429.10
4075 Restitution of Legal Costs	3,742.00
4078 Legal Fines recovered	1,000.00
4999 Interest	18.71
Total for Revenue	**$305,474.59**
Gross Profit	**$305,474.59**
Expenditures	
2106 Posting error	-1,370.59
307910 7210 DoIt Web SVb	1,623.24
5100 Board Sal	4,050.00
5175 Board Staf	
51753 Investigator Salary	20,106.50
Total for 5175 Board Staf	**$20,106.50**
5250 Workers Compensation	3,603.26
5300 PERS	35,850.79
6100 Out of State Travel	-$900.75
6101 Meals	132.26
6102 Lodging	2,119.62
6105 Auto-Public Carrier	131.05
6106 Air Tvl	676.85
Total for 6100 Out of State Travel	**$2,159.03**

Item 4A

NV State Board of Psychological Examiners

Statement of Activity

July 1, 2025-June 30, 2026

	TOTAL
6200 In State Travel	$102.29
6201 Meals	260.41
Total for 6200 In State Travel	**$362.70**
7015 Supplies	404.41
7020 Office Expense	$1,626.92
7040 Print-Copy	49.52
7050 Rent	19,125.10
85100 Shredding	89.00
Total for 7020 Office Expense	**$20,890.54**
7100 Postage	176.34
7200 Utilities	$632.87
7290 Telephone	
72902 Internet	769.08
Total for 7290 Telephone	**$769.08**
Total for 7200 Utilities	**$1,401.95**
7500 Copy Lease	1,247.92
7770 Software	5,234.37
8000 Legal & Professional Fees	$18,566.05
8010 Legal	42,296.92
8015 Tort Claim	1,507.00
Total for 8000 Legal & Professional Fees	**$62,369.97**
8050 Prof Servs	18,832.25
8250 Dues & Reg	$2,947.00
8255 Membership	6,442.00
Total for 8250 Dues & Reg	**$9,389.00**
8500 Admin Serv	
8520 LCB	750.00
Total for 8500 Admin Serv	**$750.00**
9001 Banking Fees	
9002 Bank Crgs	38.00
Total for 9001 Banking Fees	**$38.00**
90100 Miscellaneous Expense	2,617.21
9100 Payroll Expenses	$2,767.02
9110 Company Contributions	$83.86
Health Insurance	30,228.58
Retirement	29,717.37
Total for 9110 Company Contributions	**$60,029.81**
9130 Wages	160,472.57
Taxes	
9111 Federal Taxes (941/944)	37,439.33
NV Unemployment Tax	0.00
Total for Taxes	**$37,439.33**
Total for 9100 Payroll Expenses	**$260,708.73**

NV State Board of Psychological Examiners

Statement of Activity

July 1, 2025-June 30, 2026

	TOTAL
9135 PTO Expense	6,135.85
PayPal Fees	2,432.81
Reimbursements	9,603.88
Total for Expenditures	**$468,618.16**
Net Operating Revenue	**-$163,143.57**
Net Revenue	**-$163,143.57**

Item 4A

NV State Board of Psychological Examiners

Statement of Financial Position

As of Jun 30, 2026

	TOTAL
Assets	
Current Assets	
Bank Accounts	
1100 Cash in Bank	108,513.34
3309 Savings	105,151.64
Total for Bank Accounts	**$213,664.98**
Accounts Receivable	
1200 Accounts Receivable	3,837.71
Total for Accounts Receivable	**$3,837.71**
Other Current Assets	
12000 Undeposited Funds	0.00
Uncategorized Asset	0.00
Total for Other Current Assets	**$0.00**
Total for Current Assets	**$217,502.69**
Other Assets	
1300 Deferred outflows of resources	0.00
Total for Other Assets	**$0.00**
Total for Assets	**$217,502.69**
Liabilities and Equity	
Liabilities	
Current Liabilities	
Accounts Payable	
1106 Accounts Payable	2,551.38
Total for Accounts Payable	**$2,551.38**
Other Current Liabilities	
2100 Federal Income Withholding	48,620.07
2100 Payroll Liabilities	$4,337.10
2107 Federal Taxes (941/944)	-76.15
2108 PERS	37,313.89
Health Insurance	3,564.82
NV Unemployment Tax	0.00
Total for 2100 Payroll Liabilities	**$45,139.66**
2101 Federal FICA Withholding	0.00
2102 Federal Medicare Withhold	0.00
2105 Employment Security	0.00
2110 Direct Deposit Liabilities	0.00
2200 Unearned Revenue	0.00
2300 Liability	0.00
2302 Accrued PTO	13,013.73
2450 Deferred inflow-pension	0.00
2455 Net pension liability	0.00
2600 Deferred Revenue	133,384.27
2700 Direct Deposit Payable	0.00

NV State Board of Psychological Examiners

Statement of Financial Position

As of Jun 30, 2026

	TOTAL
Total for Other Current Liabilities	**$240,157.73**
Total for Current Liabilities	**$242,709.11**
Total for Liabilities	**$242,709.11**
Equity	
3000 Opening Bal Equity	-60.41
3900 2550 Fund Balance	137,997.56
Net Revenue	-163,143.57
Total for Equity	**-$25,206.42**
Total for Liabilities and Equity	**$217,502.69**

Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners
Board Meeting Staff Report

DATE: July 10, 2026

ITEM:

4B - (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2027.

Request to table this item until the Board's next meeting.

Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners
Board Meeting Staff Report

DATE: July 10, 2026

ITEM:

4C – (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve Proposed Engagement Letter from Campbell Jones Cohen CPAs for the Annual Board Audit.

SUMMARY:

Campbell Jones Cohen CPAs, which is the accounting firm that conducted the Board's annual audit for the past several years, has provided their proposed engagement letter. The firm has quoted a total of $18,000.00 for the annual audit. This amount is a $1,500 increase over what the firm charged last year, and will be accounted for in the budget for FY27.

