



State of Nevada
Speech-Language Pathology, Audiology & Hearing Aid Dispensing Board

MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING ON LCB FILE R095-19
Speech-Language Pathology, Audiology & Hearing Aid Dispensing Board

April 22, 2020

Members Present: Tami Brancamp, Andrea Menicucci, Nighat Abdulla, Michael Hodes, Timothy Hunsaker, Bonnie Lamping

Members Absent: Thomas Rainford

Staff Present: Jennifer Pierce, Executive Director
Stacey Whittaker, Executive Assistant/Licensing Coordinator
Henna Rasul, Sr. Deputy Attorney General, Board Counsel
Sarah Adler, Board Lobbyist
Alex Tanchek, Board Lobbyist

Public Present: Suzanne Anthony, Kelli Hall, Danielle Knoeppel, Nancy Kuhles, Flor Mallory, Jessica Medulla, Jeana Miller, Ryan Neider, Christine Photakis, Kim Reddig, Nicole Sheldon, Lorena Smith, Jennifer Van Tress

Call to Order, Confirmation of Quorum

Tami Brancamp, Board Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:31 p.m. A roll call confirmed a quorum was present.

Public Comment

Nancy Kuhles, Speech-Language Pathologist and Co-Chair of the NV Coalition to Address Personnel Shortages referenced Agenda Item 7, Section 2, the proposed regulation that addresses exemptions for public employees who hold a Nevada DOE teaching license and do not engage as an independent contractor/private practitioner. Ms. Kuhles stated that she was seeking confirmation that the language in this section addresses licensing and practice settings, in that those who are working in a school-based setting should be licensed for that setting through the Department of Education and those who are working outside of a school setting must hold a license from our Board.

Suzanne Anthony of Washoe County School District stated that she was interested in guidance from the Board around telepractice, specifically clarification of whether their SLPs may still provide services to children who may be temporarily in another state due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Approval of Minutes: January 22, 2020

Tami Brancamp asked if there were any corrections or revisions to the minutes of the meeting of January 22, 2020. No corrections were noted. Andrea Menicucci made a motion to approve the minutes of January 22, 2020 as written. Bonnie Lamping seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Approval of Minutes: February 12, 2020

Tami Brancamp asked if there were any corrections or revisions to the minutes of the meeting of February 12, 2020. No corrections were noted. Andrea Menicucci made a motion to approve the minutes of February 12, 2020 as written. Bonnie Lamping seconded the motion. The motion passed.

License Reinstatement Application: Lorena Smith, HAS Apprentice, License #HAS-2277 Apprentice

Tami Brancamp reviewed the summary provided to the Board by Ms. Pierce. On April 14, 2020 Board staff received a License Reinstatement Application from Ms. Lorena Smith who was initially licensed as a Hearing Aid Specialist Apprentice on March 9, 2018. Ms. Smith's license expired on March 8, 2020, and she attested in her reinstatement application that she has maintained consistent employment with Neider Hearing LLC and has been practicing since the expiration of her license. As the license has expired and there is evidence of subsequent unlicensed practice, the reinstatement application is presented to the Board for review and disposition.

Ms. Smith and her sponsor, Ryan Neider were both present in the meeting. Ms. Brancamp called for questions, and Timothy Hunsaker asked Ms. Smith to explain why the license was not renewed in a timely manner. Ms. Smith responded that it was an oversight on her part and she forgot about the renewal. Ms. Smith explained that she had been hoping to sit for the Dispensing exam to obtain a full HAS license in March 2020 but has been unable to do so due to the pandemic. Mr. Hunsaker expressed concern that the license was allowed to lapse, as typically apprentices are eager stay on top of requirements to obtain full licensure. Ms. Smith stated that she entered the renewal on her calendar for April 19th and stated that she did not receive a reminder call or email this year as she had last year, which she was relying on. Mr. Neider apologized for his part in the oversight as Ms. Smith's sponsor and stated that he missed the renewal date in part due to the current pandemic. Andrea Menicucci asked whether Ms. Smith discontinued practicing once she received the Notice Letter and Cease and Desist and Ms. Smith and Mr. Neider both confirmed that she has. Timothy Hunsaker asked how much longer Ms. Smith has in her apprentice program, and Mr. Neider confirmed that she has three (3) years to become licensed but they were hoping she could take the required exams in the next few months.

