



STATE OF NEVADA
BOARD OF EXAMINERS FOR SOCIAL WORKERS
4600 Kietzke Lane, Suite C121, Reno, Nevada 89502
775-688-2555

MINUTES OF BOARD MEETING
July 15, 2011 at 9:00 a.m.

The meeting of the Board of Examiners for Social Workers was called to order by the Board Vice President, Sandy Lowery at 9:07 a.m. The meeting was held at Mojave Adult, Child and Family Services, 4000 E. Charleston Blvd., Suite B-230 in Las Vegas, Nevada. There was a simultaneous video conference conducted at Mojave Adult, Child and Family Services, 745 W. Moana Lane, Suite 100, Reno, Nevada. Both meetings were also available to any public member who wished to observe or participate. Vice President Lowery noted that the meeting had been noticed properly and the members present constituted a quorum for the purposes of the Board meeting.

Roll call was initiated by Vice President Lowery. Shortly after initiating roll call, President Reinoso arrived and assumed the responsibilities as Chairman for the remainder of the meeting. The following Board members and Board staff were present via videoconference:

Members Present:

Randy Reinoso, LSW, President, Las Vegas
Sandy Lowery, LCSW Vice President, Reno
James Bertone, LCSW, Secretary-Treasurer, Reno
Tracy Cassity, LCSW, Reno

Staff Present

Kim Frakes, LCSW, Executive Director, Reno
Henna Rasul, Deputy Attorney General, Board Counsel, Reno

Public Attendees

Mark Nichols, Executive Director, NASW, Nevada Chapter, Las Vegas

DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL REPORT

Ms. Rasul asked President Reinoso that prior to the Board making a motion to approve the Agenda and Consent Agenda, she wished to bring the Board's attention major changes in the Open Meeting Law (NRS Chapter 241) following the passage of AB59 and AB257 during the 2011 Legislative Session. Although this item was on the agenda as Agenda Item 10A, Ms. Rasul believed it was important to present this agenda item out of order in order to bring the Board's attention to these changes that became effective on July 1, 2011. President Reinoso indicated that it was fine for Ms. Rasul to proceed with her presentation to the Board.

Summary of Legislative Changes in AB257

- The Open Meeting Law now requires multiple periods of public comment.

Ms. Rasul called the Board's attention to modifications in the agenda for this meeting. The modifications in today's Board meeting agenda already included many of the changes required in AB257. In the first paragraph of the agenda, additional language included: "...taking agenda items out of sequence, combining the agenda items, and pulling or removing the agenda items in order to aid the efficiency of the meeting or to accommodate persons appearing before the Board." Ms. Rasul indicated that more time will be allotted for public comment during board meetings and that the best way to achieve this goal was to offer public comment prior to approving the agenda and at the conclusion of a meeting prior to

adjournment. In matters involving disciplinary action, public comment regarding disciplinary actions would be allowed following a board's action or decisions on disciplinary matters. Ms. Rasul noted that these modifications were included in the agenda for this Board meeting.

Summary of Legislative Changes in AB59

- Quasi judicial meetings, such as this Board's disciplinary hearings, are subject to the OML.
- Public bodies, such as this Board, must agendize any Opinion from the Office of the Attorney General (AG) should the Opinion result from a finding from the AG'S office that a public body, such as the Board, violated the OML. The inclusion of such item on the public body's agenda is not an admission of wrongdoing for the purpose of a civil action, criminal prosecution or injunctive relief.
- In the process of investigating a public body pursuant to allegations of violations of the OML, the AG'S office may subpoena any relevant documents, records or materials.
- The definition of "public body" has been clarified and expanded.
- Enactment of authority of the AG to seek monetary penalty up to \$500.00 against member(s) of a public body who violate provisions of the OML.

In summarizing AB59, Ms. Rasul noted that recommended changes to the Board's agenda was included in this meeting's agenda. She noted that the Board was already agendizing items mention in AB59, such as agendizing complaints against licensees.

Ms. Rasul also noted that AB62 allowed the AG'S office to charge public bodies for certain types of trainings and AB63 allows the AG'S office to appoint a special deputy to provide legal advice to a public body, such as the Board, if the AG'S office determines that it would be impractical, uneconomical or a conflict of interest for the AG's office to provide services to the public body. Ms. Rasul summarized her presentation by indicating that the passage of these bills should increase government transparency and encourage public participation in meetings conducted by public agencies. President Reinoso thanked Ms. Rasul for her presentation. He noted that no one from the public wished to make a comment.