Item 4C

PROPOSAL TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL AUDITING SERVICES

FOR THE YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2026

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS

Campbell Jones Cohen CPAs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROPOSAL TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL AUDITING SERVICES FOR NEVADA STATE BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS

Campbell Jones Cohen CPAs

Item 4C

P 702-255-2330
F 702-255-2203
6920 S. Cimarron Rd., Suite 100
Las Vegas, NV 89113
www.yournevadacpa.com

June 26, 2026

Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners
3080 S. Durango Dr. Ste. 102
Las Vegas, NV 89117

To: Board of Directors

We appreciate the opportunity to submit our proposal to provide professional auditing services for Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners for the year ending June 30, 2026.

Our approach to client service is to foster strong relationships with our clients and to provide value to the organizations we serve. We have extensive experience serving entities and are confident in our ability to meet or exceed the reporting deadlines. The work conducted on your audit will be performed with significant involvement at the partner level and by certified public accountants and other staff who are committed to providing the highest level of service.

We look forward to being your firm of choice. If you have questions regarding this proposal, or if we can be of assistance in any way during this process, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Kay See

Kay See, CPA
Engagement Partner

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

FIRM OVERVIEW

Campbell Jones Cohen CPAs has been in business for more than 30 years and has a record for long-term partnerships with our clients, which is the foundation for our success and longevity. Our firm is one of the largest firms in Southern Nevada, with five partners and an overall staff approaching 60 people. In addition to audit and assurance services, our full-service firm provides extensive tax, bookkeeping, and advisory services. Our high standards for quality and our specialized team enhance our professionalism, while our size allows us to provide more personalized service, customized to our clients. We ensure every client is served by the expertise of our whole firm. We are dedicated professionals with a local firm culture who are passionate about providing personalized service.

Our firm has the desire and capacity to accept new clients. Our staff is well-balanced with diverse backgrounds to provide a wide array of expertise. Our clientele consists of a broad range of entities including non-profit organizations, government and quasi-government organizations, construction businesses, a variety of other businesses and entities, and high net worth individuals.

We enjoy assisting our clients in fulfilling their respective missions by being a resource to their staff. We maintain communication with our clients throughout the year and are generally available for consultation on accounting matters at any time and at no additional charge. In addition, we stay current on industry developments from the standard-setting organizations and share that information with our clients.

We understand that fewer changes in audit personnel equates to increased efficiencies and helps reduce potential complications that may arise during the course of an engagement. We strive to keep audit personnel on the same client engagements to maintain existing knowledge of our clients and their organizations from year to year. We have experienced low turnover in staff while continuing to add team members.

Our firm is an independent member of the BDO Alliance USA. BDO Alliance USA is a nationwide association of independently owned local and regional accounting, consulting, and service firms with similar client service goals. By supplementing our services, the BDO Alliance USA allows us to:

- Enhance our client services and broaden our capabilities overall
- Expand our domestic and international coverage
- Gain greater technical knowledge in specialty areas
- Utilize professionals with experience in a wide range of industries
- Access the most up-to-date technical information
- Participate in the latest training programs
- Provide our clients with key contacts and sophisticated professionals throughout the U.S.

The BDO Alliance USA brings us the necessary tools to help us better serve our clients with greater flexibility, efficiency, and cost effectiveness.

We are experienced conducting audits of organizations that receive funding from a variety of sources, including the State of Nevada, county funding sources, and the federal government. We also have experience conducting single audits. Please see our references in the references section.

INDEPENDENCE

We are completely independent of the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners. We continually monitor our independence with all of our clients as part of our system of quality control and ensure independence is always met with our assurance clients.

LICENSING

All of our CPA- licensed partners and staff are in good standing, with no complaints against them. We are included under the peer review program of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and are members of the Nevada Society of Certified Public Accountants.

AUDIT APPROACH

Our approach to client service includes finding ways to add value through providing recommendations to you to help improve your organization, fostering strong relationships, and ensuring good communication with your personnel. Our commitment to premium service for our clients means that a partner will be significantly involved with your engagement, with regular communication, and a specifically designated audit staff member will be assigned full-time responsibility for your audit. We will gather independent evidence that validates your controls and provides assurance regarding account balances and transactions.

TECHNOLOGY

Our firm uses the best technology available, including a full range of software, systems, and tools. We use a secure file-sharing platform which allows us to protect your information and simplify the communication process throughout the engagement. We also use sophisticated audit and tax software to ensure compliance with professional standards and accuracy of all information from financial statements to tax returns. We maintain proper back-ups, make sure that information is properly secured, and access to our information is available on a timely basis and in accordance with retention requirements.

REFERENCES

The following are recent audits we have performed under both generally accepted auditing standards and *Government Auding Standards*.

Nevada Physical Therapy Board Foundation
Charles Harvey, Executive Director
Nevada Physical Therapy Board
pted@govmail.state.nv.us
3291 N. Buffalo Dr. Ste. 100
Las Vegas, NV 89129
(702) 876-5535

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Karen Marben, Executive Director
Las Vegas Metro Police Dept. Foundation
kmarben@lvmpfoundation.org
110 N. City Pkwy. Ste. 420
Las Vegas, NV 89106
(702) 331-7881

Nevada P.E.P., Inc.
Karen Taycher, Executive Director
Nevada P.E.P., Inc.
ktaycher@nvpep.org
7211 W. Charleston Blvd. Ste. 110
Las Vegas, NV 89117-1682
(702) 388-8899

WORK PLAN AND PROPOSED AUDIT SCHEDULE

The following is the work plan we will follow to accomplish each significant segment of the audit during the proposed audit schedule:

Audit Step	Scheduled
Trial Balance received and general ledger detail of all accounts if no access to books online	Day 1
CJC to send initial document list to client	End of Week 2
Initial meeting completed by	Week 2
Client to submit all documents to CJC	Week 3-5
CJC field work (client needs to be available for questions)	Week 6-7
CJC internal review of file and drafting of financial statement	Week 8
Draft to client for review	Week 9
CJC partner review of audit file and draft	Week 10
Final report available to be issued	Week 11

Our audit effort will focus on the risk assessment performed during audit planning in accordance with auditing standards. We anticipate areas of focus will include revenues, expenditures, cash accounts receivable, inventory, liabilities, and net assets.

Our firm is based in Las Vegas, NV and our staff works both on-site and remotely. We make every effort to limit the disruptions we make to your personnel. We will discuss with you whether to perform audit work on-site or remotely, as we work comfortably in both ways to perform the fieldwork portion of our audit procedures. The fieldwork portion of the audit is generally between five to ten days.

