

HEALTH CARE WORKFORCE WORKING GROUP (HCWWG)

MEETING MINUTES – APRIL 21, 2026

The Health Care Workforce Working Group (HCWWG) held a public meeting on **April 21, 2026, beginning at 1:00 PM**. The meeting was conducted in a hybrid format and held in compliance with Nevada Open Meeting Law.

MEETING LOCATION

Physical Location:

10375 Professional Circle
Third Floor – Walker Room
Reno, NV 89521

Virtual Option:

Microsoft Teams

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by Chair Vikki Erickson.

Roll call was conducted by Dr. Mitch DeValliere. A quorum was established.

Members Present

- Vikki Erickson, Executive Director, State of Nevada Board of Examiners for Social Workers (Chair)
- Krisann Alvarez, Licensed Psychologist, Division of Child and Family Services
- Dr. Tyree Davis, Chief Medical Officer for Ancillary Services, Nevada Health Center
- Dr. Mitch DeValliere, Agency Manager, Division of Public and Behavioral Health
- Frank DiMaggio, Executive Director, Nevada State Board of Osteopathic Medicine
- Tarryn Emmerich-Choi, Health Resource Analyst III, Primary Care Office
- Charles Harvey, Executive Director, Nevada Physical Therapy Board (departed early)
- Adam Higginbotham, Executive Director, Nevada State Dental Board
- Joelle McNutt, Executive Director, State of Nevada Board of Examiners for Marriage and Family Therapists & Clinical Professional Counselors
- Jose Melendrez, Vice Chair, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, School of Public Health
- Steve Messinger, Policy Director, Nevada Primary Care Association
- David Wuest, Executive Secretary of the Nevada State Board of Pharmacy

Members Absent

- Edward Cousineau, Executive Director, Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners
- Cathy Dinauer, Executive Director, Nevada State Board of Nursing
- Sarah Restori, Administrative Director, Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners

Others Present

- Micki Golden, Accreditation Analyst, Division of Public and Behavioral Health
- Peter Heryford, Health Program Specialist I, Division of Public and Behavioral Health

- Jason Molino, Health Program Specialist I, Tribal Liaison, Division of Public and Behavioral Health

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Erickson opened the first public comment period and provided instructions for participation in accordance with Open Meeting Law requirements.

No public comment was received.

3. APPROVAL OF MARCH 19, 2026, MEETING MINUTES (*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION*)

Chair Erickson introduced the item for approval of the March 19, 2026, meeting minutes.

Motion: To approve March 19, 2026, meeting minutes

- **Motion by:** Dr. Tyree Davis
- **Second by:** Charles Harvey

No discussion was offered.

Vote: Motion carried unanimously.

4. FINALIZATION OF REDCAP SURVEY QUESTIONS (*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION*)

Initial Discussion

Dr. DeValliere introduced the survey, noting that it had been developed collaboratively and refined based on prior feedback. He acknowledged the contributions of staff supporting development of the REDCap instrument.

Members who had reviewed or tested the survey reported that:

- The survey was less burdensome than anticipated
- Navigation and completion were intuitive and efficient
- The estimated completion time appeared reasonable

Several areas for refinement were discussed:

Survey Content and Structure

- A potential duplication of questions related to direct patient care was identified:
 - One question addressed overall percentage of time spent in patient care
 - Another addressed patient care by location
- Members discussed whether both were necessary or if one could be derived from the other

Data Completeness

- A gap was identified regarding dental-specific licensing elements (e.g., nitrous oxide permit)
- It was noted that inclusion of such elements could improve completeness of provider data

Survey Burden and Clarity

Members emphasized the importance of:

- Keeping the survey concise
- Avoiding unnecessary or duplicative questions
- Ensuring clarity across provider types

Communication Strategy

Early discussion highlighted the need for:

- Consistent messaging across licensing boards
- Clear explanation of:
 - Purpose of data collection
 - Authority under statute
 - Intended use of data

Initial Motion and Approval

Motion: To approve the survey as written

- **Amended to include:** Addition of nitrous oxide permit (as applicable)
- **Vote:** Motion carried unanimously

Reconsideration of Approval

Following approval, additional concerns were raised that prompted reconsideration of the motion.

Key Concerns Identified

- **Applicability across professions**
 - Certain survey questions (e.g., practice setting categories) may not align with all provider types, particularly pharmacy
- **Feasibility of responses**
 - Some providers may not have access to specific data (e.g., payer mix percentages)
- **Data governance and legal considerations**
 - Questions were raised regarding:
 - Whether data could be subject to public records requests
 - Whether confidentiality statements could be fully guaranteed
 - How data would be accessed, stored, and used
- **Data usability**
 - Discussion of adding National Provider Identifier (NPI) to support cross-referencing and data integration
 - Concern that absence of identifiers may limit utility of collected data

Members emphasized the importance of:

- Avoiding misleading statements regarding confidentiality
- Ensuring alignment with statutory authority
- Maintaining public trust among licensees

Motion to Rescind Prior Approval

Motion: To rescind prior approval of the survey

- **Motion by:** Steve Messinger
- **Second by:** Adam Higginbotham (with additional verbal confirmation)

Vote: Motion carried unanimously

Further Discussion and Amendments

Following rescission, the survey was reopened for discussion.