Tami Brancamp summarized the Board's options to consider reinstatement of the license as well as assessment of a civil penalty. Ms. Pierce summarized two recent similar cases to give the Board context on prior decisions and explained that Ms. Smith's reinstatement request was just a week past the 30-day late renewal period. The Board discussed possible fine amounts and a suggestion was made to impose a fine and reinstatement of the license with no conditions.

Tami Brancamp called for a motion. Michael Hodes made a motion to impose a fine of \$200 for unlicensed practice and approve the reinstatement application with no conditions imposed on the license. Timothy Hunsaker seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Ms. Pierce explained to Ms. Smith that she could contact the Board office the next day and make payment to have her license reinstated immediately.

Discussion of Board Responsibility to Notify Practitioners of Code of Ethics Self-Reporting Following Disciplinary Action

Following the Board's February 12, 2020 meeting wherein the Board heard a Reinstatement Application that involved unlicensed practice, a question was posed regarding what responsibility, if any, the Board has to inform licensees of their duty to self-report to a certifying organization such as ASHA, AAA, or NBC-HIS.

The Board agreed that it would not be its responsibility to report these matters but discussed the appropriateness of providing licensees formal guidance to consider any duty on their part to self-report to any certifying/accrediting organization following these administrative actions. Ms. Pierce explained that communication following these cases is typically done in the form of an informal email from Board staff to the licensee when the license is reinstated. Henna Rasul, Board Counsel advised that while the Board is not mandated to report these actions, there would not be a problem with the Board choosing to provide this advice to a licensee. There was additional discussion about how any practitioner, including a Board Member, would report any knowledge of violation of practice law or unlicensed practice. Ms. Rasul confirmed that anyone, including a Board Member, who had knowledge of this could file a formal complaint with the Board, and if the Board Member was the complainant, they would not be involved in any discussion or action that followed on the matter.

There was discussion on how this advice would be given, and it was suggested that Ms. Pierce could craft a simple message that would be included in an email to the licensee.

Timothy Hunsaker made a motion to include a statement in the follow-up email communication to licensees advising that they check in with any certifying/accrediting organization regarding self-reporting administrative action by the Board. Andrea Menicucci and Bonnie Lamping both seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Public Hearing on Proposed Regulations LCB File No. R095-19

Tami Brancamp opened the Public Hearing on Proposed Regulation LCB File No. R095-19. Ms. Brancamp explained that the proposed regulations are on this agenda for a Public Hearing to hear comments and feedback from licensees and the public. If the language is changed substantially, it may be necessary to send the regulations back to the LCB for redrafting and/or hold a second public hearing. If not, the Board may consider feedback and adopt these regulations during this meeting in a later agenda item.

Ms. Brancamp reviewed each of the regulation sections and asked for public comment on each. Jennifer Pierce stated for the record that she did not receive any questions or comments verbally or in writing on these regulations prior to this Hearing.

- *Sec. 2.* Clarifies existing regulation language regarding the exemption from licensure by defining “practice within scope of credential” issued by the Department of Education.
Public Comment: Kim Reddig spoke and stated that she was following up on Nancy Kuhles’ earlier public comment to confirm that the wording in this section meant that a contracted SLP working for a school district would hold the DOE endorsement, but is really a private practitioner working in the school setting and would also need to be Board licensed.
- *Sec. 3.* Establishes parameters in existing regulation language on issuing citations to cease and desist and assessing administrative fines for violation of law for practicing without a valid license or endorsement, as well as a waiver of an administrative fine for “good cause”.
Public Comment: There was no public comment on this item.
- *Sec. 4.* Grants the Board authority to consider requiring applicants take and pass a Jurisprudence Examination as a condition for initial license or reinstatement of an expired license.
Public Comment: There was no public comment on this item.
- *Sec. 5.* Establishes a 30-day waiting period between attempts for the hearing aid dispensing practical examination.
- *Sec. 6.* Allows an individual who wishes to reinstate an Apprentice license credit for up to two (2) years of in-service training completed during the initial license period.
Public Comment: There was no public comment on this item.
- *Sec. 7.* Clarifies existing regulation language to require that a sponsor and an apprentice shall have the same employer.
Public Comment: There was no public comment on this item.

This agenda item was informational only and no action was taken.

Consideration of Public Comments on Proposed Regulations LCB File No. R095-19

Tami Brancamp led the Board in considering comments and feedback from licensees and the public on LCB File No. R095-19.

