



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 17, 2017

(AGENDA ITEM 1) The meeting of the Board of Examiners for Social Workers was called to order by Rod Smith, Board President, at 9:16 a.m. The meeting was held at Mojave Mental Health: Reno, 745 W. Moana Lane, Suite 100, in Reno, Nevada. There was a simultaneous videoconference conducted at Mojave Adult Clinic, 4000 E. Charleston Blvd., Suite B-230, Las Vegas, Nevada.

(It was noted that prior to the start of the Board meeting, the videoconferencing was not working. Accordingly, the initial portion of the meeting was conducted by teleconference. The videoconferencing capability was fixed approximately 20 minutes following the Call to Order).

President Smith noted that the meeting had been properly posted and that the Board members present constituted a quorum. Roll call was initiated by President Smith, with the following individuals present at the following location(s):

Members Present:

Rod Smith, Board President, Reno
Vikki Erickson, LCSW, Secretary/Treasurer, Reno
Jodi Ussher, LCSW, Board Member, Reno
Annie Wilson, LSW, Board Vice President, Las Vegas
Colleen York, LSW, Board Member, Las Vegas

Staff Present

Kim Frakes, LCSW, Executive Director, Las Vegas
Henna Rasul, Senior Deputy Attorney General, Reno
Paula Berkley, Board Lobbyist, Reno

Public Attendees

None

(AGENDA ITEM 2)

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was not anyone from the public at either the Reno or Las Vegas location to offer public comment.

(AGENDA ITEM 3)

CONSENT AGENDA

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Approval of the Consent Agenda

A motion was made by Vikki Erickson and seconded by Jodi Ussher, to approve the Agenda as submitted. This motion was carried without objection.

REGULAR AGENDA

DISCIPLINARY MATTERS

(AGENDA ITEM 4A) **Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Recommendation to Dismiss Disciplinary Case Number: G10-39.**

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. Kim Frakes will provide redacted background information pertaining to **Case G10-39**, along with her recommendation to dismiss this case. This case was reviewed with Henna Rasul, Sr. Deputy Attorney General, prior to placing this matter onto the Board meeting agenda. Following presentation of this agenda item, a motion was made by Vikki Erickson and seconded by Jodi Ussher, to dismiss disciplinary Case Number, G10-39. This motion was carried without objection.

(AGENDA ITEM 4B) **Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Overview of the Disciplinary Process and Recommendations to Improve and Streamline the Process.**

Kim Frakes presented an overview of the current disciplinary process and proposed revisions to streamline the process. Each Board members' packet contained an overview of the disciplinary process and proposed revisions. Paula Berkley indicated that given the ongoing disciplinary caseload (see Agenda Item 4C), it is imperative to develop a written policy on how these disciplinary cases will be addressed. Although the current rating system for cases (i.e. 1 = least severe; 2 = moderate severity; and 3 = severe), all of these cases should be addressed, at least with an initial letter of notification, within 30 days. Sandy Lowery indicated that there will be a recommendation to best address how to remedy this matter later on during the meeting (Agenda Item 10E and 10F). Jodi Ussher wondered why this was being brought up now. Ms. Frakes indicated that this was a follow up to the previous Board meeting pertaining to how the Board conducts its disciplinary process. There was discussion on whether to combine this with agenda items 10E and 10F. Ms. Frakes reminded the Board that there were presentations scheduled at 10:00 a.m. (Agenda Item G). Given the length of the meeting agenda, President Smith recommended not combining the referenced agenda items and instead to table this item and reference this agenda item when discussing Agenda Item 10E and 10F.

(AGENDA ITEM 4C) **Review and Discussion, Redacted Disciplinary Report and Update Pertaining to Ongoing Efforts to Address Disciplinary Cases.**

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. Each Board member's Board meeting packet contained the updated, redacted list. Ms. Frakes noted that the list of open cases, including the dismissal of Case G10-39, brought the total number of cases to, "127" cases. Ms. Frakes acknowledged that more needed to be done in order to move these cases forward in a more timely manner. Ms. Frakes indicated that discussions between President Smith, Sandra Lowery and herself have occurred, with recommendations on how to address this concern. Ms. Frakes indicated that this has been included as Agenda Item 10E-i, on this Board meeting's agenda. Although President Smith acknowledged that the list of cases have been decreasing, more needs to be done to address this issue. Jodi Ussher expressed concerns that the number of active cases was alarming.

LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY ISSUES

(AGENDA ITEM 5A) **Review and Discussion, 79th/2017 State Legislative Session Update, as Provided by the Board's Lobbyist.**

Paula Berkley presented this agenda item to the Board. She reviewed a list of complaints pertaining the Board that she is often presented with by legislators as well as stakeholders. These complaints include:

- An overall lack of responsiveness.
- Defensive and a lack of communication.

- Low technological approaches in licensure.
- Poor political judgment.
- Disciplinary backlog and no apparent guidelines on how to address this.
- Slow to process application including applications for endorsement.

Ms. Berkley added that the Board has been criticized for not doing the following:

- Does not promote the positive aspects, such as the Provisional C license.
- Does not utilize the ample funding already available.
- Has not provided her with a list of bill drafts to assist her in working with legislators pertaining to possible fee increases.

Ms. Berkley indicated that much of the Board's negative public relations ties back to the 2015 Legislative session and SB 515, the School Social Worker bill. She added that the Governor is requiring all occupational licensing boards to change their mission to that of "economic development" and "innovation". Ms. Berkley also indicated that the UNR School of Social Work appears to be generating some of the negative Board publicity. She indicated that each session, UNR School of Social Work hosts the Social Work Legislative Days during each Legislative session. This event is popular with the legislators and has provided an avenue for UNR School of Social work to have access to legislators. Unfortunately, this has not been beneficial to the Board. Ms. Berkley recommended that the President Smith should attempt to contact the UNR School of Social Work Director and see if a meeting could be scheduled to discuss his concerns. Annie Wilson also suggested that the UNLV Board of Social Work should also be considered as part of this outreach.

As this pertains to the Legislative Committee on Health Care's proposal to introduce a bill draft to consolidate the State's behavioral health boards, Ms. Berkley indicated that there may be some modest movement to deter the bill. However, there is also another bill being proposed by the State's Department of Health and Human Services, Behavioral Health Division. Overall, the bill to consolidate the behavioral health boards is anticipated to move forward during this session. Ms. Berkley indicated that she would continue to encourage legislators to allow the Interim Sunset Committee to review the four behavioral health boards in lieu of simply passing a bill to consolidate these boards. She further added that she would also continue to recommend trainings to boards and to record these trainings for ongoing access by board members and board staff.

President Smith inquired whether the legislators see themselves as being duplicitous as it pertains to their list of concerns? Ms. Berkley that unfortunately, they do not, given that this is the nature of how the Legislature operates. A legislature, by nature, primarily responds to complaints from their constituents, even if the complaints is solely from the perspective of the constituent. Over the course of time, the legislator begins to collect only negative information pertaining to the Board and accordingly, become judged on the basis of this alone.

