

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

January 23, 2026

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

The meeting of the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners was called to order by Board President Lorraine Benuto, PhD, at 8:04 a.m. on January 23, 2026, online via "Zoom" and physically at the office of the Board of Psychological Examiners, 3080 S. Durango Drive, Suite 102, Las Vegas, Nevada 89117.

Roll Call: Board President, Lorraine Benuto, PhD, Secretary/Treasurer, Stephanie Woodard, PsyD, and members, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, PsyD, Stephanie Holland, PsyD, Robert Moering, PhD, and Catherine Pearson, PhD were present at roll call. There was a quorum of the Board members.

Also present were Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Harry Ward; Board Investigators Dr. Sheila Young and Dr. Whitney Owens; Board Consultant Dr. Gary Lenkeit; Executive Director, Sarah Restori, and Board Staff, Laura Arnold. Members of the public who were present were: Brian Lech, Donald Hoier, Dr. Jodi Thomas (UNR counseling services), Kelly Robertson, Lauren Wecker (NPA), Sabrina Petrel (Government Affairs), Tracy Basile, Kristi Walter, Becky Savio, and an unidentified Call-In User.

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

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

Written public comment was included in the meeting materials. Lauren Wecker from the Nevada Psychological Association asked to take the NPA agenda item out of order. There was otherwise no public comment.

3. Minutes. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Minutes of the State of Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners' December 12, 2025, Meeting.

On motion by Catherine Pearson, second by Robert Moering, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved the meeting minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board held on December 12, 2025. Robert Moering approved the minutes as to form, but not content. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Robert Moering, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 7-0.

4. Financials

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

Board Staff Laura Arnold presented the Board financials. As of December 31, 2025, the Board had just under a combined total of \$361,000 in checking and savings. As of January 20, 2026, the Board was at about 67% of its budgeted expenses, and a little over 91% of its budgeted income, most of which is from the deferred income allocated to the second and third 2025-26 biennium quarters (and the first and second half of FY26). Ms. Arnold highlighted a couple of revisions to the budget side of the financial report that she made, and provided some information about why a few budget items are currently more than had been budgeted – for instance, FY2025 billings from the AG's office provided in FY2026, a 40% increase in the AG's hourly billing about which the Board was informed in November 2025 would be retroactive to July 2025, the expense for the hearing officer in a recent disciplinary action being much higher than had been requested and estimated, and the substantial increase in the worker's compensation coverage that the State now requires it provide (rather than the Board being able to have private worker's compensation insurance).

The Board's bookkeeper, Michelle Fox, verified and validated the information provided in this Treasurer's report through December 2025.

On motion by Monique Abarca, second by Soseh Esmaeili, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved the Treasurer's Report with the noted budget revisions for Fiscal Year 2026. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Robert Moering, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 7-0.

5. Legislative/Regulation Update

Board staff Laura Arnold stated that the Board continues to make its way through the regulatory changes that are required as a result of a few of the legislative changes and mandates from the 2025 Legislative session. She stated that the regulation revisions in R192-24 were approved by the Legislative Commission during its December 17, 2025, meeting, and are now in effect and available on the Board's website. With the approval

of the minutes from the December meeting, Ms. Arnold stated that she can now submit the regulation packet for R001-25 and R041-25 to the LCB, which will then go before the Legislative commission for final approval.

As for the legislation referenced in the table, Ms. Arnold noted that the BHWP Advisory Group continues its SB165 work, and the legislative changes to certain terminology in NRS Chapter 641 have been administratively incorporated and are in effect.

6. Report from the Nevada Psychological Association.

Dr. Lauren Wecker announced the all-day NPA conference scheduled for May 8, 2026, for which Arthur Evans would be the speaker. Dr. Wecker invited all psychologists to attend. Dr. Wecker also announced a new CE bundle from the NPA for psychologists can get all of their continuing education requirements in one place, which would be 2 hours of suicide prevention, 6 hours of ethics, and 6 hours of cultural competency for one price.