- *Sec. 2.* Ms. Brancamp acknowledged the two comments received on this section by Nancy Kuhles and Kim Reddig. Jennifer Pierce explained that following the comments received during the Public Workshop on January 22, 2020, these regulations were sent back to LCB for revision to clarify that a practitioner could hold *both* a DOE endorsement and a Board license, and that the intent of the regulation was to ensure that any person engaging in private practice or contract work *must* hold a Board license. The regulation seeks to clarify that a person holding

only the DOE endorsement could not use it to engage in private practice in Nevada. Ms. Pierce pointed out that Sec 2. (2) was a new addition intended to provide that clarification. There was additional discussion on the need for a person to also need a DOE endorsement to work with students, but there was consensus that our regulations would not have authority to address what is needed in the DOE setting.

- Sec. 3. No discussion.
- Sec. 4. No discussion.
- Sec. 5. No discussion.
- Sec. 6. No discussion.

The consensus was that there were no changes needed to any sections, and no vote was taken.

Consideration of Adoption of Proposed Regulations LCB File No. R095-19

Given that no changes were needed to any sections, Tami Brancamp called for a motion. Michael Hodes made a motion to adopt the proposed regulations LCB File No. R095-19 as written. Andrea Menicucci and Timothy Hunsaker both seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Board Response to COVID-19

Jennifer Pierce summarized how the Board office and staff have responded to the COVID-19 pandemic and presented the following questions on licensing and practice issues raised by licensees for the Board's consideration. The Board was also provided with related resources, including relevant Emergency Directives from Governor Sisolak and guidance from ASHA and the American Health Care Association.

- Practitioner Compliance with Stay-At-Home Orders/Closure of Non-Essential Businesses*
Concerns have been brought to the Board's attention regarding hearing aid dispensing in lieu of the Governor's stay at home order (Emergency Directive 010). Many healthcare providers not providing essential services have closed or reduced services but there is concern that some of our Board's licensees may be engaging in "business as usual".

The Board discussed that our practitioners have not been specifically deemed as essential or non-essential. Michael Hodes brought up that precedent has been set in California whose Board has indicated they would not take a position on who is deemed essential and what businesses should remain open. Mr. Hodes suggested that this Board consider taking the same position, and further shared that he contacted the Washoe County Sheriff's Department who indicated they are enforcing essential/non-essential operations in partnership with code authorities. Consensus was that it is not within the Board's scope to determine whether licensees and related businesses should continue to practice.

The Board further discussed the Nevada Dental Board's recent guidance to discontinue non-emergency procedures, and Michael Hodes stated that his understanding is that those decisions were related to the practice of aerosol-inducing procedures.

Recommendations included that our Board add resources on our website from the CDC regarding practice that involves aerosols, a link to the Governor’s Emergency Directives to the website, and a statement that the Board is not taking a position on essential services. Board Counsel, Henna Rasul confirmed that the Board may choose to not take a position on essential services.

Tami Brancamp called for a motion. Bonnie Lamping made a motion to add a statement that the Board has not taken a position on essential services, as well as links to all relevant association and government websites with relevant COVID-19 guidance to the Board website. Nighat Abdulla seconded the motion. The motion carried.

b. *Code of Ethics/Patient Abandonment*

The Board has received at least two (2) inquiries from practitioners who are concerned about future disciplinary action for patient abandonment during COVID-19 if they refuse to provide care to patients due to a threat to their own safety from lack of PPE or being asked to provide non-essential services, or leave their position to relocate elsewhere to shelter in place, though they have provided proper notice to the employer.

Discussion included the presence of guidance on these questions in the ASHA documentation provided to the Board, and what the Board would potentially do if a complaint case were received on this issue.

Tami Brancamp called for a motion. Michael Hodes made a motion to authorize the Executive Director to update the Board website with information and links regarding Code of Ethics and Patient Abandonment issues. Nighat Abdulla seconded the motion. The motion carried.

c. *Licensing Issues*

1. *License Extensions/Waivers*

No license extension or fee waiver requests have been received to date. The Governor’s Emergency Directive 009, Section 3 provided 90-day extensions on state licenses *“if reduced government operations due to the state of emergency makes timely renewal of the license or permit impracticable or impossible.”* Our Board has remained open throughout the pandemic and has an extremely efficient licensing process already in place that has seen no interruptions.

The Board discussed that there do not seem to have been significant delays or impacts at this time, and consensus was that no change should be made at this time but the Board can address this at a later meeting if the pandemic continues and/or if there appears to be a larger impact. The matter was tabled to a later date.

