

**LEGISLATIVE REVIEW OF ADOPTED REGULATIONS AS REQUIRED BY
NRS 233B.066**

LCB FILE NO. R025-14

The following statement is submitted for adopted amendments to Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) Chapter 641B.

1. A clear and concise explanation of the need for the adopted regulation.

The need for the proposed regulation is to protect the public health, safety and welfare by ensuring that only qualified and competent social workers are licensed in the State.

2. A description of how public comment was solicited, a summary of public response and an explanation of how other interested persons may obtain a copy of the summary.

a. How public comment was solicited:

A copy of the proposed regulation, notice of workshop to solicit comments on the proposed regulation, minutes from the public workshop, notice of input from Nevada small businesses, small business impact statement, notice of hearing and notice of intent were posted on the Board of Examiners for Social Workers (Board) website, www.socwork.nv.gov, the State's Public Notice Website <http://notice.nv.gov>, and the LCB's regulation notification website, <http://www.leg.state.nv.us>. Notice of workshop to solicit public comment were sent by U.S. mail to persons who were known to have an interest in the regulations contained in NAC 641B, pertaining to the practice of social workers in the State.

The Board also mailed notifications to solicit public comments on the proposed regulation to the following State county libraries for posting as well as other agencies who regularly post notifications of meetings for the Board:

STATE COUNTY LIBRARIES

Lander County Library
625 S. Broad Street
Battle Mountain, NV 89820

Douglas County Library
PO Box 337
1625 Library Lane
Minden, NV 89423

Esmeralda County Library
P.O. Box 430
Goldfield, NV 89013

Mineral County Library
110 1st Street
P.O. Box 1390
Hawthorne, NV 89415

White Pine County Library
Courthouse Plaza
950 Campton Street
Ely, NV 89301

Pahrump Library District
701 East Street
Pahrump, NV 89041

Lyon County Library
20 Nevin Way
Yerington, NV 89447

Pershing County Library
1125 Central Avenue
PO Box 781
Lovelock, NV 89419

Washoe County Library
301 S. Center Street
P.O. Box 2151
Reno, NV 89501

Henderson Public Library
280 S. Water Street
Henderson, NV 89105

Churchill County Library
553 South Main Street
Fallon, NV 89406

Elko-Lander Counties Library
720 Court Street
Elko, NV 89801

Humboldt County Library
85 East 5th Street
Winnemucca, NV 89445

Mineral County Library
110 1ST Street
PO Box 1390

Clark Co. District Library
833 Las Vegas Blvd.
No. Las Vegas, NV 89101

Eureka County Library
P.O. Box 293
10190 Monroe Street
Eureka, NV 89316

Lincoln County Library
63 Main Street
P.O. Box 330
Pioche, NV 89043

Carson City Library
900 N. Roop Street
Carson City, NV 89701

Tonopah Public Library
167 S. Central Street
P.O. Box 449
Tonopah, NV 89049

Nevada State Library
100 Stewart Street
Carson City, NV 89701

AGENCIES WHO REGULARLY POST NOTIFICATIONS OF MEETINGS FOR THE BOARD

Mojave Adult, Child and Family Services
4000 E. Charleston Blvd.
Las Vegas, Nevada

Mojave Adult, Child and Family Services
745 W. Moana Lane,
Reno, Nevada

Washoe County Social Services
350 S. Center Street
Reno, Nevada

Clark County Social Services
1600 Pinto Lane
Las Vegas, Nevada

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
School of Social Work
Las Vegas, Nevada

University of Nevada, Reno
School of Social Work
Anasari Business Building
Reno, Nevada

b. A summary of public response:

A summary of public comments from the public workshops conducted on May 16, 2014 are contained in the minutes from each public workshop which have been posted onto the Board's website, www.socwork.nv.gov, and are attached hereto (Attachment A). Overall, public comments were requests for clarification pertaining to specific proposed regulation changes.

c. An explanation of how other interested persons may obtain a copy of the summary.

As noted in 2-b above, the minutes from the May 16, 2014 public workshop have been posted onto the Board's website, www.socwork.nv.gov. Interested individuals may also submit a written request to the Board's office for a copy of the minutes/summary.