7. Board Office Operations.

Executive Director Sarah Restori provided an update on the Board's licensure, applicant, state exam, and registrant statistics for December 2025. She stated that in November and December 2025, the Board licensed 14 psychologists, received 16 applications for licensure, and administered 8 state examinations. She also stated that the Board has 751 licensees. And, for Psychological Assistants, Interns, and Trainees, there are 77 who are registered and provisionally licensed.

As another update, Ms. Restori stated that, per SB251, Psychological Assistants and Psychological Interns transferred from being registered to provisionally licensed effective January 1, 2026, and all Psychological Assistants, Psychological Interns, and their respective supervisors have been notified of the change in designation and have been provided update provisional licensure certificates. She also noted that all other administrative requirements for SB251 have been completed.

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

A. Complaint #23-0918

DAG Ward stated that the complaint alleged various claims of improper conduct. Respondent is represented by counsel, and a proposed disciplinary consent decree continues to be finalized with counsel for the respondent. Once finalized and signed, it will come before the Board for approval.

B. Complaint #24-0312(1)

DAG Ward stated that this is a complaint about certain representations the respondent made online. A cease and desist letter was sent, in response to which the respondent made revisions to their online information. A follow up cease and desist letter was forwarded to the respondent requesting that they remove additional language from all online presences, and the respondent complied with all requests. As a result, DAG Ward recommended and requested that this complaint be dismissed.

On motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Stephanie Woodard, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved dismissing Complaint #24-0312(1). (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Robert Moering, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 7-0.

C. Complaints #24-0711

#24-0719

#24-0726

#24-0823

DAG Ward stated these are four complaints against same psychologist. The respondent, through counsel, responded to the complaints, all complaints were forwarded to appropriate federal agencies, and witness interviews and review of all of the evidence provided have taken place. For the federal agencies heard from, the information provided has not included any action that is being taken on their part regarding the complaints, or they have otherwise stated that they do not have jurisdiction.

After further review and analysis based upon the applicable laws and regulations and this Board's jurisdiction, DAG Ward requested the following action for each case, as follows:

- 24-0711. DAG Ward stated that Complaint #24-0711 is an anonymous complaint to the Board alleging a Psychologist's inappropriate relationships with subordinates in a professional context at the work place as well as improper conduct with individuals outside of the Psychologist's employment. The complaint also provided the names and contact information of those who could substantiate the allegations. Because the complaint is anonymous, the complainant is not identified or identifiable for purposes of being able to further validate the allegations and witness names provided. Nevertheless, in addition to forwarding the complaint to appropriate federal and/or state agencies and otherwise providing the complaint to other agencies that inquired about it – none of which have taken any action – the investigation of this complaint included witness interviews and the review of written witness statements and other evidence that was received. The information received through witness

interviews and statements, as well as other evidence received, however, was contrary to the allegations in the complaint and contrary to what the anonymous complainant stated would be substantiated. As a result, DAG Ward recommended and requested that Complaint #24-0711 be closed with the possibility of being reopened if evidence is received in the future that would substantiate allegations of conduct related to the respondent's professional practice that is within the Board's jurisdiction to address. DAG Ward also differentiated a request that a complaint be closed from a request that a complaint be dismissed – a closed complaint being one that will not continue to be on the agenda unless the Board receives additional evidence that supports the complaint and reopens the matter.

On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Catherine Pearson, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved closing Complaint #24-0711. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Robert Moering, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 7-0.

- 24-0719 – DAG Ward stated that Complaint #24-0719 alleges a Psychologist's mistreatment of individuals, which was based upon information the complainant, who is a psychologist and who knows of the respondent in a professional context, heard about from another individual who saw relevant online posts. The allegations in the complaint had also been reported to the respondent's employer and other agencies, which have not indicated that any action was taken by them or will be in the future. During an interview with the complainant, it was confirmed that the complainant did not have first-hand knowledge of the alleged conduct, but that it had been told to the complainant by another individual who saw the online posts. Moreover, based on the information provided, the conduct at issue appeared to concern personal relationships and did not appear to be professional conduct over which the Board would have jurisdiction. However, because the information came to the complainant in a professional context, DAG Ward recommended that this Complaint be closed at this time with the possibility of being reopened if evidence is received in the future that would substantiate allegations of improper conduct related to the respondent's professional practice over which the Board would have jurisdiction.