(AGENDA ITEM 5B) **Review and Discussion Pertaining to the Board's Legislative Education Get Together Conducted on January 27, 2017 and February 3, 2017.**

(This agenda item was tabled in order to aid in the efficacy of the Board meeting. The Board would return to this agenda item following the presentation of Agenda Item G)

(The Board took a brief 10 minute break prior to the scheduled presentations)

BOARD OPERATIONS

(agenda Item 10G) **Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Selection from the Following List of Information Technology Vendors, who will Contract to Provide Development of the**

Board's Database, Online License Verification, Online License Renewal and Eventual Online Initial License Application:

- i. **State of Nevada EITS (Enterprise Information Technology Services);**
- ii. **ASWB (Association of Social Work Boards); or**
- iii. **G. L. Suites.**

Sandy Lowery presented this agenda item to the Board. She and Kim Frakes had conducted face-to-face meetings with the State EITS and teleconferenced meetings with ASWB and G. L. Suites. Ms. Lowery indicated that she would present their findings regarding the meeting with State EITS. Both ASWB and G. L. Suites had scheduled teleconferences to individually conduct their presentation to the Board. Each Board members' meeting packet included:

1. EITS anticipated cost worksheet.
2. ASWB informational packet. In lieu of upfront costs, ASWB will charge per application renewal. As noted in the ASWB proposal, *Social Work: Application Processing*, Section F, *Price Proposal*, ASWB is proposing a fee of \$30.00 per renewal application. **The estimated costs, based upon 2015's renewals are: ~ 2300 renewals; conservative est. of 1,850 (80% renewing applicants) choose to renew online = 1,850 x \$30.00 = \$55,500 annually.**
3. G. L. Suite proposal packet.

ASWB Teleconference Presentation

This presentation was conducted by Dave Ryzcko, Member Services, Senior Manager and Jennifer Henkel, LCSW, Director of Member Services. Mr. Ryzcko indicated that ASWB has an outstanding history of providing services to their member licensing boards. Unlike other potential vendors, Mr. Ryzcko indicated that ASWB is dedicated to serving social work licensing boards. Jennifer Henkel added that ASWB has been providing examination services as well as board support for many years and that incorporating their licensing portal would be an excellent fit for this Board, with an effortless and seamless transition. Mr. Ryzcko asked the Board to review the documents provided as part of this demonstration. He reviewed "4 main questions" he anticipated the Board members may ask, based upon the review of the provided handouts.

Question 1

Why partner with ASWB?

The process is easy, efficient and personable. ASWB offers a call center which applicants and licensees can access via email or by telephone. This is not just a software package, but an entire package which offers personal service. Nevada already interacts with ASWB and accordingly is familiar with the agency, it's mission and processes.

Question 2

Does ASWB have database management experience?

Mr. Ryzcko asked the Board to refer to the "Point/Counterpoint..." handout. He indicated that ASWB has had database management experience in the form of exam registration for the past 30 years. This includes registering 40,000 applicants annually for exams and supports 400,000 nationwide, including Nevada. Every active licensee who has taken the ASWB is part of their collected aggregate informational database. This database is highly secure and will translate into what the Board is currently seeking in terms of a database system. The ASWB system is highly adaptable and can be adapted to the Board's current and future systems. The interface would be 100% seamless as it pertains to the transfer of information between ASWB and the Board. This system would also provide online license verification.

Question 3

Does ASWB have application processing experience?

Mr. Ryczko indicated that ASWB has application processing experience via proprietary software in place and have been offering a variety of application processing for the past 12 years. ASWB provides numerous types of application processes for the state of Massachusetts, with 35,000 applications processed annually. ASWB has processed 2,000 examination preapproval applications for the Utah. ASWB also processes the social work registry, registering 4,500 licensees to date. ASWB provides continuing education auditing for certain states, including Massachusetts, Louisiana, Maryland and North Carolina. Mr. Ryczko reiterated that ASWB provides more than just software as it also provides customer service, with an exclusive focus on social workers. ASWB would provide their own staff, dedicated and versed about Nevada's requirements. The email access is available 24 hours daily, and the call center would be available during business hours.

Mr. Ryczko asked the Board to refer to the "Renewal Application Processing" flow chart. The items in this flow chart could be tailored to fit the Board's needs.

Question 4

What does it cost?

In regards to the renewal application process, all of the initial information from the Board's database would be securely provided to ASWB for the process of generating licensees' renewal applications. All information required by the Board for a licensee to renew an application would be provided to renewing applicants via a link by ASWB. Upon receipt of the renewing application and appropriate fees, the renewal process would then be handled by ASWB. Any information provided by the applicant which requires the Board to address would accordingly be forwarded by ASWB to the Board. All data and funds, following the processing of the application, including a review of each applicant via the ASWB'S Public Protection Database, would be forwarded by ASWB to the Board as directed.

Mr. Ryczko then directed the Board's attention to section F, "Price Proposal", on the handout, "Social Work: Application Processing". Option 2 indicated that the renewal application would cost "\$30.00" for each renewal application. For this cost, ASWB would incur the entire development cost, software programming cost, maintenance cost, hosting cost and servicing cost. There would not be any separate or additional costs. Mr. Ryczko suggested that following his presentation, the Board may wish to go to the ASWB website and click onto the information pertaining to the application process for the state of Massachusetts.

Colleen York inquired whether there had been any information pertaining to the overall level of satisfaction by applicants who had used ASWB for social work application in the state of Massachusetts? Mr. Ryczko indicated that internal surveys have been conducted by ASWB and the Massachusetts' board regarding applicant satisfaction. He indicated that the responses by this board have been favorable. He added that applicant complaints regarding the processing of applications for Massachusetts has been non-existent.

Annie Wilson inquired whether the call center utilized by ASWB also provides services to other licensing entities. Ms. Wilson recalled an incident pertaining to a time when she had attempted to register to take an exam for the State social work board and the person at the call center continued to refer to a "real estate" examination. Mr. Ryczko indicated that the individuals at the ASWB call center are their employees and do not provide services to any other licensing entity. Mr. Ryczko wondered if Ms. Wilson may have contacted Pearson Vue testing center, the entity which schedules the examination. Ms. Wilson indicated that she was fairly certain that her point of contact was with ASWB.

President Smith wondered about applicants' access to services by telephone, noting that the ASWB location was on the east coast, with their office hours accordingly based around business hours within their time zone (i.e. Eastern Standard Time Zone). Mr. Ryczko indicated that access to email was 24/7 and that the call center's time for Nevada could be modified, at no additional cost, to coincide with Nevada's time zone, (i.e. Pacific Standard Time Zone).

