



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 20, 2012 at 9:00 a.m.

The meeting of the Board of Examiners for Social Workers was called to order by Randy Reinoso, Board President, at 9:00 a.m. The meeting was held at Mojave Adult, Child and Family Services, 745 W. Moana Lane, Suite 100, in Reno, Nevada. There was a simultaneous video conference conducted at Mojave Adult, Child and Family Services, 4000 E. Charleston Blvd., Suite B-230, Las Vegas, Nevada. President Reinoso 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 President Reinoso, with the following individuals present:

Members Present:

James Bertone, LCSW, Secretary-Treasurer, Reno  
Tracy Cassity, LCSW, Board Member, Reno  
Sandy Lowery, LCSW, Vice President, Reno  
Randy Reinoso, LSW, President, Las Vegas (excused at 10:15 a.m.)  
Rod Smith, Public Board Member, absent

Staff Present

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

Public Attendees

No one was present from the public.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

As noted, no one from the public was present to offer public comment.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

A motion was made by Sandy Lowery and seconded by James Bertone to approve the Consent Agenda as submitted. This motion was carried.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

A motion was made by Sandy Lowery and seconded by James Bertone to approve the Agenda as submitted. This motion was carried.

**DISCIPLINARY MATTERS**

**Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Recommendation to Dismiss: G10-40 and G10-41.**

Kim Frakes presented a redacted account of the above cases and the rationale for dismissing these cases. Discussion followed regarding licensed professionals and exemption from licensure in government settings pursuant to NRS 641B.040. Following Ms. Frakes' presentation and review and discussion by the Board, a motion was made by Tracy Cassity and seconded by Sandy Lowery to dismiss G10-40 and G10-41 as presented by Ms. Frakes. This motion was carried.

**Review and Discussion, Redacted Disciplinary Report**

Kim Frakes presented a summarized, redacted disciplinary report to the Board. She noted that the disciplinary list continues to increase, despite her efforts to bring cases forward either for disciplinary action or for

dismissal. She reminded the Board that addressing and investigating disciplinary cases is a full-time effort and that when Board funding allows they may wish to examine the possibility of hiring or contracting with an individual who could assist with Board investigations. The Board discussed how efforts were progressing in utilizing James Bertone as a designated Board member who could assist Ms. Frakes. She indicated that Mr. Bertone is being trained as his time allows. Ms. Frakes suggested that the Board consider providing her with a lap top computer so that she can also perform additional Board operation assignments after routine business hours. The Board requested that Ms. Frakes email them copies of NRS 641B and NAC 641B pertaining to Board procedures regarding disciplinary case investigations in order to determine if there may be a way to assist Ms. Frakes in addressing the disciplinary cases.

## **LICENSURE, INTERN AND APPLICATION ISSUES**

### **Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, the Board's "YES Policy," Policy Providing Evaluation Criteria for Processing Affirmative Answers to Screening Questions on New and Renewal Applications for Licensure and/or Certification and the Policy's Applicability to Current Issues Facing the Board Pertaining to New and Renewal Applicants**

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. The previous Board Executive Director had discussed at a Board meeting a while ago, a mechanism to assist in providing evaluation criteria for processing affirmative answers to screening questions on new and renewal applications for licensure. A similar policy appeared to have been successfully implemented by another State board was presented during this Board meeting. During this earlier Board meeting the Board voted to implement the "YES Policy" as a guideline for processing new and renewal applications when applicants respond affirmatively to certain screening questions. Since this policy has not been reviewed by the Board for some time it was suggested that the Board review the YES Policy during today's Board meeting and following review, discuss and take possible action on:

- Whether to continue the use of the YES Policy as an evaluation guideline for applicants answering affirmatively to screening questions on new and renewal application, or to replace this policy with a suitable alternative identified by the Board;
- Any recommended changes to the YES Policy should the Board desire to continue it's use as an application evaluation guideline; and
- Following any recommended changes to the YES Policy, take action to vote on continuing the implementation of the YES Policy as an evaluation guideline, with noted recommended changes if applicable.