On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Robert Moering, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved closing Complaint #24-0719. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Robert Moering, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 7-0.

- 24-0726 – DAG Ward stated that Complaint #24-0726 alleges a Psychologist's misconduct in the context of a personal relationship with the Complainant. During the interview of the complainant, it was confirmed that the respondent's conduct that was the basis for the complaint was conduct that took place during a personal relationship between the complainant and the respondent, and not in the context of the respondent's professional practice. Because the Board does not have jurisdiction over conduct that occurs within personal relationships, DAG Ward recommended that Complaint #24-0726 be dismissed.

On motion by Monique Abarca, second by Robert Moering, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved dismissing Complaint #24-0726. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Robert Moering, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 7-0.

- 24-0823 – DAG Ward stated that Complaint #24-0823 alleges a Psychologist's misconduct in the context of personal relationships the respondent had with individuals other than the Complainant. In reference to those individuals with whom the respondent had the personal relationships at issue, the complaint alleged substance abuse, the respondent exploiting their professional status in personal contexts, and unprofessional behavior toward a subordinate. While the complaint frames its allegations in reference to ethical and professional standards and conduct, the factual allegations concern personal relationships between the respondent and others besides the complainant, and the investigator's interview with the complainant confirmed that the conduct at issue did not occur in the context of the respondent's professional practice. Because the Board does not have jurisdiction over conduct that occurs within personal relationships, DAG Ward recommended that Complaint #24-0823 be dismissed.

On motion by Robert Moering, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved dismissing Complaint #24-0823. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Robert Moering, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 7-0.

D. Complaint #24-0730

DAG Ward stated that this is a complaint for unlicensed practice, in response to which he sent and served several Cease and Dease letters. The respondent has not responded to any of them. As a result, the Board has submitted a formal complaint to the respondent's licensing board, and has filed a complaint for injunctive relief against the respondent in district court. Service of process of the Board's civil complaint against the respondent is pending.

E. Complaint #25-0110

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

F. Complaint #25-0410

DAG Ward stated that this is a complaint for ethical violations. The complaint was forwarded to the respondent for response, which has been received. The investigator has conducted a witness interview, and the complainant provided additional information, which was forwarded to the respondent for response. Based upon the results of the investigation, a formal complaint and notice of hearing has been drafted and served on counsel for respondent. Counsel for respondent has formally answered the complaint and notice of hearing. Based on the respondent's desire to resolve this complaint and the investigator's recommendations, a proposed consent agreement will be drafted and forwarded to counsel for the respondent.

G. Complaint #25-0414

DAG Ward stated that this is an anonymous complaint regarding unethical conduct as it concerned an emotional support animal letter the respondent signed for non-domesticated predators being kept on an individual's property, which the complaint alleged put neighbors and others at risk. The respondent, through counsel, responded to the complaint, which was forwarded to the investigator for consideration in the investigation. While it was determined that the circumstances under which the respondent issued an emotional support animal letter for non-domesticated predators reflected very poor judgment by the respondent, the various guidance documents for the standard of care regarding emotional support animals widely varies, and there are no provisions in the Board's regulations or statutes that would support disciplinary action for this complaint. As a result, DAG Ward recommended that this complaint be dismissed.

Board member Dr. Robert Moering recused himself from voting on this matter.

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved dismissing Complaint #25-0414. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 6-0.

H. Complaint #25-0715

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

forwarded to counsel for respondent. A response from counsel for respondent is pending.

