



State of Nevada

Board of Examiners for Social Workers

4600 Kietzke Lane, #C-121, Reno, NV 89502

(775) 688-2555

Board Meeting Minutes

Friday, July 10, 2020

Erickson referred to **Agenda Item 1, Call to Order and Roll**. She initiated the Board of Examiners for Social Workers meeting via teleconference using a Zoom platform at 9:05 a.m. In attendance: Vikki **Erickson**, Board President; Monique **Harris**, Vice President; Susan **Nielsen**, Public Member and Secretary/ Treasurer; Stefaine **Maplethorpe**, Board Member (joined at approximately 9:30 a.m.); Sandy **Lowery**, Deputy Director; Asheesh **Bhalla**, Board Counsel; and Karen **Oppenlander**, Executive Director. Guests: Mendy Elliott and Miranda Hoover from Capitol Partners.

Following, **Erickson** moved to **Agenda Item 2, Public Comment**. She noted that there was no public comment and moved forward to **Agenda Item Three - Board Operations, 3A. Review and Discussion of Board Meeting Minutes for May 8th, 2020 for Possible Action**. **Erickson** asked for a motion.

Susan Nielsen moved to accept the Board meeting minutes for **May 8, 2020 as written, seconded by Monique Harris**. Roll call vote was taken: **Erickson, aye; Nielsen, aye; and Harris, aye. Motion passed unanimously.**

Agenda Item Three - Board Operations, 3A. Review and Discussion of Board Meeting Minutes for May 8th, 2020 for Possible Action. Vikki Erickson asked for a motion to approve the Board meeting minutes from May 8, 2020.

Erickson moved to **Board Agenda, Item 3B. Review and Discussion of Financials through May 31st, 2020 for Possible Action**. **Lowery** covered the financials for May 2020 where BESW is at the 11 month point and should be coming in at about 92% of the annual budget. She pointed out that if you look at the total income at the end of May, we were at 97% or 5% over projection. **Lowery** anticipates that this will remain the same for June and that BESW will hit its income target again. In expenditures, we are at 89% in salaries which is better than our target of 92%. Our total expenses are at 86% which is 6% under budget. At the end of May, our net position is \$48,936 and our net position adjusted is \$140,646. We are seeing what we had hoped to see happen with the fee increases in that we are beginning to have some monies available to do whatever's necessary. **Oppenlander** asked for clarification about several minor differences in the numbers between when the May Financials were sent out early for the Board packet and today's meeting. Specifically she asked about why the net position was \$137,490.24 in the Board packet and higher in the presentation. **Lowery** confirmed that after sending out the Board packet, there were some very minor adjustments made. For today's Board meeting, she was working online from the updated version of the financials instead of from the Board packet materials. **Oppenlander** brought up two line items for Rent and Lobbyists which show up as \$0 paid in the month ending May 31st as these items were paid out early (doubled) in prior months. Everything balances out at the end of the fiscal year either as you would expect or with adjusting entries made at year-end June 30th. Also, you will see activity in the Furniture line item and that's where we have placed the COVID related purchases that the Board approved last month. **Erickson** asked for a motion to approve the financials through May 31st, 2020.

A motion to approve the financials through May 31, 2020 was made by Harris, seconded by Nielson. Roll call vote: Erickson, Aye; Nielson, Aye; Harris, Aye. Motion passed unanimously.

Next, **Erickson** moved to **Agenda Item 3C. Review and Discussion of Continuity Planning for the 2020-2021 Budget.** **Oppenlander** reviewed the budget that was approved at the last Board meeting to begin on July 1st, 2020 and then discussed modifications.

