

**PUBLIC NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY HEARING
STATE OF NEVADA BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS**
HEARING MINUTES

The Disciplinary Hearing in State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners versus Dr. Shera Bradley (PY0564), Case #19-0626 and #24-0103, took place over three days on November 12, 13, and 14, 2025, before Hearing Office Shirley Blazich. On November 21, 2025, Hearing Officer Blazich issued her Decision and Order in Case #19-0626 and her Decision and Order in Case #24-0103, which are attached to these minutes as Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2, respectively.

The following is a summary of the Disciplinary Hearing Proceedings as they relate to the Hearing Officer's Decisions and Orders in Case #19-0626 and #24-0103.

November 12, 2025 – Day 1 of 3

Agenda Item 1: Call to Order

The Disciplinary Hearing in Complaint #19-0626 and #24-0103, State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners versus Dr. Shera Bradley (PY0564) was called to order on November 12, 2025, at 9:02 a.m. by the Board's executive director, Laura M. Arnold, online via "Zoom" and physically at the Nevada State Business Center, *Red Rock Room*, 3300 W. Sahara Ave., Las Vegas, NV 89102.

In attendance for the Disciplinary Hearing were Hearing officer Shirley Blazich; Deputy Attorney General Harry B. Ward, counsel for the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners; Brent Vogel, counsel for the Respondent, Dr. Shera Bradley; and Dr. Shera Bradley.

Also present was the Board's Administrative Director, Sarah Restori.

Various members of the public attended the hearing via the Disciplinary Hearing's virtual platform and stated their names for the record.

Agenda Item 2: Public Comment. Note: Public comment is welcomed and may be limited to three minutes per person. Public comment will be allowed at the beginning and end of the hearing, as noted on the agenda, and additional time may be

permitted as time allows. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint; however, no public comment will be permitted on Items 3 or 4 of this Agenda unless and until a determination has been made on them. No action may be taken on a matter raised under this agenda item until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken (NRS 241.020).

The executive director reminded those who wished to participate in public comment that they were limited to three minutes per person, and that public comment is reserved for comment only; it would not be used as a platform for questions and answers. If members of the public had a statement that is longer than three minutes, they were asked to submit their statement in writing to the Board office. If members of the public had questions for which they would like answers, they were asked to email the Board office at nbop@govmail.state.nv.us.

The executive director also reminded members of the public that there could be no public comment on pending complaints before the Board, and that included the complaints that were the subject of this disciplinary hearing unless and until a determination has been made on them.

There was no public comment.

Agenda Items 3 and 4:

- **(For Possible Action) Disciplinary Hearing on Complaint #19-0626, State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners vs. Shera Bradley (License No. PY0564), and**
- **(For Possible Action) Disciplinary Hearing on Complaint #24-0103, State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners vs. Shera Bradley (License No. PY0564).**

Hearing Office Blazich convened the Disciplinary Hearing on Complaint #19-0626 and #24-0103. As a preliminary matter, the witnesses who were present and scheduled to testify were sequestered. Dr. Bradley was also provided with the option of proceeding in either a closed or open session, and opted for the Disciplinary Hearing to be conducted in open session.

The Disciplinary Hearing began with opening statements by Deputy Attorney General Harry B. Ward (DAG Ward) and by attorney Brent Vogel (Mr. Vogel), counsel for Dr. Shera Bradley. The Disciplinary Hearing then proceeded through Day 1 with DAG Ward presenting his case-in-chief through the witnesses offered on behalf of the Board, as follows:

Dr. Sheila Young
Dr. Christine Moninghoff
Dr. Amanda DeVillez

The Hearing Officer heard evidence by way of those witnesses' testimony through DAG Ward's direct examination and cross examination by Mr. Vogel. That evidence included testimony on various exhibits relevant to the witnesses that had been provided to Hearing Officer Blazich and the parties in advance of the Disciplinary Proceedings.

After the conclusion of the testimony of the witnesses who testified on Day 1, the Board's executive director opened public comment.

Agenda Item 5: Public Comment - Public comment is welcomed and may be limited to three minutes per person. Public comment will be allowed at the beginning and end of the hearing, as noted on the agenda, and additional time may be permitted as time allows. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint; however, no public comment will be permitted on Items 3 or 4 of this Agenda unless and until a determination has been made on them. No action may be taken on 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)

The executive director reminded those who wished to participate in public comment that they were limited to three minutes per person, and that public comment is reserved for comment only; it would not be used as a platform for questions and answers. If members of the public had a statement that is longer than three minutes, they were asked to submit their statement in writing to the Board office. If members of the public had questions for which they would like answers, they were asked to email the Board office at nbop@govmail.state.nv.us.

The executive director also reminded members of the public that there could be no public comment on pending complaints before the Board, and that included the complaints that were the subject of this disciplinary hearing unless and until a determination has been made on them.

There was no public comment.

Agenda Item 6: (For Possible Action) Adjournment. The executive director adjourned Day 1 of the Disciplinary Hearing at 4:55 p.m., and stated that the Hearing would resume the following morning at 9:00 a.m.

November 13, 2025 – Day 2 of 3

Agenda Item 1: Call to Order

The Disciplinary Hearing in Complaint #19-0626 and #24-0103, State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners versus Dr. Shera Bradley (PY0564) was called to order at on November 13, 2025, at 9:01 a.m. by the Board's executive director, Laura M. Arnold, online via "Zoom" and physically at the Nevada State Business Center, *Red Rock Room*, 3300 W. Sahara Ave., Las Vegas, NV 89102.

In attendance for the Disciplinary Hearing were Hearing officer Shirley Blazich; Deputy Attorney General Harry B. Ward, counsel for the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners; Brent Vogel, counsel for the Respondent, Dr. Shera Bradley; and Dr. Shera Bradley.

Also present was the Board's Administrative Director, Sarah Restori.

Various members of the public attended the hearing via the Disciplinary Hearing's virtual platform and stated their names for the record.

Agenda Item 2: Public Comment. Note: Public comment is welcomed and may be limited to three minutes per person. Public comment will be allowed at the beginning and end of the hearing, as noted on the agenda, and additional time may be permitted as time allows. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint; however, no public comment will be permitted on Items 3 or 4 of this Agenda unless and until a determination has been made on them. No action may be taken on a matter raised under this agenda item until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken (NRS 241.020).

The executive director reminded those who wished to participate in public comment that they were limited to three minutes per person, and that public comment is reserved for comment only; it would not be used as a platform for questions and answers. If members of the public had a statement that is longer than three minutes, they were asked to submit their statement in writing to the Board office. If members of the public had questions for which they would like answers, they were asked to email the Board office at nbop@govmail.state.nv.us.

The executive director also reminded members of the public that there could be no public comment on pending complaints before the Board, and that included the complaints that were the subject of this disciplinary hearing unless and until a determination has been made on them.

There was no public comment.

Agenda Items 3 and 4:

- **(For Possible Action) Disciplinary Hearing on Complaint #19-0626, State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners vs. Shera Bradley (License No. PY0564), and**
- **(For Possible Action) Disciplinary Hearing on Complaint #24-0103, State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners vs. Shera Bradley (License No. PY0564).**

Hearing Office Blazich convened the continued Disciplinary Hearing on Complaint #19-0626 and #24-0103. The witnesses who were present and scheduled to testify were sequestered.

The Disciplinary Proceedings continued into Day 2 with the continuation and remainder of DAG Ward's case-in-chief through the remaining witness offered on behalf of the Board, as follows:

Dr. Ben Adams

The Hearing Officer heard evidence by way of that witness's testimony through DAG Ward's direct examination and cross examination by Mr. Vogel. That evidence included testimony on various exhibits relevant to the witnesses that had been provided to Hearing Officer Blazich and the parties in advance of the Disciplinary Proceedings.

At the conclusion of DAG Ward's case-in-chief, the Disciplinary Proceedings continued with Mr. Vogel presenting his case-in-chief through witnesses offered on behalf of Dr. Bradley, as follows:

Joanne Malay
Dr. Paul Harvey
Dr. Sarah Damas
Dr. Scott Fiddler
Donald Hoier (direct examination)

The Hearing Officer heard evidence by way of the testimony from Ms. Malay, Dr. Harvey, Dr. Damas, and Dr. Fiddler through Mr. Vogel's direct examination and cross examination by DAG Ward. Donald Hoier's testimony through direct examination was paused and continued until the following day.

After the conclusion of the completed testimony of the first four witnesses who testified on Day 2 and the paused direct examination of Donald Hoier, the Board's executive director opened public comment.

Agenda Item 5: Public Comment - Public comment is welcomed and may be limited to three minutes per person. Public comment will be allowed at the beginning and end of the hearing, as noted on the agenda, and additional time may be permitted as time allows. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint; however, no public comment will be permitted on Items 3 or 4 of this Agenda unless and until a determination has been made on them. No action may be taken on 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)

The executive director reminded those who wished to participate in public comment that they were limited to three minutes per person, and that public comment is reserved for comment only; it would not be used as a platform for questions and answers. If members of the public had a statement that is longer than three minutes, they were asked to submit their statement in writing to the Board office. If members of the public had questions for which they would like answers, they were asked to email the Board office at nbop@govmail.state.nv.us.

The executive director also reminded members of the public that there could be no public comment on pending complaints before the Board, and that included the complaints that were the subject of this disciplinary hearing unless and until a determination has been made on them.

There was no public comment.

Agenda Item 6: (For Possible Action) Adjournment. The executive director adjourned Day 2 of the Disciplinary Hearing at 4:39 p.m., and stated that the Hearing would resume the following morning at 9:00 a.m.

November 14, 2025 – Day 3 of 3

Agenda Item 1: Call to Order

The Disciplinary Hearing in Complaint #19-0626 and #24-0103, State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners versus Dr. Shera Bradley (PY0564) was called to order on November 14, 2025, at 9:02 a.m. by the Board's executive director, Laura M. Arnold, online via "Zoom" and physically at the Nevada State Business Center, *Red Rock Room*, 3300 W. Sahara Ave., Las Vegas, NV 89102.

In attendance for the Disciplinary Hearing were Hearing officer Shirley Blazich; Deputy Attorney General Harry B. Ward, counsel for the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners; Brent Vogel, counsel for the Respondent, Dr. Shera Bradley; and Dr. Shera Bradley.