Jodi Ussher requested clarification pertaining to the number of states currently receiving database support in addition to Massachusetts and Utah. Mr. Ryczko indicated that these were the 2 states currently receiving application processing. He added that ASWB provides social worker registry for applicants nationwide. Mr. Ryczko explained the registry service, which was a credentialing repository offered to licensees at a cost of \$60.00. The registry supports the ease of mobility for social workers who could request that their credentialing information be provided by ASWB to any state whenever the licensee is seeking licensure in another state. Ms. Ussher indicated that this would be of great benefit to social worker employed with the Veterans Administration.

Mr. Ryczko indicated that the Board could also visit the ASWB website's homepage and also find licensing information, which included the user screen.

Paula Berkley inquired about how long the application approval process is for the states of Utah and Massachusetts? He responded that this notification, following receipt of all required information, usually occurred within the same day.

Mr. Ryczko recalled an earlier inquiry pertaining to a list serve. He indicated that this was something which could be provided by ASWB at a fairly reasonable cost of approximately \$100.00 per month.

Colleen York inquired about whether a satisfaction survey could be part of the application renewal process. Jennifer Henkel stated that it could be added as a part of the application process which the licensee could opt to participate in on a voluntary basis.

President Smith inquired about how soon ASWB would be able to complete this process. Mr. Ryczko indicated that this could be complete by the end of the summer. He added that this could occur sooner, it would depend upon the Board's ability to respond.

At the conclusion of ASWB'S presentation, President Smith thanked Dave Ryczko and Jennifer Henkel for their time and presentation.

GL Solutions Teleconference Presentation

Brian Bennett, Agency Consultant, provided the teleconference presentation on behalf of GL Solutions. He directed the Board to either review the attached handouts or to participate online. Mr. Bennett indicated that the founders of GL Solutions were themselves Oregon government regulators who developed their software system following dissatisfaction with the system afforded to them at the time. Formerly known as GL Suites, the software database was developed to provide state agencies with the ability to better track information. GL Solutions has been providing database software to numerous state agencies since 1997, including various agencies in Nevada. Mr. Bennett noted that GL Solutions provides services to agencies of various sizes and includes a variety of services to assist licensing boards and entities. He indicated that GL Solutions were experts in the field of both regulatory and software. Mr. Bennett indicated that GL Solutions utilizes and is familiar with Microsoft applications and utilizes the SQL server. He added that the GL software is a web-based application which is hosted as a Tier 3 datacenter. Mr. Bennett noted that any using client therefore would have the ability to login into the website in a secure manner and have the ability to perform required functions.

Mr. Bennett asked the Board to review page 5 of their handouts. He noted that the Board currently utilizes the Access format for its database and that the software package requested, based upon earlier conversations with Sandy Lowery and Kim Frakes, was the GL Suites software, which is considered a configurable software engine. Mr. Bennett indicated that GL would perform a detailed analysis of the various functions and criteria performed by Board staff as it pertains to the licensing process. He added that the system would provide support on the backend for Board staff as well as provide support for applicants as it pertained to online renewals, credit card processing, license verification, etc. Mr. Bennett noted that GL Suites is highly configurable and can be tailored to fit the needs of the using agency.

Kim Frakes inquired about how long the anticipated build and implementation would take. Mr. Bennett indicated that a typical implementation process similar to the Board's situation would, following contract execution, take approximately 10 months. He further noted that contingent upon client engagement in the process, this timeline could take a little a 4 months.

Colleen York inquired on whether GL Solutions utilized a call center and if so, which time zone would the call center be based?

Mr. Bennett responded that if a licensee had questions regarding the renewal process, these questions would be addressed by the Board's staff. He added that questions raised by Board staff pertaining to the database, GL Solutions products, would be addressed by GL, with 24/7 support. Ms. Frakes clarified that the GL process would be replacing the paper applications sent to renewing licensees, with the ability to renew online via the GL Solutions software. In the event there was a software issue, Board staff would contact GL Solutions, not the licensee.

In reviewing cost, Ms. Frakes noted that the final page of the handout indicated that the total cost quoted was, \$65,000. Mr. Bennett indicated that this was correct, with cost being implemented in stages as deliverables throughout the development stages, following execution of the contract. He further discussed the GL Turnkey support plan with a quoted cost of \$19,995.00 per year which included ongoing support and licensing software and updates. Mr. Bennett also noted that there was a cheaper, GL Simple Plan which was a basic support plan with the option to "pay as you go" as it pertained to support and updates.

Paula Berkley noted that the referring handouts reference "2" license types. She indicated that it was her understanding that the Board actually had "7" license types. Ms. Berkley wanted clarification on if GL Solutions fully understood the actual number of licenses offered by the Board and if the current quote would also include the 7 license types.

Sandy Lowery believed that this could be addressed when the Board implemented the database build, the build could include under a particular license type, e.g. LCSW, the various features of that particular license. For example, Ms. Lowery inquired, whether the build would track whether the LCSW was an expedited license, a provisional license, a veteran, etc. Ms. Berkley added, whether this tracked information might also include the length of time between various actions pertaining the application. For example, when the Board initially acknowledged the application, when the final item required for licensure was received, etc. Mr. Bennett indicated that both of the tracked requests could be included into the build.

Ms. Berkley inquired about the number of licensing board in Nevada who currently use GL Solutions and which boards are they? Mr. Bennett indicated that there were several, including the Occupational Therapy Board, the Accountancy Board, with implementation to soon begin with the Manufactured Housing and Contractors Board. He added that the State Fire Marshall utilizes GL Solutions for their permitting process as well as other entities outside of Nevada. Ms. Berkley asked Mr. Bennett if he would please provide a list of other State licensing boards which use GL Solutions to support the Board's ongoing efforts to demonstrate to the State Legislature, its diligence in pursuing a database vendor. Mr. Bennett indicated that he would gladly provide this information to Ms. Frakes and Ms. Lowery.

Jodi Ussher inquired whether GL Solutions could include a satisfaction survey to the license renewal process as a way of determining licensees' overall satisfaction with the online renewal process? Mr. Bennett indicated that a link to a survey format, such as Survey Monkey, could be added to the online renewal application.

The Board thanked Mr. Bennett for his time and interest at the conclusion of his presentation.

Noting that President Smith had briefly left the meeting, Henna Rasul indicated that it was fine for the Board to begin the deliberation process, even if he was not immediately available. Ms. Frakes indicated that State of Nevada EITS (Enterprise Information Technology System) had provided an approximate number of hours the

database build would cost. She asked the Board to review the EITS worksheet, which was a copy of their "IT LABOR" costs. It was noted that the "Program Developer" cost was "\$85.62" per hour and that the "Database Administrator" was "95.82" per hour. Ms. Frakes indicated that based upon the discussion she and Ms. Lowery had with EITS recently, an estimate of "25" hours for each project was an ample estimate.

Accordingly, the estimated overall costs would be: Program Developer @ \$85.62 x 25 hrs. = \$2,140.50; Database Administrator @ \$95.82 x 25 hrs. = 2,395.50. The total estimated database build would be: \$4,536.00.