Documentation in each Board member's meeting packet included:

1. Copy of NRS 622, pertaining to Regulatory Proceedings; Records—Please note NRS 622.330, "Consent and settlement agreements; Procedure for approving; deemed public records; exceptions."
2. Current YES Answer Policy (YES Policy) implemented by the Board
3. Copy of NRS 632.307, "Non-disciplinary condition, limitation or restriction placed on license or certificate by Board," which provides the State Nursing board statutory authority to enter into non-disciplinary agreements.
4. Copy of the State Nursing board's "YES Answer Policy"
5. Copy of the State Nursing board's Agreement for Monitoring, a non-disciplinary agreement between the Nursing board and licensees.
6. New/Initial applications for LSW and LCSW or LISW licenses
7. Renewal applications for LASW, LSW, LCSW and LISW licenses

*(Prior to discussing this matter, the Board took a break from 10:15 a.m. until 10:30 a.m. President Reinosa excused himself from the remainder of the Board meeting. Sandra Lowery assumed the role as Chair for the remainder of this meeting. It was noted that the members present continued to constitute a quorum for the purpose of continuing this Board meeting).*

During discussion of this agenda item, Tracy Cassity expressed concern pertaining to the Board's statutory limitations and screening questions on license applications and renewal applications. The relevance and statutory authority as well as limitations were included in this discussion. It was noted that in order to rule out practitioner impairment, it is necessary for the Board to be informed regarding applicant/licensee arrests, especially arrests involving impairment by alcohol and/or substances, in order to determine whether a pattern of behavior exists that could increase client risk. Professional licensure implies a level of professional competency which may be impacted should an applicant or licensee have an undisclosed substance abuse, mental health or criminal issue.

Discussion continued pertaining to new applicants and the Board's statutory authority to oversee an individual prior to licensure. Henna Rasul, who serves as legal counsel to another State occupational licensing board, noted that this particular board had on one occasion licensed an individual who presented with a significant substance abuse problem. The license issued at a Board meeting was then revoked and then reinstated with conditions (via probation) that provided this board reasonable oversight (via a settlement agreement) into the newly licensed individual's practice. Discussion followed whether the settlement agreement might be viewed as a disciplinary action taken by the particular board and whether the information would be inputted into a national disciplinary databank (i.e. the National Protection Databank/Health Integrity Protection Data Bank). The Board expressed concern regarding inputting information into a national databank for offenses occurring prior to licensure or post licensure offenses that did not appear to impact a licensee's direct practice. Ms. Frakes noted that in regards to non-disciplinary agreements other the State boards utilizing similar non-disciplinary policies did not input non-disciplinary agreements into a national database. Ms. Rasul wondered if this was allowable given State laws pertaining to private reprimands.

Following discussion, a motion was made by James Bertone and seconded by Tracy Cassity to continue the Board's use of the YES policy. Disclosures by applicants and licensees should be addressed on a case by case basis, with Ms. Frakes in her capacity as Executive Director. Ms. Frakes would conduct initial review of affirmative responses to screening questions by applicants and licensees. She would continue to follow the YES policy and accordingly would consult with a Board member responses that fell in the category of item 3F, defined as "minor" criminal events or item 5A regarding mental health and/or substance abuse rehabilitation where adequate evidence of rehabilitation exists. Following consultation with a Board member, if affirmative responses warranted bringing the matter forward to the Board for disposition, then Ms. Frakes would do so. This motion was carried.

Following action on this matter, Ms. Lowery noted that the State board who had initiated their version of this policy had periodically revised their policy. She volunteered to review both the Board's YES policy and the other board's policy and input any applicable revisions. At a subsequent Board meeting, Ms. Lowery would bring forward any recommended revisions. The Board accepted Ms. Lowery's offer without taking any formal action.

**Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Pursuant to the YES Policy, the Board's Policy and Procedures Pertaining to Affirmative Answers to Screening Questions on New and Renewal Applications for Licensure and/or Certification, and the Possible Revisions to Policy and Procedures**

This agenda item (Item 6B) was combined in part with the previous agenda item (Item 6A) in order to aid in the efficacy and effectiveness of the discussion pertaining to both agenda items. Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. The previous Board Executive Director had presented at a Board meeting a while ago, a recommendation to provide reasonable assurances of an applicant's or licensee's fitness for duty by implementing a non-disciplinary form of monitoring these individuals who answer screening questions affirmatively on initial and renewal license applications. A "Letter of Agreement" was implemented and utilized

by the Board as a means of monitoring an applicant's/licensee's fitness for duty. The agenda item presented at this Board meeting afforded the Board an opportunity:

- To discuss how the Board has utilized a "Letter of Agreement" as one option of providing reasonable assurance of a licensee's fitness for duty following disclosure of issues that did not appear to directly impact clients, by providing a non-disciplinary system of monitoring.
- To discuss alternate forms of non-disciplinary monitoring provided by other State boards will also be offered to aid in this discussion.
- To have Ms. Rasul may offer her insights and legal opinion regarding the Letter of Agreement.
- To review and discuss, how the Board may take action to considers whether it wishes to continue using the Letter of Agreement and the conditions of its use, take action to create a new policy and procedure for non-disciplinary monitoring, or choose to bring some/all applicants who answer affirmatively on screening questions before the Board in order to choose to either approve or decline the individual for licensure.

Henna Rasul offered her legal opinion to the Board. Although numerous State boards have utilized a system to monitor applicants and licensees similar to a letter of agreement, it appears that many boards are opting for a different means of monitoring. Since it appears that a letter of agreement could be misinterpreted as a private reprimand, Ms. Rasul recommended that the Board implement a non-disciplinary agreement between an applicant/licensee in order to monitor their fitness for duty. The non-disciplinary agreement would require that this item be presented during a public meeting, be posted on the Board's public agenda and the Board's review, discussion and action would also be part of the Board's public meeting minutes. The recommended sanctions in a non-disciplinary agreement could be recommended and agreed upon by the applicant or licensee as a stipulation for licensure or continued licensure. Discussion by the Board members and Ms. Frakes included the need to provide monitoring and reasonable public safety assurance of applicant/licensees while also being careful not to overstep the Board's legal authority in monitoring these individuals. Furthermore, there was discussion about entering the agreement into the ASWB Public Protection Database. There was concern about a non-disciplinary actions inputted into a public database. Ms. Frakes noted that she was aware of at least one State licensing board that did not input such agreements into a public database. A motion was made by Jim Bertone and seconded by Tracy Cassity to implement a non-disciplinary agreement for applicants or licensees who did not violate either NRS or NAC 641B, had fully disclosed an incident and pursuant to the YES policy and agreed to have this issue presented before the Board for review and discussion. Following review and discussion during the public Board meeting (which included notification on a public agenda); the Board could take action on entering into a non-disciplinary agreement that provided certain stipulations that would reasonably ensure safety to the public. Ms. Frakes would continue to review whether other State occupational and licensing boards input their non-disciplinary agreement information into a public database. This motion was carried.

**Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Pursuant to the YES Policy, the Board's Policy and Procedures Pertaining to Either Non-disclosure or Incomplete/Misleading Answers to Screening Questions on New and Renewal Applications for Licensure and/or Certification and Possible Revisions to Policy and Procedures**

This agenda item (Item 6C) was combined in part with the previous agenda item (Item 6A) in order to aid in the efficacy and effectiveness of the discussion pertaining to both agenda items. Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. Based upon policies established by the previous Board Executive Director, the Letter of Agreement has been used in instances when there appeared to be failure to disclose screening items on an application or incomplete information was disclosed by an applicant or licensee. Ms. Frakes indicated that these situations, however, would usually result in a formal Board disciplinary action. In instances, however, where there did not appear to be any direct harm to client, a Letter of Agreement could be considered. Ms. Frakes noted that most of the instances pertaining to disclosure occurred on the annual license renewal application and these disclosures were often out of compliance with the Board's required notification of arrests and convictions within twenty-one (21) days pursuant to NAC 641B.200(21). The Board

noted that most of the policies and procedures addressing this matter were previously addressed during agenda item 6A. Periodic fingerprinting during license renewal as a means of monitoring failed disclosures of arrests and convictions was addressed by Henna Rasul. Ms. Frakes noted that there have been occasions where non-disclosed arrests and convictions were identified when individuals applied for internships. Without providing specific identifying information, Ms. Frakes noted that such a situation had occurred several years ago resulting in a Board disciplinary action against the licensee. Following discussion of implementing routine fingerprinting, the Board opted to table this particular item until Ms. Rasul could research how other State boards have addressed this matter and brought to a subsequent Board meeting. A motion was made by James Bertone and seconded by Tracy Cassity to update the renewal applications to include language pertaining to the Board's mandatory twenty-one (21) day period of notifying the Board in writing of any arrests and/or convictions. It was anticipated that this language in the license renewal applications would educate licensees about NAC 641B.200(21) and hopefully reduce confusion regarding the mandated period of notifying the Board. This motion was carried.

**Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Definition of "Misdemeanor Traffic Offense," Its Applicability in NAC 641B.200, and Recommendations by the Board Pertaining to Policy and Procedures Following Either Full-Disclosure or Failure to Disclose Convictions or Charges of Criminal Offenses Other than Misdemeanor Traffic Offenses, by New or Renewal Applicants, Including Any Recommended Regulation Changes**

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. NAC 641B.200(21)(c) requires licensees to notify the Board in writing within 21 days after, "The licensee is charged with or convicted of a criminal offense, other than a misdemeanor traffic offense." In the past, this had led to some confusion for licensees since a DUI (Driving Under the Influence) of alcohol pursuant to NRS 484C.110, is considered a "misdemeanor" as defined by NRS 484C.400(1)(a). In reviewing and discussing this matter, the Board could:

- Consider regulation changes to this particular regulation that better reflects the Board's intentions for creating this particular regulation. This may include increasing the timeline that a licensee is required to notify the Board in writing, (e.g. "...notify the Board in writing within 6 months or upon the licensee's renewal of their application, whichever ever occurs first").
- Create interim policy and procedures that maintains the integrity of this regulation should the Board choose to change this regulation as discussed above.

Documentation in each Board member's meeting packet included:

1. Copy of NRS 484C.110 and NRS 484C.400(1)(a)
2. Sample copy of the State Psychology board's application screening questions

It was noted that the purpose in disclosing DUI arrests had been previously addressed as part of the discussion pertaining to agenda item 6C. The Board maintained the importance of being notified when a licensee is arrested and/or convicted of any misdemeanor offense, including misdemeanor DUI arrests. A motion was made by Tracy Cassity and seconded by James Bertone to propose changes in NAC 641B.200(21) pertaining to "misdemeanor traffic offenses" to better reflect that this includes offenses related to serious misdemeanor offenses such as DUI'S.

**Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Ratification of the Board's Final Draft of BDR Submitted to the State Department of Administration on May 31, 2012, Including Language Contained in the Bill Draft Allowing the Board to Establish by Regulation (i.e. NAC 641B) Reasonable Fees for the Approval of a Course of Continuing Education, Listed as Item "i" on Proposed Bill Draft for "NRS 641B.300, Fees"**

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. During the May 25, 2012 Board meeting, the Board took action to approve the proposed BDR that allowed the Board to propose an increase in license fee through regulation (NAC 641B) versus proposing fees increases when the legislature convenes during biennium sessions. During the May 25, 2012 Board meeting, the agenda item proposed charging a nominal processing fee for continuing education course review and possible approval. This particular agenda item, however, was inadvertently overlooked (i.e. Agenda Item 5A-2 on the May 25<sup>th</sup> agenda). Ms Frakes wished to revisit this overlooked agenda item in order to provide the Board with a rationale for including this as part of the bill draft. Following review and discussion of this agenda item, the Board may take action to ratify the final BDR draft submitted to the Department of Administration to include ratifying item "i" on the bill draft.

Each Board member's meeting packet included:

1. *"Continuing Education Applications for Groups and Individuals May 2011 Through May 2012"*, a table that summarizes the number of group and individual continuing education applications the Board has received in a 13-month period.
2. Copies of documents from two related State behavioral science boards indicating the amounts charged by these boards for review and possible approval of a continuing education application.
3. Copy of proposed bill draft proposing changes to NRS 641B.300, Fees, as submitted to the State Department of Administration on May 31, 2012.