2. *License Requirements*

i. *Transcripts*

It is possible that we may see a delay in receipt of official transcripts that are required for licensing. Tami Brancamp stated that due to reduced University operations it is likely we may encounter this issue in the future.

- ii. **Notary Requirement on Application**
The Board currently requires that new applications be notarized and may need to consider deferring this requirement to support the Governor’s stay-at-home order. Andrea Menicucci shared that she has identified mobile notary services, and many banks are still open and offer notary services.
- iii. **Hard-copy Only Submission of Application**
The Board currently requires that new applications be submitted via hard copy in person or by US mail only. No requests have been made for this to date, but Board staff anticipated this could be requested.
- iv. **Exams**
Praxis and Hearing Aid Dispensing exams have been suspended/rescheduled which may prevent practitioners from becoming licensed/beginning employment.
- v. **Provisional SLP Clinical Fellowship Year**
In order to earn their CCC-SLP through ASHA, Provisional SLPs must complete a Clinical Fellowship Year and some may lose time due to COVID-19.

There was discussion and support for considering alternatives specific to new graduates who may be held up from beginning employment due to these issues, but consensus and confirmation from Board Counsel Henna Rasul was that many of these requirements are outlined in our NRS and NAC, so the Board would not have the authority to change requirements without legislative action or emergency regulations. There was additional discussion on how the unknown timeframe for reduced operations due to the pandemic makes it difficult to make a decision at this time.

Tami Brancamp suggested a review of the current laws and regulations related to these questions and continued monitoring of the situation. Ms. Pierce will map these questions to the NRS and NAC and these questions will be tabled for a later meeting that may be called sooner than the scheduled July 2020 meeting as needed.

d. *Practitioners Supporting Long Term Care and Other Facilities*

The Board received a request for guidance on asking SLP (and OT/PT) clinicians in their facilities to assist with basic resident needs, including but not limited to: helping pass feeding trays, answering call lights, non-therapy assistance with basic ADLs, resident transportation within the facility, etc. Their interpretation was that in doing so as a helper, custodial in nature, and not as a clinician, practice act/rules and scope of practice would not apply or be considered billable treatment time.

The request referenced guidance from the American Health Care Association (AHCA) and National Center for Assisted Living (NCAL) on “The Role of Physical and Occupational Therapy and Speech-Language Pathology Personnel in LTC Facilities During the COVID-19 Pandemic”.

Tami Brancamp identified that ASHA has issued guidance on this that gives practitioners direction on how to proceed in these situations and future questions should be directed to this resource. There was no action taken on this matter.

e. *Telehealth Questions*

Our current NRS allows for telepractice in NRS 637B.244 and practitioners with questions related to telepractice have been directed to the NRS by Board staff.

Tami Brancamp addressed the earlier public comment by Suzanne Anthony related to telepractice by SLPs employed by the school district for students who have been temporarily relocated to another state due to the pandemic. There was discussion of whether the students are considered “residents” and how telepractice rules apply. Jennifer Pierce reported that ASHA is providing guidance on telepractice allowances by each state during the pandemic.

There was discussion of how the Board does not have jurisdiction outside of Nevada and outside the school district. Bonnie Lamping stated that since these are students receiving services within a school district, this would be a matter for the district or state Department of Education to address. Andrea Menicucci shared that the SLPs with these concerns are also licensed with the Board and are concerned that engaging in this practice with students could jeopardize their Board license and it would not be ethically appropriate to provide SLP services if they are not licensed in the other state. Tami Brancamp suggested that these providers document what they are doing under DOE direction with students which would provide some justification if this came up as a problem in the future. Board Lobbyist, Sarah Adler suggested that practitioners reach out to the DOE for guidance. Consensus was that this is a complicated situation, but the Board would not be likely to take action on a licensed practitioner who is providing services to students at the direction of their district. These practitioners are school district employees and should follow direction and request guidance from the district. There was no action taken on this matter.

Legislative Update

Sarah Adler, Board Lobbyist provided an update to the Board on legislative activity. Ms. Adler first addressed the earlier question about providing relief to applicants who are unable to complete exams at this time and clarified the Governor needs to sign any emergency regulation so this matter, if taken on, would need to be raised at that level. Ms. Adler further suggested that in doing so, it may be beneficial to look at this as a broader issue around barriers to licensing impacting multiple Boards/entities.