Ms. Lowery noted that Board member, Jodi Ussher, needed to return to work. She urged the Board to remain purposeful and focused in reviewing the presentations and the EITS information so that a decision could be reached prior to Ms. Ussher's departure.

Ms. Lowery provided an overview of the meeting she and Ms. Frakes had with EITS a few weeks earlier. She acknowledged that EITS could construct the database build as requested. Ms. Lowery indicated that the only concern pertained to the fact that the database build was less under the control of the Board compared to the other two vendors. She indicated that the Board is a very small agency in comparison to other State agencies. Ms. Lowery expressed concerns that unlike the previous presenting vendors, EITS would not necessarily have dedicated staff. Should a larger agency require the attention of EITS, the Board's request would more than likely be conducted after the needs of the larger agency is completed. Ms. Lowery further noted that the above estimated cost of \$4,536.00, was simply to move the Board's current database from the Access format to the SQL format. There would be additional costs affiliated to conduct online renewals and the other items which were included in the costs for the two presenting vendors.

In reviewing ASWB, Ms. Lowery noted that Ms. Frakes had included in each Board members' meeting packet, an anticipated cost for the database development and online license renewal process affiliated with ASWB. Ms. Frakes noted that ASWB proposed cost would be at \$30.00 per renewal application. This per application cost would assist them in recouping their cost for the Board's database build, online license verification and online license renewal. She indicated that in 2016, the Board had approximate 2,300 licensees. If 80% of these licensees opted to renew online, this would equal approximately "1,850" licensees. **Based upon this estimate, the anticipated cost, if ASWB was selected would be: 1,850 licensee x \$30 per renewing application = \$55,500 annually.**

Ms. Lowery indicated that she and Ms. Frakes had gone to the State's Occupational Therapy Board (OT Board), who utilize GL Solutions for both the occupational therapy board and the audiology board. Ms. Lowery indicated that she, following a demonstration by the OT Board's Executive Director of the entire licensing set up, was impressed. Overall, Ms. Lowery noted that regardless of which vendor the Board selected, there was going to be a 4-step process. First, was the conversion of the Board's current database into a SQL format. Contingent upon the effectiveness of the backend build, Ms. Lowery indicated that the Board should be able to provide statistically data as it relates to the licensing process and aggregate licensee data. Second, would be real-time license verification. Third, would be online license renewals. Ms. Lowery indicated that the fourth step would eventually have all applications completed online. Ms. Lowery indicated that ultimately, this would be the Board's decision on which vendor to select.

Annie Wilson expressed concerns pertaining to why an anticipated database build would take 10 months, as proposed by the 2 presenting vendors. Ms. Lowery indicated that since the Board's current database is in an outdated format, i.e. Access, it would take time to appropriately transfer this information to the required SQL format. Ms. Wilson indicated that she was personally familiar with a database build and transition which only required a couple of months to complete.

Jodi Ussher directed her question to Paula Berkley. She asked Ms. Berkley if one of the options for a database vendor is viewed more favorably by the State legislators in providing the statistical data they would normally request from a State licensing board. Ms. Berkley responded that she would defer questions

regarding the provision of statistical data to Sandy Lowery. Ms. Berkley noted, however, that approximately 15 State boards utilize GL Solutions for database information. Ms. Lowery added that GL Solutions has name and brand recognition throughout the State and most legislators are also familiar with this brand for database information. Henna Rasul indicated that based upon her observations with the numerous State boards she represents, once certain boards have transitioned into using GL Solutions, she noted that their performance as it pertains to licensing applications improved tremendously. President Smith indicated that he appreciated the fact that GL Solutions was based out of Bend, Oregon. He viewed this as an advantage both regionally as well as being on the same time zone, which should allow for ease of access for the Board.

Following review and discussion, a motion was made by Jodi Ussher for the Board to select GL Solutions' proposal, with a request as a negotiating point (not a contingency) that they make efforts to shorten the estimated time to complete the build. President Smith requested a second motion to approve GL Solutions' proposal, with the negotiating point to make efforts to shorten the build time. Vikki Erickson seconded the motion. Colleen York opposed the motion with a "Nay" vote. Annie Wilson indicated she would approve the vote, but stressed having the negotiating point that the timeline on the build be significantly reduced as she viewed the 10-month anticipated project build as being excessive. This motion was carried as follows: Jodi Ussher, Vikki Erickson, Annie Wilson, Yays and Colleen York, Nay.

(Following review and discussion of this agenda item, the Board took a break from 12:15 p.m. to 1:15 p.m.)

LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY ISSUES--CONTINUED

(AGENDA ITEM 5A) (Continued)--Review and Discussion, 79th/2017 State Legislative Session Update, as Provided by the Board's Lobbyist.

Paula Berkley, Board Lobbyist, continued her presentation to the Board. She indicated that she had submitted a proposed design which would bolster the current Sunset Review Committee (Sunset Committee) by providing them with permanently assigned staff who could serve not only to provide oversight of the various State boards, but also serve as a resource to these boards. Ms. Berkley noted that State boards often exist without much direction or resources. However, the State legislature then reacts extremely whenever it appears that the boards are not in compliance or appear to perform below standards, although there does not appear to be any guidelines, direction or oversight to assist the boards. Ms. Berkley further added that it appears that there are pockets of helpful information within various State entities (e.g. Governor's Office, State Legislature, Department of Administration) but the information is not centralized. She indicated that she is using her recommendation as an alternative to the proposed merger of the 4 behavioral health boards. Ms. Berkley indicated that she has pitched her proposal to one of the sponsors who is in support of the merger and also pitching her proposal to other key legislators.

President Smith asked Ms. Berkley if the remaining 3 behavioral health boards currently find themselves in a similar position politically with the legislators. Ms. Berkley indicated that both the Psychology Board and the Drug and Alcohol Board are in better standing with the legislators than the Social Work Board. They appear to be operating more efficiently and are more advanced technologically. Both of these boards have also had a lobbyist representing them during each legislative session. The Marriage and Family/Clinical Professional Counselor Board is struggling, similar to the Social Work Board. Ms. Berkley summarized current bills she is also tracking in addition to the proposed board merger bill. Ms. Berkley added that at the conclusion of each legislative session, she will provide the Board with a summary of the bills which passed and the impact this will have on the Board.

(AGENDA ITEM 5B) Review and Discussion Pertaining to the Board's Legislative Education Get Together Conducted on January 27, 2017 and February 3, 2017.

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. A Legislative Education Get Together was conducted by Kim Frakes, Sandy Lowery and Paula Berkley in Reno on January 27, 2017 and by Ms. Frakes and Ms. Berkley in Las Vegas on February 3, 2017. Board members were in attendance at both meetings, with efforts to not have more than 2 members at each location in order to avoid the appearance of conducting a Board meeting by having a quorum. Although the focus of discussion during this Get Together pertained to the proposed consolidation of the State's behavioral health boards and how licensees may participate in contacting the legislature regarding this bill, time was also allotted to other proposed bills. This agenda item provides an update regarding this Get Together. Each Board members' meeting packet contained the items which were handed out during the Get Together as prepared by Ms. Berkley. These were:

1. Proposals Relating to Health Profession Licensing and Licensing Boards;
2. Behavioral Health Licensing Board Consolidation and Transfer; and
3. Web Page for Nevada Legislature (How to contact your legislator).