Also present was the Board's Administrative Director, Sarah Restori.

Various members of the public attended the hearing via the Disciplinary Hearing's virtual platform and stated their names for the record.

Agenda Item 2: Public Comment. Note: Public comment is welcomed and may be limited to three minutes per person. Public comment will be allowed at the beginning and end of the hearing, as noted on the agenda, and additional time may be permitted as time allows. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint; however, no public comment will be permitted on Items 3 or 4 of this Agenda unless and until a determination has been made on them. No action may be taken on a matter raised under this agenda item until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken (NRS 241.020).

The executive director reminded those who wished to participate in public comment that they were limited to three minutes per person, and that public comment is reserved for comment only; it would not be used as a platform for questions and answers. If members of the public had a statement that is longer than three minutes, they were asked to submit their statement in writing to the Board office. If members of the public had questions for which they would like answers, they were asked to email the Board office at nbop@govmail.state.nv.us.

The executive director also reminded members of the public that there could be no public comment on pending complaints before the Board, and that included the complaints that were the subject of this disciplinary hearing unless and until a determination has been made on them.

There was no public comment.

Agenda Items 3 and 4:

- **(For Possible Action) Disciplinary Hearing on Complaint #19-0626, State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners vs. Shera Bradley (License No. PY0564), and**
- **(For Possible Action) Disciplinary Hearing on Complaint #24-0103, State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners vs. Shera Bradley (License No. PY0564).**

Hearing Office Blazich convened the continued Disciplinary Hearing on Complaint #19-0626 and #24-0103. Any witnesses who were present and scheduled to testify were sequestered.

The Disciplinary Proceedings continued with Mr. Vogel continuing the presentation of his case-in-chief through witnesses offered on behalf of Dr. Bradley, as follows:

Jackie Arellano
Dr. Cecilia Shermack-Warner
Dr. Laurel Stinar
Dr. Vincent Brouwers
Cookie Gamiao
Dr. Aaron Bomer
Donald Hoier (continued direct testimony and cross examination)
Dr. Shera Bradley

The Hearing Officer heard evidence by way of the testimony from those witnesses through Mr. Vogel's direct examination and cross examination by DAG Ward.

After the conclusion of the testimony of the witnesses who testified on Day 3 and Mr. Vogel's case-in-chief, DAG Ward and Mr. Vogel agreed to waive closing argument in the interest of time and based upon Hearing Officer Blazich, who presided over the Proceedings, being the finder of fact in this matter. At the conclusion of the Disciplinary Proceedings, Hearing Officer Blazich stated that she would provide her written decision within 7 days.

After the Disciplinary Proceedings concluded, the Board's executive director opened public comment.

Agenda Item 5: Public Comment - Public comment is welcomed and may be limited to three minutes per person. Public comment will be allowed at the beginning and end of the hearing, as noted on the agenda, and additional time may be permitted as time allows. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint; however, no public comment will be permitted on Items 3 or 4 of this Agenda unless and until a determination has been made on them. No action may be taken on 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)

The executive director reminded those who wished to participate in public comment that they were limited to three minutes per person, and that public comment is reserved for comment only; it would not be used as a platform for questions and answers. If members of the public had a statement that is longer than three minutes, they were

asked to submit their statement in writing to the Board office. If members of the public had questions for which they would like answers, they were asked to email the Board office at nbop@govmail.state.nv.us.

The executive director also reminded members of the public that there could be no public comment on pending complaints before the Board, and that included the complaints that were the subject of this disciplinary hearing unless and until a determination has been made on them.

There was no public comment.

Agenda Item 6: (For Possible Action) Adjournment. The executive director adjourned the third and final day of the Disciplinary Hearing at 5:01 p.m.

November 21, 2025, Decisions and Orders

On November 21, 2025, Hearing Officer Blazich issued her Decision and Order on Case #19-0626 and her Decision and Order on Case #24-0103, which are attached to these Disciplinary Hearing minutes as Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2, respectively.

EXHIBIT 1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

BEFORE THE STATE OF NEVADA
BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS

**STATE OF NEVADA, BOARD OF
PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS**

Case Number: 19-0626

vs.

Petitioner,

Decision and Order in Case #19-0626

SHERA BRADLEY

Respondent

Decision and Order in Case #19-0626

An administrative hearing on Petitioner, the State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners’ (“NVBOPE” and/or “Petitioner”) Complaint in Case #19-0626 was held in a hybrid (in-person and remote) format on November 12-14, 2025, from 9:00am to 5:00pm PST each day, before Hearing Officer Shirley Blazich, Esq. Deputy Attorney General Harry Ward, Esq., attended remotely via videoconferencing on behalf of the Petitioner. Brent Vogel, Esq., of the law firm Lewis Brisbois Brisgaard & Smith, attended in person on behalf of the Respondent, Dr. Shera Bradley (“Dr. Bradley” and/or “Respondent”). Also in attendance were the Respondent, Dr. Shera Bradley (in-person), and the Executive Director of the NVBOPE, Ms. Laura Arnold (remote). The hearing took place at the Nevada State Business Center, Red Rock Room, located at 3300 West Sahara Ave., Las Vegas, Nevada, 89102.

RELEVANT PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

This case arises out of allegations made to the NVBOPE by Ben Adams, Ph.D. (“Dr. Adams”), against Dr. Bradley. In June of 2019, Dr. Adams filed a complaint with the NVBOPE alleging inappropriate conduct and bullying by Dr. Bradley. Dr. Bradley has denied these allegations. Thereafter, the NVBOPE opened case 19-0626, regarding Dr. Adams’ complaint. Sheila

1 Young, Ph.D. (“Dr. Young”), was assigned to investigate the claims. Dr. Young initiated an
2 investigation by reviewing the allegations made by Dr. Adams and additionally interviewing three
3 (3) witnesses. Dr. Young concluded that Dr. Bradley violated regulations and the APA Ethical
4 Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct, adopted by the NVBOPE. Thereafter, a formal
5 Complaint and Notice of Hearing was filed followed by an Amended Complaint and Notice of
Hearing.

6 Petitioner’s Amended Complaint, filed on November 27, 2024, alleged four separate causes
7 of action against Respondent as follows: (1) and (2) Failing to Comply with Statutes and
8 Regulations; and (3) and (4) Violation of the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of
9 Conduct.

10 On July 15, 2025, this Hearing Officer issued an Order Granting In Part, and Denying In
11 Part, Respondent’s Motion for Summary Judgment in the above-captioned matter. This Hearing
12 Officer ruled to deny Respondent’s Motion for Summary Judgment as to Petitioner’s First, Second
13 and Fourth Claims for Relief; and ruled to grant summary judgment as to Petitioner’s Third Claim
14 for Relief – relief related to alleged violations of APA Ethics Code 3.03 – Other Harassment. The
15 remaining allegations in Petitioner’s First, Second and Fourth Claims for Relief remained for final
determination at the administrative hearing in this matter.

16 Respondent was, at the relevant times mentioned in the Amended Complaint, licensed as a
17 psychologist with the NVBOPE, and currently holds license number PY0564. Therefore,
18 Respondent is subject to the jurisdiction of the NVBOPE and the provisions of NRS Chapter 641,
19 NAC Chapter 641, and the provisions set forth in the most recent edition of the Ethical Principles of
20 Psychologists and Code of Conduct adopted by the American Psychological Association and
adopted by reference and incorporated pursuant to NAC 641.250.

21 **RELEVANT FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

22 It is alleged that Dr. Adams began employment at Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health
23 Services (“SNAMHS”) in February 2019. It is alleged that Respondent was the supervisor of Dr.
24 Adams. It is alleged that during Dr. Adams’ employment with SNAMHS that Respondent
knowingly engaged in behavior that was harassing and demeaning towards Dr. Adams and that
25 Respondent failed to take reasonable steps to avoid harm to Dr. Adams.

26 **May 15-16, 2019 Events**

27 It is alleged that on or about May 16, 2019, Respondent called Dr. Adams into her office to
28 discuss an incident that occurred at SNAMHS the day before, on May 15, 2019. It is alleged that on

1 May 16, 2019, Respondent spoke to Dr. Adams in a harassing, demeaning, and condescending
2 manner causing harm to Dr. Adams.

3 May 22, 2019 Events

4 On May 22, 2019, it is alleged that Respondent called a meeting with Dr. Adams and Joanne
5 Malay, the SNAMHS Hospital Administrator, informing Dr. Adams that Respondent was
6 considering disciplinary actions against Dr. Adams for his actions on May 15, 2019. It is alleged that
7 Respondent spoke to Dr. Adams in a harassing, demeaning, and condescending manner at this
8 meeting. It is alleged that the disciplinary actions taken against Dr. Adams were retaliatory and
9 caused additional harm to Dr. Adams.

10 June 3, 2019 Events

11 On June 3, 2019, Dr. Adams alleged that the new committee he organized, the Safety Action
12 Committee, would not be allowed to continue pursuant to a directive from Respondent to Ms.
13 Cookie Gamiao, and that the Safety Action Committee was shut down as a retaliatory act directed at
14 Dr. Adams and causing additional harm to Dr. Adams.

15 June 6, 2019 Events

16 On June 6, 2019, it is alleged that Dr. Adams met with Christine Moebius and Jackie
17 Arellano with Human Resources at SNAMHS. At the June 6, 2019, meeting Dr. Adams was
18 presented with a Written Warning from Respondent dated June 3, 2019, regarding the May 15, 2019,
19 incident. It is alleged that the Written Warning was retaliatory and caused additional harm to Dr.
20 Adams.

21 July 2, 2019 Events

22 It is alleged that on or about July 2, 2019, Dr. Adams had a discussion with Respondent
23 about his employment. It is alleged that Respondent spoke to Dr. Adams in a harassing, demeaning,
24 and condescending manner at this meeting. It is alleged that Respondent then fired Dr. Adams,
25 causing additional harm to Dr. Adams. It is alleged that Dr. Adams was fired in retaliation for
26 reporting the harassing and bullying by Respondent, causing harm to Dr. Adams.

27 It is alleged that on each of the above referenced dates, Respondent violated the Ethical
28 Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct, Section 3.04 when Respondent spoke to Dr.
29 Adams in a harassing and demeaning manner and without taking reasonable steps to avoid harm to
30 Dr. Adams.