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THOSE CHARGED WITH GOVERNANCE

In accordance with professional auditing standards, we are required to communicate with those charged with governance, including your organization's board of directors during the audit engagement. Accordingly, we generally make such communications in writing at the beginning and conclusion of the audit and may communicate via phone or email throughout the audit as deemed necessary in our professional judgment and as required by our professional standards.

PEER REVIEW

Our firm is included under the peer review program as monitored by the Nevada State Board of Accountancy. Our firm, Campbell Jones Cohen CPAs, received a peer review rating of **Pass** as of our most recent peer review. We take pride and strive to maintain that rating excellence. A copy of the report accompanies this proposal.

ENGAGEMENT TEAM – Engagement Partner

Kay See, CPA
Partner
Campbell Jones Cohen CPAs

BACKGROUND
Kay See, CPA, is a 2012 graduate of UNLV. She has been working for Campbell Jones Cohen CPAs since January 2009 and became a shareholder of Campbell Jones Cohen CPAs in 2023. Kay's expertise is in audits of not-for-profit organizations and trust tax returns. Kay became a certified public accountant in 2013.

EDUCATION
Master of Science Degree in Accounting, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION
Member in good standing: Nevada State Board of Accountancy
Satisfies the professional requirement of completing at least 80 hours of continuing professional education every two years including 24 hours directly related to government auditing (Yellow Book requirements).

ACHIEVEMENTS
Licensed CPA, State of Nevada
Member, Nevada State Society of CPAs
Member, American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA)
Not for Profit-Level II Certification by the AICPA

COMMUNITY
UNLV Department of Accounting-Advisory Board Member
Vegas City Opera-Advisory Board Member

ENGAGEMENT TEAM – Audit Manager

David A. Hines, CPA
Audit Manager
Campbell Jones Cohen CPAs

BACKGROUND
David Hines, CPA is a 2012 graduate of University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and a 2019 graduate of Florida Atlantic University. David became Audit Manager in 2024 after having been a valuable part of the firm since 2019. David works with clients in a wide variety of industries. David became a certified public accountant in 2018.

EDUCATION
Bachelor of Science Degree in Business Administration, Accounting, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Master of Accounting Degree, Florida Atlantic University

CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION
Member in good standing: Nevada State Board of Accountancy.
Satisfies the professional requirement of completing at least 80 hours of continuing professional education every two years including 24 hours directly related to government auditing (Yellow Book requirements).

ACHIEVEMENTS
Licensed CPA, State of Nevada
Member, Nevada State Society of CPAs
Member, American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AIPCA)

COMMUNITY
F.E.A.T. of Southern Nevada (Families for Effective Autism Treatment)-Board Treasurer

ENGAGEMENT TEAM – Staff Accountant

Laulea Nobriga
Staff Accountant
Campbell Jones Cohen CPAs

BACKGROUND
Laulea Nobriga is a 2023 graduate of University of Nevada, Las Vegas. He has been a member of the firm since August 2023. Laulea is a valuable team member and works on financial statement audits, reviews, and compilations.

EDUCATION

Bachelor of Science Degree in Business Administration, Accounting, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

APPENDIX A – ENGAGEMENT FEES
THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS

Fees for One -Year Audit Engagement	2026
Audit Services for 2026	$18,000

You will also be billed for out-of-pocket costs such as report production, bank confirmations, word processing, postage, lease accounting, etc. If necessary for this engagement, lease accounting software is $125 per lease, bank confirmations are $45 each. We would be confirming all bank, investment, and loan accounts. The price anticipates that your staff will assist in preparing all necessary schedules and documentation for the audit.

Our firm understands the desire to see transparent pricing. We have a history of keeping fees both consistent and reasonable from year to year. Our firm does not impose additional fees for routine communication with the company's personnel as it relates to discussing accounting-related questions.

Regulation Revisions Table

Legislative File No.	Description	Status
R088-26	SB165 Regulations (Behavioral Health and Wellness Practitioners)	The BHWP Advisory Group continues to meet and work with the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) in obtaining an LCB Regulation Draft to go before the Board during a regulation hearing.
R089-26	Criminal conduct as a basis for discipline and related reporting requirements	The LCB has provided a draft for the Board's consideration during a regulation hearing, which has not yet been scheduled.

2025 Legislative Session

Bill No	Description	Status
SB165	Revises NRS Chapter 641 (Psychologists) to provide for the licensure, regulation, investigation, and discipline of Behavioral Health and Wellness Practitioners	The BHWP Advisory Group continues to meet and work toward satisfying the Board's charge as it relates to the SB165 requirements.

Item 7A

		7/25	8/25	9/25	10/25	11/25	12/25	1/26	2/26	3/26	4/26	5/26	6/26	FY25 Totals
Psychologists	Licenses Issued	4	7	5	9	8	6	4	4	6	4	2	5	64
	Applications Received	6	7	9	8	5	11	10	6	13	4	13	8	100
Psychological Assistants	Provisional Licenses Issued	1	1	5	2	3	2	2	1	0	1	0	0	18
	Applications Received	4	1	1	2	0	2	0	2	2	2	7	3	26
Psychological Interns	Provisional Licenses Issued	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	6
	Applications Received	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	1	0	6
Psychological Trainees	Registrations Issued	4	11	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	7	1	28
	Applications Received	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	10
Non-Resident Consultants	Registrations Issued	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
Background Checks	Reviewed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	4
Continuing Education	Applications Reviewed	3	2	2	3	1	2	6	2	2	1	6	4	34
State Exams	Administered	8	9	11	9	3	5	7	3	4	3	5	9	76
Complaints	Received	6	3	5	1	2	1	3	3	2	1	1	3	31
Totals		40	43	41	35	23	31	37	23	30	20	48	36	407

Current Active Licensees - 2025-26 biennium: 777

Current Applications, Provisional Licenses, and Registrations:

	App	PL/Reg
Psychologists	148	
Psychological Assistants	19	29
Psychological Interns	6	12
Psychological Trainees	3	49

Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners

Pending Complaints
July 10, 2026

Case No.	Current Status
23-0918	This complaint made various claims of improper conduct. The Respondent is represented by counsel, and a stipulated disciplinary consent agreement has been finalized and fully executed. The agreement is before the Board for approval during its July 10, 2026, meeting and is included in the meeting materials.
24-0730	This is a complaint for unlicensed practice, in response to which Board counsel served several Cease and Dease letters on the respondent. Because the respondent did not respond to any of them, the Board has submitted a formal complaint to the respondent's licensing board and has filed a complaint for injunctive relief against the respondent in district court. The district court has ordered the case to arbitration, which is pending.
25-0110	This is a complaint for unlicensed practice, for which the respondent provided an answer. Based on the information in the respondent's answer, Board counsel prepared and forwarded to the respondent a draft consent decree. Respondent retained counsel, who has provided a response to the proposed consent agreement with supplemental information and explanation. Based on the clarification and information provided in the supplemental response, a recommendation for case closure with a follow up cease and desist letter is being made to the Board during its July 10, 2026, meeting.
25-0410	This is a complaint for ethical violations, to which the respondent provided a response. The Board investigator assigned to the complaint subsequently conducted a witness interview, and the complainant provided additional information, to which the respondent responded. Based upon the results of the investigation, a formal complaint and notice of hearing was drafted and served on counsel for respondent. Counsel for respondent has formally answered the complaint and notice of hearing. Based on the respondent's desire to resolve this complaint and the investigator's recommendations, a proposed consent agreement was drafted and forwarded to counsel for the respondent. Counsel for respondent provided a settlement offer, which was not accepted. The respondent can either accept the proposed consent agreement or the Board will hold a hearing on the matter.
25-0812(2)	This complaint alleges negligence related to an assessment. It was forwarded to the respondents, who provided a response. The Board investigator has made recommendations for a stipulated consent decree, which was drafted and forwarded to the respondents. The respondents are now represented by counsel, who has reviewed and responded to the proposed agreements. The investigator has reviewed counsel's response to the agreements and provided a response to forward to counsel for the respondents that includes requests for additional information.

25-0818(1)	This is a complaint that concerns charges for services not provided, and a response to the complaint has been received. Based on the respondent's answers to follow up inquiries, the Board investigator assigned to this complaint requested additional information, which was requested via a properly-served subpoena duces tecum. A complaint and notice of hearing is pending AG review and service on respondent.
25-1117	This complaint alleges unethical conduct against a psychologist, and the respondent has provided a response to the complaint. The Board investigator assigned to this complaint requested certain information and documentation from respondent, which was received and forwarded to the investigator for further review and consideration. Based upon the review of the information provided by the respondent, a proposed consent agreement has been drafted and is pending AG review and service on respondent.
25-1231	This is a complaint regarding the failure to provide requested records. The respondent provided a response to the complaint, and the investigator has considered additional information provided by the complainant. Based on the information provided during the investigation, the investigator has recommended a stipulated consent agreement, to which the respondent agreed and which has been fully executed. The agreement is before the Board for approval during its July 10, 2026, meeting and is included in the meeting materials.
26-0114	This is a complaint for unlicensed practice. Counsel for the respondent has provided a response to the complaint. Based on the information in the complaint and the response from counsel for respondent, a Complaint and Notice of Hearing was drafted and forwarded to counsel for respondent. Counsel for the respondent has provided an answer to the complaint, which has been forwarded to the Board investigator for review and consideration, and discussions on resolving the matter are pending.
26-0120(1)	This is a complaint alleging unlicensed practice. Board counsel sent a cease and desist letter to the respondent, who has provided a response. Based on the position taken by the respondent in response to the cease and desist, follow up admonitions have been sent to the respondent with the respondent's licensing board copied on the correspondence. Case closure is to be requested during the Board's July 10, 2026, meeting.
26-0120(2)	This is a complaint regarding an evaluation that was part of a court proceeding. The Board office requested that the complainant provide the additional information from the court proceeding and that the respondent respond to the complaint. The respondent has responded to the complaint, which has been reviewed and considered by the Board investigator assigned to this complaint, and based on which a proposed stipulated consent agreement has been prepared and forwarded to the respondent.
26-0202	This is a complaint for misrepresentation and improper conduct as it relates to a podcast. Counsel for respondent has requested a response deadline extension, which Board counsel approved. A response to the complaint is pending.

26-0213	This is a complaint regarding alleged improper therapeutic process of a minor child. The Complaint was forwarded to the respondent, who, through counsel, provided a response. Based on the Board investigator's review of the complaint and response, dismissal is recommended and will be requested during the Board's July 10, 2026, meeting.
26-0402	This is a complaint regarding a delay in providing an evaluation report, to which the respondent has responded. The Board investigator requested additional information from the respondent, which the respondent provided to the extent they had the information requested. Based on the information provided, a request for dismissal is to be requested during the Board's July 10, 2026, meeting.
26-0420	This is a complaint regarding a court-ordered evaluation. The Board office has requested that the complainant provide the documentation required for court-ordered evaluations before the complaint can be further considered. The required documentation was not forthcoming. Thus, dismissal is required and will be requested.
26-0520	This complaint alleges a psychologist's failure to report. A response to the complaint has been received and considered by the Board investigator assigned to this case, who has provided a recommendation for a proposed stipulated consent agreement.
26-0603	This is a complaint related to a licensee's recent criminal conviction related to certain records. Based upon the licensee's response to the complaint and the Board investigator's review and recommendation, a proposed stipulated agreement will be prepared for the AG's review and service on the respondent.
26-0615	This is a complaint for malpractice/unprofessional conduct, which has been forwarded to the respondent for a response.
26-0616	This is a re-submitted complaint for unprofessional conduct that was previously dismissed, consideration of which is pending.

BEFORE THE STATE OF NEVADA

BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS

STATE OF NEVADA BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS, Petitioner, vs. MARK C. ANDERSON, License No. PY0489, Respondent.	Case No. 23-0918 **STIPULATED CONSENT AGREEMENT**

PARTIES

This Stipulated Consent Agreement ("Agreement") is entered into by Petitioner STATE OF NEVADA, BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS ("Board"), by and through its counsel, AARON D. FORD, Attorney General of the State of Nevada, and HARRY B. WARD, Deputy Attorney General, and Respondent MARK C. ANDERSON, License No. PY0489, ("Respondent"). At the relevant times mentioned in this Agreement, Respondent was licensed as a psychologist by the Board under License No. PY0489, and is, therefore, subject to the jurisdiction of the Board and the provisions of NRS Chapter 641 and NAC Chapter 641.

