

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

December 12, 2025

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

The meeting of the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners was called to order by President Lorraine Benuto, PhD, at 8:03 a.m. on December 12, 2025, 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, members, Stephanie Holland, PsyD, and Catherine Pearson, PhD were present at roll call. Monique Abarca, LCSW, Soseh Esmaeili, PsyD, and Robert Moering, PsyD were absent. There was a quorum of the Board members.

Also present were Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Harry Ward; Board Investigators Sheila Young and Whitney Owens; Board Consultant Gary Lenkeit; Executive Director Laura Arnold, Administrative Director Sarah Restori; members of the public: Yvonne Fritz, Kristi Walter, David Hines and Kay See (Campbell Jones Cohen CPAs), Donald Hoier, Jodi Thomas (UNR Counseling Services), Tatsiana Razzhavaikina, Beth Scott (NV Medicaid), Christopher Shewbarran (NPA), Candis Carwell-Mitchell, Mary Marcu, Kelly Robertson, Andrew Parron, Call-In User 1 (unidentified), and Becky Savio.

2. Public Comment. Note: Public comment is welcomed by the Board and may be limited to three minutes per person at the discretion of the Board President. Public comment will be allowed at the beginning and end of the meeting, as noted on the agenda. The Board President may allow additional time to be given a speaker as time allows and in their sole discretion. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint. No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken (NRS 241.020).

Deputy Attorney General requested that no public comment be made on pending complaints.

There was no public comment.

3. (For Possible Action) Public Hearing to Solicit Comments on Regulations (Legislative Counsel Bureau File Number R001-25 and R041-25) Proposed for Adoption; Possible Action to Make Revisions to and/or Forward the

Proposed Regulation(s) to the Legislative Counsel Bureau in Accordance with NRS Chapter 233B.

Dr. Benuto noted that there were 2 regulations to be considered during the regulations hearing – R001-25 and R041-25.

- R001-25

President Benuto stated that during the December 6, 2024, and January 10, 2025, Regulation Workshops on proposed revisions to the Board's continuing education regulation, the Board made a determination as to the language regarding continuing professional development it would forward to the LCB for a regulation draft. That proposed language was forwarded to the Legislative Counsel Bureau for an LCB file number and a regulation draft, which the LCB returned as R001-25.

Dr. Benuto went on to explain that R001-25 was before the Board during the October 24, 2025, meeting, during which there were some questions that were raised and for which the Board office stated it would find and provide answers. She noted that the Board office provided answers to the questions that were raised and forwarded those answers to the Board for consideration during the continued regulation hearing.

Dr. Benuto opened the regulation hearing on R001-25 for public comment. There was no public comment.

Dr. Benuto closed public comment and opened the hearing for Board discussion. Dr. Pearson inquired about how the live/face-to-face requirements would work if all 15 live/face-to-face were done by way of continuing professional development (CPD). The executive director noted that, because CPDs are included in what can be done for continuing education, all 15 required live/face-to-face CEs could be satisfied by 15 CPD CEs, and the remaining 15 credits could be done via distance CE instruction. Dr. Benuto agreed. The executive director further clarified that, whether a CDP is live/face-to-face or distance is baked into the regulation depending on the nature of the CPD as it relates to the regulatory definition of live/face-to-face.

In clarifying Dr. Pearson's question, Dr. Woodard inquired as to whether the regulation, as drafted, is a substantive change from the in person/live CE requirement that previously existed, in response to which Dr. Benuto indicated it was not. Dr. Benuto explained that the overall requirements are the same, and that the change concerns the broad umbrella of CEs that would now include CEUs and CPDs, the requirement of 15 live/face-to-face and 15 distance learning being the same. Dr. Pearson further asked to confirm her understanding that the Ethics and Suicide P/A requirements can only be satisfied by CE courses, which the executive director confirmed as it concerns the term "instruction" as it relates to those particular CE requirements. Dr. Pearson then asked to confirm that if she satisfied the live CE requirement with CPDs, the Ethics, Cultural

Competency, and Suicide P/A could all be distance CE programs. Dr. Benuto expressed concern about what may be confusion regarding the language, in response to which the executive director recommended developing policy around the regulation that would explain the intent of the regulation.

