



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

MINUTES OF BOARD MEETING
February 15, 2013 at 8:30 a.m.

The meeting of the Board of Examiners for Social Workers was called to order by Randy Reinoso, Board President, at 8:30 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 at the following location(s):

Members Present:

Randy Reinoso, President, Las Vegas
Sandy Lowery, Vice President, Reno
James Bertone, Secretary/Treasurer, Reno
Rod Smith, Public Member, Reno
Tracy Cassity, LCSW, Reno (arriving at 9:05 a.m.)

Staff Present

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

Public Attendees

Kelly Wooldridge, Clinical Program Manager II, State of Nevada Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS), arriving at 9:55 a.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was not anyone from the public to offer comment at either the Las Vegas or Reno locations when this meeting was called to order.

REGULAR AGENDA

A motion was made by James Bertone and seconded by Rod Smith to approve the Agenda as submitted. This motion was carried. There were no objections.

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. There were no objections.

DISCIPLINARY MATTERS

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Recommendation to Dismiss Cases: G09-34; (G09-41 and G09-44), {(G10-20 and G10-22), (G10-30 and G10-34); G10-35; G10-36; and G10-37}.

Kim Frakes presented a redacted account of the above cases and the rationale for dismissing these cases as noted below. In response to the Board's questions regarding why the cases being recommended for dismissal were present with numerous parentheses, Ms. Frakes explained that the cases in parentheses were related and that this would be further explained during her presentation. In her presentation of this agenda item to the Board, Ms. Frakes explained that G09-34 was a case that did not involve other licensees. Cases G09-41 and

G09-44 were accusations against one social worker with the complainant being one of the licensees listed in the remaining cases. Furthermore G09-41 and G09-44 were employed at the same agency as the remaining cases, i.e. G10-20, G10-22, G10-30, G10-34, G10-35, G10-36 and G10-37. Ms. Frakes expressed that this matter appeared to relate to possible political turmoil within this agency and ensuing political alliances which caused the different factions within the agency to file accusations against each other. Ms. Frakes indicated that some of the allegations appeared to have merit and were investigated. Following her investigation, however, there did not appear to be any violation of NRS or NAC 641B. She further added that every one of the licensees named in the agency-based accusations have since left the agency and there did not appear to be any further concerns. Following Ms. Frakes' presentation, a motion was made by James Bertone and seconded by Rod Smith to dismiss the following cases as presented: G09-34, G09-41, G09-44, G10-20, G10-22, G10-30, G10-34, G10-35, G10-36 and G10-37. This motion was carried. There was no opposition to this motion.

Review and Discussion, Redacted Disciplinary Report.

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. She noted that during the last several weeks of 2012 and early 2013, she was limited in her ability to aggressively address the disciplinary cases due to her ongoing medical issues. She indicated, however, that the medical issues have been resolved and that over the past few weeks, she has been attempting to redirect her focus on addressing the disciplinary cases. Ms. Frakes noted that with today's dismissed cases, the number of cases are at "86" and that this is approximately the number of cases during the October 19, 2012 Board meeting. Sandy Lowery expressed concerns that the cases did not appear to be dropping. Ms. Frakes agreed that this concerned her as well and noted that since her medical issues have resolved, she would be working with James Bertone and anticipated that these cases would be addressed more aggressively once he was properly trained. Ms. Frakes also noted that she and Henna Rasul have been working to negotiate a settlement with a licensee who had three open cases. This agenda item was a presentation only which required no further action.

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Redacted 2012 Disciplinary Case Review.

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. Ms. Frakes explained that since 2012, she has presented to the Board a summary of the disciplinary cases addressed the previous year. Since the Board had expressed support in receiving an annual overview of the disciplinary actions taken the previous year, Ms. Frakes provided an overview of the outcome of disciplinary cases addressed in 2012. During 2012, the Board received a total of "36" cases. These cases are added to the list of open cases from previous years. During 2012, "9" cases were dismissed, "2" cases were brought to hearing, "2" applications for licensure were brought to hearing and "2" cases settled in a consent decree. Ms. Frakes noted that the two cases brought to hearing were the result of two (2) separate violations of a consent decree the licensee had willingly entered into with the Board in 2011. Ms. Frakes explained that while working collaboratively with Henna Rasul in the matters pertaining to disciplinary actions, she attempts to work as directly as possible when drafting settlements and hearing notifications in an effort to keep Board legal costs as trim as possible. She expressed that this appears to limit her ability to address other disciplinary matters effectively. Ms. Frakes stated that being able to work extensively with disciplinary matters while also being able to review benign cases that do not appear to support violations of NRS and NAC 641B continues to be challenging. Following review of this matter, the Board did not believe this agenda item required any action.