ALLEGED FACTS

1. At the relevant times mentioned in this Complaint, Respondent was licensed as a psychologist with the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners and currently holds license number PY0489 and, therefore, is subject to the jurisdiction of the Board and the provisions of NRS Chapter 641 and NAC Chapter 641.

2. It is asserted that Respondent is bound by the provisions set forth in the most recent edition of the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct* adopted by the American Psychological Association and adopted by reference and incorporated pursuant to NAC 641.250. It is also asserted that the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct* states that the Ethics Code applies to psychologists' activities that

are part of their scientific, educational, or professional roles as psychologists. It is further asserted that the areas covered include, but are not limited to, the clinical, counseling, and school practices of psychology; research; teaching; supervision of trainees; public service; and administration. The Code of Ethics applies to these activities across a variety of contexts, such as in-person, postal, telephone, Internet, and other electronic transmissions. Membership in the American Psychological Association ("APA") commits members to comply with the standards of the APA Ethics Code and to the rules and procedures used to enforce them.

It is asserted that in the process of making decisions regarding their professional behavior, psychologists must consider the Ethics Code in addition to applicable state laws and psychology board regulations. Pursuant to the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct*, if the Ethics Code establishes a higher standard of conduct than is required by state law, psychologists must meet the higher ethical standards.

3. It is asserted that Respondent has been practicing across state lines without proper licensure, pursuant to NRS 641.390. Except as authorized by the Psychology Interjurisdictional Compact enacted in NRS 641.227, a person shall not represent himself or herself as a psychologist within the meaning of this chapter or engage in the practice of psychology unless he or she is licensed under the provisions of this chapter or without being licensed in the sister state.

In his response to the consumer complaint in this case, Respondent admits having between 5-10 out of state interactions with patients per year. Respondent's admission indicates that he has been practicing across state lines without proper licensure, pursuant to NRS 641.390, and that he has probably had additional such violations over the years.

4. It is asserted that Respondent has entered into a dual relationship wherein Respondent provides professional services and sells dietary supplements to his clients. Pursuant to the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct*, 3.05 – Multiple Relationships, a multiple relationship occurs when a psychologist is in a professional role with a person and at the same time is in another role with the same person; or at the same

time is in a relationship with a person closely associated with or related to the person with whom the psychologist has the professional relationship; or promises to enter into another relationship in the future with the person or a person closely associated with or related to the person. A psychologist must refrain from entering into a multiple relationship if the multiple relationship could reasonably be expected to impair the psychologist's objectivity, competence, or effectiveness in performing his or her functions as a psychologist, or otherwise risks exploitation or harm to the person with whom the professional relationship exists. Multiple relationships that would reasonably be expected to cause impairment or risk exploitation or harm are considered unethical. By selling dietary supplements to his clients, the Respondent created a dual relationship by virtue of being an agent of the product and/or company with his clients. It is also asserted that Respondent exhibited a lack of understanding of the requirement to practice within the scope of his training by selling dietary supplements to clients. These actions are in violation of NAC 641.208 (Scope of Practice for a Psychologist).

5. It is asserted that Respondent has exceeded the Boundaries of Competence. Pursuant to the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct*, 2.01 – Boundaries of Competence, a Psychologist must provide services, teach, and conduct research in areas only within the boundaries of their competence, based on their education, training, supervised experience, consultation, study, or professional experience.

It is asserted that Psychologists must base their treatment plans on appropriate assessment, conducted at the outset of the therapeutic relationship, and which guides the treatment plan. It is alleged that Respondent continued to see Complainant for several years without getting a good assessment of her conditions and her needs, often referring her to others because he did not have a particular skill set and could not meet her needs, and that Respondent's actions were undertaken without an appropriate assessment and diagnosis of Complainant.. In his response to the consumer complaint in this case, Respondent states that there were no formal evaluations conducted with Complainant.

Respondent's statement indicates that his actions were at a great expense of time and money.

It is asserted that Respondent's actions reflected poor judgment or were simply self-serving (such as receiving cash for services), or both. It is alleged that Respondent does not set appropriate boundaries with clients, which kept Complainant engaged when Respondent should have recognized the concerns and referred Complainant to someone capable of managing the Complainant's care. In his response to the consumer complaint in this case, Respondent states that there were brief hugs at the end of some sessions that were designed to increase therapeutic rapport and that the Complainant stated to Respondent that the hugs increased feelings of safety. It is asserted that it is the responsibility of psychologists to set and maintain appropriate boundaries.

6. It is alleged that Respondent has violated the confidentiality of his patients. Pursuant to the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct*, 4.01 – Maintaining Confidentiality, Psychologists have a primary obligation and must take reasonable precautions to protect confidential information obtained through or stored in any medium, recognizing that the extent and limits of confidentiality that may be regulated by law or established by institutional rules or professional or scientific relationship.

It is asserted that Respondent is responsible for providing care in appropriate settings and establishing appropriate boundaries, and that Respondent provided care to the Complainant in violation of both obligations.

In his response to the consumer complaint in this case, Respondent states that, while he and the Complainant never met outside of the therapeutic context, they had one therapy session outside of his office during Covid, which occurred at Complainant's home, outside on the porch, with others in the house at the time. Respondent also states that he has a laptop for use for telehealth sessions. It is alleged that the appropriate boundaries and appropriate care settings were not established in this relationship, as the Respondent's home visit is both a boundary violation and a violation of confidentiality. It is asserted that having other people in Complainant's house during a therapy session, as well as in view of neighbors who could potentially observe the session, is not a situation in which privacy is maintained, and that health care providers who are trained in providing telehealth are able to establish parameters to maintain privacy.