Following review and discussion of this agenda item, a motion was made by Tracy Cassity and seconded by James Bertone to ratify the bill draft submitted on behalf of the Board by Ms. Frakes to the State Department of Administration on May 31, 2012 which included language pertaining to a processing fee being charged for review of applications for continuing education and possible approval. This motion was carried.

**Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Ratification to the Governor's Executive Order 2012-11, "PROVIDING RECIPROCITY FOR MILITARY SPOUSES SEEKING LICENSURE IN THIS STATE", Issued May 7, 2012, and the Board's Executive Director's Response to this Order, Including Ratification of Bill Draft Language to NRS 641B.275, Allowing the Board to Facilitate Endorsement of Substantially Equivalent Out-of-State Social Work License by Issuing a Provisional License to Spouses of Active Military Duty Personnel Until Establishment of "Substantially Equivalent" Criteria for Endorsement of Out-of-State License Can be Determined by Board Staff**

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. During the May 7, 2012, the Governor issued Executive Order 2012-11 ordering:

- State licensing boards to facilitate endorsement of a current license from another state as long as the requirements for licensure in that jurisdiction are substantially equivalent to the requirements in Nevada;
- Where possible, provide for a temporary or provisional license allowing a military spouse to practice while awaiting verification of documentation supporting such an endorsement; and
- Expedite application procedures for a military spouse, including where possible the approval of a license based on an affidavit from the applicant that the information provided on the application is true and that verifying documentation has been requested.

The Order further directed that, where statutory requirements prohibit any of the actions outlined above, the executive director or chairman of a professional licensing board shall inform the Governor's office in writing of

suggested statutory changes to make endorsement for military spouse licensure, "...an efficient and practical reality". Included in each Board member's meeting packet was:

1. A Copy of Executive Order 2012-11;
2. The Board's Executive Director's response, June 27, 2012 with suggested language changes in NRS 641B.275; and
3. Rationale for Executive Order 2012-11 as printed from the Governor's State website.

Discussion by Board members included whether this was a blanket endorsement for out-of state licenses, as licensing criteria, such as education and experience, vary from state to state. Ms. Frakes noted the language in item 1 from the Executive Order 2012-11 which specified that the endorsement of an occupational license from another state must meet the requirements for substantially equivalent licensure in Nevada. Following review and discussion, a motion was made by Tracy Cassity and seconded by James Bertone to ratify the response to Executive Order 2012-11 made by Ms. Frakes on behalf of the Board, including suggested language in NRS 641B.275 affording the Board the ability to issue a provisional license to spouses of active duty personnel based upon an affidavit of licensure criteria until official verification of licensure qualifications is subsequently obtained. This motion was carried.

**Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Proposed Regulation Changes to NAC 641B and Strategic Planning Pertaining to:**

1. Proposed fee schedule (NAC 641B.115) for the issuance of a license by initial application, application for licensure endorsement, application for provisional license, renewal of all levels of licensure, renewal of a delinquent license, and restoration of a revoked or expired license, as submitted and approved by the Board during the May 25, 2012 Board meeting.

The Board noted that this agenda item was addressed previously during agenda item 7A and did not see a need to readdress this matter.

2. Proposed fee schedule for courses submitted to the Board for approval as a course of continuing education included in NAC 641B.115.

The Board noted that this agenda item was addressed previously during agenda item 7A and did not see a need to readdress this matter.

3. Proposed language pertaining to NAC 641B.112, which allows the Board to facilitate endorsement of substantially equivalent out-of-state social work license by issuing a provisional license to spouses of active military duty personnel until establishment of "substantially equivalent" criteria for the out-of-state license can be determined by Board staff, as noted in agenda item 7B.

The Board noted that this agenda item was addressed previously during agenda item 7B and did not see a need to readdress this matter.

4. Any additional changes pertaining to NAC 641B recommended by the Board.

A motion was made by James Bertone and seconded by Tracy Cassity to table this item and address this matter a subsequent Board meeting. Ms. Frakes was tasked to draft proposed regulation changes discussed to date for the Board to review. This motion was carried.

Sandy Lowery inquired about the status of updating the Board's list of continuing education providers. Ms. Frakes indicated that she was waiting for Rod Smith to complete his Board member training before utilizing his assistance in this matter. Since Mr. Smith recently completed this training, Ms. Frakes indicated that she would be contacting him in the near future.

**ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORK BOARDS (ASWB); NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS (NASW)**

**Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Selection of a Delegate and Alternate Delegate to Attend the ASWB Annual Meeting, Scheduled November 1 through 3, 2012, in Springfield, Illinois.**

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. Annually, ASWB conducts a meeting and highly encourages attendance of delegates from member boards, of which, Nevada is a member. ASWB will cover the costs of airfare and accommodations for attending delegates. Since ASWB will need a confirmation of attendees in the near future, the Board may, following review and discussion, select a delegate and alternate to attend this meeting. Board members and Board staff are eligible to attend as delegates. Following review and discussion, a motion was made by James Bertone and seconded by Tracy Cassity to appoint Ms. Frakes as the Board delegate for the ASWB 2012 Annual Meeting. Should Ms. Frakes become unable to attend, President Reinoso could select an alternate attendee. This motion was carried.

**Review and Discussion, NASW, Nevada Chapter, 2012 Annual Conference, September 13 through 15, 2012, in Las Vegas, Nevada**

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. This item served as a discussion item advising Board members of the upcoming NASW, Nevada Chapter, 2012 Annual Conference conducted in Las Vegas. Although NASW had historically requested Board members to conduct an ethics presentation during their conference, another individual who was not a Board member was approached to conduct an ethics presentation during the 2011 conference. It appeared that attendees at the 2011 NASW, Nevada Chapter conference highly approved of the presentation and the presenter. Since NASW, Nevada Chapter had not approached Ms. Frakes about having a Board member present at the 2012 Annual Conference, Ms. Frakes concluded that perhaps the same individual would be asked to present again. The Board members inquired whether Ms. Frakes has had the opportunity to meet the new NASW, Nevada Chapter Executive Director. She indicated that aside from having a brief encounter with the interim NASW, Nevada Chapter Executive Director, she has not had the opportunity to meet the new director. She hoped to meet the new director in the near future.

**Review and Discussion, Senior Deputy Attorney General Report**

Henna Rasul presented this agenda item to the Board. Typically, the Senior Deputy Attorney General uses this time to bring the Board up-to-date on legal issues of concern to the Board or make recommendations for future agenda items. This time may be used to ask questions of counsel. Ms. Rasul indicated that she did not have anything to add to today's Board meeting.

**Review and Discussion, Presiding Officer's Comments**

Typically, President Reinoso or presiding officer will use this time to bring the Board up-to-date on items of concern (items of interest that do not require action or do not need a full agenda position) or to make recommendations for future agenda items. It was noted that President Reinoso had left the meeting earlier. Chairperson Lowery indicated that she did not have anything to add to this meeting.

**BOARD OPERATIONS**

**Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Approval of Minutes for the May 25, 2012, Board Meeting**



Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. The Board meeting minutes for the May 25, 2012 was prepared by Ms. Frakes and submitted in each Board member's meeting packets for their review, discussion and possible action to approve these minutes. Pursuant to the State's Open Meeting Law, these minutes were posted on the Board's website in "DRAFT" form. Following final approval by the Board, a final version of these minutes will be posted on the Board's website. A motion was made by Tracy Cassity and seconded by James Bertone to approve the May 25, 2012 Board meetings as noted. This motion was carried.

### **Executive Director's Report**

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. This time is routinely used to bring the Board up-to-date on items of concern (items of interest that do not require action or do not need a full agenda position) or to make recommendations for future agenda items. This time may also be used to ask about any issues relating to the day to day operations of the Board. Ms. Frakes noted that in June, the Board office had processed sixty-six (66) applications for licensure. This was a record number of applications for licensure. Ms. Frakes reviewed with the Board possible future Board meeting dates. Tentative meeting dates included August 17<sup>th</sup>, September 21<sup>st</sup> and October 19<sup>th</sup>. Aside from this, Ms. Frakes did not have anything further to add.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

No one was available from the public to offer comment.

### **ADJOURNEMENT**

A motion was made by James Bertone and seconded by Tracy Cassity to adjourn the Board meeting at 11:47 a.m. This motion was carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kim Frakes, LCSW  
Executive Director