3. The number of persons who:

a. Attended each public workshop, the public hearing and notification to act upon a regulation and provided public comment:

May 16, 2014, Public Workshop to Solicit Comments, Las Vegas:

2 Board members
2 Board staff
14 Public attendees
18 Total

May 16, 2014, Public Workshop to Solicit Comments, Reno

3 Board members
1 Board staff
3 Public attendees
7 Total

June 20, 2014, Hearing and Notification to Act Upon a Regulation

4 Board members (2 in Reno and 2 in Las Vegas, via videoconference)
2 Board staff (Reno)
1 Public attendee, (Las Vegas) commenting on an unrelated matter
7 Total

b. Testified at each hearing:

May 16, 2014, Public Workshop to Solicit Comments, Las Vegas: 9 public participants offered testimony.

May 16, 2014, Public Workshop to Solicit Comments, Reno: 3 public participants offered testimony.

June 20, 2014, Hearing and Notification to Act Upon a Regulation: 0 public participants offered testimony.

c. Submitted written comments to the Board:

The Board received two (2) written comments pertaining to the proposed increase in fees. Both comments were in response to the Board's solicitation to small business regarding the fiscal impact pertaining to proposed fee increase. Since both responses were received after the deadline to receive comments from small business, the respondents' comments were included as written public comment. Both respondents indicated that the proposed fee increase would not impact their small business, as noted below:

Tanitsha Bridgers, LCSW, Owner, Mobile Mental Health Support Services, comments: "The proposed increase will not pose a direct economic burden on my organization, however, I wonder where the extra funds will be going..."

Patrick R. Scott, LCSW, Owner, Clinical Director, Heads Up Guidance and Wellness Centers of Nevada, comments (on the impact of the proposed increase in fees): "None at all".

4. A list of names and contact information, including telephone number, business address, business telephone number, electronic mail address, and name of entity or organization represented, for each person identified above in number 3, as provided to the agency.

Please find the requested information in Attachment B.

5. A description of how comment was solicited from affected businesses, a summary of their response, and an explanation of how other interested persons may obtain a copy of the summary.

Small business fitting the definition of NRS 233B.0382 who were known by the Board to hire social workers received a written solicitation of input pertaining to possible economic impact pertaining to the proposed fee increase and whether this proposal presented a "direct and significant economic burden" to them. The written solicitation included a copy of the current and proposed fee increase and a five (5) question survey pertaining to how the proposed regulation may create an economic burden to the small business owner. Written responses were to be mailed to the Board office by April 28, 2014. By April 30, 2014, the Board did not receive any responses either by mail or via email. As noted in number 3b, above, two (2) written comments pertaining to the Board's request from small business were received after April 30, 2014 and were added to public comment. Both respondents indicated that the proposed fee increase would not negatively impact their business. A summary of these responses may be obtained by submitting a written request for a copy of the workshop minutes.

6. If the regulation was adopted without changing any part of the proposed regulation, a summary of the reason for adopting the regulation without change.

The regulation was adopted by the Board on June 20, 2014. As noted in the summary of the public comments received during both May 16, 2014 workshops, the received public comments either requested clarification from Board members and staff regarding the proposed changes or were comments which did not relate to the proposed regulations. It is noted that the Board did not receive any additional public comment related to the regulation changes during the June 20, 2014 hearing and notification of intent to adopt a regulation. Following review and discussion by the Board of all public comments, it was determined that the proposed regulations did not appear to have a negative impact on the practice of social work in the State and accordingly, approved to adopt the regulations as written in LCB File No. R025-14.

7. The estimated economic effect of the adopted regulation on the business which it is to regulate and on the public. These must be stated separately, and each case must include:

a. Both adverse and beneficial effects

The Board does not directly regulate businesses only individuals who are licensed by the Board. The small business impact statement indicates that the increase in fees would not negatively impact these businesses. The Board also solicited comments from agencies (not fitting the definition of small businesses) who routinely pay the licensing fees for social workers employed by the agency. The Board did not receive any inquiries or comments. Furthermore, the Board did not receive any inquiries or comments from public and private employers of social workers regarding any of the proposed regulations. The Board therefore assumes that there does not appear to be an adverse impact of the regulation change upon businesses, licensees or the public.