BURDEN OF PROOF AND REQUIREMENTS FOR PROOF

Pursuant to NRS Chapter 641, upon proof by a preponderance of the evidence that an applicant or licensee has engaged in activity that is grounds for disciplinary action as described in NRS Chapter 641 and NAC Chapter 641, the NVBOPE may take disciplinary action pursuant to NRS 641.240 including the imposition of a fine of not more than \$5,000.

Pursuant to NRS 641.285, requirements for proof: notwithstanding the provisions of chapter 622A of NRS, in any disciplinary proceeding before the NVBOPE, a panel of its members or a hearing officer: 1. Proof of actual injury need not be established where the complaint charges deceptive or unethical professional conduct, practice of psychology, or practice as a psychological assistant, psychological intern or psychological trainee harmful to the public.

RELEVANT LAW

The authority of the NVBOPE to pursue the claims herein against Respondent is demonstrated by a brief review of the applicable law:

Pursuant to NAC 641.200, Applicability:

1. The provisions of NAC 641.200 to 641.255, inclusive:

(a) Apply to the conduct of **any licensee** or any applicant for licensure pursuant to this chapter and chapter 641 of NRS, including conduct during any period of education, training or employment required for licensure.

(b) Constitute the standards of conduct which a psychologist, licensed behavior analyst or licensed assistant behavior analyst shall follow in the provision of services.

2. A violation of the provisions of NAC 641.200 to 641.255, inclusive, constitutes **unprofessional conduct** and is a ground for **disciplinary action** or the denial of an application for an initial license or the renewal of a license. (emphasis added).

According to NAC 641.215, Disclosure to patient or legal representative; termination of services; care of patients and research subjects. A psychologist:

11. Shall not willfully harass, abuse or intimidate any patient or other person to whom he or she has a professional responsibility.

It is alleged that Respondent violated NAC 641.215(11). It is clear from the plain language of this code section that it is intended to apply to patients *or their* legal representatives, such as a guardian or power of attorney. Nothing in this code section implies that it is intended to apply to co-workers, interns or students. As such, NAC 641.215(11) is inapplicable in the instant matter and

1 does not provide the NVBOPE with authority to initiate disciplinary action against its licensee
2 pertaining to an incident between *co-workers*.

3 According to NAC 641.250: Adoption of codes of conduct by reference; revision.

4 1. The provisions set forth in the most recent edition of the Ethical Principles of
5 Psychologists and Code of Conduct adopted by the American Psychological Association are hereby
6 adopted by reference and incorporated herein.

7 Although NAC 641.215(11) is inapplicable herein, NAC 641.250 does give the NVBOPE
8 authority to initiate disciplinary actions against its licensee pertaining to alleged violations of the
9 Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct adopted by the by the American
Psychological Association.

10 Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct

11 3.04 Avoiding Harm (a) Psychologists take reasonable steps to avoid harming their
12 clients/patients, **students, supervisees**, research participants, organizational clients, **and**
13 **others with whom they work, and to minimize harm where it is foreseeable and**
14 **unavoidable.**

15 In addition, NRS 648.150, Grounds for disciplinary action against licensee, provides that the
16 NVBOPE may discipline any licensee for “**any unprofessional conduct or unfitness of the**
17 **licensee.**” Based upon the foregoing, the NVBOPE has the right to initiate disciplinary actions
18 against any licensee for conduct which it believes constitutes “unprofessional conduct” and/or
violations of the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct adopted by the by the
19 American Psychological Association.

20 FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

21 Notably, at all relevant times herein, Respondent was a licensed psychologist II at SNAMHS,
and was the direct supervisor of Dr. Adams, a licensed psychologist I.

22 May 15-16, 2019 Events

23 According to the evidence presented at the time of the administrative hearing, the allegations
24 of bullying by Dr. Adams against Respondent stem from an incident on May 15, 2019 where Dr.
25 Adams left two psychological tests, with answer keys, with an in-patient to be completed overnight.
26 This occurrence caused Respondent to express concerns about Dr. Adams’ competence during a
27 team case meeting on May 16, 2019. Dr. Adams testified at the administrative hearing and
confirmed that he had in fact left the two tests with the patient, a fact which he has never disputed,
and testified that Respondent told him to “never do that.” Dr. Adams testified that it was ok to leave

1 tests with patients at other facilities where he worked. Dr. Adams also testified that Respondent
2 asked him something to the effect of “why do you think it was a bad idea” to leave a psychological
3 test with the patient overnight? Dr. Adams testified that he felt that these comments were
4 intimidating, excessive and unnecessary. Petitioner alleges that these comments constitute “harm”
5 and a violation of the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct 3.04(a). No definitive
6 definition of “harm” was provided at the time of the administrative hearing. According to NRS
7 641.285, proof of actual injury (a.k.a. “harm”) need not be established. However, section 3.04(a) of
8 the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct appears to require a showing of harm.

9 Regardless, a complete analysis herein must first look at whether or not the alleged conduct
10 at issue is objectively inappropriate, before making a determination of whether harm occurred. In
11 determining whether the conduct at issue is objectively inappropriate, the analysis must necessarily
12 look at the circumstances surrounding the alleged conduct and whether the conduct was isolated or
13 severe and pervasive. Since “harm” is largely subjective, determining whether “harm” occurred will
14 depend on the perception of the individual to whom the alleged conduct was directed. If the conduct
15 at issue is not objectively inappropriate, then the question of harm becomes moot. The alleged
16 conduct of the Respondent must first be found to be objectively inappropriate, in order to constitute
17 a violation of NRS Chapter 641, NAC Chapter 641, and the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and
18 Code of Conduct adopted by the by the American Psychological Association.

19 There was evidence presented at the administrative hearing that Respondent uses the Socratic
20 method for training purposes and often questions other psychologists and interns about their
21 diagnoses and reasons therefore. This is a common training method utilized by psychologists and is
22 intended, at least partly, to help train licensed psychologists to withstand cross-examination when
23 they testify at trial, a common work-related occurrence. There was also evidence presented that
24 some staff members feel that this type of “cross-examination” makes people uncomfortable and like
25 they are being “called out” or “put on the spot.” There was no testimony that the behavior at issue
has anything to do with the personal protected characteristics of the person being questioned. Ms.
26 Joanne Malay, the SNAMHS Hospital Administrator, testified at the administrative hearing that she
27 has never seen Respondent “call people out” or “cross-examine” them at meetings and that, instead,
28 these meetings are typically very interactive.

29 Dr. Sarah Damas, Respondent’s co-worker, testified that she has observed Respondent’s
30 management style at meetings and confirmed that Respondent utilizes the Socratic method. Dr.
31 Damas testified that she has never felt that Respondent was bullying or demeaning to anyone and

1 that Respondent treated everyone equally. Dr. Damas testified that this training technique helps to
2 train forensic psychologists to testify in court. In addition, Dr. Scott Fiddler, a licensed psychologist,
3 testified that he has worked with Respondent and the work culture has always been collegial and
4 “chill”. Dr. Fiddler testified that any licensed psychologist should be prepared to testify in court and
5 the Socratic method can be a challenging, but important, process for any psychologist. In addition,
6 Dr. Fiddler testified that SNAMHS is APA accredited, and that the process for training
7 psychologists at other APA accredited facilities is the same and the purpose of the training is to
8 improve patient care. Dr. Fiddler testified that he has never observed any bullying, harassment or
9 demeaning conduct by Respondent. Dr. Cecilia Shermack-Warner, a licensed psychologist I at
10 SNAMHS, testified that she worked with Dr. Adams briefly and was aware of the incident where he
11 had left two psychological tests with a patient overnight to complete on their own. Dr. Shermack-
12 Warner confirmed that this incident was very concerning because there are strict requirements on
13 how these tests are to be administered and they cannot be left with a patient that is unsupervised.
14

15 Respondent testified and explained that she believes in lifelong learning and uses team
16 meetings as opportunities for training in a collaborative learning environment. Respondent also
17 testified that she was involved in the hiring process when Dr. Adams was initially hired and she was
18 aware that Dr. Adams did not have forensic experience and did not have experience with some of the
19 psychological tests used at SNAMHS. She therefore gave Dr. Adams the tests and manuals to read
20 and become familiar with. Respondent testified that there are ethical obligations about test security
21 and strict rules about how tests are administered. She was extremely concerned when she learned
22 that Dr. Adams had left the tests with a patient. According to Respondent, after she shared her
23 concerns with Dr. Adams, he did not seem to understand why there was a concern and seemed
24 unwilling to admit any wrongdoing. Although Respondent admits to questioning Dr. Adams about
25 the two tests, she denies that her questioning was in any way improper. In fact, Respondent
26 explained that, as Dr. Adams’ supervisor, it was her responsibility to address this issue with Dr.
27 Adams.
28

May 22, 2019 Events

29 According to Dr. Adams, there was another group work meeting on May 22, 2019, where
30 Respondent again brought up the issue of the two psychological tests being left with the patient. Dr.
31 Adams testified that he felt that Respondent brought up the issue again in order to make him look
32 bad. Dr. Adams also testified that he felt that bringing up the issue again made him feel bullied and
33 degraded, so he stood up and walked out of the meeting.
34

1 Respondent testified that at this meeting Dr. Adams stood up, slammed his chair against the
2 wall, and abruptly left the meeting. Dr. Shermack-Warner, who was present at this meeting, also
3 confirmed that Dr. Adams had stood up abruptly, said something loud, ejected himself from his
4 chair, pushed the chair back against the wall, walked out and did not attend any other meetings after
5 that. Respondent testified that she texted Dr. Adams to see where he was and went to his office.
6 Respondent described Dr. Adams' behavior as "aggressive" in that he was "leaning over" his desk
7 and that this caused Respondent to feel fearful and very uncomfortable. She went to get Ms. Malay
8 so that there would be another person present for the meeting. Once Ms. Malay became involved,
9 Respondent testified that Ms. Malay spoke to Dr. Adams and from that point on human resources
10 and administration became involved in the matter. Ms. Malay confirmed Respondent's version of
11 events, mainly, that Dr. Adams was resistant to direction, coaching and guidance, and that his
12 behavior had escalated in a concerning manner after Respondent had approached him to discuss the
13 incident with the psychological tests.