The Administrative Director noted that she gets a lot of questions from licensees regarding CE requirements under existing language, and requested confirmation that, as the revision moves forward, the Board approves the scenario of 15 live CPD credits with the remaining CE requirements being distance learning. Dr. Woodard asked whether there was previously a requirement that those specific CE programs be live, as it was her understanding that there was not. The executive director said her understanding was correct, and that this is all under the same umbrella that has always existed for CEs required for renewal, but that the Board is just adding additional ways for CEs to be satisfied. Dr. Benuto suggested a “cheat sheet” for licensees regarding the CE requirement to help make things clear, and suggested moving on to a motion to approve the regulation.

Before asking for a motion, the executive director asked to be able to provide the answer to the other question raised regarding why the teaching CPD was not expanded to other mental health professions. She explained that during the December 2024 workshop, there had been discussion on that issue, and the Board decided to expand the CPD teaching to include both counseling and clinical psychology and to allow the teaching of master’s level courses in addition to doctorate level course, but that, despite being directed to the further expansion query, the Board did not expand the teaching CPD beyond that.

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Catherine Pearson, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved LCB draft R001-25. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Stephanie Holland, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 4-0.

Dr. Benuto again opened the regulation hearing for public comment. Dr. Tatsiana Razzhavaikina expressed her gratitude for the Board taking the time and effort it did to consider the various aspects of professional education and said that the language serves the profession and her as a professional in continuing her education. Dr. Razzhavaikina also supported the Board preparing a policy that would further clarify the CE requirements, and further asked about submitting a course for the Board’s approval.

The executive director asked to respond to the latter request for clarification, and explained that there is a separate application for licensees to submit for approval a CE program that is not otherwise accredited or previously approved by the Board, and that the application is available on the Board’s website.

Dr. Benuto closed the regulation hearing on R001-25.

- R041-25

Dr. Benuto stated that, during its August 22, 2025, meeting, the Board conducted a Regulation Workshop on proposed revisions to NAC Chapter 641 resulting from 2025 SB251 (designations for psychological interns and psychological assistants) and AB196 (in relevant part, repealing the statutory requirement that firms, partnerships, and corporations register with the Board). She explained that, during that workshop, the Board made a determination as to the regulatory language on which it would move forward to align with SB251 and AB196. That proposed language was forwarded to the Legislative Counsel Bureau for an LCB file number and a regulation draft, in response to which the LCB provided R041-25.

Dr. Benuto noted that the LCB draft of R041-25 was included in the meeting materials for the Board's review, and that the notice of the Board's regulation hearing was timely posted on November 10, 2025.

Dr. Benuto opened the regulation hearing on R041-25 for public comment.

There was no public comment.

Dr. Benuto then opened the regulation hearing for comments or questions from the Board. Dr. Holland inquired about the language changes and the intent to expand services in reference to insurance coverage and whether the use of the word "provisional" would create barriers for trainees to be credentialed under other insurances besides Medicaid. In response to Dr. Holland's inquiry, the executive director explained that the language revisions in the regulation came directly from the legislation that made the changes to the designations for Psychological Assistants and Psychological Interns, and those legislative changes did not come from the Board. They were driven by others outside of the Board and approved by the legislature.

On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Catherine Pearson, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved LCB draft R041-25. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Stephanie Holland, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 4-0.

Dr. Benuto again opened the regulation hearing for public comment. There was no public comment.

Dr. Benuto closed the regulation hearing on R001-25.

4. Minutes. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Minutes of the State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners' October 24, 2025, Meeting and the November 12-14, 2025, Disciplinary Hearing in Complaints #19-0626 and #24-0103.