The benefits of the proposed regulation promote ethical and professional social work practice which should be of benefit to the public and the agencies which serve the public.

b. Both immediate and long-term effects.

See number 5-a above.

8. The estimated cost to the agency for enforcement of the adopted regulation.

There is no additional cost to the Board for the enforcement of this regulation.

9. A description of any regulations of other state or government agencies which the proposed regulation overlaps or duplicates and a statement explaining why the duplication or overlapping is necessary. If the regulation overlaps or duplicates a federal regulations, the name of the regulating federal agency.

There are no other state or government agency regulations that the proposed regulation duplicates.

10. If the regulation includes provisions that are more stringent than a federal regulation which regulates the same activity, a summary of such provisions.

There are no federal regulations that apply.

11. If the regulation provides a new fee or increase an existing fee, the total annual amount the agency expects to collect and the manner in which the money will be used.

The anticipated revenue received by the proposed increase in fees is approximately \$39,500.00. The fees would be applied towards computers and technological support, telephone and copier upgrades and office space expansion.

ATTACHMENT A
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS
MAY 16, 2014 PUBLIC WORKSHOP, LAS VEGAS

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC WORKSHOP TO SOLICIT COMMENTS
PERTAINING TO REVISED PROPOSED REGULATIONS
Las Vegas, Nevada

LCB FILE NO. R025-14

May 16, 2014

The Public Workshop to Solicit Comments Pertaining to Revised Proposed Regulations (Public Workshop) of the Board of Examiners for Social Workers (Board), LCB File Number R025-14, was called to order by Kim Frakes, Board Executive Director, at 10:01 a.m. The Public Workshop was conducted at Mojave Adult, Child and Family Services, 4000 E. Charleston Blvd., Suite B-230, Las Vegas, Nevada. Ms. Frakes noted that the Public Workshop had been properly noticed. She clarified that the purpose of the Public Workshop was to solicit comments from the public pertaining to the Board's proposed revised regulations contained in LCB File No. R025-14. Ms. Frakes indicated that a public hearing pertaining to the adoption of these regulations would be conducted on June 20, 2014 where the solicited public comments would be reviewed and discussion by the Board prior to making a determination on whether to move forward in officially adopting the proposed regulations. Ms. Frakes initiated roll call with the following Board members, Board staff and participants (arriving and departing at various times) present:

Members Present:

Annie Wilson, LSW, Board Member
C.J. Yao, LCSW, Board Member

Staff Present:

Kim Frakes, LCSW, Executive Director
Gina Diluzio, Certified Court Reporter, Sunshine Litigation Services

Public Attendees:

Sylvia Naseath, LCSW
Phyllis Montavon, LSW
Riley Kline, LCSW
Pamela Kurez
Valerie Tines-Braggs, LCSW
Jacqueline Austin, LSW
Luke Hatch, LCSW
Adam Crawford
Yancy Whipple
Mark Hutcherson, LCSW

Gary Waters, LCSW
Jason Engle, LSW
Randy Reinoso, LSW
Martha Camero, LSW

INTRODUCTION – OPEN WORKSHOP

Ms. Frakes reiterated that that purpose of the Public Workshop (workshop) was to receive public comments pertaining to proposed additions, amendments, and/or repeal of regulations pertaining to Chapter 641B of the Nevada Administrative Code. She further added that the purpose of the workshop was to solicit comments from interested parties on the general topics contained in the “Notice of Workshop to Solicit Comments on Proposed Regulations” (Notice). The Notice was mailed to: all individuals licensed by the Board, all persons on the Board’s mailing list, all county libraries, and the Nevada State Library. The Notice had also been electronically posted to: the Board’s website, the Legislative website and the State’s Public Notice website.

The general topics to be addressed during the public workshop as follows (Agenda Item 2A):

Item 1 When an applicant is required to pass an examination under an open application.

Item 2 Requirements for license restoration applicants.

Item 3 Increase in fees allowable under NRS 641B.300.

Item 4 Licensure by endorsement for out-of-state applicants.

Item 5 Accrued internship hours not leading directly to licensure.

Item 6 Conditions leading to Board withdrawal of internship approval.

Item 7 Board acceptance of postgraduate hours from another state.

Item 8 Changes for Board approved supervisors of interns, including reports.