As a reminder, everything has changed rapidly since March when State Employees started working from home. At our May meeting, we discussed the Governor's requests for substantial budget cuts for General Fund agencies. As a Fee-Funded agency, we were and are uncertain if these cuts will apply to BESW. Yesterday, we learned that the cuts apply to the Executive Branch and that we are in the Executive Branch. However, we have not received direction re: Boards and Commissions. With the shortfall of \$1.2 Billion, the Governor has called for a hiring freeze, budget cuts, layoffs of some State employees, a freeze on merit pay, and a one day per month furlough for State workers. Therefore, the Board approved a budget that was reduced from our customary budget and that is what you are reviewing today. Our budget includes a hiring freeze, discontinuance of utilizing a consultant/ lobbyist for the upcoming 2021 Legislative session to move forward a new licensing category, deferral of the implementation of application and disciplinary software modules to streamline services, and an elimination of merit raises for office staff. We took our budget monies intended to reduce our backlog which included costs for additional investigations and costs for attorney fees, removed our part-time office administrative assistant position, removed travel, and reflected a slight reduction in income because wouldn't be doing as much statewide training.

We factored in our new five year lease in the budget. Our current lease is up in August and the new lease terms include modest incremental increases. To summarize, the new 60 month lease has a slight increase effective August 1st, 2020 that will be in place for 2 years; this is followed by another slight percentage increase in 2022 that would last for the next 2 years, and then for the fifth year of the lease, we would have a final small percentage increase. It's essentially set up in the same fashion as our current lease. State Leasing Services indicated that the rates we are going to get were appropriate and gave us their go-ahead even with all of the current unknowns. **Erickson** asked if there was any room for negotiation with the lease. Regarding the lease, State Leasing Services thought that this proposed lease structure was very fair. So, I did talk about that and I haven't signed this before bringing it to the Board. **Lowery** contextualized the lease increase for the first two years as a \$600 annual increase and not a significant increase over what we are currently paying.

Still on the topic of the budget, **Oppenlander** indicated that moving forward, we had planned to continue to build reserves in the approved budget. We understand from listening to recent Sunset Committee meetings, that they are contemplating legislating the amount of reserves that Boards and Commissions will have on hand. The committee members referred to a discussion with former LCB Auditor Rocky Cooper when he had recommended having between four to six months as an appropriate level. Using the same reference during our Board's strategic discussions, the Board determined to have five months of reserves on hand by 2023. Continuing, the Board finished up a review of the recently approved budget.

Next, **Oppenlander** discussed new circumstances that have come up that require adjustments to the Board's approved budget due to changes since the May Board meeting. She referred the Board to a handout re: Annual Funding and One Time Costs for Data Migration to a Different Infrastructure/

Network. The biggest adjustment that we now face is both structural and very important. We will now have to come up with annual funding and one-time costs to migrate our data to a different infrastructure and network.

We are currently in the midst of data migration planning as during the week of June 15th we learned that Business and Industry would need to discontinue providing free IT services to the Board. The verbal agreement that was in place for about a decade has to be replaced with a new budgetary arrangement with a different agency. For years, we essentially have had a slice of the Business and Industry server for our data. Additionally, they have provided other IT services support at no cost including intermittent onsite desktop IT support. Business and Industry finds that they no longer have the staffing or budgetary resources to continue to accommodate us.

As we have had to immediately consider migrating our data, we learned that a minimum of five other larger state agencies are in the same situation that we are in. This matter has led to various discussions with the Nevada's Enterprise IT Services (EITS). EITS has started working with us to develop a data migration plan for us to get our data moved from the Business and Industry server. The reality is that we can't get provisioned for some of the hardware that we'll need to accomplish this right away. It may take us up to four months. In your handout are the three options that we started to look at between June 17th and the beginning of July. One option with Business and Industry for a potential solution was not viable. Another option also didn't work out. So we found our best solution was to work with EITS although it's expensive. We did project our budget out for several years using the information provided to you today and learned that we can afford to do this. While we can't provide precise budget numbers today, we will bring these numbers to you at the September 11th Board meeting. We are waiting for an onsite assessment from EITS to determine the specific hardware needs (new switch, circuit) and wiring to make this data migration plan work. When we have these specifics, we will be able to order the equipment and set up the installation. Also, in reviewing various options, **Oppenlander** realized that Business and Industry has been very generous with their support of our Board; they have probably saved us well over \$100,000.

