

August 24, 2016, e-mailed remarks regarding licensing of Certified Professional Counselors in Nevada from Louise Bailey-Walker to Megan Comlossy, Policy Analyst, Legislative Committee on Health Care Committee (LCHC), for the August 24, 2016, LCHC meeting.

The most notable licensing concerns that have negatively impacted/affected my journey to Nevada CPC Licensure are as follows:

1. It is inconceivable that after successful employment in the field for 16 years that includes 13 years under Washington State and Georgia Licensure that Nevada's Board is requiring that I retake the NCC exam. Although I successfully passed the NBCC's NCE exam in 2003. The purpose of requiring a Licensed Professional Counselor to provide anything additional for licensure should totally rest with need for public concern. Taking a different style of the exam proctored by the same agency lends nothing to the safety of the public especially after 13 successful years under licensed service that includes not only LPC, but Approved Clinical Supervisor (ACS), Georgia Certified K-12 Educator/Guidance Counselor. and years of Non-profit and Private Practice.

For the life of me, I have not been able to cumulate a reasonable reason for this rule. It appears that MFTs are the basis for this rule that appears to serve only the MFTs field of service and lock out the general citizenry from needed CPCs services of. Although, it appears that this rule put Nevada's citizenry at risk for deeper/prolonged mental health treatment due to delayed treatment. There are not enough MFTs in Las Vegas NV to provide the needed services to the citizenry.

Ethical concerns are the same regardless of what of where a Licensee is located. Perhaps if my, chosen field was an Attorney, a different style of testing would be in order due to different state laws. However, my chosen field is counseling/therapy that provides for the same laws and ethics regardless of the state. My educational tract and internships was found to be in line with Nevada's criteria.

With my rich background, I am excellent in service delivery; however, Nevadans will never have the opportunity to benefit from my knowledge and my strong sense of ethics. I will not go forward in seeking Nevada's CPC licensure as many of my colleagues have chosen not to pursue.

2. With my credentials and background, why would Nevada's rule of one year supervision apply. It makes zero reasonable sense for this rule to be completed under someone who may be still classified as an intern or may have a year of licensure service? How does this positively affect/effect public safety or make reasonable clinical sense!
3. Why are there zero CPCs on the board or CPC guidelines Not sure of the preference for responding to the above issue. However, the most notable licensing concerns that have negatively impacted/affected my journey to Nevada CPC Licensure are as follows:

4. In reviewing my attached Master's transcript and CV, please explain why there would be a barrier in servicing families? Most Mental health conditions generally stem from environmental/family constructs and family interventions may be a huge healing factor. It appears that Nevada laws desires to slice and dice an individual rather than see the whole of an individual that lends to recovery that cannot be sliced and diced into individual pieces. What a tragedy!
5. Additionally, the licensure process is disrespectful, disjointed, inconsistent, long and unnecessarily arduous for the following reasons:
 - A. Inaccessibility of office personnel
 - B. Calls are never returned
 - C. Submitted documents (that cost the applicant dollars be sent) are often lost.
 - D. Inconsistent office hours for office personnel
 - E. No consistent times in which the Board meets
 - F. Every decision must go through the Board regardless of the “minuscule” of the decision and who knows when they may decide to meet.
 - G. Rules and process is not spelled out where a seeking licensee could interpret with any accuracy and the Board can never be reached. I believe the seeking licensee plays the State of Nevada too much dollars to be simply ignored, dismissed, or otherwise deemed unimportant.

It is my hope that the Nevada Legislators will take a hard long review of their rules and regulations and seek to make well deserved changes. Especially, when Nevada see free trade and undue regulations as a hindrance to small business and individual Americans to chart their own course. The Model is to do NO HARM!

Respectfully,
Louise Bailey-Walker, CPC (IP), LPC, ACS, NCC
Safe School Professional, SWMHC III
Brinley Middle School
2480 Maverick Street
Las Vegas, NV 89108
Ofc: 702-799-4550 ext 4502