Item 9 Conditions under which licensees are required to self-report to the Board.

Item 10 Expanding the applicability of unprofessional conduct.

PUBLIC COMMENT (Agenda Item 3)

Ms. Frakes opened the floor to public comment pertaining to the general topics contained in the proposed regulation.

Mark Hutcherson, LCSW

Mr. Hutcherson raised a question pertaining to the proposed increase in license fees and the rationale for the proposed fee increases. Ms. Frakes directed Mr. Hutcherson to the small business impact statement, which was part of the distributed workshop

informational documentation. Mr. Hutcherson inquired about Item 6, pertaining to conditions leading to Board withdrawal of internship approval. Ms. Frakes directed Mr. Hutcherson to pages 12 and 13 of the proposed regulations, LCB File No. R025-14. Ms. Frakes clarified these conditions by reviewing the proposed conditions.

Luke Hatch, LCSW

Mr. Hatch indicated that his business is in Hiko, Nevada. His agency, located in rural Nevada, is an experiential-based treatment program for adolescents. The agency is located on a working cattle ranch. Because he is one of the few social workers in this area, he finds himself receiving a lot of clients, including referrals from Lincoln County drug court. This can be overwhelming at times. Mr. Hatch described his adolescent residential treatment program and difficulty he has experienced in meeting the Board's expectations pertaining to approval of internship agencies. Mr. Hatch requested the Board to consider some "leeway" for these rural agencies especially in providing therapy to diverse populations. He indicated that his agency may not be able to demonstrate the provision of therapy to a diverse population. He indicated that the hiring of a clinical social work intern would prove more beneficial than hiring a fully licensed therapist. Mr. Hatch indicated his interest in attending the Board's next scheduled Intern Supervisor Training.

Sylvia Naseath, LCSW

Ms. Naseath inquired about electronic supervision. She indicated that Nevada Medicaid has already approved Skype and telephone contact for therapy and supervision on a limited basis. Ms. Frakes indicated that although this particular topic was not included in the general topics to be addressed during this meeting, this could be a possible topic of discussion at a future Board meeting.

Yancy Whipple, LCSW

Ms. Whipple indicated her support of Mr. Hatch's comments pertaining to the Board's review and considerations of rural internship program site approval. She indicated that the Board's standards for approving internship agency site approval may be difficult for rural agencies to meet and echoed Mr. Hatch's sentiments for Board considering in making decisions pertaining to approving rural programs and agencies.

Adam Crawford

Mr. Crawford indicated that he had conducted his postgraduate supervision in Utah but is not licensed as a clinical social worker there. The economy prompted him to relocate to Nevada. Mr. Crawford inquiries pertained to licensure via endorsement of his postgraduate supervised hours in Utah. Mr. Crawford wanted to know if there were any informational workshops pertaining to licensure via endorsement. Ms. Frakes indicated that periodically in the past, both UNLV and UNR requested speakers from either the Board or Board office to present on licensure via endorsement. She added that this request has not occurred over the past few years, however. Aside from this, the Board does not provide ongoing workshops. Mr. Crawford requested the Board consider providing such workshops. Mr. Crawford added that more information pertaining to postgraduate supervision towards clinical licensure on the Board's website would also be

helpful. C.J. Yao indicated that presently, Mr. Crawford could contact the Board should he have any further questions pertaining to the internship (postgraduate supervision) process. Ms. Frakes inquired whether internship related questions posed as “Frequently Asked Questions” on the website may be considered helpful. Mr. Crawford indicated that such postings on the Board’s website would be helpful.

Jacqueline Austin

Ms. Austin’s inquiries and comments pertained to her accrued postgraduate supervised hours obtained in Ohio. Although she had conducted her postgraduate supervised hours in Ohio, she was not licensed there. Ms. Austin moved to Nevada and was subsequently licensed as an LSW. Ms. Frakes acknowledged that reviewing the present regulations for endorsement of postgraduate supervised hours may be confusing. She added that one of the proposed regulations attempts to streamline endorsement for out-of-state individuals who have been licensed ten (10) years or more. Ms. Frakes further added that without the benefit of having access to Ms. Austin’s file, it would be difficult to adequately address her concerns. Ms. Frakes suggested that Ms. Austin contact the Board office next week and a staff member could review her file and attempt to address her concerns. Ms. Frakes asked Ms. Austin if she happened to have any additional questions pertaining to the general topics noted on the workshop agenda. Ms. Austin indicated that she did not.