Additional points included:

- The need for flexibility in survey interpretation across professions
- Recognition that some questions may:
 - Be optional
 - Allow “unknown” responses
- Agreement that further refinements could be made over time as data collection proceeds

Final Motion

Motion: To approve the survey as amended

- **Vote:** Motion carried unanimously

Final Outcome

The survey was approved with the understanding that:

- It represents an initial implementation tool
- Adjustments may be made in future iterations
- Profession-specific considerations may be addressed as data is collected

5. ESTABLISHMENT OF HEALTH CARE PROVIDER DATABASE (NRS 439A.116) (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

Dr. DeValliere noted that the survey serves as a foundational step toward implementation of the provider database required under NRS 439A.116.

Discussion emphasized that:

- The database will be populated through survey responses
- Initial survey deployment constitutes progress toward statutory compliance

No formal action was taken under this agenda item.

6. SELECTION OF LICENSING BOARDS FOR SURVEY TEST RUN (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

Dr. DeValliere reviewed prior expressions of interest from licensing boards willing to participate in a pilot test of the survey.

Boards Identified for Test Run

- Physical Therapy Board
- Dental Board
- Marriage and Family Therapy (MFT) Board

Motions and Votes

Physical Therapy Board

- **Motion by:** Charles Harvey
- **Second by:** Dr. Tyree Davis
- **Vote:** Passed unanimously

Dental Board

- **Motion by:** Dr. Mitch DeValliere
- **Second by:** Adam Higginbotham
- **Vote:** Passed unanimously

MFT Board

- **Motion by:** Joelle McNutt
- **Second by:** Jose L. Melendrez
- **Vote:** Passed unanimously

Implementation Strategy Discussion

Members discussed rollout considerations, including:

- Aligning survey distribution with licensure renewal cycles
- Using pilot boards to:
 - Generate initial dataset
 - Identify operational challenges
- Potential for broader rollout across all boards once validated

7. MEETING SCHEDULE AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (2026) (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

Meeting Frequency

Members discussed reducing meeting frequency from monthly to a more targeted schedule.

Next Meeting

Consensus to hold a meeting in June 2026 to:

- Review initial survey responses
- Evaluate pilot implementation

Scheduling Approach

- Proposed dates: mid-June (Tuesday or Thursday options discussed)
- Decision: A Doodle poll will be distributed to determine availability

Future Agenda Items

- Review and analysis of survey data
- Evaluation of survey effectiveness
- Ongoing database development
- Consideration of survey refinements

EMAIL TEMPLATE FOR SURVEY DISTRIBUTION (ASSOCIATED WITH AGENDA ITEMS 5 & 6)

Purpose

Members collaboratively developed standardized language to accompany survey distribution.

Key Discussion Themes

Clarity and Transparency

- Clearly state:
 - Authority under NRS 439A.116
 - Purpose of data collection
 - Intended use of data

Encouraging Participation

- Emphasize:
 - Benefits to providers and communities
 - Role in workforce planning and resource allocation
- Highlight that:
 - Survey replaces duplicative outreach (e.g., phone surveys)

Minimizing Burden

- Include estimated completion time:
 - Approximately 5–10 minutes
- Encourage respondents to prepare:
 - Medicaid patient percentage
 - Medicare patient percentage
 - Sliding fee scale data

Data Use and Confidentiality

- Language refined to avoid misinterpretation
- Final phrasing indicated:
 - Data will be maintained and utilized by the Nevada Department of Human Services
 - Results will be reported in aggregate form

Flexibility

- Template approved as a baseline communication tool
- Individual boards may tailor messaging to their audiences

Motion to Approve Email Template

Motion: To approve the draft email template as baseline language for survey distribution

- **Motion by:** Adam Higginbotham
- **Second by:** Steve Messinger

Vote: Motion carried unanimously

Survey Implementation Timeline

- Suggested response deadline: **May 15, 2026**
- Recommendation:
 - Send follow-up reminder approximately two weeks after initial distribution
- Data will be used for:
 - Initial analysis
 - Presentation at June meeting

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Erickson opened the second public comment period.

No public comment was received.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: To adjourn

- **Motion by:** Steve Messinger
- **Second by:** Adam Higginbotham

Vote: Motion carried unanimously

The meeting was adjourned.

DRAFT