Before entertaining a motion to approve the minutes from the October meeting and the November disciplinary hearing, Dr. Benuto inquired as to process for approving the November disciplinary hearing minutes. DAG Ward stated that the hearing was held and recorded under the Open Meeting Law, so he requested that the Board approve the minutes as to form, not content.

As to the October 24, 2025, minutes, the executive director noted that a minor correction was requested and has been made for the final version of the minutes.

On motion by Catherine Pearson, second by Stephanie Holland, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved the meeting minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board held on October 24, 2025. Stephanie Woodard approved the minutes as to form, but not content. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Stephanie Holland, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 4-0, with the minor correction the executive director noted.

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Stephanie Holland, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved the minutes from the November 12-14, 2025, Disciplinary Hearing. The Board members approved the minutes as to form, but not content. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Stephanie Holland, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 4-0

5. Financials

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

The executive Director presented the Board financials. As of November 30, 2025, the Board had just under a combined total of \$402,000 in checking and savings. The Board is currently at just under 44% of its budgeted expenses, and about 55% of its budgeted income, most of which is from the deferred income allocated to this second 2025-26 biennium quarter (and the first half of FY26). The executive director noted that, with being just about halfway through the fiscal year, she will be making some revisions to the Board's budget to bring to the Board at the next meeting.

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

On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Stephanie Woodard, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved the Treasurer's Report for Fiscal Year 2026. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Stephanie Holland, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 4-0.

6. Legislative/Regulation Update

The executive director stated that the Board continues to make its way through the regulatory changes that are required as a result of some of the legislative changes and mandates from the 2025 Legislative session. She explained that the regulation revisions in R192-24 (national exam regulation) have been submitted to the LCB and will be included for review during the December 17, 2025, Legislative Commission meeting, which she would be attending. As to R001-25 and R041-25, she referred to the Board's approval of those regulations during the hearing it had on those drafts earlier in the meeting, and stated that they will be submitted to the LCB once the Board approves the minutes from this meeting in which the regulation drafts were approved. The Board office otherwise continues to make the administrative changes required to comply with the 2025 legislation identified on the update table.

7. Report from the Nevada Psychological Association.

Dr. Christopher Shewbarran advised that the Nevada Psychological Association's annual conference will be the second Friday in May, for which the NPA invited Dr. Arthur Evans, the CEO of the APA, to be the keynote speaker. He also stated that the Spring Social is coming up.

8. Board Office Operations.

The Administrative Director provided an update on the Board's licensure, applicant, state exam, and registrant statistics for October and November, 2025.

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

A. Complaint #23-0918

DAG Ward stated that the complaint alleged various claims of improper conduct. Respondent is represented by counsel, with whom a proposed disciplinary consent decree is being finalized and, once finalized and signed, will come before the Board for approval.

B. Complaint #24-0312(1)

DAG Ward stated that this is a complaint about certain representations the respondent made online. A cease and desist letter was sent, in response to which the respondent made revisions to their online information. A follow up cease and desist has been forwarded to the respondent requesting that they remove additional language from all online presences, and we are awaiting a response.

C. Complaints #24-0711
#24-0719
#24-0726
#24-0823

DAG Ward stated that these are four complaints against same psychologist. The respondent, though counsel, has responded to the complaints, all complaints have been forwarded to appropriate federal agencies, and witness interviews have taken place. For the agencies the Complaints team has heard from, the information provided has not included any action that is being taken on their part regarding the complaints. The complaints team continues to review and consider these complaints in the context of the Board's jurisdiction.

D. Complaint #24-0730

DAG Ward stated that this is a complaint for unlicensed practice, in response to which he sent and served several Cease and Dease letters. The respondent has not responded to any of them. As a result, the Board has submitted a formal complaint to the respondent's licensing board. A complaint for injunctive relief has also been drafted and is being prepared for filing in district court.

E. Complaint #25-0110

DAG Ward stated that this is a complaint for unlicensed practice, which was forwarded to the respondent, and to which the respondent answered. Based on the information in the respondent's answer, DAG Ward has prepared draft consent decree to forward to respondent. Service on the respondent is pending.