Riley Kline

Mr. Kline’s inquiries pertained to Item 5, accrued internship hours not leading directly to licensure. Ms. Frakes clarified the rationale for this proposed regulation. Following clarification, Mr. Kline indicated that he did not have any additional questions pertaining to this regulation. Mr. Kline then inquired about the process pertaining to the Board’s approval of new internship sites. He indicated that he would like to see this process become more expedient. Ms. Frakes acknowledged his frustration and indicated that the Board is attempting to address this matter, including the possibility of hiring additional staff. She added that any increase in Board office staffing may require fee increases in order to pay for the additional staffing.

Mark Hutcherson

Mr. Hutcherson recalled a situation where he was supervising an intern who required an extended medical leave of absence. (At this point, a break was taken from around 10:45 a.m. until 11:00 a.m.) Following the break, Mr. Hutcherson resumed his comments. Returning to his example, Mr. Hutcherson indicated that he would like to see the Board consider some considerations pertaining to item 5, under the conditions of medical hardship. Ms. Frakes asked if Mr. Hutcherson could offer an alternative period of time in lieu of the three (3) years as noted in the proposed regulation. Mr. Hutcherson indicated that he did not but requested considerations as it pertained to certain situations, such as medical circumstances.

Mr. Hutcherson inquired about item 9, pertaining to conditions under which licensees are required to self-report to the Board. Ms. Frakes pointed out where the proposed regulation change was located on LCB File No. R025-14 and provided an overview of the proposed regulation.

Phyllis Montavon

Ms. Montavon indicated that she is in a Board approved internship program and experiences test anxiety. Ms. Montavon inquiries pertained to item 5, accrued internship hours not leading directly to licensure. Ms. Montavon requested clarification pertaining to her present situation. Because she had not successfully taken and passed the clinical examination and her internship hours were completed, she was required to open a new internship program file. Ms. Montavon wanted to know how long her previously accrued internship hours would be eligible to be applied towards her new internship hours following the successful taking and passing of the clinical examination. Ms. Montavon then inquired about how often she would be allowed to take her clinical examination. Ms. Frakes directed Ms. Montavon to review the letter that the Board sent her pertaining to her examination. The letter would specify when Ms. Montavon was eligible to retake the examination as well as the time frame she was approved by the Board to take the examination. She further advised Ms. Montavon that if she was able to independently verify from a mental health professional (that she is not already affiliated with through her agency or personally) that she has a diagnosable anxiety disorder, she could request special accommodations through ASWB (pursuant to the mental health professional's documentation) on the date of the examination. Ms. Frakes further suggested that Ms. Montavon contact the Board office if she happened to have any further inquiries pertaining to her internship and/or clinical examination.

Mark Hutcherson

Mr. Hutcherson requested clarification pertaining to item 1, and the Board's current schedule of taking a licensing examination under an open application. Ms. Frakes clarified the Board's schedule of taking a licensing examination under an open application. Mr. Hutcherson inquired whether there was a total cap on the number of times an applicant could take the licensing examination. Ms. Frakes indicated that overall, the Board did not limit the total number of times an applicant could take a licensing examination. The limitation proposed in item 1 pertained to the number of times an applicant could take a licensing examination under his/her current open application before being required to reapply.

Riley Kline

Mr. Kline requested clarification pertaining to Ms. Montavon's accrued hours in her previous internship program and requested clarification on how long the Board would consider accepting these previously accrued hours towards her new internship program. Ms. Frakes indicated that the hours accrued in the previous internship would be considered towards application in her new internship for three (3) years following the closure of the previous program. Mr. Hutcherson requested clarification on when this would take effect and its applicability towards Ms. Montavon's situation. Ms. Frakes stated that it appears that this particular regulation would take effect on January 1, 2015.

Phyllis Montavon

Ms. Montavon requested clarification the number of times she would be eligible to take the clinical examination in her new internship programs. Ms. Frakes indicated that since

Ms. Montavon had questions specific to her internship, it would be best if she contacted the Board and Board staff could review her file with her during the telephone call.