A motion was made by Sandy Lowery and seconded by Tracy Cassity to approve the Agenda as presented. This motion was carried.

CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Sandy Lowery and seconded by Tracy Cassity to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. This motion was carried.

REGULAR AGENDA

DISCIPLINARY MATTERS

Recommendation to Close Files: G09-29, G10-24 and G10-38

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. Using redacted information she offered her recommendations, following review of the cases listed above with Board Counsel, to dismiss these three cases. Following review and discussion, a motion was made by Tracy Cassity and seconded by James Bertone to dismiss cases: G09-29, G10-24 and G10-38 as presented. This motion was carried.

Disciplinary Report (Non-Action) and Review, Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Steady Increase of Accusations Received by the Board and Recommendations to Address This Issue

In the interest of aiding the efficiency of the Board meeting both agenda items, "5B and 5C" were combined. Kim Frakes presented the redacted Disciplinary Report via oral report to the Board. Ms. Frakes indicated that

the number of disciplinary cases have been steadily increasing and that presently, the number of open cases on the disciplinary list has reached "73" cases. She noted that with the dismissal of the three cases presented

earlier in the meeting, the actual number of open disciplinary cases was "70". Ms. Frakes noted that the cases on the redacted Disciplinary Report were in various stages of the investigative process with some cases from 2009 still under investigation and certain cases from 2011 requiring notification of the licensee that an accusation had been filed against them. She also reviewed a table in the Board packet that tracked the total number of disciplinary cases filed for the past five (5) years, i.e. from 2007 to date. Ms. Frakes noted that in 2009, the number of cases almost doubled from "21" total disciplinary cases in 2008, to "44" disciplinary cases in 2009 and "47" disciplinary cases in 2010. In 2011, to date, the Board had received "26" disciplinary cases.

In discussing how to the Board could be of assistance in this matter, Ms. Frakes reviewed NAC 641B.305(5) which allows the appointment of Board members to assist in the investigation process and in determining whether substantial evidence exists to sustain alleged violation of NRS and NAC 641B by the licensee under investigation. She suggested that in order to address the increase in the number of disciplinary cases, the Board could consider having certain Board members appointed, on a limited basis, to review certain cases. Following their review of certain cases, the appointed Board member(s) would make determinations, along with Board Counsel, regarding the disposition of each case at subsequent Board meetings. Ms. Frakes also presented other options such a hiring an outside consultant to review and investigate certain cases.

Following review and discussion, a motion was made by Sandy Lowery, to have President Reinoso, during his next visit to the Board office, along with an appointed Board member and the Executive Director, review the Board's prosecuted cases in order to learn how the disciplinary investigative process occurs and following this review, make and implement any necessary recommendations. This motion was seconded by Tracy Cassity and was carried. President Reinoso indicated that he would review his schedule with Kim Frakes in order to make arrangements for his visit to the Board office.

LICENSURE, INTERN, AND APPLICATION ISSUES

Review, Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Revision and Recommended Changes to Board Forms Presently Used in the Internship Program Approval Process, Including But Not Limited to, Board Forms Used as Part of the Internship Program Approval

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. The Internship Program Site Approval form was last revised on February 20, 2007. It appears that the program site forms may need updating in order to assist the applicant site in better understanding the expectations of a Board approved internship program and accordingly complete the application process should the site meet the Board's internship site criteria. Likewise, the Board office is attempting to better inform licensee's who are applying for an internship program at a site that is pending Board approval about how their decision to apply under these particular circumstances may impact their ability to complete an internship program. Following review and discussion, the Board may take possible action on the following:

- Propose recommended changes to the Internship Program Site approval form and the Internship Application Waiver forms.
- Continued revision of these forms, and any additional forms identified during the Board's discussion of this matter, by the individuals presently involved with the revision process (Sandy Lowery, LCSW, Vice President and Kim Frakes, LCSW, Executive Director) and any other member appointed to assist with this matter.
- Once recommended revisions are completed, the Board office will begin to implement these forms as part of a pilot study in order to determine the efficacy of these revisions.