F. Complaint #25-0410

DAG Ward shared that this is a complaint for ethical violations. The complaint was forwarded to the respondent for response, which has been received. The investigator has conducted a witness interview, and the complainant provided additional information, which was forwarded to the respondent for response. Based upon the results of the investigation, a formal complaint and notice of hearing has been drafted and forwarded to counsel for the respondent. Counsel for respondent is in contact with DAG Ward about possible resolution.

G. Complaint #25-0414

DAG Ward stated that this is an anonymous complaint regarding unethical conduct. A request to was made to the complainant for evidence or corroborating information regarding the basis for the complaint, to which a response was received. The complaint

was forwarded to the respondent for a response. Respondent has retained counsel and a response is to be forthcoming.

H. Complaint #25-0715

DAG Ward stated that this is a complaint alleging negligence, which was forwarded to the respondent for response; respondent has submitted an answer to the complaint and relevant records, which were forwarded to the investigator for review and consideration. The Investigator has made a recommendation for a stipulated consent agreement, which has been drafted and is pending review and service on counsel for the respondent.

I. Complaint #25-0721

DAG Ward stated that this is a complaint by a social worker against a psychologist for inappropriate and unethical conduct with complainant's client (who was previously respondent's client). The complainant provided authorization to forward complaint to the respondent for response, which has been received. The investigator has made recommendations for a stipulated consent agreement, which has been sent to and received by counsel for respondent.

J. Complaint #25-0812(2)

DAG Ward stated that this complaint alleges negligence related to an assessment. It was forwarded to the respondents, who provided a response. The Investigator has made recommendations for a stipulated consent decree, which has been drafted and forwarded to the respondents. The respondents will provide their response to the proposed stipulated consent decree in mid-December.

K. Complaint #25-0818(1)

No update was provided on this complaint.

L. Complaint #25-0925(2)

DAG Ward shared that this is a complaint regarding improper billing. The complaint has been forwarded to the respondent for a response, which has been received. Based on the information in the complaint and the response, dismissal of this case is recommended based upon the information that the Board investigator assigned to this case read into the record, a summary of which is as follows:

The complaint alleged that the respondent failed to notify the complainant of a change in his insurance copay and that a balance was accruing on his account, that there was a breach of trust in reference to discussing the complainant's outstanding balance with the respondent, and that sending the debt to a collection agency resulted in damage to the complainant. After reviewing the complaint, the response to the complaint, and the information that accompanied the response, the Board's investigator determined that the respondent is not in violation of any applicable standards of conduct. Based on the evidence provided, the respondent made repeated efforts to notify the complainant of the outstanding balance, tried to address the variations in reimbursement with the

complainant's insurance company and keep the complainant apprised of those efforts, and offered the complainant a discount on the bill and arrangements for a payment plan, but without response from the complainant.

On motion by Catherine Pearson, second by Stephanie Woodard, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved dismissing Complaint #25-0925(2). (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Stephanie Holland, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 4-0.

M. Complaint #25-1117

This complaint alleges unethical conduct against a psychologist. The complaint has been forwarded to the respondent for a response, which is due later this month or the beginning of January.

N. Complaint #25-1125

This is a complaint for unprofessional conduct, and has been forwarded to the respondent for a response. Respondent has acknowledged receipt of the complaint and has been granted an extension of time to the end of January to respond.

10. (For Possible Action) Review and Possible Action on Applications for Licensure as a Psychologist or Registration as a Psychological Assistant, Intern, or Trainee. The Board May Convene in Closed Session to Receive Information Regarding Applicants, Which May Involve Considering the Character, Alleged Misconduct, Professional Competence or Physical or Mental Health of the Applicant (NRS 241.030). All Deliberation and Action Will Occur in an Open Session.