LICENSURE, INTERN AND APPLICATION ISSUES

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 641B.150(4)(e)(4)(5) Pertaining to the Board's Definition and Approval Criteria for Internship Site Program Agencies and NAC 641B.160 Pertaining to Access of Client Records for Off-site Intern Supervisors and the Applicability of These Regulations for a Particular State Agency.

Sandy Lowery requested that this agenda item be addressed later as the DCFS Clinical Program Manager II was scheduled to arrive at 10:00 a.m. to address this agenda item with the Board. The Board agreed to address this agenda item later pursuant to NRS 241.020.

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 641B.150(3) Pertaining to Criteria Required by the Board in Establishing "Evidence of...Satisfactory Completion..." of the Applicant's Supervised Post-graduate Clinical Hours From Another State to Include Verification of These Hours Being Provided to the Board From the State Licensing Entity Where the Applicant Conducted His/Her Supervised Post-graduate Clinical Hours.

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. Sandy Lowery, given her expertise and support to the Board in the area of clinical internships assisted in presenting this agenda item as well. Individuals requesting LCSW in Nevada are required to complete a post-graduate supervision process referred to as an "Internship Program" pursuant to NRS 641B.240 and NAC 641B.150. In the past, certain states did not require a post-graduate supervision of hours. Certain states that required post-graduate supervision of hours conducted this process somewhat informally, which may have included an informal method of tracking the accrual of post-graduate hours. Over the past several years, however, it appears that this supervision process has become more formalized, with a mechanism of tracking post-graduate supervised hours being required on a form provided by each state. Individuals applying to the Board for endorsement of their out-of-state clinical license request the Board to consider their out-of-state clinical hours as part of the endorsement process. With the exception of NAC 641B.126 (the endorsement of clinical hours for individuals licensed over 20 years in another state who were under the supervision of a licensed mental health profession who was not a licensed clinical social worker), the Board's Executive Director requested the Board to consider verification from the state where the applicant conducted his/her clinical hours to be sent directly to the Board on the state's verification form. Ms. Frakes indicated that most states are willing to send their verification of post graduate supervised hours directly to the Board, while some states, such as New York, view this information as "confidential" and would only release the information directly to the applicant. Tracy Cassity suggested that in such instances, the applicant could request the issuing state to give them the verification in a "sealed" and envelope, such as the practice conducted by certain universities and colleges with transcripts. James Bertone wondered if it would be prudent to eventually require a regulation change specifying that the only method verification of an applicant's post-graduate supervised hours would be on forms from the applicant's state. Ms. Frakes indicated that she was requesting this as a guideline with flexibility being available in the event of any deviations in this matter.

A motion was made by Sandy Lowery to establish a Board policy that would make primary verification of "evidence of satisfactory completion" of post-graduate, supervised clinical hours would come from the applicant's state directly to the Board on the state's verification form. In instances where the applicant's state is not able to send the verification directly to the Board, the applicant would request the state to provide the verification of post-graduate supervised hours in a sealed envelope which the applicant would in turn submit to the Board. Any exceptions would continue to be addressed on a case by case basis. This motion was seconded by Tracy Cassity with a request for discussion.

Per Mr. Cassity's request, discussion followed to clarify this matter. The process was reiterated as discussed above, with any exceptions being staffed between Ms. Frakes and a Board member. The Board member Ms.

Frakes usually reviews application exceptions with is usually Ms. Lowery given her expertise in this Board's post-graduate supervised clinical and independent experience (via Board approved internships) and what the Board would considered substantially equivalent standards for this State versus another state. Following discussion, this motion was carried with no opposition.

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 641B.270 Pertaining to the "Substantially Equivalent...Requirements..." From Another State When Considering Granting a Clinical Social Work License to an Applicant in this State Without Examination.

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. NAC 641B.126(1)(a) requires individuals applying to the Board for licensure endorsement may be exempt from taking the "appropriate licensing exam" (ASWB exam), if the exam was taken within the immediate preceding 15 years. Applicants for endorsement of their out-of-state clinical hours and those who were able to take the clinical examination before licensure (as noted further) request that the Board accept their clinical examination score towards endorsement of their clinical licensure or for licensure after an internship. Requirements pertaining to when an individual is eligible to take the clinical examination vary from state to state. Although the Board's statues and regulations do not specify the exact period of time when an individual is eligible to take the clinical examination, the Board allows individuals in a Board approved internship to take the examination following completion of 1,000 documented post-graduate supervised clinical hours.