The costs that are listed in the table in your handout are published by EITS on a State of Nevada website for fiscal year 2020-2021. In the table are two general line items shaded out as we won't need these: GL number 7289 and GL number 7508. Also, GL number 7532 will be recalculated and we expect some small savings. GL number 7506 is a projected cost for securing a contract with an external vendor to provide onsite desktop support services (based on approximately \$65 an hour per hour for 63 hours of service annually).

Bottom line is our annual costs with EITS will be about \$15,500. Additionally, we will have onetime costs for hardware and wiring, with the possibility of an additional phone line will be determined after we go through the onsite assessment. We will bring the final costs to the Board in September as well as the Board's year-end financials through June 30 2020 and July 31, 2020.

Harris asked about our choices e.g. accessing our data on a cloud-based system or having a server onsite with a local area network. The EITS solution is cloud based and is not an internal onsite server solution. We are studying another small board that has a small onsite server; yesterday, they shared a lot of information with us about how they have managed all of their data on an in-house server.

Erickson asked if there were further questions about this section of budget adjustments. **Oppenlander** stated that she would like the Board to contemplate the entire budget situation and that she would look for a Board motion to give its authority so that Board staff can continue working on the data migration plan.

Next, **Oppenlander** proceeded to the next item under budget changes re: a potential 90 day contract with lobbyist/ consultant. She reminded the Board about their decision at their March 13th meeting to approve plans for the upcoming 2021 legislative session including the intent to add an LMSW category. After making budget cuts during the May Board meeting, we let our contract with Capitol Partners expire on June 30 2020. During the Board meeting in May, **Erickson** asked to revisit this decision in July to potentially reconsider its need for lobbyist/ consultant services moving forward. On a related note, we've been speaking with Mendy Elliott and Miranda Hoover and have invited them to today's meeting to update the Board about current legislative efforts that will be taking place.

Mendy Elliott (for the record) told the Board that right now, things in the Legislature are really fluid and that they've been keeping Karen in the loop as a Special Session is in process. There are going to be multiple special sessions. We know that at least two are going to be back to back and there could possibly be three. The third would potentially be in late August or September and that really depends on what gets passed in the first two sessions.

Elliott added that there was a bill that dropped last night (SB4 on the state website) that would change the trajectory of the state. Simply stated, it would be legislation that would enable the Executive Branch to borrow money for revenue shortfalls in the general fund. You can think about it this way. If you're not working and you need money, you can use your credit card to get a cash advance, and then you pay it back over time. That is what this bill does. There are states that have used strategy including Illinois and California. This bill will change how Nevada potentially funds state government moving forward with the general fund (does not pertain to the fee-driven agencies). It really concerns the general fund which includes education as well as Medicaid which are both linked to social work. So that's the first legislative topic that is of interest to this Board.

The second thing for this Board to pay attention to is the issue of criminal justice reform. Capitol Partners has been in contact with Assemblyman Jaeger who is a champion of criminal justice reform. They have worked very closely with him (Miranda Hoover and Mendy Elliott) on the Board's behalf. We've discussed criminal justice and we anticipate that the bill that we're going to be looking at may have a space for social workers to have enhanced responsibilities. Therefore, social workers may be an integral part of the discussions going on in the state as it relates to criminal justice and social reforms.

She went on to tell the Board that they discussed a 90-day consulting contract with Karen, keeping their same rate and continuing to help represent the Board at the state level as these conversations take place; she let the Board know that they are certainly willing to do that. They respect BESW and thought it was important to continue to help monitor what is happening and help the Board through these unchartered times that we are all facing right now.

Miranda Hoover added that there are certain line items within the cuts to Medicaid that do directly affect social workers. There was a lot of the legislation that Karen, Mendy and Miranda were involved with last session, and the bill sponsors wanted us to be involved in those bills. And a lot of those programs are now being cut and were never really put into place and therefore are not going to be happening anytime in the near future.

Harris asked if the Nevada Association of Social Workers (NASW) has a lobbyist and **Lowery** said that she would text the volunteer chair of the Nevada Chapter of NASW, Tom Durante. Durante reported that NASW does not currently have a lobbyist but is considering trying to hire one.