The following applicants are recommended for approval of licensure contingent upon completion of licensure requirements: **Carolyn Gibson, Nancy Graies, Ari Lakritz, Bahara Payandeh, Lucas Klein, Madison Martins, David Brown, Robert Montgomery, Mary Ann Rowe, Arthur Bennett, Jr., Paula Wilbourne, Martha Hernandez, and Stephen Francis.**

On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Catherine Pearson, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the following applicants for licensure contingent upon completion of licensure requirements: Carolyn Gibson, Nancy Graies, Ari Lakritz, Bahara Payandeh, Lucas Klein, Madison Martins, David Brown, Robert Montgomery, Mary Ann Rowe, Arthur Bennett, Jr., Paula Wilbourne, Martha Hernandez, and Stephen Francis. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Stephanie Holland, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 4-0.

A. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on Candis Mitchell's EPPP efforts Update.

Dr. Benuto stated that, during the Board's June 13, 2025, meeting, the Board considered Dr. Candis Mitchell's request to extend her registration as a Psychological Assistant for a 7th year so that she could retake the EPPP to move toward licensure. Due to the Board's regulatory limitations on how long a Psychological Assistant can be registered and the reasons it enacted those limitations, the Board was cautious to extend Dr. Mitchell's Psychological Assistant registration, and requested that she appear at the Board's October meeting to provide an update on her efforts to retake the EPPP. Because Dr. Mitchell did not appear for the October meeting, the Board tabled this item for this meeting to hear from Dr. Mitchell on her EPPP efforts.

Dr. Mitchell was present and stated that she is scheduled to take the exam February 28, 2026, has obtained study materials, and has been studying.

B. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Consider Dr. Kristi Walter's Application for Re-licensure.

Dr. Benuto stated that Dr. Kristi Walter has applied to the Board to be re-licensed following a 2017 disciplinary action through which Dr. Walter surrendered her license. She explained that the resolution of that disciplinary action permitted Dr. Walter to re-apply for licensure in the future, but under a number of conditions. Dr. Benuto noted that the Board office has provided some information to the Board with some historical information about the disciplinary action and included the conditions that Dr. Walter is required to satisfy for re-licensure, as well as additional conditions the Board is permitted to require.

Dr. Lenkeit stated that the voluntary surrender agreement spells out the requirements for Dr. Walter to be re-licensed. He suggested that the Board require a written statement from Dr. Walter regarding her professional activities and what she has done since April 2019 so that the Board can consider anything further that needs to be done before Dr. Walter can become licensed again.

Dr. Benuto inquired with the Board whether they have any further questions or comments regarding Dr. Walter's application and/or Dr. Lenkeit's suggestion. DAG Ward suggested that the Board table this agenda item and request the written statement from Dr. Walter based on Dr. Lenkeit's recommendation. The matter was tabled for a future board meeting after receipt of Dr. Walter's written statement that Dr. Lenkeit recommended.

- C. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve Dr. Dylena Pierce's request to extend her registration as a Psychological Assistant for a Sixth Year.

President Benuto stated that Dr. Dylena Pierce has requested that her registration as a Psychological Assistant for a sixth year so that she can retake the EPPP, and that Dr. Pierce's explanation in support of her request was provided to the Board.

On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Stephanie Woodard, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved extending Dr. Dylena Pierce's Psychological Assistant registration for a sixth year. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Stephanie Holland, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 4-0.

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

Dr. Benuto stated that 2025 SB165 creates a new licensure designation that is to be house in and regulated by the Board – the Behavioral Health and Wellness Practitioners. She reminded the Board that, during the October meeting, it had appointed the 4 members of the SB165 Behavioral Health and Wellness Practitioner Advisory Group, one of whom is Dr. Owens, who would be giving an update on the Advisory Group's work.

In providing the update on the BHWP Advisory Group's work, Dr. Owens stated that the Advisory Group has met and, following their charges, the Group will be working on finding grant money to help supplement the Board office needs as a result of SB165. She explained that there was significant concern from the Board office regarding the tremendous additional work that SB165 will impose on it, including the need for additional staff to manage the additional work load. Additionally, the Advisory Group will be meeting at the end of January to work on the regulations that SB165 requires, as well as rules regarding the BHWP's scope of practice and education and training.