- At a subsequent regularly scheduled Board meeting, and as an agenda item, Ms. Lowery, Ms. Frakes and any other appointed Board members will bring their findings and final copies of the revised forms to the Board.

Included in the Board packets for Board members to review were the current Internship Approval Application, two different proposed site application checklists and an Internship Application Waiver form for individuals applying for internship programs in sites that are not yet approved. Following review and discussion of this agenda item, a motion was made by Sandy Lowery and seconded by Tracy Cassity to have Ms. Lowery and Ms. Frakes continue to develop the site application checklist, to proceed to use the initial developed site application checklist in a pilot study and to follow up in a subsequent Board meeting about the outcome of the pilot study to determine the efficacy of the revised site application check list. This motion was carried.

(This Board action was followed by a brief ten minute break).

BOARD OPERATIONS

Review, Discussion and Possible Action Regarding June 30, 2011 Board Year End Cash Flow Statement

This agenda item was taken out of sequence in order to accommodate the Board's Program Assistant (PA) who had arrived to present agenda items "12 B, 12 C and 12 D" to the Board. The Board's PA presented this agenda item. She noted that a year end Board cash flow statement was included in the Board packet for each member's review. This Statement served to inform the Board regarding the Board's revenue versus expenses for the 2010 through 2011 fiscal year. It was noted that the FYE (fiscal year end) date was June 30, 2011. It appeared that the Board, with few exceptions, were on-target. The Board was at 100% of its projected income, generated from initial and renewal application fees. The Board was at 99% of its projections in staff salaries and compensations. The Board was also at 88% of its projections in the area of expenses. Following review and discussion of this agenda item, a motion was made by James Bertone and seconded by Tracy Cassity to approve the June 30, 2011 Board Year End Cash Flow Statement as submitted. This motion was carried.

Review, Discussion and Possible Action Regarding 2011-2012 Fiscal Year Board Budget

The PA presented this agenda item to the Board. The 2011-2012 fiscal year Board Budget was included in each Board member's packet. This Budget served to inform the Board regarding the Board's anticipated revenue versus expenses for the 2011 through 2012 fiscal year. In preparing this budget, the PA budgeted a modest increase in anticipated fees collected for initial and renewal licenses. This increase was based upon an overall 5% increase noted in licenses over each year. Sandy Lowery noted that once the State economy stabilized, the Board should consider proposing an increase in the initial application fee, which is presently at \$40.00 pursuant to NRS 641B.300. The PA also noted that the projected expenditures contained a modest increase of \$5,000. Kim Frakes noted that should any unexpected increases in expenditures arise, she would agendize this concern and present the Board with an amended budget during a regularly scheduled Board Meeting. A motion was made by Tracy Cassity and seconded by James Bertone to accept the 2011-2010 Fiscal Years Board Budget as submitted. This motion was carried.

Review, Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Board's Policy on the Number of Times an Applicant Can Re-take the ASWB Examination Within the Limitations Presently Imposed Pursuant to NAC 641B.105(5), of the Newly Adopted Regulations, Under an Open Application.

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. Pursuant to NAC 641B.105(5) of the Newly Adopted Regulations, *A failed examination may be retaken 90 days after the failed examination. Thereafter, only one examination may be taken every 6 months.* NRS 641B.250 and NAC 641B.105(5) does not appear to impose limitations on the number of times an applicant can re-take an examination and/or request an extension to take the licensing exam. Furthermore, NAC 641B.120(4) states, *An applicant for licensure on which no action has been taken by the applicant for 1 year after receipt by the Board will be considered by the Board to have lapsed. The Board will not refund any fee related to an application which has lapsed.* It has come to the attention of the Board's Executive Director that a number of applicants routinely "wait" until the one-year deadline and request an extension to take their licensure examination either initially or to re-take the exam. This situation has presented a situation where applicants, under one open application, has either put off taking or re-taking their licensing exam for a certain number of years. This agenda item has been brought to the Board's attention in order for the Board to discuss whether this is an appropriate use of Board staff resources. Ms. Frakes wondered whether the Board wanted to discuss modifying this particular Board policy or whether this change would be better served by introducing a regulation change.