Valerie Tines-Braggs

Ms. Tines-Braggs inquiries pertained to item 6, conditions leading to Board withdrawal of an internship program. Her question pertained to the minimum number of hours required in order to properly sustain an internship. Ms. Frakes clarified the minimum number of hours required weekly and quarterly and the number of weeks in each quarter. She further provided a rationale for the Board proposing the regulations in this section.

A break was taken from about 11:30 a.m. until 11:45 a.m. The workshop resumed at 11:46 a.m. The remaining participants were: Kim Frakes, C.J. Yao, Annie Wilson, Randy Reinoso and Gina Diluzio. No further comments were received from 11:46 a.m. until 1:00 p.m. Ms. Frakes indicated at 1:00 p.m. that the Public Workshop pertaining to the revised proposed regulations contained in LCB File Number R025-14 was officially concluded.

ATTACHMENT A
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS
MAY 16, 2014 PUBLIC WORKSHOP, RENO

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC WORKSHOP TO SOLICIT COMMENTS
PERTAINING TO REVISED PROPOSED REGULATIONS
Reno, Nevada

LCB FILE NO. R025-14

May 16, 2014

The Public Workshop to Solicit Comments Pertaining to Revised Proposed Regulations (Public Workshop) of the Board of Examiners for Social Workers (Board), LCB File Number R025-14, was called to order by Sandy Lowery, Board President and workshop Chair, at 10:00 a.m. The Public Workshop was conducted at Mojave Adult, Child and Family Services, 745 West Moana Lane, Suite 100, Reno, Nevada. President Lowery noted that the Public Workshop had been properly noticed. Roll call was initiated by President Lowery, with the following Board members, Board staff and participants (arriving and departing at various times) present:

Members Present:

Sandy Lowery, LCSW, Board President
Rod Smith, Board Secretary/Treasurer
James Bertone, LCSW, Board Vice President

Staff Present

Lesley A. Clarkson, Certified Court Reporter, Sunshine Litigation Services

Public Attendees

Mark Arnold, LCSW
Erin Snell, LCSW
Betsy Crumrine, LCSW

INTRODUCTION – OPEN WORKSHOP

President Sandy Lowery presented this Public Workshop agenda item. President Lowery indicated that purpose of the Public Workshop (workshop) was to receive public comments pertaining to proposed additions, amendments, and/or repeal of regulations pertaining to Chapter 641B of the Nevada Administrative Code. She further added that the purpose of the workshop was to solicit comments from interested parties on the general topics contained in the “Notice of Workshop to Solicit Comments on Proposed Regulations” (Notice). The Notice was mailed to: all individuals licensed by the Board, all persons on the Board’s mailing list, all county libraries, and the Nevada State Library. The Notice had also been electronically posted to: the Board’s website, the Legislative website and the State’s Public Notice website.

President Lowery summarized the topics to be addressed during the public workshop as follows (Agenda Item 2A):

Item 1 When an applicant is required to pass an examination under an open application.

Item 2 Requirements for license restoration applicants.

Item 3 Increase in fees allowable under NRS 641B.300.

Item 4 Licensure by endorsement for out-of-state applicants.

Item 5 Accrued internship hours not leading directly to licensure.

Item 6 Conditions leading to Board withdrawal of internship approval.

Item 7 Board acceptance of postgraduate hours from another state.

Item 8 Changes for Board approved supervisors of interns, including reports.

Item 9 Conditions under which licensees are required to self-report to the Board.

Item 10 Expanding the applicability of unprofessional conduct.

PUBLIC COMMENT (Agenda Item 3)

President Lowery opened the floor to public comment pertaining to the general topics contained in the proposed regulation.

Mark Arnold, LCSW

Mr. Arnold raised a question pertaining to accrued internship hours not leading directly to licensure. His question pertained to how stringent would Board requirements be in requesting an extension. President Lowery indicated that a length of an extension for an internship is addressed on a case by case basis. She added that in the course of providing quarterly report statements to each intern and supervisor, the Board provides ample notification to both parties if it appears that an internship will not be completed in the required time.