- **Board's Legislative Agenda**
Ms. Adler stated that she has been working with Ms. Pierce on the questions of licensing Assistants and raising the fee caps. Ms. Adler concurs with using the survey included on this

meeting's agenda to guide the Board's work on these two issues to guide the path forward and consider the nature of the stakeholder involvement and the timing of these priorities. Ms. Adler has reached out to a legislator but has not heard back yet as to whether they will be willing to carry the fee cap increase bill, but she feels comfortable that there is an identified need for the increase. There may be some concern about the relative impact of the COVID 19 pandemic, but it may not outweigh the need to move forward.

- **Legislative Interim Activity**
Ms. Adler reported that interim activity has slowed considerably, and most committees have not yet begun meeting remotely. Ms. Adler confirmed that this Board is not on the list for review by the Sunset Subcommittee of the Legislative Commission this year however it is likely those reviews are continuing as most of that work is done by LCB staff. Ms. Adler highlighted the Sunset Subcommittee's priorities this year, including ensuring Board membership diversity, allowing for expedited licensing for military spouses, and whether there should be a statutory definition of licensure by endorsement or reciprocity. Ms. Adler referenced a later agenda item regarding Board reappointments and encouraged the Board to consider diversity when recruiting new members. Ms. Adler stated that our current statutes are very clear on military spouse licensing and license by endorsement which puts the Board in a good position in relation to these questions.
- **Governor Sisolak's Announced Approach to Re-Opening Nevada**
Ms. Adler summarized the Governor's announcement from the day before about his approach to reopening the state. Ms. Adler stated that in her opinion this Board's professions would be able to comply with the sanitation and social distancing guidelines to reopen in Phase I. Ms. Adler reported that the Board could consider reaching out to the newly established Governor's Office of Economic Recovery with a statement that our licensed professions could be included as Phase I businesses.

There were no additional questions or comments. This agenda item was informational only and there was no action taken.

Work Session on Legislative Priorities

Tami Brancamp called on Jennifer Pierce who summarized the potential legislative priorities presented for the Board's consideration. Ms. Pierce stated that the only task needed for this meeting's work session is to review and approve the drafted licensee survey.

- **NRS - New - *Speech-Language Pathologist Assistant, Audiologist Assistant***
Ms. Pierce explained that following the February 12, 2020 meeting she facilitated several meetings to start the Assistants discussion, and the consensus was that the two roles (audiology and SLP) might look very different and it may take some time for the Board to determine how to proceed and collaborate with other entities. Since those meetings, the current pandemic began and there has been little movement since. Ms. Pierce recommended that this priority be considered for the 2023 session, as the complicated nature of the licensing question coupled with the pandemic will require more time to flush out than is reasonable for

the upcoming session. Ms. Pierce presented two white papers on Assistant licensing for the Board's review and reference as these discussions continue.

- NRS 637B.175 - Fees

Ms. Pierce reported that she and Ms. Adler have been working closely conducting financial research and considering past and future budgets and it is recommended that the Board continue to pursue this as a bill draft on the 2021 legislative session.

Ms. Pierce referenced the drafted survey and plan to disseminate to licensees to gather information and inform both priorities. Tami Brancamp confirmed that the plan is to survey current licensees only. The Board reviewed the proposed questions and suggested edits and changes. Ms. Brancamp offered to review the final version of the survey once Ms. Pierce completes the edits. There was consensus to disseminate the survey as soon as possible to have results for the Board's review at the scheduled July 2020 meeting.

Review of Drafted Revisions to Board Policy 03 – Dispensing Examinations and Related Forms

Tami Brancamp called on Ms. Pierce and the Advisory Committee, and Michael Hodes summarized the impetus for the drafted changes to *Policy 03 – Dispensing Examinations*. These changes were authorized by the Board during its January 22, 2020 meeting specific to 1) the potential use of a Proctor Agreement and Confidentiality Form between the Board and any proctor who administer exams, and 2) the potential use of a Test Subject Informed Consent Form for individuals who agree to sit as test subjects during exams.

Ms. Pierce reported that the policy already existed, and the current revisions include the two matters identified above as well as language regarding examination retakes that will encompass the proposed regulation changes requiring a 30-day waiting period. Board staff are also presenting a suggested change to the requirement for a practitioner to retake both exams when requesting a reinstatement, with an allowance to waive this if the individual is currently licensed and practicing in another state.