I. Complaint #25-0721

DAG Ward stated that this is a complaint by a social worker against a psychologist for inappropriate and unethical conduct with complainant's client (who was previously respondent's client). The complainant provided authorization to forward the complaint to the respondent for response, which has been received. The investigator has made recommendations for a stipulated consent agreement, which was sent to and received by counsel for respondent. Counsel has indicated that respondent will sign the agreement, and has been advised as to how to forward the signed draft to the AGs office. DAG Ward expects to have the signed agreement for the Board's next meeting.

J. Complaint #25-0812(2)

DAG Ward stated that this complaint alleges negligence related to an assessment. It was forwarded to the respondents, who provided a response. The Investigator has made recommendations for a stipulated consent decree, which has been drafted and forwarded to the respondents. The respondents are now represented by counsel, who will review the proposed agreement and follow up in the next few weeks. DAG Ward hopes to have an agreement to bring before the Board at the next meeting.

K. Complaint #25-0818(1)

DAG Ward stated that this is a complaint that concerns charges for services not provided. A response to the complaint has been received, and based on the respondent's answers to follow up inquiries, the investigator is requesting additional information, which is expected to be provided via a subpoena that was provided and, after correspondence with counsel for the subpoena recipient, is being prepared to be served via out of state personal service.

L. Complaint #25-1117

DAG Ward stated that this complaint alleges unethical conduct against a psychologist. The respondent has provided a response to the complaint, which has been forwarded to the investigator for review and consideration.

M. Complaint #25-1125

DAG Ward stated that this is a complaint for unprofessional conduct and was forwarded to the respondent for a response. Respondent has acknowledged receipt of the complaint and has been granted an extension of time to the end of January to respond.

N. Complaint #25-1231

DAG Ward stated that this is a complaint regarding the failure to provide requested records. The respondent has provided a response to the complaint, and the matter is being further considered and investigated.

O. Complaint #26-0114

This is a complaint for unlicensed practice. The Complaint has been forwarded to the respondent with a request for a response within 30 days of the complaint notice. The response is not yet due.

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

The following applicants are recommended for approval of licensure contingent upon completion of licensure requirements: **Heidi Bausch-Ryan, Chelsea Howe, Amanda de Armas, Holly Majszak, Olivia Rold, Alyssa Berlin, Elizabeth Buckley, Lisa Orbe-Austin, Thao Taylor, Marilyn McCune, Christie Stallard, Judith Sachs, and Alan Christensen.**

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Catherine Pearson, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the following applicants for licensure contingent upon completion of licensure requirements: Heidi Bausch-Ryan, Chelsea Howe, Amanda de Armas, Holly Majszak, Olivia Rold, Alyssa Berlin, Elizabeth Buckley, Lisa Orbe-Austin, Thao Taylor, Marilyn McCune, Christie Stallard, Judith Sachs, and Alan Christensen. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Robert Moering, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 7-0.

A. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on Dr. Tracy Basile's Request to Extend her Registration as a Psychological Assistant for a Fourth Year.

Dr. Benuto stated that Dr. Tracy Basile submitted her request to extend her Psychological Assistant registration for a fourth year, and that her explanation in support of her request has been provided to the Board. Dr. Benuto sought questions or comments from the Board members.

Dr. Holland stated that she read Dr. Basile's letter of explanation and acknowledged the significant challenges she has faced, and inquired with Dr. Basile as to whether she's confident she will complete her hours. Dr. Basile stated that her hours are complete and that she just needs to take the EPPP. Dr. Basile also stated that she has been in her position for almost 2 years as a Psychological Assistant.

On motion by Robert Moering, second by Soseh Esmaeili, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved extending Dr. Tracy Basile's Psychological Assistant registration for a Fourth Year. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Robert Moering, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 7-0.

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

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

Dr. Benuto noted that this item was before the Board during the last meeting and that, before it was further considered, the Board had requested that Dr. Walter provide an explanation of, among other things, what she has been doing since she surrendered her license in 2019. She said that, in addition to the other materials that have been made available, Dr. Walter provided that explanation, which was provided to the Board with Dr. Walter's application materials.