During discussion, the Board discussed what would be considered a reasonable amount of time to either take and pass the licensure examination or to retake the examination after failing it. It was eventually determined that a drafted policy would better serve the Board in making a decision. A motion was made by Sandy Lowery and seconded by Tracy Cassity to have Ms. Lowery draft a policy regarding: (1) the length of time an application will remain open in order for an applicant to take an examination; (2) the number of times under an application can an applicant take the examination; and (3) if approved by the Board, when this policy would become effective. Ms. Lowery would bring this drafted policy back to a subsequent meeting. This motion was carried.

(Following presenting agenda items "12 B, 12 C and 12 D", the Board's Program Assistant excused herself from the remainder of the Board meeting. The Board then returned to where they had left off on the agenda.)

LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY ISSUES

Review, Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Outcome of the 76th (2011) Legislative Session, Including the Passage of Bills Impacting the Board and/or Licensees

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. The 76th (2011) Legislative Session adjourned on June 7, 2011 at 1:20 a.m. This agenda item serves to update the Board regarding the outcome of various bill drafts initially proposed at the beginning of this Legislative session and brought to the Board's attention during the January 21, 2011 Board meeting as well as other bills that were proposed during the Legislative session, including SB354. Although this agenda item serves as information only, following review and discussion, the Board had the option to take action on any identified bills passed during this Legislative Session which may impact the Board and/or licensees or recommend placing any identified bills on the next regularly scheduled

Board meeting agenda. A table of bills proposed during the 76th/2011 Legislative Session that had the potential to either impact licensees and/or the Board, and the disposition of each bill was included in the Board packet for each member's review. There was no action taken following review and discussion of this agenda item.

DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL REPORT

This agenda item was taken out of sequence in order to accommodate Henna Rasul's schedule. Ms. Rasul discussed a law suit filed by an inmate that named several State agencies, including the Board. She indicated that another Deputy Attorney General who routinely represents State agencies had agreed to represent the Board in this matter as part of her representation of the other State agencies. Aside from the items discussed earlier in this meeting, Ms. Rasul indicated that she did not have anything further to discuss at the meeting. Ms. Rasul agreed to be available to the Board for the remainder of the meeting by telephone if a need arose. She excused herself from the remainder of the meeting at 10:35 a.m.

CONTINUING EDUCATION

Review, Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Ongoing Research Conducted by the Board's Secretary/Treasurer and Executive Director Regarding Online Courses

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. This item has been an item of ongoing discussion for our Board. NAC 641B.189(2) of the February 9, 2009, newly adopted regulations increased the number of allowable Board approved online courses to "15 continuing education hours" for LSW'S and LASW'S and "18 continuing education hours" for LISW'S and LCSW'S. The Board took action during the December 18, 2009 Board meeting to begin researching appropriate online courses that the Board could approve. A select Board member and the Special Projects Manager were appointed by the Board to continue to research online continuing education courses.

During the January 22, 2010 Board meeting, the Special Projects Manager identified certain online courses which she suggested the Board may consider approving. Even though they did not meet the criteria of being "time limited and interactive" pursuant to NAC 641B.189(1), the newly adopted regulations specific to this regulation has added language that indicates, "*A continuing education program that is not limited in time or interactive may be approved by the Board if the program meets specific criteria set forth by the Board*". The list of courses suggested were: the ASWB ACE programs (pending clarification from ASWB regarding certain courses), Cross Country Education, NASW California, PESI, Psychotherapist Network and University of Wisconsin. Due to time constraints and changes in Board members and staff working on this project, there has been delay in getting this project started. Over the past several months, however, James Bertone, Board Secretary/Treasurer and Ms. Frakes selected NASW California as an initial on-line program to initiate their research of on-line courses. This agenda item served to update the Board on their findings regarding the NASW California online courses.