Erickson asked if a new bill regarding law enforcement and social justice/ social workers has been posted yet. Elliott answered that the Governor has to first issue a proclamation so that they can discuss it. So we might see a bill draft on Monday. **Erickson** also asked if any other behavioral health professionals are involved in this besides social workers. **Hoover** answered that a lot of the psychologists and counselors are involved with it. She added that the Board may remember that one of the bills from last session related to Safe School Professionals, a position created that includes social workers, MFTs, psychologists and mental health counselors. **Harris** asked if **Hoover** was saying that they would be included in a Safe School Professionals bill or in a criminal reform bill. **Hoover** stated that she expected that the various professions that make up Safe School Professionals could be included in the criminal reform bill. **Harris** and Elliott agreed that a lot of the monies to fund the Safe Schools Professionals efforts were being removed from the state budget.

In terms of adjustments to our approved budget due to changes occurring since the May Board meeting, **Oppenlander** requested assistance from a lobbyist/ consultant for 90 days during the upcoming Special Session(s) not to exceed \$5000. While she is aware that the Sunset Committee doesn't fully appreciate the necessity for lobbyist/ consultant, it is far too difficult with a small staff to follow the sessions (even of limited duration) for several days at a time that are being held simultaneously by both the Senate and Assembly, and being held around the clock, and also without sufficient notice ahead of time about when sessions will begin/ end.

Next, **Oppenlander** continued to present additional adjustments to the approved budget since the May Board meeting. She said that if the Board is directed by the state, we may be expected to implement further spending cuts e.g. furloughs that are being called for. At this time, we have not received specific direction and there are other Boards and Commissions awaiting direction as they are in the same situation.

And the last proposed adjustment to the approved budget is a request for the Board's consideration of funding for a line item: COVID19 UNK in the amount of \$1000. This line item is being added so that if something unexpected happens during the 2020-2021 fiscal year and that is occurs in between Board meetings that staff could proceed with the purchase of de minimis items if needed.

Speaker 4 ([01:03:24](#)):

So in summary, to continue forward, she asked the Board for a motion for the to pursue the migration of the BESW data to a different infrastructure/ network, pursue a lobbyist/ consultant contract, be able to follow potential directives regarding furloughs, and fund a discretionary line item in the amount of up to \$1,000 to be utilized for de minimis items that occurs as a result of COVID-19.

Erickson asked for a motion because of the changes that have happened in our budget, and in our state, and in our country.

Susan Nielsen moved that the Board approve the Data Migration and exploration of how to accomplish that; approve a 90-day contract for Lobbyist/ Consultant services; approve potential spending cuts and furloughs if in fact the Board is subject to this under the Executive Branch recognizing that BESW is not in the general fund; and approve a One Thousand Dollar Line Item for Funding of COVID-19 Unknown Expenses as they occur; seconded by Monique Harris. Roll call vote: Erickson – Aye, Harris – Aye, Nielsen – Aye, Maplethorpe – Aye. Motion passed unanimously.

Erickson moved to **Agenda Item D, Review and Discussion regarding the Nomination of Board Officers for Possible Action** asking **Oppenlander** for comments. **Oppenlander** mentioned that **Maplethorpe** may have “graduated on June 30th” and that she doesn’t know if the Governor has reappointed her as yet. **Maplethorpe** stated that she has not submitted paperwork to the Governor but will submit the paperwork this week. **Oppenlander** that in the “public member” position, **Nielsen** has stated that she would stay in the position until it is filled by the Governor. **Oppenlander** put forward that the Board could decide to keep the current officer roles as they are and later select new officers when all of the new Board members are selected by the Governor.