DAG Ward stated that there were three members of the Board that needed to recuse themselves due to them having been on the Board when the lawsuit against the Board was filed, so there would be only 4 Board members discussing and voting on this agenda item. Of those four members, it would have to be a unanimous decision either way.

Dr. Benuto noted that the Board had quorum with those four members. Board staff Laura Arnold noted that the members who have to recuse themselves should be identified for the record. Executive Director Sarah Restori stated that the members who need to recuse are Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, and Stephanie Holland.

Dr. Holland clarified that, because she has to recuse herself, it is not appropriate for her to participate in any conversation on this agenda item. DAG Ward confirmed that is

correct. Those who have to recuse themselves cannot participate in the discussion on this agenda item.

Dr. Benuto inquired about whether there are questions or discussion from the Board members who can participate in this agenda item. Dr. Moering noted that Dr. Walter indicated having completed 100 hours of continuing education, but that there was not any verification of that. Executive Director Sarah Restori confirmed that the Board does not have those CE verifications, but that could be a possible condition for re-licensure. Dr. Benuto clarified that it is not that she should have provided that information and did not because taking CE was not a requirement for re-licensure. She noted that Dr. Walter just included that information in her explanation, but the Board can make additional requirements for re-licensure. Dr. Moering stated that he would like to see verification of those CE hours completed because it has been some time since Dr. Walter has been licensed and the world of psychology has changed over those years. He wanted to ensure Dr. Walter is current on how the practice and governing laws have changed.

Dr. Pearson noted that the Voluntary Surrender Agreement had a couple of other requirements that were listed and were part of what Dr. Walter would need to complete in order to re-apply for licensure and asked if those had been satisfied yet. Ms. Restori stated that, for purposes of Dr. Walter's application, none of those conditions have yet been satisfied. Dr. Benuto went through the conditions and confirmed that Dr. Walter has submitted a new application for licensure, but has not yet satisfied the other conditions.

DAG Ward suggested that a very well crafted motion on the application for re-licensure can include the requirement that Dr. Walter comply with the stated and other required conditions for re-licensure.

Ms. Arnold referenced the information that she had prepared for the Board, both comprehensive historical information and a one-page summary that identifies both what is required for re-licensure and what the Board is permitted to additionally require, and also some recommendations by the Complaints team as to the second category of what the Board is permitted to require. Ms. Restori requested that the Board refer to the recommended additional conditions document that has been prepared for that purpose.

Dr. Benuto highlighted some of the additional recommendations that had been provided, and noted that the Board is neither limited nor committed to those.

Dr. Moering inquired about the recommendation that the required fitness for duty evaluation be a neuropsychological evaluation, and wondered the reason for a neuropsychological evaluation as opposed to just a psychological evaluation. DAG Ward thought that was one of the original issues prior to the voluntary surrender and the subsequent lawsuit, which is why it is in the recommendations. Ms. Arnold clarified that some of the members of the complaints team were on or involved with the Board at the time of disciplinary action and VSA and have historical knowledge.

Dr. Benuto thought it might be helpful to understand what the reasoning of the neuropsychological evaluation recommendation is. DAG Ward suggested that, because it is of a sensitive nature, the Board go into a closed session with Dr. Walter to make its inquiries the issues that are of a sensitive nature. Dr. Benuto noted that a required condition of re-licensure is that Dr. Walter undergo a fitness for duty evaluation by a licensed psychologist, but did not see a requirement that it be conducted by a neuropsychologist. Dr. Moering cited to provision of the VSA that required the comprehensive fitness for duty evaluation by a licensed psychologist approved by the Board. Dr. Pearson noted that the neuropsychologist provision is in the one page summary under the additional recommendations for re-licensure. Dr. Moering thought the recommendation for a neuropsychological evaluation came after the VSA, and has questions related to that, which might be of a sensitive nature.