Drafts of the policy revisions, and the *Proctor Agreement* and *Consent & Waiver* forms were reviewed by the Board. Ms. Brancamp asked if Board Counsel had pre-reviewed the documents. Ms. Pierce had not sent them ahead of the meeting, and it was agreed that Ms. Pierce would request a legal review.

Tami Brancamp suggested that the Board approve the current revisions pending legal review and approval of the policy and forms and called for a motion. Michael Hodes made a motion to approve the current revisions pending legal review and approval of the policy and forms. Bonnie Lamping seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Appointments/Reappointments to the Advisory Committee on Fitting and Dispensing Hearing Aids

Tami Brancamp summarized that the terms of three (3) members of the Advisory Committee, Nanci Campbell, Jennifer Joy-Cornejo, and Melissa Maestas are scheduled to expire on July 19,

2020. Per NAC637B.033: “Members may be reappointed to serve additional terms at the discretion of the Board” and Board policy stipulates that reappointments are for one (1) year. Ms. Pierce reported that all three members have requested reappointment in writing. There were no questions or discussion.

Tami Brancamp called for a motion. Michael Hodes made a motion to reappoint Nanci Campbell, Jennifer Joy-Cornejo, and Melissa Maestas to the Advisory Committee for one year. Bonnie Lamping seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Executive Director’s Report

Tami Brancamp called on Jennifer Pierce who directed the members to the written report and summarized as follows:

- *Licensure Statistics*
Licensure statistics for the period of January 1, 2020 through March 31, 2020 show a net decrease of 16 licenses (1%) which is not unexpected given that a large majority of our licenses still expired at the end of the calendar year (December 31) so we expect a larger than usual number of non-renewals during this quarter as licensees are allowed a 30-day grace period to complete late renewal. This is consistent with FY19 Q3 totals, which saw a drop of 29 licenses (-2%) at the end of March 2019.
- *FY 2020 2nd Quarter Summary*
Q2 financial statements were provided for the Board’s review and Ms. Pierce summarized that as of March 31, 2020, total revenue is \$80,735.46, representing 49.99% of the budget, deferred revenue is \$94,940.48, and total expenses are \$113,833.43, or 54.15% of the budget. Net income is currently -\$33,097.97 and total equity is \$70,344.06. There were no significant deviations or overages in this quarter. The Q2 summary includes planned moving costs, but not the website redesign services as we have not yet received an invoice.
- *Board Member Appointments/Reappointments*
Ms. Pierce reported that the terms of three (3) Board Members are scheduled to expire in July 2020. Nighat Abdulla, Public Member, will have served two (2) terms and is not eligible for reappointment. Both Tami Brancamp, Board Chair, and Michael Hodes, Board Member, are eligible for reappointment and if desiring to remain on the Board, will need to apply to the Governor’s Office for reappointment. Ms. Pierce suggested that Board members and licensees may assist in actively recruiting for a new Public member.
- *Complaints*
Ms. Pierce reported that there no open complaint cases at this time.

Tami Brancamp stated that she is willing to apply for reappointment. There was no further discussion or questions. No action was taken.

Report from Legal Counsel

Henna Rasul, Board Counsel confirmed that she will review the policy and forms as discussed earlier in this meeting. Ms. Rasul acknowledged another special Board Meeting scheduled for next week, April 29, 2020 on an alleged Consent Decree violation, and briefly reviewed the process the hearing will follow, including the Board making a finding as to whether the Consent Decree was violated, and if so, assessing a penalty for the violation. There was no action taken on this matter.

Reports from Board Chair and Board Members

a. Report from Board Chair and Board Members

There was no report.

b. 2020 Meeting Schedule

Tami Brancamp reviewed proposed future meeting dates for July 22, 2020 at 4:30pm and October 21, 2020 at 4:30pm and asked if there were any objections to these dates, of which there were none.

c. Future Agenda Items

1. Board Orientation/Training for Members and Staff

Ms. Brancamp explained that Ms. Pierce is working on an updated and more accessible Board Training for members.

2. FY21 Budget

Ms. Brancamp confirmed with Ms. Pierce that she will present the FY21 draft budget for approval at the July 2020 meeting.

3. Continued work on Legislative Priorities: NRS 637B.175 - Increase Statutory Caps on Licensing Fees, and NRS New - Speech-Language Pathology Assistant, Audiology Assistant and results of licensee survey.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Adjournment

Tami Brancamp adjourned the meeting at 7:43 p.m.