Ms. Frakes recommended that discussion by the Board should provide clarification pertaining when "substantially equivalent" conditions/circumstances for taking the clinical exam would be applicable as noted:

1. Prior to graduation from a program to obtain a Master's Degree in Social Work;
2. The length of time following graduation from an MSW program before the Board will consider a clinical examination to have been taken under "substantially equivalent" conditions/circumstances; and
3. If the length of time an applicant licensed in another state, excluding requirements as noted in NAC 641B.126, may be cause to grant a license without examination pursuant to NRS 641B.270.

Copies of NRS 641B.240, NRS 641B.270, NAC 641B.126 and NAC 641B.150 were included in each Board member's packet to assist them with this discussion. Discussion led by Sandy Lowery and Tracy Cassity followed. In determining "substantially equivalent" circumstances/conditions in granting clinical social work interns the ability to take the clinical exam, it was noted that clinical social work interns become eligible to take the clinical examination after completing 1,000 psychotherapy hours. Ms. Frakes noted, that in many instances, it would be difficult to determine how may hours an applicant from another state had achieved when they took the clinical exam. Following review and discussion of this matter, a motion was made by Sandy Lowery and seconded by Tracy Cassity to:

1. Require and applicant for clinical social work to re-take the clinical examination if the examination was taken prior to graduation from a program to obtain a Master's Degree in Social Work;
2. One year post-graduate supervised clinical experience would be the established length of time before the Board will consider a clinical examination taken by a clinical social worker applicant to have been taken the exam under "substantially equivalent" conditions/circumstances expected by clinical social work interns in this State; and
3. An exemption may occur on a case by case basis if the applicant for clinical social work licensure can demonstrate post graduate clinical supervised experience and has been licensed five (5) years or longer, excluding requirements as noted in NAC 641B.126, may be cause to grant a license without examination pursuant to NRS 641B.270.

This motion was carried. There were no objections.

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Michaela Back, LSW and LCSW applicant, following her written permission to agendaize matters pertaining to clinical licensure in this state, including:

- 1. The Board's consideration and acceptance of Ms. Back's accrued out-of-state post-graduate hours as it applies towards the number of hours she shall be required to complete in a Board approved clinical social work internship; and**
- 2. Acceptance of Ms. Back's ASWB clinical examination score taken a little over one month following posting of her MSW degree as it applies towards the Board's review, discussion and possible action of Agenda item 6C.**

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. On August 17, 2012, Ms. Back applied to the Board for endorsement of her LISW Ohio license. As she had taken the clinical examination, she applied to this State for a clinical social work license, requesting that in considering her application, her clinical hours from Ohio be endorsed. Pursuant to NAC 641B.150(1), an applicant for clinical licensure must demonstrate that they have completed a minimum of 3,000 postgraduate supervised hours. Furthermore, pursuant to NAC 641B.150(2), at least 2,000 of these postgraduate hours must be in the area of psychotherapeutic methods and techniques... As submitted, Ms. Back's Ohio state verified experience did not appear to meet the psychotherapeutic criteria, with "psychotherapy" defined in NAC 641B.057. In reviewing Ms. Back's application she appeared to lack supervised experience in the area of treatment of emotional and behavioral disorders, conditions and addictions. Accordingly, Ms. Back's application for endorsement of her Ohio clinical license was denied. A redacted copy of Ms. Back's clinical social work application and supporting documentation she had submitted to the Board was included in each Board member's packet to assist them in reviewing and discussing this matter. Following review and discussion, a motion was made by Rod Smith and seconded by Sandy Lowery to uphold the decision made by Board staff to deny Ms. Back's clinical social work application on the basis that her supervised postgraduate experience did not meet the substantially equivalent criteria as it pertained to the requirement of 2,000 postgraduate supervised experience in the area of psychotherapeutic methods and techniques pursuant to NAC 641B.057. This motion was carried. There were no objections.

LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY ISSUES

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, rejection by the Governor's office of the Board's proposed bill draft (BDR #13ABDC1138) which proposed moving licensing fees and allowing the Board to charge a minimal processing fee for continuing education application in the Board's regulations (NAC 641B) instead of in statute (NRS 641B).