Following review and discussion, no action was taken on this agenda item.

(AGENDA ITEM 5C) **Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, 78th/2015 Legislative Revisions Pertaining to NRS 433A.115:**

- i. **78th/2015 Legislation (Senate Bill 7), Expanding the List of Professionals who Allowed to Certify/Decertify the Updated L2K2, Legal 2000 Form to include APRN (Advanced Practice Registered Nurse) and Board Approved LCSW (Licensed Clinical Social Workers) with Board Approved Experience and Training to Certify/Decertify Patients from a L2K2;**
- ii. **Adopted General Policy by the State Board of Nursing Pertaining to Approved Experience and Training; and**
- iii. **Social Work Board's Consideration of Implementing Similar Criteria.**

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item. During the previous 78th/2015 Legislative Session, Senate Bill 7 (SB 7) was passed. SB 7's relevance to the Board is the expansion of licensed professionals who could either certify or decertify a person with mental illness who was placed on a Legal Hold, also known as a "Legal 2000" or "L2K2". This expanded list of professionals included licensed clinical social workers with Board approved training and experience. This expanded list also included APRN (Advanced Practice Registered Nurse) with postgraduate experience and training. Ms. Frakes had indicated that she had contacted the State Nursing Board in an attempt to see how they were planning to address the issue stipulated in SB 7 pertaining to "experience" and "training". She indicated that she had expressed to the Nursing Board this Board's interest in partnering with the training aspect pertaining to this bill. Ms. Frakes noted that recently, Nursing Board staff had emailed her and brought her attention to how they addressed the issue pertaining to experience and training. Each Board members' meeting packet had a copy of information which was linked on the Nursing Board's website to their policy, dated August 22, 2016. Pursuant to this policy, it had been determined by the Nursing Board that APRN'S (Advance Practice Registered Nurses) already have, through their efforts for licensure, the experience and training required to adequately complete the certification or the decertification individuals who are on an involuntary hold. Ms. Frakes indicated that the purpose of this agenda item was for the Board to possibly consider implementing a similar policy. Each Board members' meeting packet also contained the current language pertaining to clinical social workers, in LCB File T001-16. Vikki Erickson expressed concerns that about the Board's specifications as it pertained to appropriate training. Sandy Lowery indicated that an affidavit could be developed which specified the areas of training an LCSW would be required to have (as part of the 12 CEU'S already required in a licensee's area of practice) as well as the number of years of postgraduate experience, already reflected in LCB File T001-16. Colleen York expressed concern that LCSW'S may be coerced into engaging in this area of practice by employers. Ms. Lowery acknowledged her concerns, adding that licensees often have to advocate with their employers regarding their willingness to

engage in certain areas of practice. Vikki Erickson wondered in other states were requiring their LCSW'S to engage in the certification/decertification process. Ms. Frakes indicated that she had posted this as a question on the ASWB listserv with only a few states responding that their state does not allow LCSW'S to engage in this area of practice. Ms. Erickson continued with her concerns that in the rural portion of the State, an LCSW may be asked to engage in this process remotely via Skype or other electronically distant means. Ms. Frakes responded that the University of Utah Hospital has already expressed interest in engaging in telehealth services in Nevada and has inquired about licensing their staff. Ms. Frakes added that she was informed by the University of Utah that the teleconference would include input from licensed practitioners, such as nurses, who have been working with the patient, as part of the process to either certify or decertify a patient. Following review and discussion, a motion was made by Annie Wilson and seconded by Colleen York to have Board staff create an affidavit which reflects the experience and training, via continued education, which supports eligible LCSW's in participating in the certification/decertification process. Vikki Erickson opposed the motion, which was carried by majority. Kim Frakes indicated that she would follow up on the ASWB listserv again to see how other states have addressed similar legislation.

(AGENDA ITEM 5D) **Review and Discussion, Findings of Site Visit Conducted by the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Contractor Pertaining to the State's Behavioral Health Boards:**

- i. Contractor's Findings and Recommendations Specific to this Board;**
- ii. Board's Response to the Contractor's Findings and Recommendations; and**
- iii. Aggregate Findings from the Remaining State's Behavioral Health Boards.**

Sandy Lowery, presented this agenda item to the Board. This agenda item served to update the Board regarding the findings and concerns expressed by the DHHS Contractor (Contractor) pertaining to her site visits to various boards, including this Board during the later half of 2016. The Contractor had made recommendations to the behavioral health boards, as part of an ongoing discussion between DHHS, the Contractor and the State's behavioral health boards. The noted concerns are being considered by the State Legislature and the Governor's office as supporting their proposed bill to consolidate the behavioral health boards.

Each Board member's Board meeting packet contained:

1. A copy of the Contractor's findings;
2. 1/27/17 Conference Call Notes pertaining to findings; and
1. A copy of the Board's response to the Contractor's findings, including recommended timelines to address and/or correct these concerns.

It appeared that most of the items under this agenda item had previously been addressed by the Board's lobbyist, there did not appear to be much more to discuss under this agenda item.

(AGENDA ITEM 5E) **Review and Discussion, Update Pertaining to the Filing of Temporary Regulation, LCB File No.: T001-16, January 30, 2017, with the Nevada Secretary of State Office.**

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. Ms. Frakes indicated that this agenda item served to update the Board regarding the adopted temporary regulations, LCB File No.: T001-16 and that the official filing with the Nevada Secretary of State's Office occurred on January 30, 2017. The filing makes the regulation "official". These regulations will "expire" by limitation on November 30, 2017, if the Board does not engage in the process to make these regulations "permanent" prior to this expiration date. Depending upon the outcome of this Legislative session, if the Board's existence continues, it will be imperative for the Board to move quickly following the session, to engage in the regulation change process for the purpose of changing these regulations into permanent regulation changes. Each Board member had in their Board meeting packet,

a copy to LCB File T001-16, as submitted to Nevada Secretary of State Office. LCB File T001-16 was also posted on the Board's website.

(The Board's Lobbyist, Paula Berkley, departed soon after the above agenda item was presented).

(AGENDA ITEM 5F) Review and Discussion, 79th/2017 Legislative Session and Bills Tracked by the Board's Executive Director:

- i. List of Bills to Date, Which May Have Relevance to the Board; and**
- ii. List of Bills to Date, Which May Have Relevance to the Practice of Social Work and Posted on the Board's Website.**

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. This agenda item served to update the Board regarding bills proposed during the 79th/2017 Legislative session which were being tracked by Ms. Frakes. It was noted that this agenda item was combined with Agenda Item 5-A, and appeared to have already simultaneously addressed items contained with this agenda item. The list of tracked bills were already included in agenda item 5A.