Mr. Arnold also raised a question pertaining to out-of-state clinical social worker applicants requesting endorsement. Mr. Arnold cited as an example, clinical social worker applicants from California. President Lowery explained the requirement, pursuant to NAC 641B, of the clinical social work applicant in establishing substantial equivalency of their postgraduate work experience and supervision. She added that this occurs on a case by case basis and that California's postgraduate supervised experience for clinical social work licensure standards has proven to be inconsistent. This can make it difficult for some individuals from California in applying for endorsement in Nevada as some California applicants present with postgraduate supervised experiences that would

be deemed substantially equivalent to Nevada's postgraduate experiences, while other applicants from California do not.

Erin Snell, LCSW

Ms. Snell indicated that she was initially there to view the Public Workshop process. She requested a recap of the topics being covered during the public workshop. President Lowery provided a recap to Ms. Snell (see Agenda Item 2A). Ms. Snell inquired regarding the regulation change process following the workshop. President Lowery reviewed the process and indicated that the most immediate next step would be the public hearing pertaining to the intent of adopting the regulations.

Betsy Crumrine, LCSW

Ms. Crumrine expressed concerns pertaining to the increase in license fees. Ms. Crumrine, who is employed by the State of Nevada (State), Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) as a Rural Regional Manager, employs social workers. She indicated that the State's pay scale for child welfare workers at DCFS is significantly less than comparable child welfare agencies throughout the State.

Ms. Crumrine viewed the increase as being a significant financial hardship for her employees. President Lowery clarified that the increase in license fees for licensed social workers (LSW) would be \$25.00 annually. The remaining increases pertained to licensees whose licenses have expired (i.e. failed to renew their license one month following their renewal deadline). Ms. Crumrine inquired about the rationale for the fee increases. President Lowery respond that the Board has not had an increase in fees since 2009. The costs of conducting business, including related Board costs, have continued to increase. President Lowery indicated that the Board is self-funded through licensing fees and do not draw from the State's general fund. In order to appropriately address the increasing operating costs, the regulation propose increases where presently allowable under NRS 641B.300.

Ms. Crumrine inquired about the proposed regulation pertaining to an applicant being required to take and pass the licensing examination within one (1) year following examination approval. President Lowery provided clarification for this proposed regulation. It had been brought to the Board's attention that a number of applicants had continued to request an extension in keeping their application open in order to take and pass the examination. This resulted in a number of applications being extended several months or in some instances, several years. The continued open applications proved to burden the Board's resources. The proposed regulation provides clarification to applicants that they will be required to take and pass their examination one (1) year following examination approval or reapply.

Ms. Crumrine inquired about the proposed regulation pertaining to fingerprinting. President Lowery clarified that this pertained to individuals who are restoring an expired license. Upon restoration of an expired license, the Board retroactively licenses the individual from the date of their last renewal. Since a license may expire for various reasons, including possible criminal or civil offenses, fingerprinting the restoring individual is deemed a public protection measure. Ms. Crumrine requested the Board to

consider a 60-day grace period before fingerprints would be required as part of the restoration process.

Ms. Crumrine inquired about certain proposed regulation language changes from “will” to “may”. President Lowery and Vice President Bertone indicated that the proposed regulation language changes from “will” to “may” throughout portions of the proposed regulation changes were deemed housekeeping items.

Ms. Crumrine inquired about proposed regulation changes pertaining to internships. President Lowery and Vice President Bertone clarified conditions when additional internship sites may be required as part of an internship program.

Ms. Crumrine inquired about proposed regulations pertaining to supervisors of interns, including reports. President Lowery clarified that internship quarterly reports have specified due dates which are well known to both the intern and supervisors. She added that the proposed language pertaining to the rejection of a report that was not submitted timely indicates that a report “may” be rejected, not “will”. Concessions are made on a case by case basis. The proposed regulation affords clarification that reports may be rejected in instances where the reports are consistently late, despite warnings from the Board to submit their reports timely. Ms. Crumrine requested the Board to consider a thirty (30) day extension beyond the date quarterly reports are due.

Ms. Crumrine expressed additional concerns which did not pertain to the general topics contained on the Notice of Workshop to Solicit Comments on Proposed Regulations. The Board members attempted to address Ms. Crumrine’s inquiries which pertained to overall Board operations. The discussion concluded with the rationale for increasing Board fees where presently allowable under NRS 641B.300.