14 June 3, 2019 Events

15 Dr. Adams alleged that the new committee he organized, the Safety Action Committee,
16 would not be allowed to continue pursuant to a directive from Respondent to Ms. Cookie Gamiao,
17 the Director of Quality Improvement at SNAMHS, and that the Safety Action Committee was shut
18 down as a retaliatory act. Ms. Gamiao testified at the administrative hearing that the Safety Action
19 Committee was not shut down, but rather that Dr. Adams had to be reminded that this was a sub-
20 committee, which had to be approved by administration, and was still part of the larger Patient
21 Safety Committee. Therefore, any decisions or actions by the Safety Action Committee had to be
22 approved by the larger Patient Safety Committee. Ms. Gamiao testified that Ms. Malay was in
23 agreement that the Safety Action Committee was a good idea. However, Dr. Adams was doing
24 things on his own without involving other members of the Patient Safety Committee. Ms. Gamiao
25 testified that Respondent was not the one to "kill" the Safety Action Committee, and in fact, Dr.
26 Adams was encouraged to continue with the Safety Action Committee, that had been approved by
27 the hospital administrator.

28 June 6, 2019 Events

29 On June 6, 2019, Christine Moebius and Jackie Arellano of human resources called a
30 meeting with Dr. Adams to inform him that he was being given a written warning for his ethical
31 violations and put on a formal improvement plan to gain competency with psychological testing. Dr.
32 Adams claims that these actions were retaliatory.

1 Ms. Arellano testified at the administrative hearing that Dr. Adams was having performance
2 and conduct issues and, as such, SNAMHS was required to give Dr. Adams' notice of these issues.
3 As such, he was given a written warning by Ms. Malay.

4 July 2, 2019 Events

5 Ms. Malay testified that at this time a decision was made to terminate Dr. Adams. This was a
6 human resources and hospital leadership decision. Ms. Malay testified that Respondent was not the
7 person who made the decision to terminate Dr. Adams. Ms. Malay also testified that Capital Police
8 were called to escort Dr. Adams off the premises after he was terminated due to concerns by human
9 resources about his behavior. Ms. Malay testified that Dr. Adams was a probationary employee at
10 the time and could be "released" from probation for any legitimate reason, such as performance,
11 behavior, or a policy breach. Ms. Arreano testified and confirmed that Dr. Adams was having
12 performance and conduct issues which led to him being released from his probation. Ms. Arreano
13 explained that after DHHS determined that Dr. Adams' allegations of bullying were unsubstantiated,
14 she delivered that news to Dr. Adams and was part of the decision to release him from his probation
15 because she did not think that he was a good fit for the agency. Ms. Arreano also testified that Dr.
16 Adams did not want to learn or take direction and that she had concerns about his behavior.
17 Respondent also testified and confirmed that she was not involved in the meeting or decision to
18 terminate Dr. Adams. Based upon the foregoing, it appears that the decision to terminate Dr. Adams
19 was a facility decision made primarily by the director of human resources and the hospital
20 administrator. The decision was not made by the Respondent as alleged by Petitioner and was not
21 done for retaliatory purposes.

22 Notably, Respondent denies ever bullying, harassing or demeaning Dr. Adams. The
23 overwhelming weight of the evidence in this case tends to support Respondent's version of events.
24 The only testimony of any alleged bullying, harassing or demeaning conduct by Respondent towards
25 Dr. Adams comes from Dr. Adams himself and is entirely subjective. The evidence in the case, as
26 presented at the time of the administrative hearing, reveals that there are concerns about the
27 credibility of Dr. Adams' testimony due to some of the questionable actions of Dr. Adams from the
time he filed his complaint of bullying against Dr. Bradley at work and his complaint against Dr.
Bradley with the NVBOPE. In fact, the NVBOPE took disciplinary action *against Dr. Adams* related
to some of his questionable actions, which included bizarre social media posts and making public
statements about Respondent and SNAMHS to a local publication, the Nevada Current.

1 Regardless of any issues concerning Dr. Adams’ credibility, even if we assume that
2 everything Dr. Adams testified to at the administrative hearing were true, the testimony by Dr.
3 Adams fails to demonstrate objectively inappropriate conduct by the Respondent herein. The
4 Respondent’s alleged actions of questioning Dr. Adams about the two psychological tests, cross-
5 examining him at team meetings, and asking him why it was a “bad idea” to give a patient
6 psychological tests to take on their own, do not amount to objectively inappropriate or harassing
7 behavior. Respondent’s alleged actions of giving Dr. Adams a written warning and later terminating
8 him do not amount to objectively retaliatory conduct given the totality of the circumstances in this
9 case. There is no objective evidence in this case that Respondent bullied, harassed, demeaned, or
10 harmed Dr. Adams or otherwise failed to avoid harm to Dr. Adams. Respondent was Dr. Adams’
11 direct supervisor at all times relevant herein and her actions at issue were merely her fulfilling her
12 professional work requirements and obligations in supervising Dr. Adams. There also is significant
evidence that legitimate and non-discriminatory reasons existed for the adverse employment actions
taken against Dr. Adams at SNAMHS.

13 At the time of the administrative hearing, the Respondent argued and presented evidence
14 that, after an investigation by Dr. Bradley's employer and by the State of Nevada Department of
15 Health and Human Services (DHHS), no action was taken by either against Dr. Bradley based upon
16 the exact same allegations as those at issue herein. This fact constitutes additional evidence that
Respondent's conduct was not objectively inappropriate.

17 Based upon the foregoing, this Hearing Officer finds that: (1) the evidence presented by Dr.
18 Adams and the NVBOPE fails to show, by a preponderance of the evidence, objectively
19 inappropriate conduct by Respondent constituting bullying, harassment or demeaning conduct, and
20 (2) that legitimate, non-discriminatory reasons exist for the adverse employment actions taken
21 against Dr. Adams at SNAMHS, and (3) that Respondent did not violate section 3.04(a) of the
22 Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct adopted by the American
23 Psychological Association, NRS Chapter 641 or NAC Chapter 641. Based upon the foregoing, the
issue of whether or not the alleged conduct caused Dr. Adams any “harm” is moot.

WHETHER DR. YOUNG WAS REQUIRED TO
HAVE A LICENSE AS A PRIVATE INVESTIGATOR

26 Dr. Sheila Young, as the investigator for the NVBOPE, conducted an investigation based
27 upon the complaint filed by Dr. Adams against Dr. Bradley to the NVBOPE. Notably, Dr. Young
28 testified at the hearing in this matter that her investigation consisted of review of the material

1 submitted by Dr. Adams and interviews with three (3) witnesses. Respondent argues that Dr. Young
2 did not possess the required private investigators license as required by NRS 648.012.

3 According to NRS 648.012 "Private investigator" defined:

4 1. "Private investigator" means any person who for any consideration engages in business or accepts
5 employment to furnish, or agrees to make or makes any investigation for the purpose of obtaining
6 information with reference to:

7 (a) The identity, habits, conduct, business, occupation, honesty, integrity, credibility, knowledge,
8 trustworthiness, efficiency, loyalty, activity, movement, whereabouts, affiliations, associations,
9 transactions, acts, reputation or character of any person; and
10 (e) Securing evidence to be used before any court, board, officer or investigating committee; or

11 According to NRS 648.018 Applicability of Chapter:

12 Except as to polygraphic examiners and interns, this chapter **does not apply**:

13 4. To any private investigator, private patrol officer, process server, dog handler or security
14 consultant **employed by an employer regularly in connection with the affairs of that employer if**
15 **a bona fide employer-employee relationship exists**, except as otherwise provided in NRS 648.060,
16 648.140 and 648.203.

17 According to NRS 641.125 Hearings and investigations; taking evidence:

18 In a manner consistent with the provisions of chapter 622A of NRS, the Board **may** hold
19 hearings **and conduct investigations** related to its duties under this chapter and take evidence on
20 any matter under inquiry before it.

21 According to NRS 641.270 Complaints: Review; investigation:

22 When a complaint is filed with the Board, the Board **or an investigator designated by the**
23 **Board** shall review the complaint. If, upon completing the review of the complaint, the Board **or the**
24 **investigator** designated by the Board determines that the complaint is not frivolous, the Board,
25 through the President of the Board **and the investigator** designated by the Board, **shall investigate**
26 the complaint.

27 At the administrative hearing herein, NVBOPE Investigator Dr. Young testified that she was
28 an employee of the NVBOPE for purposes of conducting investigations. The Petitioner also
produced IRS w-2 forms which indicated that Dr. Young was an employee of the NVBOPE. The
NVBOPE's Complaint, Discipline and Remediation Policy, section F(1), discusses the qualifications
of the NVBOPE's Investigators, however, there was no evidence or argument presented at the

1 administrative hearing that Dr. Young failed to satisfy the requirements enumerated in that policy
2 concerning the qualifications of an NVBOPE Board Investigator.

3 Based upon the foregoing, this Hearing Officer finds that: (1) NRS 641.125 and NRS
4 641.270 both specifically authorize the NVBOPE to utilize the services of an investigator and to
5 conduct investigations into complaints made against its licensees, and (2) Pursuant to NRS 648.018,
6 Dr. Young was not required to have a license as a private investigator if there was an employer-
7 employee relationship with an employer in connection with the regular affairs of that employer, and
8 (3) Dr. Young was an employee of the NVBOPE at the time that she conducted the investigation
9 into Dr. Adams' complaints against Respondent which are the subject of the matter herein,
NVBOPE case #19-0626, and (4) that the investigation done by Dr. Young, at the direction of the
10 NVBOPE, was in connection with the regular affairs of the NVBOPE.

SUFFICIENCY OF DR. YOUNG'S INVESTIGATION

11 Although the crux of the NVBOPE's allegations against Dr. Bradley seem to stem from
12 human resources type issues, the Nevada Revised Statutes, Nevada Administrative Code and the
13 APA Ethics Code give the NVBOPE broad jurisdiction over such matters. It is Respondent's
14 position that the NVBOPE's investigation performed by Dr. Young was inadequate and insufficient
15 due to its failure to follow its own policies and procedures. Although Respondent takes issue with
16 the way in which Dr. Young conducted the investigation (specifically by allegedly failing to
17 interview witnesses and review evidence offered by Dr. Bradley), there is no evidence that the
18 manner in which the investigation was performed violated the NVBOPE's Complaint, Discipline
19 and Remediation Policy so as to render the investigation (and subsequent disciplinary proceedings)
somehow void or improper.

