

Attachment A

Applied Behavior Analysis Board Meeting: October 22nd, 2020 Public Comment from:
Dr. Kerri Milyko (Nevada Applied Behavior Analysis Board Member)

I'm disappointed to see the agenda laid out as it is. First, given our emergency meeting, I felt like it was rather obvious that we had more to discuss regarding the 011 executive order from the governor. Julie kept us honest in saying "we can't discuss it now" and I kept on saying, we need to talk about this at our next meeting as documented in the minutes... For me, I have questions that need discussion with my fellow board members and Julie around clarifications and how we look to proceed – and action with how we distribute our understanding and findings with our constituents. Now it seems like that discussion requires us to hold an emergency meeting which cuts into our work time because it was not properly agendaed.

Second, while it isn't against our statute, it was revealed at our emergency meeting that there is a conflict of interest with 2 board members: Rachel and Matt where one receives services at another's place of employment where Rachel receives services at Matt's place of employment. I brought this up with Jennifer that I would like to have an open discussion around the conflict, and why it wasn't disclosed, as these possible dual relationships are discouraged in our ethical code that can lead to bias in treatment. Just as if Brighid and I worked at the same company, this conflict should be disclosed and a conversation had about how we would work to be nonbiased even though that relationship is not excluded in the statute. So, it is a conflict of interest – whether or not that conflict of interest should result in action is another thing. But I'm disappointed in the secretive nature of our board members in not disclosing and of the decision to not bring this to a meeting after it was revealed.