Dr. Owens also stated that the Advisory Group requests the Board's assistance in helping to move the SB165 effort along. To that end, after its January 30, 2026, meeting, the Advisory Group will be forwarding materials to the Board in preparation for getting the effort moving along. She stated that, because this will be a huge undertaking for the Board office as well as the Advisory Group, the Board's cooperation and help will be required.

12. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Fiscal Year 2025 Audit Report.

David Hines, Audit Manager with Campbell Jones Cohen CPAs, presented the Board's Audit Report for Fiscal Year 2025. In so doing, Mr. Hines reviewed the various sections

Board of Psychological Examiners, December 12, 2025
Meeting Minutes, Page 11 of 15

of the Audit Report, explaining and summarizing the content in each. First was the Management's Discussion and Analysis, which provides the Board's financial highlights, an overview of the annual financial report, summaries of the statements of net position and activities, general fund budgetary highlights, and economic factors and next year's budgets and rates. Mr. Hines went on to the auditors' report and their opinion, and highlighted changes in accounting principles that are being applied. He then explained the Governmental Fund Balance Sheet and the modified accrual basis that is applied to the Board's finances, as well as the Governmental Fund Revenue, Expenditures, and Changes in the fund balance, all in the context of the modified accrual basis on which the Board's finances are evaluated. In addressing the notes to the financial statements, Mr. Hines explained the nature and a summary of the content of each. For instance, Note 1 contains various accounting policies, budgeting processes, various definitions, the nature of licensing fees received and applied incrementally over time, post employment benefits, new accounting pronouncements, etc. Mr. Hines highlighted two very large notes regarding pensions (Note 6) and other post-employment benefits other than pensions (Note 7), both of which rely heavily on the State's annual reporting information that it issues. Mr. Hines noted that Note 9 is new information based on compliance with new accounting standards implemented this fiscal year. As for the supplemental budgetary comparison schedule, Mr. Hines explained the 2-year budgeting cycle as it relates to the licensure renewal period, as well as the pension and other post-employment benefits. Finally, Mr. Hines explained portion of the report regarding internal control over financial reporting and on compliance and other matters, stating that there are no internal fiscal control findings for FY2025. They did not find any significant deficiencies or material weaknesses in reference to internal control. They also did not find non-compliance to be a material issue.

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Stephanie Holland, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved the Audit Report for Fiscal Year 2025. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Stephanie Holland, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 4-0.

13. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve Moving Forward with Regulatory Language that Provides for Criminal and Other Conduct as a Basis for Disciplinary Action and the Duty of Licensees to Report Such Conduct.

The Executive Director explained that this was an item that had been included in the agenda for the Board's October meeting, that being the issue of whether criminal and other conduct that is not related to a licensee's professional practice could be a basis for discipline under the Board's statutes and regulations. It is an issue that has come up in a couple of recent complaints. She stated that Board counsel had advised that, unlike other Boards, this Board does not make criminal or other conduct not related to the profession a basis for disciplinary action. To that end, she had provided the Board with links to other Boards' regulations and statutes that address disciplinary action for

general criminal conduct not related to the profession. During the October meeting, Board members indicated that they wanted to do a deeper dive into that information to further discuss during this meeting.

The executive director reminded the Board that the question before it is whether it wants to expand the basis for disciplinary action for criminal or other conduct that aligns with how other Boards provide for disciplinary action based on criminal and other conduct not specifically tied to the profession. At this point, it is a matter of gauging whether there is consensus for expanding the Board's bases for imposing discipline to include criminal conduct not related to the practice of psychology and, if so, what does the Board want those regulatory revisions to look like based on the examples the Board office has been given. With that information, the executive director stated that she can work with Board counsel and the Complaints team to propose some regulatory language for the Board to consider at a future Board meeting.