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 would allow the Board to seek licensee fee increase through regulation (NAC 641B) versus waiting to propose fee increases during the biennium Legislative sessions. The proposed BDR was submitted on May 30, 2012 and updated following permission from the Budget Analyst on June 26, 2012 to include language pertaining to continuing education applications. During the July 20, 2012 Board meeting, this proposed BDR was ratified by the Board. Ms. Frakes was notified on February 6, 2013, that the BDR had been rejected by the Office of the Governor. The rationale was explained by a Governor's Aide, citing an overwhelming number of bills during this Session as the reason for rejection by the Governor. The Aide confirmed that the Board's BDR could be revived if a Legislator sponsored the bill. Ms. Frakes explained that to date, she had contacted two (2) Legislators but had received a response from them. Following review and discussion of this bill, the Board may take action to determine:

1. Whether they wished to continue pursuing sponsorship of the BDR by a Legislator during the 77th/2013 Legislative session;

2. Whether to implement a concurrent plan to propose fee increases already allowable under the Board's present statutes and regulations; and
3. Identify interested Board members who are available to assist in seeking BDR sponsorship by a Legislator(s) during this Legislative session.

In reviewing and discussing this agenda item, the Board also included agenda item 7B, pertaining:

"Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, implementation of strategic planning in response to rejection of the Board's proposed BDR as noted in agenda item 7A (above) which included:

1. Recommendations to seek sponsorship of the rejected BDR by a willing member of the Legislature during the 77th (2013) Legislative session and nomination of Board staff and/or Board member(s) to engage in efforts to find sponsorship of the rejected BDR; and
2. Concurrent strategic planning that allows for development and implementation of proposed changes to the Board's regulations (NAC 641B) that may include regulation changes that allow for increases in Board fees affiliated with licensure, in accordance with NRS 439B.225, and NRS 233B, Nevada Revised Statutes pertaining to administrative procedure act for State agency regulation changes.

Following review and discussion, a motion was made by Sandy Lowery and seconded by Rod Smith to defer to Ms. Frakes to make appropriate decisions in response to this Legislative session's climate as to how she should best proceed in implementing strategic plans and course of action pertaining to the Board's BDR (BDR # 13 ABDC 1138) and any other matters arising during the course of this session. This motion was carried. There were no objections. Ms Frakes expressed that she would continue to keep President Reinoso informed regarding any relevant information arising during this Legislative session as well as any actions taken by her in response to the Board's rejected BDR and/or ongoing Legislative bills.

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, strategic planning by Board members and staff should any proposed BDR'S appear during the 77th (2013) Legislative session which may affect Board operations and/or the practice of social work, including nomination of Board staff and/or Board member(s) who are willing to engage in the Legislative process in response to said BDR'S.

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board and noted that it appears that this portion of this agenda item may have already been discussed with action taken as noted in agenda items 7A and 7B.

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, findings from the Sunset Subcommittee of the Legislative Commission, Bulletin Number 13-17, January 2013.

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. Created during the 2011 Legislative session following passage of Senate Bill 251, the Sunset Subcommittee was formed. The Subcommittee is responsible for conducting reviews of all boards and commissions in the State that are not provided for in the *Nevada Constitution* or established by an Executive Order of the Governor. The Subcommittee is charged with determining whether those entities should be terminated, modified, consolidated with another board or commission, or continued. During the 2011 – 2012 Legislative Interim, members of the Subcommittee included Legislators and non-Legislators appointed by the Chair of the Legislative Commission. The Commission reviewed 29 boards, commissions, and similar entities. Their findings were published in the *Sunset Subcommittee of the Legislative Commission, Bulletin No. 13-17*, and provided for each Board member's review. Following review of the "Bulletin" the Board determined that this was informational only and did not take any action.

(Following this agenda item, the Board took a fifteen minute break)

LICENSURE, INTERN AND APPLICATION ISSUES—CONTINUED

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 641B.150(4)(e)(4)(5) pertaining to the Board's definition and approval criteria for internship site program agencies and 641B.160 pertaining to access of client records for off-site intern supervisors and the applicability of these regulations for a particular State agency.

Pursuant to NRS 241.020, this agenda item had been tabled following a request by Sandy Lowery so that the DCFS Clinical Program Manager II, who was scheduled to arrive around 10:00 a.m., could be present in order to participate in the discussion of this agenda item.