7. It is asserted that Respondent has exploited his relationship with his patients. Pursuant to the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct*, 3.08 – Exploitative Relationships, Psychologists shall not exploit persons over whom they have supervisory, evaluative or other authority such as clients/patients, students, supervisees, research participants, and employees. It is alleged that the Respondent made money by selling a dietary supplement to his clients that was unhelpful or benign, and that Respondent did not respond to requests from the Complainant and her cardiologist about the safety of the supplement, Securus. They are examples of exploitation and possible harm not only the Complainant, but to the public at large, and are in violation of the APA Code of Ethics Principles C: Integrity.

8. It is asserted that Respondent has failed to comply with the HIPAA rules and regulations resulting in confidentiality issues within his practice. Pursuant to the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct*, 6.02 – Maintenance, Dissemination, and Disposal of Confidential Records, Psychologists shall maintain confidentiality in creating, storing, accessing, transferring, and disposing of records under their control, whether these are written, automated, or in any other medium. If confidential information concerning recipients of psychological services is entered into databases or systems of records available to persons whose access has not been consented to by the recipient, psychologists use coding or other techniques to avoid the inclusion of personal identifiers. Psychologists must also make plans in advance to facilitate the appropriate transfer and to protect the confidentiality of records and data in the event of psychologists' withdrawal from positions or practice.

It is alleged that Respondent did not take appropriate measures to protect his client treatment records and also failed to protect or keep appropriate business records. In his response, Respondent downplays the loss of treatment records from 2017-2021, and states that a psychologist is only a covered entity under HIPAA if that psychologist electronically transmitted health information in reference to transactions for which HHS has adopted standards. It is asserted that it is Respondent's responsibility to purchase and maintain a program to protect his computer and his client files, and that Respondent's response to the complaint indicates that he does not understand his responsibilities and requirements under the law in HIPAA. Confidentiality of records applies across a broader range of activities than electronic transmission of data and requires psychologists to be vigilant with regard to patient privacy in general. It is alleged that Respondent's response to the complaint describes public behavior that did not protect client privacy.

RESPONDENTS' REPLY TO ALLEGED VIOLATIONS

Without conceding any of the allegations contained herein, the Respondent submitted an informal response to the Board's informal inquiry and later filed an Answer and Affirmative Defenses in this matter.

It is agreed that this Agreement is for the sole purpose of resolving the allegations brought against the Respondent, that no admission of wrongdoing is intended by entering into this Agreement, and this Agreement shall not be admissible in any current or subsequent civil action against the Respondent. Additionally, this Agreement will constitute a disciplinary action against Respondent's license and is considered a disciplinary action against the Respondent pursuant to NRS Chapter 641.

Respondent understands that this Agreement is not a private reprimand; will be presented to the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners for approval during an open meeting; is a public document; and that the public records law may require the Board to make available for inspection this Agreement and related documents.

PROPOSED STIPULATED CONSENT AGREEMENT

1. In the interests of resolving this matter, Respondent voluntarily agrees to and enters into this Agreement.

2. Respondent agrees to the following:

a. To reimburse the Board for investigation costs and costs to prosecute the matter in an amount of One Thousand Five Hundred ($1,500.00) Dollars and agrees to pay this amount within six (6) months from the date of the Board's approval of this Agreement.

b. To take and pass the EBAS Essay Examination (Ethics and Boundaries Assessment Service) within nine (9) months from the date of the Board's approval of this Agreement with the results sent to the Board.

c. To take an additional eight (8) hours of Continuing Education, in additional to the required Continuing Education pursuant to NAC Chapter 641, within nine (9) months of the approval of this Agreement by the Board. The additional eight (8) hours of Continuing Education must be approved by the Board's Investigator in this matter.

d. Two (2) years of supervised practice by an approved supervisor by the investigator in this matter, with Quarterly reports to the investigator. Respondent may petition the Board after completion of one (1) year supervision if completion is successful and with a supporting recommendation by the investigator.

e. To abstain from taking on and providing any clinical supervision to any new supervisees until after the Respondent's two (2) years of supervised practice is completed.

f. A fine in the amount of One Thousand ($1,000) Dollars and to pay this amount within twelve (12) months from the date of the Board's approval of this Agreement.

g. Upon good cause shown and a request to the Board from Respondent, the Board may extend the time for completion of this requirement.

3. The Board may institute collection and recovery actions against Respondent, if Respondent fails to pay the costs assessed above within the time given for payment.

4. Respondent and the Board agree that by entering into this Agreement, the Board does not concede any defense or mitigation Respondent may have asserted herein, and that once this Agreement is approved and fully performed, the Board will close its file in this matter.

5. Respondent agrees and understands that if the costs assessed above are not paid within the time allowed, or if any requirements specified above are not timely

completed and there has been no extension granted by the Board, the Board may, at its option, rescind this Agreement and proceed with conducting a formal hearing on this matter before the Board. Further, recovery actions for the assessed cost reimbursement for the Board's costs may be instituted by the Board.

6. Respondent agrees and understands that by entering into this Agreement, Respondent is waiving his/her right to a hearing at which Respondent may present evidence in his/her defense and to be represented by counsel, to judicial review of any adverse decision by the Board, and to present a defense to the Board which has had no prior familiarity with the instant matter. The Board members who review this matter for approval of this Agreement may be the same members who ultimately hear the Board Staff's Complaint if this Agreement is either not approved by the Board or is not timely performed by Respondent.

STIPULATION IS NOT EVIDENCE

Neither this Agreement nor any statements made concerning this Agreement may be discussed or introduced into evidence at the hearing of the Complaint, if the Board Staff must ultimately put on a case based on the Complaint filed in this matter.

APPROVAL OF STIPULATED CONSENT DECREE

Once executed, this Agreement will be filed with the Board and will be put on the agenda for approval at its next Board meeting, which by Nevada law is a public meeting. Respondent and/or his/her representative(s) may attend the meeting in either location or via remote platform.

This Agreement is one of several matters scheduled at the same time as part of a regular meeting of the Board. When this matter is called, the counsel for the Board will recommend approval of this Agreement by the Board. Respondent acknowledges and agrees that the Board may approve this Agreement, reject it, or suggest different terms that must be communicated to Respondent and accepted or rejected by Respondent before any such amendment shall become effective.