Erickson checked in to gauge if there is someone else who desires to work in the position of the President; or, if we want to maintain this group of officers until Board spots are filled. **Harris** stated, “No, thank you. You are doing a great job. Vikki should hold onto it until things”. **Harris** asked for clarification about the timeline. **Bhalla** clarified that everyone serves in their position voluntarily, as long as they want to, until the Governor reappoints them. And so these officer nominations would support that. So, when the Governor does change an individual member’s position, then they would no longer be able to serve as an officer because they would no longer be a member of the Board. So there is some flexibility here right now, but these officer positions would only be good as long as the member is a part of the Board.

Lowery spoke generally about the Board from her position of having been a Board member for nine years and also the Board President for a portion of that. Historically the Board reviews its officers annually. So there’s regularly an opportunity for changing things up and switching things around. At the last Board meeting, **Maplethorpe** and **Nielsen** agreed to remain on the Board until their positions were filled so that we could continue to have a quorum. So at this point, you're deciding if you want to change who’s in each spot. Or, you can hold the officer positions until such time as there are new Board members.

Erickson asked if there are thoughts from the Board on which direction to take right now. **Maplethorpe** stated that it should stay the same until gubernatorial appointments are made. **Erickson** asked for a motion and made a suggestion. **Bhalla** made a recommendation for the motion as follows: to maintain the Board officer positions for the next year or until membership of the Board necessitates a further change or as the Board deems necessary.

Nielsen made a motion to maintain the Board officer positions for the next year or until membership of the Board necessitates a further change or as the Board deems necessary, seconded by Harris. Roll call vote: Erickson – Aye; Harris – Aye; Nielsen – Aye; Maplethorpe – Aye. Motion passed unanimously.

Next, **Erickson** moved to **Agenda Item E. Review and Discussion re: Selection of Board Member Designee to Represent Board During Interim Session, 2021 Legislative Session, Related Meetings. (For Possible Action)**. **Oppenlander** suggested that since we will have the support from a lobbyist/consultant that this designee would have a “doable” role. In the past session, **Erickson** was selected by the Board as she was knowledgeable about Board matters. So, the person selected could be the President of the Board or it could be another Board member. **Bhalla** added that the Board does need to make a specific vote on the record to identify a member. If the Board wants a member to speak in front of a specific committee or otherwise engage with the Legislature then a vote on the record here is required. Or, if the Board does not want to have a member engage with the Legislature, they would not

be required to put someone there. **Oppenlander** added that while it is good to have the Executive Director represent the Board, it is even better if the Board has a Board member join her at the table. And additionally, the Board's lobbyist/ consultant is authorized. **Erickson** agreed that it was important to show Board support.

Next, the Board deliberated the Board designee role with **Harris** and **Maplethorpe** favoring **Erickson** continuing to represent the Board. Each also offered their support and Harris offered to also join **Erickson** as a designee. **Erickson** asked for a motion. **Bhalla** suggested that the Board would make a motion to designate President **Erickson** and member **Harris** to appear at the Legislative Session(s) supporting Director **Oppenlander**. **Maplethorpe** made this motion but before continuing with a vote, **Nielsen** discussed potential travel expenses for **Harris** to travel to Carson City. **Harris** offered to pay her own expense if these expenses are not covered in the budget already. Elliott commented that the Legislative building is currently locked down. There are no committee hearings being held right now and no face-to-face meetings. We can't get into the building. We are communicating with Legislators via text, phone, email, etc. Elliott anticipates that whoever the selected lobbyist will be may have to make comments on behalf of the Board when comments are requested and make these via the Zoom platform or via phone. So it, it makes it easier from the standpoint of planning purposes, that you can provide testimony as an expert from your kitchen table. As the building is literally locked, the only people that are allowed in there currently are the LCB staff and the Legislators.

Maplethorpe made a motion to designate President Erickson and member Harris to appear at Legislative Session(s) and meetings to support Director Oppenlander. Seconded by Nielsen. Roll call vote: Nielsen – Aye; Harris – Aye; Maplethore – Aye; Erickson – Aye. Motion passed unanimously.