20 Notably, pursuant to the NVBOPE's Complaint, Discipline and Remediation Policy, section
21 A(2)(g)(i)(1), "at the Board Investigator's discretion and as part of the investigation, the Board
22 Investigator may interview the parties, including the Complainant and the Respondent, as well as
any possible witnesses." Although Dr. Young's investigative report is brief, it technically does
23 contain all of the sections required by the NVBOPE's Complaint, Discipline and Remediation
24 Policy. Although Dr. Young may not have reviewed and/or referenced some of the evidence offered
25 by Dr. Bradley, there is no rule which states that Dr. Young is required to consider all available
26 evidence or required to list in her final investigative report her reasons for relying upon specific
27 pieces of evidence and not others.

28

Since the handling of the investigation is at the discretion of the NVBOPE Board Investigator, and there are no requirements that all possible witnesses be interviewed and all possible evidence reviewed and/or considered, there is no legal or factual basis to determine that the manner in which Dr. Young performed the investigation in this case was so deficient as to render the results of the investigation, and the instant Complaint against Dr. Bradley, somehow void or improper.

CONCLUSION

The undersigned Hearing Officer, having presided over the administrative hearing on this matter, having heard the evidence presented by witness testimony, having reviewed the documentary evidence provided by the parties, and having listened to the arguments of counsel, hereby issues the following ruling:

Based upon the above stated findings of fact and conclusions of law, the undersigned Hearing Officer hereby finds in favor of the Respondent Dr. Shera Bradley, and against the Petitioner, the NVBOPE. The Petitioner has failed to meet its burden of proof, that Respondent engaged in unprofessional conduct, by a preponderance of the evidence, that violated the provisions of the NRS Chapter 641, NAC Chapter 641, or section 3.04(a) of the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct adopted by the American Psychological Association.

AS SUCH, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's Complaint #19-0626 against the Respondent is hereby DISMISSED, with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated, the 21st day of November, 2025.

/s/ Shirley Blazich, Esq.

Shirley Blazich, Esq.

Hearing Officer

EXHIBIT 2

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

BEFORE THE STATE OF NEVADA
BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS

**STATE OF NEVADA, BOARD OF
PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS**

Case Number: 24-0103

vs.

Petitioner,

Decision and Order in Case #24-0103

SHERA BRADLEY

Respondent

Decision and Order in Case #24-0103

An administrative hearing on Petitioner, the State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners (“NVBOPE” and/or “Petitioner”) Complaint in Case #24-0103 was held in a hybrid (in-person and remote) format on November 12-14, 2025, from 9:00am to 5:00pm PST each day, before Hearing Officer Shirley Blazich, Esq. Deputy Attorney General Harry Ward, Esq., attended remotely via videoconferencing on behalf of the Petitioner. Brent Vogel, Esq., of the law firm Lewis Brisbois Brisgaard & Smith, attended in person on behalf of the Respondent, Dr. Shera Bradley (“Dr. Bradley” and/or “Respondent”). Also in attendance were the Respondent, Dr. Shera Bradley (in-person), and the Executive Director of the NVBOPE, Ms. Laura Arnold (remote). The hearing took place at the Nevada State Business Center, Red Rock Room, located at 3300 West Sahara Ave., Las Vegas, Nevada, 89102.

RELEVANT PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

This case arises out of an investigation conducted by NVBOPE Investigator Dr. Sheila Young (“Dr. Young”), against Respondent Dr. Bradley. In June of 2019, Dr. Ben Adams (“Dr. Adams”) filed a complaint with the NVBOPE alleging inappropriate conduct and bullying by Dr. Bradley. Dr. Bradley denied these allegations. The NVBOPE filed a formal complaint, case #19-

1 0626, against Dr. Bradley based upon Dr. Adams' allegations. During discovery in case #19-0626,
2 the depositions of Dr. Christine Moninghoff ("Dr. Moninghoff") and Dr. Amanda DeVillez ("Dr.
3 DeVillez") were taken. Dr. Young reviewed these depositions at a later date and subsequently
4 recommended to the NVBOPE that additional allegations of unprofessional conduct be made against
5 Dr. Bradley based upon the deposition testimony of Drs. Moninghoff and DeVillez. The instant case,
6 #24-0103, followed. Notably, Drs. Moninghoff and DeVillez did not themselves file any complaints
about Dr. Bradley with the NVBOPE.

7 Petitioner's Amended Complaint, filed on December 4, 2024, alleged five separate causes of
8 action against Respondent as follows: (1) and (2) Failing to Comply with Statutes and Regulations;
9 and (3), (4) and (5) Violation of the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct.
10 Respondent was, at the relevant times mentioned in the Amended Complaint, licensed as a
11 psychologist with the NVBOPE, and currently holds license number PY0564. Therefore,
12 Respondent is subject to the jurisdiction of the NVBOPE and the provisions of NRS Chapter 641,
13 NAC Chapter 641, and the provisions set forth in the most recent edition of the Ethical Principles of
14 Psychologists and Code of Conduct adopted by the American Psychological Association and
adopted by reference and incorporated pursuant to NAC 641.250.

15 On July 15, 2025, this Hearing Officer issued an Order Denying Respondent's Motion for
16 Summary Judgment in the above-captioned matter. As such, all of Petitioner's allegations in case
#24-0103 remained for final determination at the administrative hearing in this matter.
17

RELEVANT FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

18 It is alleged by Petitioner that, at the time of the alleged violations in the Amended
19 Complaint, Respondent was bound by the provisions set forth in the most recent edition of the
20 Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct adopted by the American Psychological
21 Association and adopted by reference and incorporated pursuant to NAC 641.250. It is also alleged
22 that the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct states that it applies to
23 psychologists' activities that are part of their scientific, educational, or professional roles as
24 psychologists. It is further alleged that the areas covered include, but are not limited to, the clinical,
25 counseling, and school of practice of psychology; research; teaching; supervision of trainees; public
service; and administration.

Dr. Christine Moninghoff

27 It is alleged that Dr. Moninghoff worked at the Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health
28 Services ("SNAMHS") while Respondent was her supervisor from 2015 to 2018. It is alleged that

1 Respondent's actions caused harm to Dr. Moninghoff by making the work environment at SNAMHS
2 so uncomfortable and harmful that it caused harm to Dr. Moninghoff, forcing her to leave the
3 employment of SNAMHS. It is alleged that during this period of time, Respondent violated the
4 Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct, Sections 3.03 and 3.04 when Respondent
5 spoke to Dr. Moninghoff in a harassing and demeaning manner and without taking reasonable steps
6 to avoid harm to Dr. Moninghoff. It is alleged that Respondent stated to Dr. Moninghoff that she
7 was clinically superior to Dr. Moninghoff and that Dr. Moninghoff was inferior to Respondent. It is
8 alleged that the Respondent harmed, harassed or demeaned Dr. Moninghoff making these statements
9 about Dr. Moninghoff's educational background, the types of programs she took, and that the
10 program Dr. Moninghoff attended did not produce real high-quality psychologists. It is alleged that
11 Respondent instructed Dr. Moninghoff to do things "her way" and not in the customary
12 "administrative way". It is alleged that Respondent told Dr. Moninghoff she was being
13 "argumentative" regarding discussions about intern supervision and then accusing Dr. Moninghoff
14 of "not participating" in intern supervision discussions with Dr. Moninghoff believing she could not
15 professionally disagree with Respondent making Dr. Moninghoff feel she was stuck between a "rock
16 and a hard place". It is alleged that Respondent told Dr. Moninghoff in staff meetings in a
17 demeaning manner that some of Dr. Moninghoff's opinions were ridiculous, absurd, or did not make
18 any sense, causing harm to Moninghoff. It is alleged that Respondent brought Dr. Moninghoff and
19 Dr. Moninghoff's intern into her office and provided the intern with a long laundry list of things to
20 do which left Dr. Moninghoff and the intern overwhelmed with work. It is alleged that Respondent
21 did not take reasonable steps to avoid harming Dr. Moninghoff and the intern by punishing the
22 intern with extra work even though Respondent knew the intern was already overwhelmed with
23 work. It is alleged that Respondent harassed Dr. Moninghoff's pregnant intern requiring the intern to
24 bring in doctor notes for all her prenatal appointments. It is alleged that Respondent unfairly
25 discriminated against the pregnant intern by saying: "I can't believe an intern would get pregnant
26 during internship". It is also alleged that Respondent harassed Dr. Jaitly in the presence of Dr.
27 Moninghoff and singled out Dr. Jaitly in a staff meeting in a harassing and demeaning manner.
28

It is alleged that Respondent acted in a harassing and demeaning manner to intern Dr. Holczer. It is alleged that Dr. Moninghoff witnessed Respondent's harmful and harassing actions toward intern Dr. Holczer who was overwhelmed with work and Respondent knowingly then giving intern Dr. Holczer a longer, and longer, and longer laundry list of things to do. It is alleged Respondent commented in a harassing and demeaning manner about an African American female

1 intern that was wearing a “hoodie” causing the intern to become very upset and to cry in the
2 workplace. It is alleged that Respondent’s actions toward the intern were discriminatory, harassing,
3 demeaning and harmful towards the intern. It is alleged that Dr. Moninghoff witnessed Respondent’s
4 actions and perceived them to be unnecessarily harsh treatment to the interns regarding things such
5 as the interns’ attire and their ability to balance work with the rest of their life.

5 Dr. Amanda DeVillez

6 It is alleged that Dr. Amanda DeVillez (“Dr. DeVillez”) began working as an intern at
7 STEIN in the summer of 2016. It is alleged that Dr. DeVillez became a Nevada State employee at
8 SNAMHS in November 2016. It is alleged that Dr. DeVillez left SNAMHS in December 2018. It is
9 alleged that during these time periods, her supervisor was Respondent Dr. Bradley and that
10 Respondent’s actions caused harm to Dr. DeVillez. It is alleged that during this period of time,
11 Respondent violated the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct, Sections 3.01,
12 3.03 and 3.04 when Respondent engaged in unfair discrimination towards pregnant intern Dr.
13 DeVillez by failing to make accommodations for her and making her repeatedly come into work at
14 certain times of the day and attend weekly meetings in-person instead of remotely attending. It is
15 alleged that Respondent engaged in unfair discrimination towards pregnant Dr. DeVillez and that
16 Respondent knowingly harassed or demeaned Dr. DeVillez and failed to take reasonable steps to
17 avoid harming Dr. DeVillez by making her do things that other licensed psychologists weren’t
18 required to do, like attending weekly Friday didactics meetings in-person, and by reprimanding only
19 her for things that other psychologists did at SNAMHS.