Referring to the information that the executive director provided regarding the other boards that provide for criminal and other conduct not related to the profession as a basis for discipline, Dr. Holland inquired about what boards other than this Board do not. The executive director stated that the information she provided was focused on the Boards that do have criminal and other conduct not related to the profession as a basis for discipline, but was happy to further that information by identifying the boards that do not and provide it to the Board for the next Board meeting.

Dr. Woodard inquired with DAG Ward about the absence of a regulation in support of the current NRS poses a risk to the Board should it become aware of criminal conduct that could be concerning if the Board is unable to take action. DAG Ward stated that the Board has summary suspension in its regulations and statutorily, which has been used in the past when someone was either convicted or arrested for a heinous crime, such as murder, so the Board does have some authority in absence of a specific statutory or regulatory provision to act or not act based on criminal conduct if something major comes up.

Dr. Pearson inquired about whether NRS 641.230(1)(b) is too broad to encompass what is being discussed, and whether some of the criminal conduct would influence the ability to practice psychology even if the offense is not specifically related to the practice of psychology. DAG Ward stated that it depends on the perspective and what legal arguments the Board will get from legal counsel when they challenge any of the statutes. An example of a statute that has been generally challenged is for "moral turpitude" crimes because it is vague. He explained that if summary suspension is used, the respondent has the opportunity to have a hearing within 30 days in order to protect the due process rights of a licensee who has been summarily suspended, but overall, the Board has a lot of discretion in these matters.

Dr. Owens asked if DAG Ward could speak to how not moving forward with including general criminal and other conduct as a basis for disciplinary action would protect the public. DAG Ward noted that the Board has a duty to protect the public, so on a case-by-case basis, he would review information brought to the Board about criminal conduct and give a recommendation as to summary suspension or bring a complaint and hearing under the ethics code. Dr. Owens clarified her inquiry in reference to the Board's appetite for adopting additional regulatory language on this issue and the limits it might create for its ability to protect the public. DAG Ward stated that without additional language, all the Board has is summary suspension or complaint and notice of hearing, depending on the nature of the conduct/crime.

Dr. Benuto noted there did not appear to be a strong appetite for additional regulatory language. The executive director suggested that, because not all of the Board members were in attendance, the item be tabled for a future board meeting for further discussion.

The discussion was tabled for a future Board meeting.

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 Administrative Director proposed a meeting schedule for 2026 with a 6 week cadence. She explained that was based on the Board office changes and the significant preparation that goes into each of the Board's meetings, and that a six week meeting cadence would put the Board at about 8 meetings per year. She further stated that the additional time between meetings would allow for thorough preparation and some breathing room to attend to other board office duties, and that the next meeting under that schedule would be January 23, 2026.

The executive director shared the proposed meeting dates for 2026 under a six week meeting cadence.

Dr. Benuto stated that while she does not have an objection to the new meeting schedule, she emphasized that it will be critical for all Board members to attend all Board meetings because if a meeting does not have quorum, there will be a significant gap in between meetings. She also requested that the Board be efficient with their time during the Board meetings due to the additional content that is expected to be included.

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Catherine Pearson, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved the proposed meeting schedule

for 2026, which provides for 8 meetings at a 6 week meeting cadence. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Stephanie Holland, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 4-0.

Based on the Board's approval of the proposed 2026 meeting schedule, Dr. Benuto stated that the next regular meeting of the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners will be Friday, January 23, 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)

There were no requests for future Board Meeting agenda items.

16. Public Comment - Public comment is welcomed by the Board and may be limited to three minutes per person at the discretion of the Board President. Public comment will be allowed at the beginning and end of the meeting, as noted on the agenda. The Board President may allow additional time to be given a speaker as time allows and in their sole discretion. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint. No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken (NRS 241.020).

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

There was no public comment.

17. (For Possible Action) Adjournment

There being no further business before the Board, President Dr. Benuto adjourned the meeting at 9:33 a.m.