Erickson moved to **Item F, Increased Use of Telehealth Presentation by Sandra Lowery. (For Discussion Only)**. In terms of telehealth, **Lowery** shared that the waiver authority that the Governor granted has allowed individuals not licensed in the State of Nevada to treat individuals in the state has been moving forward very smoothly. **Lowery** currently has 50 LCSWs and one LSW that have requested waiver status so that they can treat individuals that live in Nevada. It's complicated and we have individuals who are being told varying pieces of information by numerous insurance carriers about what they can and can't do. So, they call the Board to get clarification. For example, the most recent question was that an LCSW in the Las Vegas area called and said that her insurance carrier wants to know if she can treat people in other states; and she can't. She has to contact each of those states and find out if they have any temporary license waiver opportunities. Another piece of confusion is about: Where is the patient? Are they a resident of the State of Nevada? Or are they in Nevada? So, we do try to help individuals understand the distinctions. For example, if I'm on vacation in California, then I have to have permission for my therapist to treat me while I'm in California. It's confusing and the Federal Department of Health and Human Services Directives on Medicare and Medicaid have further clouded some of the telehealth issues. Still, I think that we're doing okay in terms of helping people understand where the bumpers are in regards to telehealth for Nevada licensed social workers. Also, we are starting to convert some of the waivers into endorsed license applications. Also, some individuals that have tried working as social workers in Nevada are deciding to get a license here i.e. we're seeing endorsements coming out of these waivers.

Nielsen asked if there is a standardized structure of some kind that identifies what can be done via telehealth. **Lowery** replied that each state has its own legislation around telehealth. Social work in

Nevada basically gives us authority to provide treatment via telecommunication technology. We actually uses language from the 2017 legislative session to create our definition of telehealth. So each board does it differently, each state does it differently, and there isn't standardization at this time. **Harris** asked if there is a 641B NAC that tells us what can be done and what is not appropriate? **Lowery** answered that yes, this is laid out in our Nevada Administrative Code. **Harris** asked about the mechanism for determining when the waivers are over. **Lowery** conveyed that when the Governor lifts the Emergency Directive, we will communicate this to the individuals electronically. For now, it's essentially ongoing until the Governor lifts the Emergency Directive for currently licensed individuals from other states. This waiver is ongoing and will stop on the day that the directive ends. **Erickson** thanked **Lowery** for her work on this.

Following this presentation, **Erickson** moved to **Item G, Executive Director's (ED) Report (For Discussion Only)**. **Oppenlander** began by stating that for accuracy she would primarily be reading information into the record during the ED report as she feels obligated to convey a great deal of material today.

- i) On May 26th, **Oppenlander** attended an Occupational Roundtable hosted by the Nevada Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation (OWINN) in collaboration with the American Institute of Research; Identifying barriers and challenges faced by potential licensees (referring to all types of licensees); Discussion on the processes for determining licensing requirements and policies.
- ii) On June 2nd, there was a National Association of Social Workers – Nevada Chapter Town Hall with NASW-NV President Tom Durante, Nevada Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson and the BESW Executive Director to primarily forewarn Nevada social workers of the State of Nevada budget shortfall. The Assemblywoman asked BESW to kick off the Town Hall with an update from the Board. BESW was given an opportunity to talk about "Social Workers as Essential Workers" that are on the front lines providing much-needed care in numerous settings. We also spoke about the Board's ability to successfully overlay Governor's Emergency Directive #11 with existing 641B Nevada Revised Statutes and 641B Nevada Administrative Code. When this directive came about, BESW had new applicants that were in the queue waiting for their transcripts to arrive in our office from their colleges; some were waiting for their successful ASWB examination results to arrive; and others were waiting for their background checks to come to us from the Nevada Division of Public Safety. We told the Town Hall audience that within 3 working days of the directive, BESW was able to move forward 56 new applicants as licensees while those documents were still on their way. All of the licensees were immediately notified that they were able to join Nevada's workforce to help out with COVID-19. Also, because of the directive, **Lowery** was able to give temporary waivers to 17 LCSW practitioners from other states to treat Nevada residents on a temporary basis until the Governor lifts our state's medical emergency status. And, BESW was able to amend our Licensing Protocol at the LSW level to offer temporary Provisional A Licenses very effectively. As a result, within a week of official graduation from UNR and UNLV, we moved 84 new graduates into temporary LSW status. They are able to continue practicing while they get their examinations taken and their paperwork into the BESW office. So, these new provisional licensees currently have until December 28th 2020 to take care of the details. And, the Governor's Emergency Directive #11 made it possible for BESW to waive provisional license fees which saved Nevada licensees \$14,625.
- iii) On June 23rd, the Sunset Committee heard a Business and Industry presentation re: Boards and Commissions Occupational and Professional Licensing Boards Governance. Of note to the Board: A presentation was made to the Sunset Committee by the Director of the Governor's Office Of Economic Development - Michael Brown and Business and Industry (B&I) Director - Terry Reynolds. They spoke about how they believe that the central administration of Board and Commissions under the umbrella of B&I would result in consistency of regulation for occupational and professional