20 It is alleged that in 2017 Dr. DeVillez filed a grievance with human resources at SNAMHS
21 asserting that Respondent harassed her and discriminated against her because she was pregnant. It is
22 alleged that Dr. DeVillez witnessed Respondent harassing and bulling another pregnant intern, Dr.
23 Antrice Hronek, and that Respondent told Dr. DeVillez: “Who gets pregnant during internship?”
24 causing harm to Dr. DeVillez. It is alleged that during this period of time Respondent harassed and
25 harmed Dr. DeVillez causing significant mental and physical distress requiring Dr. DeVillez to seek
26 professional help. It is alleged that Respondent made the work environment at SNAMHS so
27 uncomfortable and harmful for Dr. DeVillez that Respondent’s harmful actions caused Dr. DeVillez to leave
SNAMHS. It is alleged that Respondent harassed Dr. DeVillez when Dr. DeVillez told
Respondent that she was leaving SNAMHS and gave Dr. DeVillez extra work, and last-minute
assignments previously assigned to others, causing harm to Dr. DeVillez.

28

It is alleged that with regard to each of the above referenced occurrences, Respondent violated NRS Chapter 641, NAC Chapter 641, and the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct, Sections 3.01, 3.03 and 3.04.

BURDEN OF PROOF AND REQUIREMENTS FOR PROOF

Pursuant to NRS Chapter 641, upon proof by a preponderance of the evidence that an applicant or licensee has engaged in activity that is grounds for disciplinary action as described in NRS Chapter 641 and NAC Chapter 641, the NVBOPE may take disciplinary action pursuant to NRS 641.240 including the imposition of a fine of not more than \$5,000.

Pursuant to NRS 641.285, requirements for proof: notwithstanding the provisions of chapter 622A of NRS, in any disciplinary proceeding before the NVBOPE, a panel of its members or a hearing officer: 1. Proof of actual injury need not be established where the complaint charges deceptive or unethical professional conduct, practice of psychology, or practice as a psychological assistant, psychological intern or psychological trainee harmful to the public.

RELEVANT LAW

The authority of the NVBOPE to pursue the claims herein against Respondent is demonstrated by a brief review of the applicable law:

Pursuant to NRS 641.250(1), the Board or any member thereof which becomes aware that any one(1) or combination of the grounds for initiating disciplinary action may exist as to a person practicing psychology in the State of Nevada shall file a written complaint specifying the relevant facts with the Board.

Pursuant to NAC 641.200, Applicability:

1. The provisions of NAC 641.200 to 641.255, inclusive:
 - (a) Apply to the conduct of **any licensee** or any applicant for licensure pursuant to this chapter and chapter 641 of NRS, including conduct during any period of education, training or employment required for licensure.
 - (b) Constitute the standards of conduct which a psychologist, licensed behavior analyst or licensed assistant behavior analyst shall follow in the provision of services.
2. A violation of the provisions of NAC 641.200 to 641.255, inclusive, constitutes **unprofessional conduct** and is a ground for **disciplinary action** or the denial of an application for an initial license or the renewal of a license. (emphasis added).

According to NAC 641.215, Disclosure to patient or legal representative; termination of services; care of patients and research subjects. A psychologist:

1 11. Shall not willfully harass, abuse or intimidate any patient or other person to whom he or
2 she has a professional responsibility.

3 It is alleged that Respondent violated NAC 641.215(11). It is clear from the plain language
4 of this code section that it is intended to apply to patients *or their* legal representatives, such as a
5 guardian or power of attorney. Nothing in this code section implies that it is intended to apply to co-
6 workers, interns or students. As such, NAC 641.215(11) is inapplicable in the instant matter and
7 does not provide the NVBOPE with authority to initiate disciplinary action against its licensee
pertaining to an incident between *co-workers*.

8 According to NAC 641.250: Adoption of codes of conduct by reference; revision.

9 1. The provisions set forth in the most recent edition of the Ethical Principles of
10 Psychologists and Code of Conduct adopted by the American Psychological Association are hereby
adopted by reference and incorporated herein.

11 Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct

12 3.01 Unfair Discrimination In their work-related activities, psychologists do not engage in
13 unfair discrimination based upon age, gender, gender identity, race, ethnicity, culture,
14 national origin, religion, sexual orientation, disability, socioeconomic status, or any basis
proscribed by law.

16 3.03 Other Harassment Psychologists do not knowingly engage in behavior that is harassing
17 or demeaning to persons with whom they interact in their work based on factors such as
those persons' age, gender, gender identity, race, ethnicity, culture, national origin, religion,
18 sexual orientation, disability, language, or socioeconomic status.

19 3.04(a) Avoiding Harm (a) Psychologists take reasonable steps to avoid harming their
20 clients/patients, students, supervisees, research participants, organizational clients, and others
with whom they work, and to minimize harm where it is foreseeable and unavoidable.

22 In addition, NRS 648.150, Grounds for disciplinary action against licensee, provides that the
23 NVBOPE may discipline any licensee for "**any unprofessional conduct or unfitness of the**
24 **licensee.**" Although NAC 641.215(11) is inapplicable herein, NRS 641.250(1), NRS 648.150, and
25 NAC 641.250 do give the NVBOPE authority to initiate disciplinary actions against its licensee for
conduct which it believes constitutes "unprofessional conduct" and/or pertaining to alleged
26 violations of NRS Chapter 641, NAC Chapter 641, and the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and
27 Code of Conduct adopted by the by the American Psychological Association.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

2 Notably, at all relevant times herein, Respondent was a licensed psychologist II at SNAMHS,
3 and was the direct supervisor of Drs. Moninghoff and DeVillez. No definitive definition of “harm”
4 was provided at the time of the administrative hearing. According to NRS 641.285, proof of actual
5 injury (a.k.a. “harm”) need not be established. However, section 3.04(a) of the Ethical Principles of
6 Psychologists and Code of Conduct appears to require a showing of harm. Regardless, a complete
7 analysis herein must first look at whether the alleged conduct at issue is objectively inappropriate,
8 before making a determination of whether harm occurred. In determining whether the conduct at
9 issue is objectively inappropriate, the analysis must necessarily look at the circumstances
surrounding the alleged conduct and whether the conduct was isolated or severe and pervasive.
10 Since “harm” is largely subjective, determining whether “harm” occurred will depend on the
11 perception of the individual to whom the alleged conduct was directed. If the conduct at issue is not
12 objectively inappropriate, then the question of harm becomes moot. The alleged conduct of the
13 Respondent must first be found to be objectively inappropriate, in order to constitute a violation of
14 NRS Chapter 641, NAC Chapter 641, and the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of
Conduct adopted by the American Psychological Association.

Dr. Christine Moninghoff

16 Dr. Moninghoff testified that Respondent was her supervisor when she worked at SNAMHS
17 and that she had interactions with Respondent that she was not pleased with which included
18 harassing and demeaning behavior to Dr. Moninghoff personally as well as others. Dr. Moninghoff
19 clarified that Respondent did not “harass” her, but that she did feel Respondent’s conduct was
20 demeaning. Dr. Moninghoff never personally filed any complaints or grievances against
21 Respondent. In her testimony Dr. Moninghoff did not assert that Respondent’s behavior toward her
was due to any protected characteristic of Dr. Moninghoff or that it was discriminatory in nature.

22 Dr. Moninghoff testified that when she spoke up during staff meetings, she was told by the
23 Respondent that she was being “argumentative” and when she did not speak up, she was accused of
24 not participating. She felt that this was demeaning and that she could not provide professional
25 feedback and was made to feel that she wasn’t as knowledgeable or experienced as others. Dr.
26 Moninghoff acknowledged that Respondent made sure that people knew what was expected of them
27 and that the term “micromanager” could apply to Respondent in this situation. Dr. Moninghoff also
28 testified that there was a lot of “back and forth” with Respondent about personnel issues and if
coverage was needed when a doctor was on PTO for more than 2 days. Dr. Moninghoff testified that

1 a large part of why she left SNAMHS was because of how things were going with Respondent.
2 Notably, Dr. Moninghoff received a promotion to a licensed psychologist II after she left
3 employment at SNAMHS.

4 Dr. Moninghoff also testified that during Respondent's interactions with interns, some of
5 them were feeling overwhelmed and yet they kept being given additional tasks to complete. When
6 meetings with the interns took place, they would leave the meetings feeling more overwhelmed than
7 before. Dr. Moninghoff acknowledged that she was not an intern at that time, but she felt that it was
8 inappropriate to give the interns additional tasks to complete. Dr. Moninghoff also felt that interns
9 were "called out" during staff meetings and made to feel uncomfortable, which she characterized as
10 being inappropriate. She also testified that she felt it was unnecessary to require interns to bring in a
11 doctor's note for missed work time.

12 Dr. Moninghoff testified that she witnessed harsh treatment of another intern who was told
13 not to wear a hoodie to work and was put on a remediation plan. Dr. Moninghoff testified that she
14 had seen other people wear hoodies without repercussion and that there was no safety risk in
15 wearing a hoodie at a staff meeting. She did acknowledge that there could be a safety risk if wearing
16 a hoodie on the floor while working with patients.

17 In addition, Dr. Moninghoff testified that she witnessed Respondent "bullying" Dr. DeVillez
18 and Dr. Hronek. Although Dr. Moninghoff could not recall all of the details due to the amount of
19 time that had passed, she recalled seeing Dr. Hronek crying at one point.

20 Respondent testified that Dr. Moninghoff was already working at SNAMHS when
21 Respondent was hired. Respondent was Dr. Moninghoff's supervisor and had concerns about Dr.
22 Moninghoff's work. Specifically, Respondent was concerned that Dr. Moninghoff was doing work
23 for her other job during her work hours at SNAMHS. As her supervisor, it was Respondent's
24 responsibility to ensure that she could account for 80 hours' worth of work from the staff she was
25 responsible for each pay period.

