



# STATE OF OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING IN NEVADA

DECEMBER 2020 | REVISED: MARCH 2021

**AIR Principal Investigator:** Christina Curnow, PhD

Email: [ccurnow@air.org](mailto:ccurnow@air.org)

**AIR Project Director:** Gauri (Gee) Rege, MA

Email: [grege@air.org](mailto:grege@air.org)

Gauri (Gee) Rege, MA | Tessa Riley, MA | Christina Curnow, PhD | Tessa Youngner | Chelsi Campbell, MA | Sibley Lyndgaard, MS | Semret Yibass, MA | Soner Dumani, PhD

MAKING RESEARCH RELEVANT



# Contents

	<b>Page</b>
Executive Summary.....	i
Glossary & Acronyms .....	vi
1. Overview.....	1
2. Summary of Methodology.....	3
3. Findings and Discussion.....	6
Nevada and Comparison States.....	6
Populations of Interest .....	26
Industry-Level Findings .....	31
Additional Interview Findings .....	40
Composite Licensing Difficulty Scores .....	45
4. Conclusion .....	47
References .....	48
Appendices.....	A-1
Appendix A. Research Method and Approach .....	A-1
Appendix B. List of 111 Occupations by Industry.....	B-1
Appendix C. List of Subset of 25 Occupations by Industry.....	C-1
Appendix D. Data Elements and Definitions .....	D-1
Appendix E. Overall Nevada Data Analysis Output .....	E-1
Appendix F. Comparison State Data Analysis Output .....	F-1

## Exhibits

	Page
<b>Exhibit 1.</b> Organization of Report .....	2
<b>Exhibit 2.</b> Occupational Licensing Data Element Categories and Data Elements .....	3
<b>Exhibit 3.</b> Number of Licensed Occupations in the Comparison States .....	6
<b>Exhibit 4A.</b> Selected Entry-Related Licensing Requirements for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States .....	7
<b>Exhibit 4B.</b> Selected Licensing Exam Requirements for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States .....	10
<b>Exhibit 4C.</b> Selected Entry-Related Licensing Fees for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States .....	11
<b>Exhibit 5A.</b> Minimum Education Requirement for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States .....	13
<b>Exhibit 5B.</b> Selected Education and Training Requirements for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States .....	15
<b>Exhibit 6.</b> Selected Renewal Requirements for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States .....	17
<b>Exhibit 7.</b> Selected Reciprocity, Endorsement, and Compact Provisions for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States .....	20
<b>Exhibit 8.</b> Selected Findings on the Data Reported by Licensing Boards for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States .....	22
<b>Exhibit 9.</b> Information Accessibility for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States .....	24
<b>Exhibit 10A.</b> Data Elements Related to Justice-Involved Individuals for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States .....	26
<b>Exhibit 10B.</b> Data Elements Relevant to Foreign-Trained Professionals and Immigrant Population for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States .....	28
<b>Exhibit 10C.</b> Data Elements Related to Military-Related Populations for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States .....	29
<b>Exhibit 11A.</b> Comparison of Data Elements Across Industries of Interest in Nevada .....	32
<b>Exhibit 11B.</b> Comparison of Data Elements Across Nevada and the Five Comparison States for Health Care and Social Assistance .....	34
<b>Exhibit 11C.</b> Comparison of Data Elements Across Nevada and the Five Comparison States for Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services .....	36
<b>Exhibit 11D.</b> Comparison of Data Elements Across Nevada and the Comparison States for Educational Services .....	38
<b>Exhibit 12.</b> Occupational Licensing Boards That Participated in The Interviews Conducted by the AIR Team in November 2020 .....	40
<b>Exhibit 13.</b> Data Elements Used to Calculate Composite Licensing Difficulty Scores .....	45
<b>Exhibit 14.</b> Difficulty Scores for Occupations in the Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States .....	45

## Executive Summary

The Nevada Governor’s Office of Workforce Innovation (OWINN) is in the process of reexamining the occupational licensing (OL) requirements for the state with a focus on efforts to better serve dislocated workers, transitioning service members, and veterans. The aim is to identify existing policies that create unnecessary barriers to the labor market and create an action plan that expands access to and improves the portability of and reciprocity for selected occupations. The American Institutes for Research (AIR) is working with OWINN to help accomplish these goals by gathering information on the state of occupational licensing in Nevada.

This report focuses on the (1) collection and analysis of publicly available OL information for Nevada and five comparison states, overall and by industry; (2) information collected during interviews with 15 occupational licensing boards; and (3) actionable recommendations to reduce barriers to occupational licensing in Nevada.

**Research Method.** To inform this report, AIR collected and analyzed publicly available OL information for 111 licensed occupations in Nevada<sup>1</sup> and interviewed staff members from 15 occupational licensing boards. We also collected and analyzed publicly available information on a subset of 25 of the 111 occupations across five comparison states: Colorado, South Dakota, Wyoming, Vermont, and Montana. We collected information from June through August 2020. Additionally, based on the information gathered, we developed a composite indicator of the level of licensing difficulty across Nevada and the comparison states.

**Organization of Report.** The first two chapters of the report provide an Overview and Summary of the Methodology, respectively. The third chapter, Findings and Discussion, is organized into five categories: Nevada and Comparison States, Populations of Interest, Industry-Level Findings, Additional Interview Findings, and Composite Licensing Difficulty Scores. The last and fourth chapter concludes the report. The appendices include the detailed research method and approach (Appendix A), a list of 111 licensed occupations by industry in Nevada (Appendix B), a list of 25 subset occupations by industry (Appendix C), data elements and definitions (Appendix

---

<sup>1</sup> Most occupations researched as a part of this study are those for which an individual is granted a license. The Nevada State Board of Contractors does not license individuals—it licenses businesses. In order to receive a contractor’s license, a business is required to have at least one individual who is qualified to oversee the day-to-day business transactions and actual work being performed. As such, the AIR team gathered information on these requirements for contractor classifications.