Included in the Board member's packet for their review and consideration was: (1) Copy of online courses presently offered by NASW, California Chapter; (2) Copy of an NASW, California Chapter online course, *Social Workers' Ethical Responsibility to Clients*, taken by the Executive Director on January 23, 2011, as part of her ongoing research on online courses; and (3) Copy of the Board's Application for Accreditation of Material for Continuing Social Work Education. James Bertone and Ms. Frakes shared their research observations. Ms. Frakes noted that overall, the list of online courses provided by NASW California provided a vast array of topics. Furthermore, she noted that the online courses offered contained current and relevant educational material

that was applicable to the profession. Additionally, the courses were developed by competent instructors, many of whom were social workers. In regards to the sample course in the Board member's packet, Ms. Frakes noted that she initially experienced some difficulty in logging in for the course, but once she became more familiar with the site, this problem diminished. Based upon his research on these online courses, Mr. Bertone expressed concern that an individual could sign up for a course and then go straight to the post-test, complete these questions, and then print out their certificate of completion. The Board noted the input from Mr. Bertone and Ms. Frakes regarding the online courses. They acknowledged concern that an individual could misrepresent having taken a course by fast-tracking to the post-test and printing up a certificate of completion. The Board agreed, however, that similar instances may have occurred at various in-person continuing education courses and that the Board is resigned to trust licensees and their investment in their own professional development.

Mark Nichols indicated that since all state NASW Chapters have the capacity to share their resources, including online courses. He stated that he would be meeting with the NASW, California Chapter, Executive Director in person on August 5, 2011 and wondered whether it would be beneficial for him to discuss and establish an arrangement for NASW, Nevada Chapter, to have a link established to the NASW California Chapter's online courses. These courses would then be approved under the NASW, Nevada Chapter's Board issued Provider Number. When an individual in Nevada wished to sign up for an online course, they could go to the NASW, Nevada Chapter website and enroll in the online course, pay the fee established by the NASW, Nevada Chapter, and then be transferred to the NASW California Chapter online course. Mr. Nichols believed that one of the benefits of this arrangement would be for the dollars to remain in Nevada instead of going to California.

Sandy Lowery wondered why there was a concern regarding whether the money spent by continuing education course attendees remained in Nevada. Ms. Lowery pointed out that the Board utilizes numerous continuing education providers, many of whom are out-of-state providers. She indicated that the selection of continuing education courses by the Board was for the benefit of enhancing the professional knowledge and competency of licensees. Which state receives or benefits from the payment of the continuing education course is a non-issue for the Board.

Kim Frakes reminded Mr. Nichols that several months ago, he had approached her and the Board's Special Projects Manager about developing a catalogue of online courses for NASW, Nevada Chapter, and then marketing these online courses under the provider number already issued to the NASW, Nevada Chapter by the Board. Mr. Nichols expressed that there had been unexpected difficulty in pursuing this venture.

Ms. Frakes wanted to know if the Board wanted the NASW California Chapter to submit initially submit an application for each individual online course and eventually grant them Board "Provider status". Ms. Lowery did not see a need to over-regulate NASW California Chapter's online courses and believed that they should be granted Provider status if they expressed an interest in having their online courses approved by the Board.

Following review and discussion regarding this agenda item, a motion was made by Tracy Cassity and seconded by James Bertone to: (1) Have Ms. Frakes initiate discussion with NASW, California Chapter by contacting their Executive Director about having their online courses approved by our Board; (2) Send an application for Board Provider status should NASW, California express interest in becoming a Board approved provider of online courses; and (3)

Appropriately notify licensees regarding the approval of online courses for continuing education credit once NASW, California Chapter has completed the necessary paperwork and documentation to become a Board approved provider of online courses. This motion was carried. Ms. Lowery asked Ms. Frakes to follow up on this matter as soon as possible.

ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORK BOARD (ASWB); NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS (NASW)

Review, Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the 2010 ASWB Examination Pass Rates for North America and Nevada

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. Annually, ASWB provides their members with the examination results for North America and a comparison of their member's jurisdiction examination results, comparing the member's exam scores with the overall North American examination results. Ms. Frakes indicated that although this was primarily an information only agenda item, following review and discussion of this agenda item, the Board may take possible action regarding the examination results or recommend an item be put on the next regularly Board meeting agenda. Included in each Board member's packet was a copy of the cover letter from ASWB and the 2010 ASWB Examination Pass Rates.

The Board noted how the State of Nevada placed overall in comparison to test candidates throughout ASWB. It appeared, that for the most part, Nevada's examination test scores appeared to match or exceed the average examination scores in North America (which included Canada). There were some noted exceptions, with Nevada's test candidates scoring higher than the average North American test scores in the Bachelor's examination. Ms. Lowery noted that Nevada's Clinical examination test scores were slightly lower than the North American average examination scores. President Reinoso thanked Ms. Frakes for the information presented in this agenda item. The Board did not take any action on this agenda item.