26 Respondent also testified that there are strict hourly requirements for interns at SNAMHS to
27 complete the required 2,000 hours of training. Interns typically did not receive a lot of paid time off
28 because the internship only lasted a year. There were meetings to discuss the internship program and
supervision requirements which Dr. Moninghoff attended. As such, Respondent maintains that Dr.
Moninghoff was aware of the requirement that interns provide doctor's notes for any time missed
from work. Respondent explained that this was needed for record-keeping purposes in order to

1 ensure that interns received the correct pay and proper credit for the hours needed to complete their
2 internship programs.

3 Respondent testified and confirmed that she had told an intern not to wear a hoodie to work.
4 Respondent explained that hoodies were against the dress code and were safety concerns because of
5 the type of patient population the psychologists saw and treated. In addition, Respondent recalled
6 that on the day of the event at issue, there were other prospective interns touring the facility and she
7 felt that it was important that the staff at SNAMHS looked professional. Other witnesses, including
8 Dr. Shermack-Warner, another licensed psychologist at SNAMHS, confirmed that hoodies were
against the SNAMHS dress code and presented a safety risk.

9 There was evidence presented at the administrative hearing that Respondent used the
10 Socratic method for training purposes and often questioned other psychologists and interns about
11 their diagnoses and reasons therefore during staff meetings. This is a common training method
12 utilized by psychologists and is intended, at least partly, to help train licensed psychologists to
13 withstand cross-examination when they testify at trial, a common work-related occurrence. There
14 was also evidence presented that some staff members felt that this type of “cross-examination” made
15 people uncomfortable and like they were being “called out” or “put on the spot.” There was no
16 testimony that the behavior at issue has anything to do with the personal protected characteristics of
17 the person being questioned. Notably, Respondent admitted to having a different supervisory style
18 than her predecessor, Dr. Walter. Respondent testified and explained that she believed in lifelong
learning and used team meetings as opportunities for training in a collaborative learning
environment.

19 Ms. Joanne Malay, the SNAMHS Hospital Administrator, testified at the administrative
20 hearing that she has never seen Respondent “call people out” or “cross-examine” them at meetings
21 and that, instead, these meetings are typically very interactive. Dr. Sarah Damas, Respondent’s co-
22 worker, testified that she has observed Respondent’s management style at meetings and confirmed
23 that Respondent utilizes the Socratic method. Dr. Damas testified that she has never felt that
24 Respondent was bullying or demeaning to anyone and that Respondent treated everyone equally. Dr.
25 Damas testified that this training technique helps to train forensic psychologists to testify in court. In
26 addition, Dr. Scott Fiddler, a licensed psychologist, testified that he has worked with Respondent
27 and the work culture has always been collegial and “chill”. Dr. Fiddler testified that any licensed
28 psychologist should be prepared to testify in court and the Socratic method can be a challenging, but
important, process for any psychologist. In addition, Dr. Fiddler testified that SNAMHS is APA

1 accredited, and that the process for training psychologists at other APA accredited facilities is the
2 same and the purpose of the training is to improve patient care. Dr. Fiddler testified that he has never
3 observed any bullying, harassment or demeaning conduct by Respondent.

4 Dr. Amanda DeVillez

5 According to Dr. DeVillez, she completed her internship and became a licensed psychologist
6 in November of 2017. Despite having completed her internship, Dr. DeVillez testified that
7 Respondent continued to require her to have individual supervision and meetings with Respondent
8 that other licensed psychologists were not required to have. Overtime, Dr. DeVillez testified that this
9 snowballed and became harassing and that she was not being treated as a licensed psychologist.
10 According to Dr. DeVillez, she felt that she was being harassed by Respondent and that Respondent
11 was always looking for any opportunity to bring Dr. DeVillez into her office to address her being
12 late for work and the Respondent even told Dr. DeVillez that she could be fired for being late.

13 Dr. DeVillez testified that she was not pregnant during any of the relevant times, but she did
14 have a disability for which she eventually requested accommodation. According to Dr. DeVillez, it
15 was very difficult for her to make the in person 8am weekly meetings due to her disability. Although
16 Dr. DeVillez did acknowledge receiving an accommodation which allowed her to come to work an
17 hour later on days when there were no early morning staff meetings, she did not believe that this
18 accommodation was adequate. Dr. DeVillez testified that another employee was allowed to work
19 remotely on Fridays because she lived in Pahrump, Nevada. Dr. DeVillez did not know whether the
20 other employee had been given an accommodation or not.

21 Dr. DeVillez also testified about an incident where she was subpoenaed to testify in person in
22 trial in northern Nevada, but that Respondent told her to ask if she could testify remotely instead.
23 According to Dr. DeVillez this was a good opportunity for her professional development because
24 licensed psychologists are often required to testify in trial. Dr. DeVillez apparently never asked if
25 she could testify remotely, and ultimately, ended up testifying in person anyway. After this incident
26 Dr. DeVillez was given a letter of instruction, the first step in progressive discipline. According to
27 Dr. DeVillez, the only reason that she left her employment at SNAMHS was because of the
28 treatment by Respondent. The Respondent's conduct towards her caused Dr. DeVillez to feel
anxiety and depression and exacerbated her chronic medical condition.

29 In addition, Dr. DeVillez testified that the manner in which Respondent questioned people
30 amounted to "cross-examination" and was unreasonable, harassing, and not productive. Dr. DeVillez

1 did acknowledge that part of her job was testifying at trial and that SNAMHS offered mock trial
2 training to help the psychologists learn to testify.

3 According to Dr. DeVillez, there was also an incident at a potluck at Respondent's home
4 where Respondent made a comment about Dr. DeVillez being a picky eater. Dr. DeVillez explained
5 that she was on a strict medical diet for her chronic medical condition, which Respondent knew
about, and could not eat a lot of things.

6 There was a pregnant intern, Dr. Hronek, and Dr. DeVillez testified that she heard
7 Respondent make a comment in a derogatory tone to the effect of "Who gets pregnant during an
8 internship?" However, this comment was not made to, or in front of, Dr. Hronek, and Dr. DeVillez
9 testified that she could not recall any specific interactions between Respondent and Dr. Hronek and
10 could not recall ever seeing Dr. Hronek crying at work.

11 Respondent denies ever making this comment and went on to state that she herself was
12 pregnant during her internship. Notably, Respondent denies ever bullying, harassing or demeaning
13 Dr. DeVillez, or anyone else. According to Respondent, Dr. DeVillez was a newly licensed
14 psychologist and still required supervision. New, or early career, licensed psychologists still have
15 gaps in their clinical knowledge and experience. Respondent was Dr. DeVillez' supervisor and
16 testified that Dr. DeVillez was having performance issues with getting her work completed on time
17 and attending required weekly meetings. There were strict time requirements when evaluations of
18 patients had to be completed and so late work was not an insignificant issue. Respondent testified
19 that things were fine with Dr. DeVillez while she was still in her internship but that the relationship
20 changed over time. Respondent also testified that she treated Dr. DeVillez just like everyone else.

21 Dr. Laurel Steinar, another licensed psychologist, also testified that she worked closely with
22 Dr. DeVillez and provided her with secondary supervision. Dr. Steinar testified that Dr. DeVillez
23 consistently required more supervision and encouragement than others to get her work done,
24 including needing repeated reminders and calendar invitations to meet deadlines. Dr. Steiner
25 confirmed that Dr. DeVillez was frequently late for meetings, was unprepared, and was rushed. Dr.
26 Steiner also confirmed that use of the Socratic method in meetings was a standard part of training
27 and was never bullying or harassing or demeaning. She admitted that it could feel uncomfortable for
28 some people, but that it was generally a relaxed environment, and she never perceived Respondent
as being too harsh. Dr. Aaron Bomer testified that he has worked at SNAMHS for 26 years and that
there have been a lot of improvements since Respondent started working there. He testified that he

1 has seen Respondent interact with staff and has never observed any behavior from Respondent that
2 is bullying, harassing or demeaning. He has only seen a supervisor exercising supervisory duties.

3 Dr. Vincent Brouwers testified and confirmed that the Socratic method is a common training
4 method used to help develop critical thinking skills. Dr. Brouwers acknowledged that the process
5 could be difficult for some, but that he never witnessed Respondent acting in a manner that was
6 bullying, harassing or demeaning. Dr. Brouwers confirmed that psychologists, especially those on
7 the forensic side, had to be prepared to testify at trial and to defend their work and diagnoses. Dr.
8 Brouwers also confirmed that Dr. DeVillez had performance and attendance issues at work.

9 Ms. Jackie Arreano, the Director of Human Resources at SNAMHS, testified and confirmed
10 that Dr. DeVillez was having performance and attendance issues. Ms. Arreano explained that Dr.
11 DeVillez did not comply with the terms of the letter of instruction that she had been given and,
12 therefore, she received a written reprimand which was later reduced to a written warning at Dr.
13 DeVillez' request. Ms. Arreano confirmed that hoodies are not appropriate work wear, are against
14 the dress code, and can represent a safety risk in that particular work environment. Ms. Arreano
15 testified that in order for an employee to receive an ADA accommodation, it was joint decision
16 between human resources, the employee, and their supervisor. Ms. Arreano confirmed that Dr.
17 DeVillez had been approved for an accommodation. Ms. Arreano testified that Dr. DeVillez never
18 made any complaints of bullying to the human resources about Respondent.

19 According to Respondent, even after receiving an accommodation Dr. DeVillez continued to
20 be consistently late to work, sometimes as much as 1 ½ hours late to a 2 hour meeting and continued
21 to miss significant portions of early morning staff meetings. When Dr. DeVillez came to meetings
22 late, Respondent explained that it was disruptive and affected workflow. SNAMHS was required to
23 move patients quickly through the system and Respondent was tasked with making sure the facility
24 met its requirements and that staff were working as required. Respondent explained that she would
25 be responsible for ensuring that other psychologists worked their required hours. When someone
26 was not doing what they were supposed to do, it was Respondent's responsibility to address it.
27 Respondent testified that she provided Dr. DeVillez the accommodation which she had been
28 approved for, but that Dr. DeVillez felt that she had not gotten all of the accommodation that she
wanted. Respondent further testified that Dr. Shermack-Warner had been approved to work from
home one day a week before Respondent ever worked at SNAMHS. Dr. Shermack-Warner also
testified at the administrative hearing and confirmed that she had been given approval before

1 Respondent was hired to have an administrative day in order to catch up on charting, reports and
2 other documentation.