CONTINUING EDUCATION

(AGENDA ITEM 6A) Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Approval of NASW (National Association of Social Workers, National Chapter) to be Approved by the Board as a Provider of Continuing Education, Live and Online Presentations, Pursuant to NAC 641B.189 through NAC 641B.190, of the Adopted Regulations and LCB File No.: R018-16 and NAC 641B.191.

Sandra Lowery presented this agenda item to the Board. Board staff, Sandra Lowery, LCSW, has requested the Board to consider including NASW, National Chapter, as a Board approved provider of continuing education. If approved, the approval will be based upon current Board regulations, pursuant to the referenced NAC 641B and Adopted Regulations. Any desire to deviate from the current Board regulations pertaining to approval standards will require a change in Board regulations. Each Board members' packet contained:

1. A copy of Adopted Regulations, R018-16, pages 21 through 26; and
2. A copy of NAC 641B.191, *Approval: Application by provider; action by Board; provider to submit quarterly reports...*

A motion was made by Colleen York and seconded by Annie Wilson to approve having NASW National, to be a Board approved provider of continuing education programs. Ms. Frakes reminded the Board that in order to become a Board approved provider, NASW National would be required to complete an application, pursuant to Board regulations. She further noted that this may be a regulation change which the Board may consider later this year, contingent upon the outcome of this legislative session. This motion was carried without objection.

(AGENDA ITEM 6B) Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Approval of ASWB (Association of Social Work Boards) to be Approved by the Board as a Provider of Continuing Education, Live and Online Presentations, Pursuant to NAC 641B.189 through NAC 641B.190, of the Adopted Regulations, LCB File No.: R018-16 and NAC 641B.191.

Sandra Lowery presented this agenda item to the Board. Board member, Jodi Ussher, LCSW, had requested the Board to consider including ASWB as a Board approved provider of continuing education. If approved, the

approval will be based upon current Board regulations, pursuant to the referenced NAC 641B and Adopted Regulations . Any desire to deviate from the current Board regulations pertaining to approval standards will require a change in Board regulations. The documents provided in Agenda Item 6A was also used as reference material for this agenda item. A motion was made by Annie Wilson and seconded by Colleen York to also approve ASWB to become a provider of continuing education programs. This motion was carried without objection.

ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORK BOARDS (ASWB) AND NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS (NASW), NEVADA CHAPTER

(AGENDA ITEM 7A) **Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Follow Up to Board's Action, During the December 16, 2016 Board Meeting Pertaining to:**

- i. **Attendance and Participation by Board Members and Selected Board Staff During the 2017 Spring Education Meeting, April 27 Through 29, 2017, in Henderson, Nevada, Including Approval of Budget to Cover Expenses; and**
- ii. **Reconsideration of the Board's Action During the December 16, 2016 Board Meeting (Agenda Item 8-A-i) in Light of Newly Acquired Board Expenses (Agenda Items 10-B; 10-F and 10-G, Under Board Operations).**

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. As noted in the Agenda Items above, the Board will be acquiring expenses related to these agenda items. These items include: (Item 10-F) An Increase in Sandy Lowery's Hours and Hourly Rate; and (Item 10-G) Selection of a IT Vendor who will be developing the Board's database, online verification and renewals, among other items. The Board's Executive Director is recommending the Board reconsider funding Board members and certain staff to attend the ASWB Spring Education Meeting. Each Board members' packet contained a copy of the Year-to-Date Board cash flow statement in comparison to the 2016/2017 fiscal year budget should be reviewed. (See Agenda Item 10-B, documents). Sandy Lowery suggested that in lieu of providing mementos as other hosting boards have provided, it would be more important to have Board representation. Following review and discussion, a motion was made by Vikki Erickson and seconded by Colleen York, to revise the proposed Board budget to cover travel and accommodation expenses to \$2,000 total to attend the ASWB Spring Education meeting, April 27 through 29, 2017, in Henderson, Nevada. This motion was carried without objection.

SENIOR DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL'S REPORT

(AGENDA ITEM 8A) **Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Open Meeting Law (OML) Violations by the Board during the October 21, 2016 Board Meeting:**

- i. **October 25, 2016 Notification by the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) Pertaining to OML Complaint, OAG File No. 13897-212;**
 - ii. **Executive Director's Response to the OML Complaint, OAG File No. 13897-212, Submitted on November 1, 2016;**
 - iii. **OAG'S Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law Pertaining to the OAG File No. 13897-212, Including Finding of One (1) OML Violation; and**
-

iv. Pursuant to NRS 241.0395, Acknowledgement that this Finding has Been Posted on the Board's Next Scheduled Board Meeting Agenda, Following Receipt of the OAG'S Finding (i.e. this Board Meeting Agenda).

Kim Frakes indicated that an Open Meeting Law (OML) Complaint was filed against the Board alleging violations during the October 21, 2016 Board meeting. The Complaint alleged with Ms. Frakes' rebuttal to the AG's Office as follows:

- The Board did not provide the Complainant with a Board meeting packet and instead provided the only public copy of the packet to another Board member:

Ms. Frakes' rebuttal indicated that the Board was required to provide a minimum of one copy at the meeting site. The Board was in compliance with this requirement. The NASW Nevada Chapter President requested the public copy of the Board packet, which was provided to her by Ms. Frakes. The NASW President is not a Board member.

- The Board should have had a public copy available prior to the Board meeting for any public person to obtain and review.

Ms. Frakes indicated that the Board was compliant with this law as a public copy of the Board packet was placed on the Board office counter and available to anyone prior to the Board Meeting.

- If a Board packet was not available for any other public attendee, the Board was required to "stop" the Board meeting until an additional copy of the packet could be made and provided to the requestor. The only exception would be if it would significantly inconvenience the Board meeting to stop the meeting for the purpose of making an additional copy. The definition of "inconvenience" would be determined by the requestor.

Ms. Frakes' rebuttal indicated that she had offered to share her copy of the Board packet with the requestor. However, as noted by the AG'S office, the correct approach was to "stop" the Board meeting for purpose of making an additional copy for the Complainant. Although Ms. Frakes believed this would have proven to be an inconvenience for the Board meeting to have been delayed the additional time to make a copy for the Complainant, chances are, the Complainant would not have viewed it this way. Accordingly, the Board was deemed to have been non-compliant with the OML. The AG'S office indicated that to remedy any future complaints regarding this matter, the Board should scan and post their Board packet on its website. Ms. Frakes indicated that this will be occurring, moving forward.

- The Complainant indicated that the Board President did not provide time for public comment at the beginning of the Board meeting.

Ms. Frakes' rebuttal included a "certified copy" of the Boards' audio recording which clearly supports President Smith providing time for public comment at the beginning of the Board meeting.