Dr. Benuto suggested moving into closed session to hear from Dr. Walter on that issue.

Ms. Restori inquired as to whether the Board first wanted to consider the other recommendations that are more straight forward. DAG Ward stated that the Board can do 2 different motions – the base motion, then go into closed session for answers to inquiries, then come back out and deliberate and make a second motion on a different topic.

Dr. Benuto noted that a motion on the required conditions was not required, but that the Board needed to go into closed session to address the more sensitive items. DAG Ward recommended a formal motion to go into closed session, and when the Board members come out of closed session, there would be another motion regarding the re-licensure requirements. DAG Ward also clarified that the 3 non-voting members of the Board who had to recuse themselves be kept out of the closed session.

On motion by Robert Moering, second by Catherine Pearson, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved moving into closed session regarding Dr. Walter's application for re-licensure. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Robert Moering, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 4-0.

The Board, DAG Ward, and certain Board staff went into closed session with the members of the Board able to vote on this agenda item.

On motion by Robert Moering, second by Stephanie Woodard, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved moving back into open session regarding Dr. Walter's application for re-licensure. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Soseh Esmaeili, Robert Moering, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 5-0.

The Board resumed open session.

Dr. Benuto stated that, based on the information provided during the closed session, she would provide language for a potential motion and open the discussion for deliberation. Dr. Benuto proposed that the motion be one to approve the application of Dr. Kristi Walter for re-licensure contingent on completing the requirements in the 2019 Voluntary Surrender Agreement, including:

- submitting a new licensure application, which she has done;
- meeting the requirements of NRS 641.170;
- completing and paying the cost of a comprehensive fitness for duty evaluation conducted by a licensed psychologist approved by the Board and including completing any recommendations made by that psychologist, such as completing a neuropsychological examination if that is part of any recommendations;
- take and pass all five topic areas of the EBAS Essay Examination;
- reimburse the Board for its investigative costs and attorney fees related to the prior complaint of \$5,438.55;
- provide proof of the 100 CEUs that Dr. Walter states that she has taken;
- that any license issued to Dr. Walter be on probation for 2 years and that her practice be supervised by a Board-approved licensed psychologist at Dr. Walter's expense during the probationary period; and
- that Dr. Walter be required to take and pass the Nevada jurisprudence examination.

On motion by Robert Moering, second by Catherine Pearson, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved Dr. Kristi Walter's application for re-licensure contingent on satisfying the requirements stated in the 2019 Voluntary Surrender Agreement and the additional conditions required by the Board as outlined on the record by Dr. Benuto. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Robert Moering, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 4-0.

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

Dr. Benuto inquired as to whether there was anyone there from the Behavioral Health and Wellness Practitioner Advisory Group. Executive Director Sarah Restori provided an update, stating that Dr. Michelle Paul, chair of the Advisory Group, submitted an update to the Board, which included stating that the Advisory Group would be having a day-long working meeting at the end of January focused on drafting regulations, and that she and Ms. Arnold would also be attending that meeting. Moreover, per Dr. Raines' request that the Board office provide a budget proposal in support of grant funding to assist the Board office, that proposal was submitted to Dr. Raines at the beginning of January.

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

Dr. Benuto noted that Ms. Arnold may have some updates and provided some additional information to the Board per the Board's request at the last meeting. She went on to state that, after hearing from Ms. Arnold, the Board would consider whether there was any appetite for this effort based upon there appearing not to be much appetite for it during the last meetings on this topic.

Ms. Arnold stated that this was an item that was included in the agenda for the Board's October and December meetings, for which she explained that the issue of whether criminal or other conduct that is not related to a licensee's professional practice could be a basis for discipline under the Board's statutes and regulations had come up in a recent complaint. Board counsel had advised that, unlike other Boards, this Board does not make criminal and/or other conduct not related to the profession a basis for disciplinary action. To that end, Ms. Arnold had provided the Board with links to other Boards' publicly-available regulations and statutes that address disciplinary action for general criminal and other conduct not related to those Boards' professions. During the October meeting, Board members indicated that they wanted to do a deeper dive into that information to further discuss during the December meeting.