licensing in Nevada and is a step in the right direction for effective government and consumer protection. **Oppenlander** added that this subject will be echoed again as this matter is being discussed regularly in various State of Nevada meetings and is why she feels obligated to inform the Board of this.

- iv) On June 30th, there was a Sunset Committee presentation of the responses to the Subcommittee's Special Survey of Certain Regulatory Bodies Related to their Operations. In the following week's five hour Sunset Committee meeting, there were some items of note to this Board. There was an update to the committee by Craig Von Collenberg, Executive Director, OWINN. This update was generated by the same research group that put on the meeting that I attended on May 26th (see item i) above). One of the reasons that there is currently so much focus on regulatory boards is that over 26% of Nevada's workforce is licensed, making it the state with the highest percentage of licensed workers in the nation. OWINN is in the process of reexamining licensure requirements for the state with a focus on efforts to better serve dislocated workers, transitioning service members, and veterans. The aim is to do so by identifying existing policies that create unnecessary barriers to the labor market and creating an action plan that expands access to and improves portability and reciprocity for select occupations.

Recently published materials were reviewed to gain an up-to-date understanding of the state of occupational licensing, general best practices, and opportunities for improvements. The research team reviewed 44 sources and determined 29 documents as eligible including journals, periodicals, reports, and internal documents from Nevada state agencies. They found that: (a) the value of occupational licensing is academically divisive, and its value in protecting consumers versus protecting current practitioners remains a subject of debate. (b) Key Takeaways: (i) Occupational licensing legislation should protect the general welfare of the public; (ii) Occupational licensure can have negative impacts, both economically and in terms of social harm.

The OWIIN research team also reviewed and reported on recommendations that were made to establish executive branch oversight of licensing Boards and Commissions under B&I while still allowing the 34 independent boards to operate semi-autonomously. In their report, which was one week after the Sunset Committee had a presentation on this matter, OWIIN emphasized that B&I already has 23 regulatory bodies under its oversight and has experience establishing standards. They went on to outline suggested first steps to incorporate these 23 regulatory bodies into B&I including: to maintain independent board authority for establishing standards for professions, hiring, responding to inquiries, setting qualifications and requirements, and administering examinations. And B&I would assume varying degrees of control over aspects of operations based on the needs of the individual boards and commissions to include: facilities management, regulatory processes, budgeting, financial accounting and reporting, complaint investigations, personnel policies, and record keeping. The audit report also recommended that the Boards, in turn, would benefit from B&I's review of regulatory actions, operational practices, and administrative procedures. B&I also would be able to establish best practices among Boards; provide a framework to lessen reliance on single positions (e.g., executive director) to ensure that operations meet statutory requirements; provide HR functions, including qualifications, compensation, and evaluation for executive director positions; and monitor and approve board activities to protect the state from antitrust liability.