Following introductions by Board members and staff to the DCFS Clinical Program Manager (Program Manager), Kim Frakes presented the initial portion of this agenda item to the Board. Following a telephone conversation between her (Ms. Frakes) and the DCFS Clinical Program Planner on or around January 31, 2013, a letter was submitted requesting clarification during the Board's meeting regarding:

1. NAC 641B.150 pertaining to intern supervisors having "complete access to all records of the agency," in the process of providing intern supervision as part of an agency becoming a Board approved internship site, pursuant to NAC 641B.150(4)(e)(4)(5);
2. NAC 641B.160 which appears to limit the duties of an intern supervisor in the course of supervising interns to: observing the intern's direct practice; reviewing the intern's notes; and process recordings; and
3. Clarification of the Board's regulatory requirements (as noted above) as it pertains to off-site intern supervision requirements as it relates to the protection of certain documents deemed as "confidential" by DCFS.

Copies of: NAC 641B.150; NAC 641B.160 and the January 31, 2013 letter referenced above were included in each Board member's packet to assist them in reviewing and discussing this agenda item. Discussion, facilitated by Sandy Lowery followed. The Program Manager expressed concerns regarding DCFS'S ability to allow access to client records as noted in NAC 641B.150 while providing necessary confidentiality to these records. In order to allow clinical social work interns to practice at DCFS clinical sites, supervision has been provided internally by qualifying Board approved clinical social workers. Unfortunately, this has put a strain on DCFS to provide supervision based upon their limited number of available Board approved clinical social work supervisors within their agency. The Program Manager wanted clarification on whether Board approved supervisor outside of the agency could be afforded "limited" information versus the "complete access to client records" as specified in NAC 641B.150. Board members expressed concerns on whether "limited" access to information would provide the off-site Board approved clinical social work intern supervisors would afford these supervisors enough information to provide adequate supervisions. There was discussion regarding the vicarious liability this could pose for the supervisors, whether recruitment of potential off-site supervisors would be difficult given this stipulation, and whether denying complete access to client records by an agency in the course of providing supervision may be in violation of NAC 641B.150. Ms. Lowery noted that routinely, off-site supervisors, in the course of coming on site to supervise a clinical social work intern, would by there primarily to conduct a cursory review of the intern's work in the file and would rarely be afforded the time to review the entire file. Review of additional information in the client file may occur as needed.

James Bertone suggested that in considering whether to bring in off-site clinical intern supervisors to lessen the burden internally on having supervision conducted by DCFS clinical social workers who are Board approved clinical intern supervisors, DCFS may consider bringing any off-site Board approved supervisors as "Agents" of DCFS. At the conclusion of discussing this agenda item, the Program Manager believed that this approach could serve to address DCFS'S dilemma regarding how to implement Board approved off-site clinical intern

supervisors. The Board did not see a need to take action following this discussion. The Program Manager did not stay following the discussion on this agenda item.

ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORK BOARDS (ASWB)

Review and Discussion minutes from the ASWB 2012 Annual meeting Administrators Forum conducted November 1, 2012 as part of the ASWB 2012 Annual meeting held November 1 through 3, 2012, in Springfield, Illinois.

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. Although Ms. Frakes did not attend the Annual meeting, minutes of the Administrator's Forum held on November 1, 2012 were emailed to all member boards. Of particular interest is a summary to date of the total number of disciplinary actions taken by boards listed by state and providence. This summary was located on page 7 and 8 and a copy of the minutes were included in each Board member's packet for review. Following review and discussion of this agenda item, the Board determined that this informational only and did not take any action.

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, the Spring Education Meeting, April 11 through 14, 2013, in Austin, Texas, available ASWB sponsorships to attend this meeting and identification of a Board member or Board staff and alternate who wish to apply for the sponsorship by the February 25, 2013 deadline.

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. Although ASWB does not routinely fund the travel and accommodations to their spring meeting, each year a limited number of sponsorships are available to individuals from member boards. This year, ASWB had five (5) sponsorships available with selection criteria noted in the attached application. Following review and discussion of this agenda item, the Board determined that any interested Board member could contact Ms. Frakes directly for information on applying and if no one expressed interest in attending the spring education meeting, Ms. Frakes could also consider applying for one of the sponsorships herself. Following review and discussion of this agenda item, the Board determined that this informational only and did not take any action.

SENIOR DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, update pertaining to Nevada's Open Meeting Law Manual, Eleventh Edition, June 2012, with full manual published online at: <http://ag/state/nv.us/opengovt/om/manual.pdf>, presented as an overview via the Manual's table of contents.