Review, Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the 2010 Pass/Fail Rates for Graduates of Each Nevada University School of Social Work Education Program

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. Annually, ASWB provides their member boards the examination results for the pass/fail rates for graduates of each social work education program in Nevada (i.e. UNLV and UNR). The data is based upon candidates for social work licensure who have taken one of the ASWB examinations. The examination results for the *first time* examination applicant is deemed by ASWB as being the most reliable indicator of how each social work program prepares the applicant for the examination. A copy of a cover letter from ASWB and the 2010 ASWB Examination Pass Rates for graduates of UNLV and UNR were included in each Board member's packet for review. In comparing the examination scores between the two social work programs, it was noted the UNLV scored higher than UNR and the National average on the Bachelor's examination. Both UNLV and UNR scored higher than the National average on the Master's examination, with UNR scoring higher than UNLV overall on this exam. There were not any candidates from UNLV who had taken the Advanced Generalist examination. UNR had one candidate who had taken the Advanced Generalist examination. This candidate scored significantly higher than the national average. Both graduates from UNLV and UNR scored higher than the national average on the Clinical examination, with UNR scoring higher overall than UNLV.

President Reinoso thanked Ms. Frakes for the information presented in this agenda item. The Board did not take any action on this agenda item.

Review, Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the 2010 ASWB Annual Report

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. Annually, ASWB provides their members a copy of the 2010 Annual Report. Although primarily an information only agenda item, following review and discussion of this agenda item, the Board may take possible action regarding the 2010 ASWB Annual Report or recommend an item be put on the next regularly Board meeting agenda. A copy of a cover letter from ASWB and an abbreviated copy of the ASWB 2010 Annual Report which included in each Board member's packet for their review. The ASWB 2010 Annual Report included: (1) Financial Statements, Assets and Liabilities, Year Ended December 31, 2010; (2) Statements of Revenue and Expense, Year Ended December 31, 2010, and; (3) ASWB Strategy Map, as of November 2010. Ms. Frakes noted that a copy of the entire 2010 Annual Report may be obtained on their website, www.aswb.org/pdfs/ASWB2010AnnualReport.pdf. Following review of this agenda item, President Reinoso thanked Ms. Frakes for the information presented in this agenda item. The Board did not take any action on this agenda item.

Review, Discussion and Possible Action regarding request by NASW, Nevada Chapter, to have Board member(s) present at their 2011 NASW-Nevada Chapter, Annual Conference, September 22 through 24, 2011, in Reno, Nevada

Kim Frakes introduced this agenda item to the Board. Annually, NASW, Nevada Chapter holds an annual conference, with the location of these conferences alternating between Las Vegas and Reno. Each year, NASW, Nevada Chapter requests the Board to present at their conference. Mark Nichols indicated that the NASW, Nevada Chapter, was able to find a qualified presenter to present an ethics presentation on Thursday of the conference. Accordingly, he did not see a need to have members from the Board present at this year's conference. He thanked the Board for their support and past presentations at past conferences and encouraged Board members to attend this year's conference in Reno. Following review of this agenda item, President Reinoso thanked Ms. Nichols for the information presented in this agenda item. The Board did not take any action on this agenda item.

PRESIDING OFFICER'S COMMENTS

President Reinoso indicated that he did not have anything further to add to today's Board meeting. He acknowledged that he would be conducting an on-site annual visit to the Board within the next few months and would attempt to have the onsite visit conducted the day before and the day of a Board meeting. If his schedule allows, President Reinoso was contemplating an onsite visit to the Board office in August.

BOARD OPERATIONS

Review, Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Approval of Minutes for March 18, 2011 and April 29, 2011 Board meetings

Following review of the March 18, 2011 and April 29, 2011 Board meeting minutes, a motion was made by Sandy Lowery and seconded by Tracy Cassity to approve the minutes as submitted. This motion was carried.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. She indicated that she did not have anything further to add to today's Board meeting. Ms. Frakes thanked the Board member's for their attendance and participation at today's Board meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment offered at the end of this Board meeting.

ADJOURNEMENT

A motion was made by James Bertone and seconded by Tracy Cassity to adjourn the Board meeting at 12:30 p.m. This motion was carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kim Frakes, LCSW
Executive Director

DRAFT