Next, there was a presentation of the Responses to the Subcommittee's Special Survey of Certain Regulatory Bodies Related to their Operations made by Cesar Melgarejo, Senior Policy Analyst, Research Division for the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) and his team. We were surveyed and we

submitted our answers on May 19th 2020. The survey was for the collection of data and input from each professional and occupational board or commission. The data and input collected was to be used to provide recommendations for reform and improvement of Nevada's professional and occupational licensure requirements. We answered questions in four categories:

- Information Pursuant To Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 (2019) to be submitted to the Sunset Committee with the results of this interim study and any recommended legislation to be transmitted to the 2021 Legislature.
 - Required Information Pursuant to NRS 232b.237 and 622.085 - Assembly Bill 319 (2019) requires the Sunset Subcommittee to collect certain information to determine whether the restrictions on the criminal history of an applicant for a license, certificate, registration, permit, or other similar authorization issued by a regulatory body are appropriate and to include any suggestions for modification, continuation, or removal of such restrictions in its recommendations for appropriate direct legislative action to the Legislative Commission (NRS 232B.237 and 232B.250). Certain regulatory bodies are required to develop and implement a process by which a person with a criminal history may petition the regulatory body to review the criminal history of the person to determine if the person's criminal history will disqualify the person from obtaining a license, certificate, registration, permit, or other similar authorization from the regulatory body. (NRS 622.085).
 - Additional Information Regarding Licensure by Endorsement and Reciprocal Licensure.
- v) Additional Information Regarding Military Spouses. Next, **Oppenlander** covered Handout: Two June 2020 Wall Street Journal Articles Re: Social Workers and Law Enforcement. Because the Special Session(s) will in part be dealing with Social Justice she handed out two June 2020 articles from the Wall Street Journal (WSJ). On June 16, 2020 - NASW CEO Angelo McClain responded to a negative column on social work and policing that was published on earlier in the month on 6/9/20 in the WSJ. Speaking on behalf of NASW and many of its 110,000 members, the NASW CEO expressed deep disappointment with the editorial titled "Are Social Workers the Answer?" The earlier article he responded to was penned by Naomi Schaefer Riley, a resident fellow at the conservative/ neo-conservative American Enterprise Institute. McClain stated that it was an egregious column that that called into question the practice of police departments hiring more social workers to help bring about policing reforms. He went on to say that Riley relied on the well-worn stereotype that social workers are ineffective in the child welfare system, so therefore could not help law enforcement better serve their communities, including people who are African Americans, homeless, or living with a mental illness. He said that this issue is especially crucial now considering the widespread unrest that has occurred after the police murder of George Floyd and the deaths of other unarmed people. **Oppenlander** spoke about a fundamental pillar of social work is social justice and she will be interested in seeing where Nevada's legislators may go.
- vi) She moved on to highlight a handout on the updated BESW Safe and Healthy Workplace Policy, Phase Two in a continuing effort to update the Board when we are changing phases in the State and Local Government recovery plans.
- vii) Then she covered the Board's Strategic Plan Goal 4B – "BESW Will Clear 75% of Backlogged Disciplinary Cases Prior to January 1 2018 by December 31 2019"; she let the Board know that the actual results were that 76% of these cases were cleared by June 30 2020. She highlighted the work of the Compliance Unit in this accomplishment: Miller, Durante, Bhalla, Lowery, Rhuys, and Weaver. **Erickson** thank everyone for their progress on the investigations. It's amazing about how you have all worked together to try to expedite that process.

- viii) Last, **Oppenlander** covered the expensed items related to Nevada's Reopening Plan including a) Plexiglas Sneeze Guards: \$1946.65, b) Rewiring/ Move of Copier for Social Distancing: \$768.60, c) Handout: Xerox Master Service Agreement - new five year agreement, and (d) miscellaneous: \$222.79.
- ix) To wrap up, she asked for ideas for Future Agenda Items and
- x) The next Board meeting is scheduled for September 11, 2020.

Erickson moved to **Agenda Item 4: Public Comment** and hearing none, moved to **Agenda Item 5: Adjournment**.

Nielsen motioned to adjourn, seconded by Harris. Roll call vote: Erickson – Aye; Harris – Aye; Maplethorpe – Aye; Nielsen – Aye. Motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

Meeting minutes were respectfully submitted by Karen Oppenlander.