Each Board members' meeting packet included:

1. A copy of the OML Complaint, File No. 13897-212;
2. A copy of the Board's Executive Director's response. One copy will be provided at each Board meeting location, as well as scanned and posted on the Board's website;
3. The Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law pertaining to File No. 13897-212; and
4. A copy of Chapter 241 (State's Open Meeting Law) has been provided at each Board meeting locations, as well as scanned and posted on the Board's website.

Following review of this agenda item, the Board did not take any action.

Henna Rasul presented this agenda item to the Board. She indicated that she did not have anything to add to the meeting.

PRESIDING OFFICER'S COMMENTS

(AGENDA ITEM 9A)

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Application for Possible Reappointment by Current Board President, in the Interest of Board Leadership Continuity:

- i. Expiration of Appointment on June 30, 2017;**
- ii. Submission of Application for Possible Reappointment by the Governor's Office, Traditionally for a Three (3) Year Term; and**
- iii. President's Consideration of Completing a Limited Term of Approximately One-Year.**

President Smith presented this agenda item to the Board. He noted that his term on the Board will expire after June 30, 2017. By this date, the Board should know whether the Board will be dissolved, following the passage of legislation during the 79th/2017 Legislative session, or whether the Board may be continued and more than likely recommended for review by the State's Sunset Review Committee following the Legislative session. President Smith would like to discuss his consideration of reappointment, contingent upon the Governor's approval, for a partial term in lieu of the full three-year term. Following review and discussion of this agenda item, the Board did not take any action.

(AGENDA ITEM 9B)

Review and Discussion, Presiding Officer's Comments

President Smith offered his "kudos" to Board staff for their continued efforts in spite of difficulties presented during this particular Legislative session. Aside from this, President Smith indicated that he did not have anything further to offer.

BOARD OPERATIONS

(AGENDA ITEM 10A)

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Approval of Minutes for the December 16, 2016 Board Meeting.

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. Following review and discussion of the December 16, 2016 Board meeting minutes, the Board should take action to approve these minutes. A copy of the **December 16, 2016** Board meeting minutes were included in each Board members' meeting packet. A copy of the December 16, 2016 Board meeting minutes were be emailed to the Board members in Las Vegas, given critical time constraints in preparing for the February 17, 2017 Board meeting. Both Annie Wilson and Colleen York indicated that they had received a copy of their minutes by email. Ms. Wilson and Ms. York noted that there appeared to be an error in the minutes pertaining to Agenda Item 5A. Ms. York indicated that according to her recollection, she had objected to moving the applicant in this agenda item forward for licensure, as approved by the remainder of the Board. Ms. Wilson also indicated that to the best of her recollection, she also had objected to moving the applicant forward for licensure, as approved by the remainder of the Board. Ms. Frakes indicated that she would review the meeting recording and make any necessary corrections accordingly. Following review and discussion, a motion was made by Annie Wilson and seconded by Colleen York, to approve the December 16, 2016 Board meeting minutes, contingent upon Ms. Frakes making the corrections to this minutes as noted in the discussion. This motion was carried without objection.

(AGENDA ITEM 10B)

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Year-to-Date 2016/2017 Fiscal Year Cash Flow Statement for the 2nd Quarter (July 1, 2016 through December 31, 2016) in Comparison to the Board's 2016/2017 Fiscal Year Budget (July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017).

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. Ms. Frakes noted that in reviewing the 2nd Quarter Fiscal Year Cash Flow Statement, expenses and revenue at or near "50%" are considered as being on target.

Accordingly, it appeared that the Board was performing well in the area of revenue. It was noted that the "103%" collected as revenue in the area of "Disciplinary Costs Reimbursed" pertained to a disciplined individual who managed to pay his costs in full. It was also noted that the Board was over anticipated costs in the area of "Printing and Copying" due to the Board's notifications sent to licensees regarding the temporary regulation changes and the recent notification pertaining to the Legislative Educational Get-Together. Overall, it appeared that the Board continues to remain on target pertaining to the 2nd Quarter Fiscal Year report. A copy of the 2nd Quarter Fiscal Year (July 1, 2016 through December 31, 2016) Budget in comparison to the 2016/2017 Fiscal Year Budget was located in each Board members' meeting packet. Following review and discussion of this agenda item, a motion was made by Annie Wilson and seconded by Vikki Erickson, to approved the Year-to-Date 2016/2017 Fiscal Year Cash Flow Statement for the 2nd Quarter (July 1, 2016 through December 31, 2016), in comparison to the Board's 2016/2017 fiscal year budget. This motion was carried without objection.

(AGENDA ITEM 10C)

Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Annual Election of Board Officers, Pursuant to NRS 641B.120.

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. Annually, the Board is required to elect its list of officers as noted in NRS 641B.170(2). Included in each Board members' packet was the current list of officer positions and respective Board members holding these positions, as noted below:

Officer Positions	Currently Held by
President	Rod Smith, Public Member
Vice-President	Annie Wilson, LSW
Secretary/Treasurer	Vikki Erickson, LCSW

Each Board members' meeting packet also had a copy of NRS 641B.120, which mandated annual elections. (See the referenced NRS below).

NRS 641B.120 Officers; elections; meetings; quorum.

1. The Board shall elect from its members a President, a Vice President and a Secretary-Treasurer, who hold their respective offices at its pleasure.
2. An election of officers must be held annually.
3. The Board shall meet at least once in each quarter of the year and may meet at other times at the call of the President or a majority of its members.
4. A majority of the Board constitutes a quorum to transact all business.
(Added to NRS by [1987, 1117](#))

Henna Rasul recommended that the Board go down the list of offices, and nominate an individual. If a motion was made to elect a particular individual to an office, the nominated individual would have to indicate on record that he/she was abstaining from voting. Ms. Frakes indicated that the Board could also make a motion to keep the Board offices filled by the same Board members who currently hold these offices. A motion was made by Colleen York and seconded by Annie Wilson, to fill the offices of President, Vice-President and

Secretary/Treasurer, by the individuals who currently hold these offices. This motion was carried without objection.

(AGENDA ITEM 10D) Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Employee Appraisal and Job Performance Evaluation (Evaluation), Pertaining to the Board's Executive Director, Conducted by Board President Smith and Board Secretary/Treasurer, Erickson on January 27, 2017:

- i. Approval to Accept, Reject or Revise the Evaluation; and**
- ii. Based Upon Detachment from the State's Pay Scale in 2009, Approval or Denial of a 1.5% COLA (Cost of Living Allowance) Increase and 0.5% Salary Increase, to Total 2.0% Increase, Effective March 1, 2017.**

President Smith presented this agenda item to the Board. He indicated that one of his goals was to have all Board staff receiving their employee performance evaluation as close to an annual basis as possible. Kim Frakes' review, as the Board's Executive Director, requires that her Employee Appraisal and Job Performance Evaluation (Evaluation) be placed on the public agenda and conducted publicly. Attached in each Board member's meeting packet was the Employee Evaluation for Kim Frakes. The previous evaluation was conducted on February 2, 2016, with the Board approving a "1.5%" increase. As noted, the recommended pay increase was a "1.5%" COLA and "0.5%" salary increase, for a total of "2.0%" pay increase. If approved, this increase would become effective March 1, 2017. Each Board member's packet contained a copy of the referenced Evaluation. Following review of the Evaluation a motion was made by Annie Wilson and seconded by Colleen York to: (i) Approve Ms. Frakes' Evaluation as submitted. This motion was carried without objection. A second motion was made by Annie Wilson and seconded by Colleen York to: (ii) Approve Ms. Frakes salary increase to include a 1.5% COLA and an additional 0.5% salary increase, for a total of 2.0 % salary increase, effective March 1, 2017. This motion was carried without objection. Ms. Frakes thanked the Board for the salary increase. President Smith indicated his appreciation for the hard work provided by Ms. Frakes and the Board staff.