No further public comments were received and Ms. Lowery indicated that the Public Workshop pertaining to the revised proposed regulation of the Board, LCB File Number R025-14 was concluded at 1:00 p.m.

ATTACHMENT B
LIST OF ATTENDEES

LIST OF ATTENDEES

**PUBLIC WORKSHOP TO SOLICIT COMMENTS PERTAINING TO REVISED
PROPOSED REGULATIONS, LCB FILE NO. R025-14,**

May 16, 2014

LAS VEGAS

NAME	TELEPHONE NUMBER	BUSINESS NAME AND ADDRESS	EMAIL ADDRESS	PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED
Sylvisa Naseath, LCSW	(702) 370-6792	Private Practice, 4170 W. Cheyenne, Suite 101, LV 89037	Not provided	N/A
Phyllis Montavon, LSW	(702) 451-7542	Bilingual Behavioral Services, 4660 S. Eastern Ave., #200, LV 89119	www.bbscounseling.com	N/A
Riley Kline, LCSW	(702) 451-7542	Bilingual Behavioral Services, 4660 S. Eastern Ave., #200, LV 89119	www.bbscounseling.com	N/A
Pamela Kurez	(702) 631-0230	New Beginnings, 345 W. Cheyenne Ave., #500, N.LV 89031	Not provided	N/A
Valerie Tines- Braggs, LCSW	(702) 631-0230	New Beginnings, 345 W. Cheyenne Ave., #500, N.LV 89031	Not provided	N/A
Jacqueline Austin, LSW	Not Provided	Health Care Partners	hcpv.nv.com	N/A

Luke Hatch, LCSW	(775) 725-3900	KW Legacy Ranch, HC 61, Box 87, Hiko, NV 89017	www.kwlegacyranch.com	N/A
Adam Crawford	(775) 725-3900	KW Legacy Ranch, HC 61, Box 87, Hiko, NV 89017	www.kwlegacyranch.com	N/A
Yancy Whipple	(775) 725-3900	KW Legacy Ranch, HC 61, Box 87, Hiko, NV 89017	www.kwlegacyranch.com	N/A
Mark Hutcherson, LCSW	(702) 202-2567	Apple Grove Foster Care, 3105 Coleman St., # B, N.LV 89032	Not provided	N/A
Gary Waters, LCSW	(702) 726-8601	Beacon Academy, 7360 W. Flamingo Rd., LV 89147	Not provided	N/A
Jason Engle, LSW	(702) 726-8600	Center for Health and Learning, 7360 W. Flamingo, LV 89147	Not provided	N/A
Randy Reinoso, LSW	(702) 455-5709	CCSS, 1600 Pinto Ln., LV 89106	www.clarkcountynv.gov	N/A
Martha Camero, LSW	(702) 830-5090	Heads Up Guidance and Wellness, 5801 S. Valley View Blvd., # 6, LV 89102	Not provided	N/A

LIST OF ATTENDEES

**PUBLIC WORKSHOP TO SOLICIT COMMENTS PERTAINING TO REVISED
PROPOSED REGULATIONS, LCB FILE NO. R025-14**

May 16, 2014

RENO

NAME	TELEPHONE NUMBER	BUSINESS NAME AND ADDRESS	EMAIL ADDRESS	PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED
Mark Arnold, LCSW	(775) 688-1600	NNCAS, 2655 Enterprise Rd., Reno 89512	Not provided	N/A
Erin Snell, LCSW	Not provided	Value Options	Not provided	N/A
Betsy Crumrine, LCSW	(775) 684-7926	DCFS, 2533 N. Carson St., # 100, Carson City	Not provided	N/A

LIST OF ATTENDEES

**HEARING AND NOTICE OF INTENT TO ACT UPON A REGULATION PROPOSED
REGULATIONS, LCB FILE NO. R025-14**

June 20, 2014

Conducted via Videoconference Between Reno and Las Vegas

NAME	TELEPHONE NUMBER	BUSINESS NAME AND ADDRESS	EMAIL ADDRESS	PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED
Biancia Goldstein	(775) 688- 1600	HBI, 2740 S. Jones Blvd., LV 89146	Not provided	N/A