When this discussion was revisited during the December meeting, the Board requested information on which Boards do not have criminal or other conduct not related to the profession as a basis for disciplinary action, in response to which Ms. Arnold said she would survey the Boards and provide that information. After the December meeting, Ms. Arnold reviewed publicly available information on that request and summarized it to the Board.

With information she provided to the Board, Ms. Arnold stated that the question before the Board is whether it wants to expand the basis for disciplinary action for criminal or other conduct that aligns with how other Boards provide for disciplinary action based on criminal and other conduct not specifically tied to the profession. She explained that it is a matter of gauging whether there is consensus for expanding the Board's bases for imposing discipline to include criminal conduct and/or other conduct not related to the practice of psychology, and if so, what does the Board want those regulatory revisions to look like based on the examples the Board has been given.

Dr. Holland clarified that the question before the Board right now is whether there is an appetite to move forward in developing some regulatory language, which Ms. Arnold confirmed. Ms. Arnold stated that, if there is an appetite for it, then she can work with Board counsel to develop language for the Board to consider. She highlighted the range of examples that have been provided to the Board based on other Boards' regulatory and/or statutory language. Dr. Holland appreciated the additional work and information that Ms. Arnold provided, and noted that Nevada is in the minority and would be in favor of moving forward and developing some language, minimally in broad-based verbiage. Dr. Moering agreed. Dr. Woodard stated that the information that the Board investigators provided was also helpful in supporting the Board's efforts to develop regulatory language for this topic.

Dr. Owens stated that the Board has the discretion to review criminal behavior for Board applicants. She explained that the Board does background checks and that, in 2021, the Board developed policy with a way to evaluate that criminal conduct prior to licensure that creates a fair review process. By the way those background checks are evaluated, only one or two applicants have come before the Board for consideration and conversation, and it has not prevented licensure. It has just allowed the Board the opportunity for evaluation for fitness and licensure, and the Board has an opportunity with this to create enough broad language in regulation, but then more specifics in policy to evaluate criminal conduct and not be overly punitive or discriminatory. Instead, creating pathways for those with criminal conduct to ensure they are working with the Board, hopefully for the purpose of rehabilitation and keeping their license. It

would be intended to provide a mechanism for if there is someone who is a potential threat to the public.

Dr. Benuto said that there appears to be consensus on the Board to move forward with drafting regulatory language for disciplinary action for criminal and other conduct not related to the practice of psychology and to impose a reporting requirement. She asked for a motion to approve that, and stated the Board can then go from there.

On motion by Robert Moering, second by Stephanie Holland, the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners approved moving forward with developing regulatory language regarding criminal and other conduct not related to the profession as a basis for disciplinary action. (Yea: Lorraine Benuto, Stephanie Woodard, Monique Abarca, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Robert Moering, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 7-0.

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

Dr. Benuto stated that the next regular meeting of the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners will be Friday, March 6, 2026, beginning at 8:00 a.m. There were no conflicts with that date.

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

Dr. Benuto thanked the Board for their time and for being so engaged in and preparing for the meeting. She also reminded the Board that they can make requests for future Board agenda items.

DAG Ward reminded that any such requests should be emailed to the Board office without CC'ing other board members so that there are not any open meeting law violations.

Ms. Arnold stated as a reminder that the agenda item regarding criminal and other conduct not related to the practice of psychology as a basis for disciplinary action would be on the next Board agenda with some proposed language and information for the Board to consider.

There were no requests for future Board Meeting agenda items.

14. Public Comment - Public comment is welcomed by the Board and may be limited to three minutes per person at the discretion of the Board President. Public

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

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

There was no public comment.

15. (For Possible Action) Adjournment

There being no further business before the Board, President Dr. Benuto adjourned the meeting at 9:53 a.m.