(Agenda items 10E and 10 F were combined in order to assist with the efficacy of the Board meeting).

(AGENDA ITEM 10E) Review, Discussion and for Possible Action, Contingent Upon Board's Approval of Agenda Item 10-F:

- i. Effective March 1, 2017, Change of Job Title for Kim Frakes from Executive Director for the Board to Director of Social Work Practice (or Similar, Appropriate Job Title);**
- ii. Transfer of Most Job Duties to Sandra Lowery in Order to Afford Ms. Frakes the Opportunity to Focus on the Board's Disciplinary Case Load; and**
- iii. June 30, 2018, Anticipated Date of Retirement, Contingent Upon the Outcome of the 79th/2017 Legislative Session.**

(COMBINED WITH AGENDA ITEM 10F) Review, Discussion and for Possible Action:

- i. Change of Job Title for Sandra Lowery from Internship Program Coordinator to Interim Executive Director for the Board;**
- ii. Increase in Hourly Pay from \$30.00 per Hour to \$40.00 per Hour; and**
- iii. Increase in Hours from Sixteen (16.0) Hour per Week and (24.0) Hours per Pay Period, Increased to Twenty-Five (25.0) Hours per Week and Fifty (50.0) Hours per Pay Period, with Benefits.**

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. Given the volume of disciplinary cases, Ms. Frakes recommended a change in her job title and duties which should better enable her to address these cases more expeditiously. Ms. Frakes indicated that this has been a topic of ongoing discussion between herself and President Smith for quite some time. Since she was very familiar with the disciplinary process, including processes related to NRS and NAC, Ms. Frakes expressed her belief that she would be the best candidate to

address this matter. Ms. Frakes added that the next item on the agenda addressed more specifics regarding how Sandy Lowery would move into the position of Interim Executive Director, including her compensation. Each Board members' packet contained a proposed job description for the Director of Social Work Practice and Goals to be completed by the end of 2017. This included the goal of having at least "60" disciplinary cases either dismissed, or moved forward for either settlement (consent decree) or hearing. The Board members' Board meeting packet also contained a copy of the proposed job description for the Interim Executive Director and breakdown of costs pertaining to the increase in hourly pay and benefits. Ms. Lowery would fill the position of Interim Executive Director until the end of the year (i.e. 2017). Contingent upon the Board's survival following the end of the current legislative session, the Board would then seek to hire a permanent Executive Director at the beginning of 2018. Sandy Lowery indicated that although scheduled to physically be in the office 25 hours weekly, she would be available by email and telephone for the Board office. Ms. Frakes anticipated 2 of the Board staff having email access within the next couple of weeks. Colleen York asked if the Board was in a position financially to afford increasing Ms. Lowery's hours to 25 per week, with the inclusion of benefits. Ms. Frakes indicated that the Board was in a sound position financially to afford Ms. Lowery, including with benefits. Following review and discussion of both agenda items, motions were made as follows:

(Agenda Item 10E) A motion was made by Annie Wilson and seconded by Colleen York to, approve the transfer of Kim Frakes' job title and job description to, "Director of Social Work Practice", effective March 1, 2017. She would be afforded the salary increase already approved by the Board in agenda item 10D, with an anticipated retirement date of June 30, 2018. This motion was made without objection; and

(Agenda Item 10F) A motion was made by Annie Wilson and seconded by Colleen York to, approve the transfer of Sandy Lowery's job title and job description to, "Interim Executive Director", at 25 hours per week, an increase in hourly pay from \$30.00 per hour to \$35.00 per hour, with benefits (health insurance). This would be effective March 1, 2017. Contingent upon the Board's survival following this current legislative session, the Board would begin its search for a permanent Executive Director at the beginning of 2018. This motion was carried without objection.

Vikki Erickson thanked Ms. Frakes for her hard work and dedication to the Board throughout the years. President Smith also provided, "kudos", to Ms. Frakes and the Board staff for all of their hard work to keep the office running effectively and efficiently.

(AGENDA ITEM 10H) Review, Discussion and For Possible Action, Board's YES Answer Policy and any Recommended Revisions.

President Smith presented this agenda item to the Board. This served as a follow up to a previous Board meeting discussions pertaining to the Board's YES Answer Policy (Policy). President Smith indicated that he wanted to ensure there was follow up by Board members regarding the input and any recommendations to revise the Board's YES Policy. Kim Frakes reminded the Board regarding the relevance of this Policy since it enabled the afforded the ability to provide an internal review of applicants and licensees who committed minor offenses (as described on the Policy) while also providing guidelines as to when it would be prudent to bring the applicants and licensees before the Board. A copy of the YES Answer Policy was emailed to each Board member prior to the Board meeting and was also provided in their Board meeting packet. Ms. Frakes indicated that given the duration of this Board meeting, she would accept anyone wishing to volunteer to pursue this matter in more detail outside of the Board meeting and bring back the findings at a later date. Ms. Frakes asked Annie Wilson if she would be interested in working with her on the Policy, given the fact that Ms. Wilson has an extensive background in forensic social work. Ms. Wilson agreed to assist Ms. Frakes with reviewing to Policy for possible revisions. Following review and discussion, this agenda item was tabled.

(AGENDA ITEM 10-I) Review and Discussion, the Board's 4th Quarter, 2016 Board Licensure Statistics and the Board's Biennium Report, List of Social Workers by License Level and County, Provided to the State's Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), as Located on the Board's Website: <http://socwork.nv.gov/about/Board-Licensure-Statistics/>.

Kim Frakes presented this agenda item to the Board. This agenda item served to update the Board pertaining to the Board's licensure statistics and the Board's Biennium Report (prepared for the State's DHHS) which is posted on the Board's website as noted. Each Board members' meeting packet included:

1. A copy of the Board's 4th/Quarter Licensure Statistics; and
2. A copy of the Biennium Report prepared for the State's DHHS.

The Board reviewed the information as submitted.

(AGENDA ITEM 10-J) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Kim Frakes thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

(AGENDA ITEM 11) PUBLIC COMMENT

There wasn't anyone present to offer public comment.

ADJOURNMENT

President Smith adjourned the Board meeting at 3:27 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kim Frakes

Kim Frakes