WITHDRAWAL OF AGREEMENT

If the Board rejects this Agreement or suggests terms unacceptable to Respondent, Respondent may withdraw from this Agreement and Board Staff may pursue this matter by filing a Complaint and Notice of Hearing before the Board.

RELEASE

In consideration of execution of this Agreement, Respondent, for himself/herself, his/her heirs or successors, executors, administrators, and assigns, hereby release, remise, and forever discharge the State of Nevada, Board of Psychological Examiners, and each of its members, agents, and employees in their individual and representative capacities, from any and all manner of actions, causes of action, suits, debts, judgments, executions, claims, and demands whatsoever, known and unknown, in law or equity, that the Respondent ever had, now has, may have, or claim to have against any or all of the persons or entities named in this section, arising out of or by reason of the Board Staff's investigation, this disciplinary action, and all other matters relating thereto.

INDEMNIFICATION

Respondent hereby indemnifies and holds harmless the State of Nevada, Board of Psychological Examiners and each of its members, agents, and employees in their individual and representative capacities against any and all claims, suits, and actions brought against said persons and/or entities by reason of the Board Staff's investigation, this disciplinary action and all other matters relating thereto. Respondent hereby agrees to indemnify the State of Nevada, Board of Psychological Examiners any and all expenses, damages, and costs, including court costs and attorney fees, which may be sustained by the persons and/or entities named in this section as a result of said claims, suits, and actions.

IT IS SO STIPULATED:

MARK C. ANDERSON,
License No. PY0489

Dated: 4/23/26

MARK C. ANDERSON

HALL PRANGLE & SCHOONVELD, LLC
Counsels for Respondent

Dated: April 24, 2026

Marie Ellerton
HALL PRANGLE & SCHOONVELD, LLC
MARIE ELLERTON, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 4581
HALL PRANGLE & SCHOONVELD, LLC
1140 North Town Center Drive, Suite 350
Las Vegas, Nevada 89144

STATE OF NEVADA,
BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL
EXAMINERS

Dated: 4-27-2026

By: Sarah Restori
SARAH J. RESTORI
Executive Director

Approved as to form:

AARON D. FORD
Attorney General

By: HBWard
Harry B. Ward
Deputy Attorney General
100 North Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701
Telephone: (775) 684-1216
Attorney for Petitioner,
State of Nevada, Board of Psychological Examiners

BEFORE THE STATE OF NEVADA

BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS

STATE OF NEVADA BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS, Petitioner, vs. BLAKE H. TEARNAN, License No. PY 0142, Respondent.	Case No. 25-1231 **STIPULATED CONSENT AGREEMENT**

PARTIES

This Stipulated Consent Agreement ("Agreement") is entered into by Petitioner STATE OF NEVADA, BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS ("Board"), by and through its counsel, AARON D. FORD, Attorney General of the State of Nevada, and HARRY B. WARD, Deputy Attorney General, and Respondent BLAKE H. TEARNAN, License No. PY 0142 ("Respondent").

ALLEGED FACTS

1. Respondent is, and at all relevant times mentioned in the Complaint in this matter was, licensed as a psychologist with the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners as PY0142 and, therefore, subject to the jurisdiction of the Board and the provisions of NRS Chapter 641 and NAC Chapter 641.

2. Respondent is bound by the provisions set forth in the most recent edition of the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct* adopted by the American Psychological Association and adopted by reference and incorporated pursuant to NAC 641.250. The *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct* states that the Ethics Code applies to psychologists' activities that are part of their scientific, educational, or professional roles as psychologists, and establishes a higher standard of conduct than is required by state law, psychologists must meet the higher ethical standards.

3. Respondent is also required to comply with the provisions of NRS Chapter 641, NAC Chapter 641, and NRS Chapter 629.

4. During the investigation of consumer complaint that was filed against the Respondent regarding the release of records from in or around March 2024, the Respondent stated that he was unable to provide certain records that the Board investigator requested because they had been destroyed in or about the summer of 2025.

5. Respondent's 2025 destruction of records from March 2024 violates NRS 641.2291 and NRS 629.051, which require that a provider of health care retain health care records for five years. Respondent is also in violation of the APA Ethics Code: Standard 6.01 Documentation of Professional and Scientific Work and Maintenance of Records.

RESPONDENTS' REPLY TO ALLEGED VIOLATIONS

Without conceding any of the allegations contained herein, it is the information that the Respondent provided in the Response to the consumer complaint against him on which this Stipulated Consent Agreement is based, that being that the Respondent was unable to provide certain records the Board investigator requested in reference to that complaint because they had been prematurely destroyed.

CONSENT AGREEMENT AND TERMS

It is agreed that this Agreement is for the sole purpose of resolving the allegations brought against the Respondent, that no admission of wrongdoing is intended by entering into this Agreement, and this Agreement shall not be admissible in any current or subsequent civil action against the Respondent. Additionally, this Agreement will constitute a disciplinary action against Respondent's license and is considered a disciplinary action against the Respondent pursuant to NRS Chapter 641.

Respondent understands that this Agreement is not a private reprimand; will be presented to the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners for approval during an open meeting; is a public document; and that the public records law may require the Board to make available for inspection this Agreement and related documents.

The Terms of the Stiplated Consent Agreement are as follows:

1. In the interests of resolving this matter, Respondent voluntarily agrees to and enters into this Agreement.

2. Respondent agrees to the following:

a. To reimburse the Board for investigation costs and costs to prosecute the matter in an amount of Seven Hundred Fifty ($750) Dollars and agrees to pay this amount within six (6) months from the date of the Board's approval of this Agreement.

b. To take an additional six (6) hours of Continuing Education, in addition to the required Continuing Education pursuant to NAC Chapter 641, within nine (9) months of the approval of this Agreement by the Board. The additional six (6) hours of Continuing Education must concern the maintenance of health care records and must be approved by the Board's Investigator in this matter.

c. Upon good cause shown and a request to the Board from Respondent, the Board may extend the time for completion of this requirement.

3. The Board may institute collection and recovery actions against Respondent, if Respondent fails to pay the costs assessed above within the time given for payment.

4. Respondent and the Board agree that by entering into this Agreement, the Board does not concede any defense or mitigation Respondent may have asserted herein, and that once this Agreement is approved and fully performed, the Board will close its file in this matter.