3 Due to the fact that Dr. DeVillez went to testify at trial in person against Respondent's
4 wishes, she was given a written reprimand which was later reduced to a written warning at Dr.
5 DeVillez' request. Notably, Dr. DeVillez had been offered another accommodation, to switch job
6 roles to a position on the civil side which did not have the same requirements for attending early
7 morning meetings, which Dr. DeVillez declined. According to Respondent, Dr. DeVillez only filed
8 her grievance *after* she was disciplined and requested that her discipline be lowered from a written
9 reprimand to a written warning. According to Respondent, she was concerned about the cost to
10 SNAMHS of having Dr. DeVillez testify in person, as it would entail the cost of a flight and missed
11 time from work. Given the relatively minor role Dr. DeVillez had played while she was an intern
12 with regard to the case in trial, Respondent did not feel that this warranted the financial cost to
13 SNAMHS to have Dr. DeVillez testify in person. Respondent explained that there would be other
14 opportunities for Dr. DeVillez to testify in person.

15 Based upon the foregoing, the overwhelming weight of the evidence in this case tends to
16 support Respondent's version of events. The testimony at the administrative hearing pertaining to
17 any alleged bullying, harassing or demeaning conduct by Respondent is entirely subjective and
18 based primarily upon people's feelings about the alleged conduct at issue. Regardless, even if we
19 assume that everything Dr. Moninghoff and Dr. DeVillez testified to at the administrative hearing
20 were true, the evidence fails to demonstrate objectively inappropriate conduct by the Respondent
21 herein. The Respondent's alleged actions of questioning staff during staff meetings, giving too much
22 work to interns, requiring doctor's notes, telling staff not to wear hoodies, and taking disciplinary
23 actions against staff that were having performance and attendance issues, does not amount to
24 objectively inappropriate bullying, harassing or demeaning behavior. Given the totality of the
25 circumstances in this case, there is no objective evidence in this case that Respondent bullied,
26 harassed, demeaned, or harmed Dr. Moninghoff, Dr. DeVillez, or other staff, or otherwise failed to
27 avoid harm to Dr. Moninghoff, Dr. DeVillez, or other staff. Respondent was the direct supervisor of
28 all of the staff at issue at all times relevant herein and her actions towards them were merely
fulfilling her professional work requirements and obligations in supervising them. Respondent may
be a strict boss, but there is no objective evidence that Respondent acted in a discriminatory manner
or ever crossed the line and engaged in conduct that was bullying, harassing or demeaning. There

1 also is significant evidence that legitimate and non-discriminatory reasons existed for the adverse
2 employment actions taken against Dr. DeVillez at SNAMHS and for Respondent's alleged conduct
3 at issue towards Drs. Moninghoff, DeVillez and others.

4 Based upon the foregoing, this Hearing Officer finds that: (1) the evidence presented by the
5 NVBOPE fails to show, by a preponderance of the evidence, objectively inappropriate conduct by
6 Respondent constituting bullying, harassment or demeaning conduct, and (2) that legitimate, non-
7 discriminatory reasons exist for the adverse employment actions taken against Dr. DeVillez at
8 SNAMHS and for Respondent's alleged conduct at issue towards Drs. Mininghoff, DeVillez and
9 others, and (3) that Respondent did not violate sections 3.01, 3.03 or 3.04(a) of the Ethical Principles
10 of Psychologists and Code of Conduct adopted by the by the American Psychological Association,
11 NRS Chapter 641 or NAC Chapter 641. Based upon the foregoing, the issue of whether or not the
12 alleged conduct caused any "harm" to Dr. Moninghoff, Dr. DeVillez, or other staff, is moot.

13 WHETHER DR. YOUNG WAS REQUIRED TO
14 HAVE A LICENSE AS A PRIVATE INVESTIGATOR

15 Dr. Young, as the investigator for the NVBOPE in case #19-0626, conducted an
16 investigation based upon the complaint filed by Dr. Adams against Dr. Bradley to the NVBOPE.
17 Notably, Dr. Young testified at the hearing in this matter that her investigation consisted of review
18 of the material submitted by Dr. Adams and interviews with three (3) witnesses. During discovery in
19 case #19-0626 the depositions of Drs. Moninghoff and DeVillez were taken. Dr. Young, at a later
20 date, reviewed these depositions and this became the basis for the Petitioner's claims against
21 Respondent in the instant case, #24-0103.

22 Respondent argues that Dr. Sheila Young did not possess the required private investigators
23 license as required by NRS 648.012.

24 According to NRS 648.012 "Private investigator" defined:

25 1. "Private investigator" means any person who for any consideration engages in business or accepts
26 employment to furnish, or agrees to make or makes any investigation for the purpose of obtaining
27 information with reference to:
28 (a) The identity, habits, conduct, business, occupation, honesty, integrity, credibility, knowledge,
trustworthiness, efficiency, loyalty, activity, movement, whereabouts, affiliations, associations,
transactions, acts, reputation or character of any person; and
(e) Securing evidence to be used before any court, board, officer or investigating committee;

1 According to NRS 648.018 Applicability of Chapter:

2 Except as to polygraphic examiners and interns, this chapter **does not apply**:

3 4. To any private investigator, private patrol officer, process server, dog handler or security
4 consultant **employed by an employer regularly in connection with the affairs of that employer if**
5 **a bona fide employer-employee relationship exists**, except as otherwise provided in NRS 648.060,
6 648.140 and 648.203.

7 According to NRS 641.125 Hearings and investigations; taking evidence:

8 In a manner consistent with the provisions of chapter 622A of NRS, the Board **may** hold
9 hearings **and conduct investigations** related to its duties under this chapter and take evidence on
any matter under inquiry before it.

10 According to NRS 641.270 Complaints: Review; investigation:

11 When a complaint is filed with the Board, the Board **or an investigator designated by the**
12 **Board** shall review the complaint. If, upon completing the review of the complaint, the Board **or the**
13 **investigator** designated by the Board determines that the complaint is not frivolous, the Board,
14 through the President of the Board **and the investigator** designated by the Board, **shall investigate**
the complaint.

15 At the administrative hearing herein, NVBOPE Investigator Dr. Sheila Young testified that
16 she was an employee of the NVBOPE for purposes of conducting investigations. The Petitioner also
17 produced IRS w-2 forms which indicated that Dr. Young was an employee of the NVBOPE. The
18 NVBOPE's Complaint, Discipline and Remediation Policy, section F(1), discusses the qualifications
19 of the NVBOPE's Investigators, however, there was no evidence or argument presented at the
20 administrative hearing that Dr. Young failed to satisfy the requirements enumerated in that policy
concerning the qualifications of an NVBOPE Board Investigator.

21 Based upon the foregoing, this Hearing Officer finds that: (1) NRS 641.125 and NRS
22 641.270 both specifically authorize the NVBOPE to utilize the services of an investigator and to
conduct investigations into complaints made against its licensees, and (2) Pursuant to NRS 648.018,
23 Dr. Sheila Young was not required to have a license as a private investigator if there was an
employer-employee relationship with an employer in connection with the regular affairs of that
24 employer, and (3) Dr. Sheila Young was an employee of the NVBOPE at the time that she
conducted the investigation in NVBOPE cases #19-0626 and #24-0103, and (4) that the
25 investigation done by Dr. Sheila Young, at the direction of the NVBOPE, was in connection with the
26 regular affairs of the NVBOPE.

SUFFICIENCY OF DR. YOUNG'S INVESTIGATION

Although the crux of the NVBOPE’s allegations against Dr. Bradley seem to stem from human resources type issues, the Nevada Revised Statutes, Nevada Administrative Code and the APA Ethics Code give the NVBOPE broad jurisdiction over such matters. It is Respondent’s position that the NVBOPE’s investigation performed by Dr. Young, was inadequate and insufficient due to its failure to follow its own policies and procedures. Although Respondent takes issue with the way in which Dr. Young conducted the investigation (specifically by relying only upon deposition transcripts and allegedly failing to interview witnesses and review other evidence), there is no evidence that the manner in which the investigation was performed violated the NVBOPE’s Complaint, Discipline and Remediation Policy, or the NRS or NAC, so as to render the investigation (and subsequent disciplinary proceedings) somehow void or improper.

Notably, pursuant to the NVBOPE’s Complaint, Discipline and Remediation Policy, section A(2)(g)(i)(1), “at the Board Investigator’s discretion and as part of the investigation, the Board Investigator may interview the parties, including the Complainant and the Respondent, as well as any possible witnesses.” Although Dr. Young may not have reviewed all available evidence or interviewed all witnesses, there is no rule which states that Dr. Young is required to do these things.

Since the handling of the investigation is at the discretion of the NVBOPE Board Investigator, and there are no requirements that all witnesses be interviewed and all evidence reviewed and/or considered, there is no legal or factual basis to determine that the manner in which Dr. Young performed the investigation in this case, by reviewing and relying on deposition transcripts, was so deficient as to render the results of the investigation, and the instant Complaint against Dr. Bradley, somehow void or improper.

CONCLUSION

The undersigned Hearing Officer, having presided over the administrative hearing on this matter, having heard the evidence presented by witness testimony, having reviewed the documentary evidence provided by the parties, and having listened to the arguments of counsel, hereby issues the following ruling:

Based upon the above stated findings of fact and conclusions of law, the undersigned Hearing Officer hereby finds in favor of the Respondent Dr. Shera Bradley, and against the Petitioner, the NVBOPE. The Petitioner has failed to meet its burden of proof, that Respondent engaged in unprofessional conduct, by a preponderance of the evidence, that violated the provisions of the NRS Chapter 641, NAC Chapter 641, or sections 3.01, 3.03, and 3.04(a) of the Ethical

1 Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct adopted by the by the American Psychological
2 Association.

3 AS SUCH, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's Complaint #24-0103 against the
4 Respondent is hereby DISMISSED, with prejudice.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED

6 Dated, the 21st day of November, 2025.

7 /s/ ***Shirley Blazich, Esq.***

Shirley Blazich, Esq.

8 Hearing Officer

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28