Kim Frakes initially presented this agenda item to the Board. A copy of this Manual was emailed to Ms. Frakes after the October 2012 Board meeting. Henna Rasul agreed to provide an overview of this Manual. Given the length of this Manual, Ms. Frakes had included in each Board member's packet the table of contents from the Manual and noted that the full Manual could be accessed at the web address noted above. The Board thanked Ms. Rasul for providing an over of the Manual and highlighting areas of applicability to the Board. Following review and discussion of this agenda item, the Board determined that this informational only and did not take any action.

Review and Discussion, Senior Deputy Attorney General Report.

Henna Rasul indicated that she did not have anything to add to today's Board meeting.

PRESIDING OFFICER'S COMMENTS

President Reinoso indicated that he did not have anything to add to today's Board meeting.

BOARD OPERATIONS

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Approval of Minutes for the October 19, 2012, Board meeting.

Following review of the October 19, 2012 Board meeting minutes, a motion was made by Sandy Lowery and seconded by James Bertone to approve the minutes as submitted. This motion was carried. There were no objections.

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, the Year-to-Date Board Cash Flow Statement Covering July 1, 2012 through January 31, 2013, in comparison to the fiscal 2012/2013 Budget.

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. The 2012/2013 Board fiscal year began on July 1, 2012. This agenda item serves to update the Board regarding the total revenue, Board costs and expenditures. Following review and discussion, the Board may take action on any budget recommendations and/or vote to approve the 2012/2013 Year-to-Date Cash Flow Statement as submitted. Percentages at "58.3%" are on target for the seven months of this fiscal year. Following review of the Cash Flow Statement included in each member's packet, a motion was made by Sandy Lowery and seconded by Rod Smith to approve the 2012/2013 Cash Flow Statement as submitted. This motion was carried. There were no objections.

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, the Board's audited financial statement for fiscal year July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. A copy of the Board of Examiners for Social Workers Financial Statements, June 30, 2012, an audit of the Board's financial fitness occurred and filed with the State Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB), pursuant to Nevada law, by December 1, 2012. A copy of the audit as submitted to LCB was included in each Board member's packet. Following review of the Board's audited financial statement for fiscal year July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012, a motion was made by Sandy Lowery and seconded by Rod Smith to approve the 2012/2013 Cash Flow Statement as submitted. This motion was carried. There were no objections.

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, election of Board officers pursuant to NRS 641B.120.

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. In order to be compliant with NRS 641B.120, the Board needed to nominate members from the Board to fill the offices of: President, Vice President and Secretary/Treasurer. A table of Board member's appointments and dates of anticipated expiration was included in each Board member's packet in order to inform them when their terms were due to expire and whether those with terms approaching expiration were interested in being reappointed. President Reinoso noted that his term had expired on June 30, 2011 and whether Ms. Frakes had heard anything from the Office of the Governor. Likewise, Ms. Lowery noted that her term had expired last year on June 30, 2012. Ms. Frakes explained that James Bertone was reappointed by the Office of the Governor on February 4, 2013. Aside from this, she had not heard any additional information regarding reappointments. Tracy Cassity noted that his term would be expiring on June 30, 2013 and that he was interested in being reappointed. Ms. Frakes instructed Mr. Cassity to contact her after the Board meeting for assistance.

A motion was made by Sandy Lowery and seconded by James Bertone to continue to have Randy Reinoso serve as Board President. This motion was carried. President Reinoso abstained from voting. Ms. Frakes indicated that should Mr. Reinoso not be reappointed that the Board would hold election of Board officers during a subsequent Board meeting.

A motion was made by Tracy Cassity and seconded by Rod Smith to continue to have Sandy Lowery serve as Board Vice President. This motion was carried. There were no objections.

A motion was made by Tracy Cassity and seconded by Rod Smith to have James Bertone to continue to serve as Board Secretary/Treasurer. This motion was carried. There were no objections.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT.

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. She noted that the Board office successfully interviewed and hired a replacement for the part-time staff member who left at the end of December. Ms. Frakes noted that the newly hired staff member appears to be adapting to the rigors of her position and that Board staff was happy to have her on board. Aside from this, Ms. Frakes indicated that she did not have anything further to add to today's meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was not anyone available from the public to offer comment.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Tracy Cassity and seconded by James Bertone to adjourn this meeting. This motion was carried with the Board meeting concluding at 11:10 a.m. There were no objections.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kim Frakes, LCSW
Executive Director