5. Respondent agrees and understands that if the costs assessed above are not paid within the time allowed, or if any requirements specified above are not timely completed and there has been no extension granted by the Board, the Board may, at its option, rescind this Agreement and proceed with conducting a formal hearing on this matter before the Board. Further, recovery actions for the assessed cost reimbursement for the Board's costs may be instituted by the Board.

6. Respondent agrees and understands that by entering into this Agreement, the Respondent is waiving their right to a hearing at which Respondent may present evidence in his/her defense and to be represented by counsel, to judicial review of any adverse

decision by the Board, and to present a defense to the Board which has had no prior familiarity with the instant matter. The Board members who review this matter for approval of this Agreement may be the same members who ultimately hear the Board Staff's Complaint if this Agreement is either not approved by the Board or is not timely performed by Respondent.

STIPULATION IS NOT EVIDENCE

Neither this Agreement nor any statements made concerning this Agreement may be discussed or introduced into evidence at the hearing of the Complaint, if the Board Staff must ultimately put on a case based on the Complaint filed in this matter.

APPROVAL OF STIPULATED CONSENT DECREE

Once executed, this Agreement will be filed with the Board and will be put on the agenda for approval at its next Board meeting, which by Nevada law is a public meeting. Respondent and/or his/her representative(s) may attend the meeting in either location or via remote platform.

This Agreement is one of several matters scheduled at the same time as part of a regular meeting of the Board. When this matter is called, the counsel for the Board will recommend approval of this Agreement by the Board. Respondent acknowledges and agrees that the Board may approve this Agreement, reject it, or suggest different terms that must be communicated to Respondent and accepted or rejected by Respondent before any such amendment shall become effective.

WITHDRAWAL OF AGREEMENT

If the Board rejects this Agreement or suggests terms unacceptable to Respondent, Respondent may withdraw from this Agreement and Board Staff may pursue this matter by filing a Complaint and Notice of Hearing before the Board.

RELEASE

In consideration of execution of this Agreement, Respondent, for himself/herself, his/her heirs or successors, executors, administrators, and assigns, hereby release, remise, and forever discharge the State of Nevada, Board of Psychological Examiners, and each of its members, agents, and employees in their individual and representative capacities, from any and all manner of actions, causes of action, suits, debts, judgments, executions, claims, and demands whatsoever, known and unknown, in law or equity, that the Respondent ever had, now has, may have, or claim to have against any or all of the persons or entities named in this section, arising out of or by reason of the Board Staff's investigation, this disciplinary action, and all other matters relating thereto.

INDEMNIFICATION

Respondent hereby indemnifies and holds harmless the State of Nevada, Board of Psychological Examiners and each of its members, agents, and employees in their individual and representative capacities against any and all claims, suits, and actions brought against said persons and/or entities by reason of the Board Staff's investigation, this disciplinary action and all other matters relating thereto. Respondent hereby agrees to indemnify the State of Nevada, Board of Psychological Examiners any and all expenses, damages, and costs, including court costs and attorney fees, which may be sustained by the persons and/or entities named in this section as a result of said claims, suits, and actions.

IT IS SO STIPULATED:

BLAKE H. TEARNAN,
License No. PY0142

Dated: 5/8/2026

BLAKE H. TEARNAN

STATE OF NEVADA,
BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL
EXAMINERS

Dated: 5-12-2026

By: Sarah Restori
SARAH J. RESTORI, Executive Director

Approved as to form:

AARON D. FORD
Attorney General

By: ______________________________
Harry B. Ward
Deputy Attorney General
100 North Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701
Telephone: (775) 684-1216
Attorney for Petitioner,
State of Nevada, Board of Psychological Examiners

Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners
Board Meeting Staff Report

DATE: July 10, 2026

ITEM:

11 - (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on the Board's Residency Requirements for Applicants from Non-APA Accredited Doctoral Programs.

SUMMARY:

The purpose of the Board's Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Panel and Committee is to evaluate whether applicants from non-APA accredited doctoral programs meet substantial equivalency as it concerns the Board's educational requirement stated NAC 641.062. Those requirements include "At least 1 year of full-time residence at the institution granting the doctoral degree" (NAC 641.062(3)(d)), and apply to non-APA accredited applicants who apply for provisional licensure as a Psychological Assistant or Psychological Intern (NAC 641.151 and NAC 641.1515), as well as those who apply for registration as a Psychological Trainee (NAC 641.1516).

Doctoral education models have evolved over time, with some programs utilizing traditional campus-based residency models, and others using hybrid, blended, or low residency formats. The ATEAM has previously approved applicants from non-APA accredited programs that utilize blended residency models when the residency, coursework, and other education requirements were determined to be substantially equivalent to NAC 641.062's requirements. As non-APA accredited programs that require a residency have changed and evolved, the ATEAM members have raised questions about whether certain blended residency models can be considered substantially equivalent to NAC 641.062(3)(d)'s residency requirements. As a result, the ATEAM has requested that the Board: (1) revisit and review the issue of blended residency models as they relate to applicants from non-APA accredited doctoral programs and the Board's residency requirement; (2) discuss whether the current approach remains appropriate; and (3) if not, provide additional guidance regarding the standard that should be applied moving forward.

Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners
Board Meeting Staff Report

DATE: July 10, 2026

ITEM:

13 - (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action for a Board Staff Vacation Request approval.

SUMMARY:

This Board's Employment Policy states that Board staff

- accrues 1.25 days of vacation per month
- cannot accrue more than 15 days of vacation per fiscal year, and
- must use all vacation time on or before September 1 that follows the fiscal year or forfeit any vacation time not used.

A Board staff member has a vacation scheduled in September 2026, which would require her to use between 10 and 12 vacation days. At the end of June 2026, this Board staff member had 13 unused accrued vacation days, but will be unable to use them prior to September 1, 2026. The request is for the Board's approval for the Board staff member to use between 10 and 12 of those vacation days accrued during FY2026 for her vacation scheduled in September 2026.

Moreover, the Board's Employment Policy requires Board approval for requests for vacation time of five (5) days or more. Because the scheduled vacation at issue is for 10 or 11 business days, Board staff is requesting the board's approval for her to take that vacation time.