D), select overall Nevada data analyses output (Appendix E), and select comparison state data analyses output (Appendix F).

**Findings.** The most relevant findings regarding occupational licensing requirements are presented and discussed in the report. Across these findings, those that are particularly salient are identified here.<sup>2</sup>

✚ **Good moral character.** Data collection efforts revealed that most of the 111 licensed occupations in Nevada stipulate a good moral character (GMC) requirement for applicants. However, interviews with select Nevada occupational licensing board members and staff revealed a broad scope of criteria used to determine if an individual is of "good moral character." While some boards rely on the applicant's criminal history, others rely on character references, while for others the process is not clear.

✚ **Financial Burden.** The average cost for initial licensure for applicants was found to be \$1,022 for the 111 licensed occupations in Nevada. To retain licensure, the average total renewal cost per year was found to be \$401. These costs are the highest within the manufacturing and construction industries in Nevada.

Across the comparison states and Nevada, for the subset of 25 occupations, the average cost for initial licensure for applicants ranged from \$582 (in Colorado) to \$1,031 (in Nevada), and the average total renewal cost per year ranged from \$30 (in Colorado) to \$182 (in Nevada). Thus, Nevada had the highest costs both for initial licensure and for yearly renewals.

✚ **Education and experience.** Some occupations in Nevada (e.g., architecture) were found to require a higher level of education than any of the comparison states required for the same licensed occupation. On the other hand, for the subset of 25 occupations, Nevada has a lower percentage of occupations that require industry experience (24%) than do any of the comparison states.

✚ **Reciprocity agreements and endorsement.**<sup>3</sup> Only one of the 111 licensed occupations in Nevada publicly shared information about reciprocity information online. For the subset of

---

<sup>2</sup> The Findings and Discussion section of the report includes a more detailed discussion and additional findings.

<sup>3</sup> Due to a lack of shared vocabulary across occupational licensing (OL) boards, the AIR team relied on definitions and provisions for reciprocity and endorsement (outlined in Nevada Revised Statutes 622) to ensure consistency in the information being collected. See Appendix D for definitions used by the AIR team.

25 occupations, Nevada was found to offer licensure by endorsement provisions more often than the comparison states.

- ✚ **Compacts.** Across the 111 occupations, Nevada participates in two compacts—the Psychology Interjurisdictional Compact (PSYPACT) and the Interstate Medical Licensure Compact (IMLC)—out of a possible seven compacts.
- ✚ **Licensee information.** In terms of the type of licensee information provided to the public, the extent of information available varied across Nevada licensing boards. While licensee names were published for most occupations (77%), fewer boards included details about disciplinary actions (28%) on their websites.
- ✚ **Populations of Interest:**
  - ❖ With regard to justice-involved individuals, blanket bans for individuals were found for 5% of the 111 licensed occupations in Nevada and only 12% of these occupations provided information on predetermination processes.
  - ❖ Very few occupational licensing exams are offered in more than one language (3%) or offer interpreters for foreign-trained professionals or individuals who speak English as a second language (3%).
  - ❖ Overall, less than half of the licensed occupation in Nevada offer either initial fee waivers (20%) or discounts (17%) for military-related populations.
  - ❖ Of the 111 Nevada occupations studied no provisions were found that catered to economically disadvantaged populations.
- ✚ **Board composition.** All 15 boards that were interviewed reported having at least one member of the public on the board. Also, the boards in our sample that regulate multiple occupations shared that board member composition reflects the distribution of licensed members, ensuring representation of all occupations regulated by the board.

**Summary of recommendations.** Based on the findings, we recommend the following:

- ✚ **Good moral character.** *In the interest of aligning licensing requirements with job relevance, the need for a good moral character (GMC) requirement could be reassessed. In instances where it is determined that the requirement is relevant to the occupation, we encourage inclusion of the specific criteria on which an applicants' character is assessed to promote transparency and clarity for applicants.*

✚ **Cost of licensing.** *Large fees, which are a particular concern for individuals who are economically disadvantaged, unemployed, or pursuing a low-wage occupation, can deter applicants from pursuing a career in a licensed profession since they place an additional financial burden on them (on top of the financial burden they may already face as a result of required education and training). Based on the findings, especially with respect to the comparison states, we recommend that fee structures be reevaluated, particularly for lower wage occupations, to reduce applicant financial burden. In instances where this may not be feasible due to limited funds or reserves, consideration could be given to developing more cost-effective staffing structures and/or identifying process efficiencies that could alleviate some financial burden (e.g., sharing services with other boards).*

✚ **Education and experience.** *Consider conducting a comparative analysis of Nevada’s education and experience requirements to those in other states to determine whether there are any existing differences in the current minimum education requirements. Then evaluate these requirements with respect to public safety.*

*Based on the comparison state findings, Nevada might benefit from reviewing education/training and industry experience licensing requirements to identify occupations where some industry experience could replace education/training hours.*

✚ **Reciprocity and endorsement.** *Nevada might benefit from identifying opportunities to engage in reciprocity agreements with other states that have similar occupational qualifications. Also, there is a need for shared vocabulary around reciprocity and endorsement to ensure that licensing boards, applicants, and policymakers are referring to the same concepts.*

✚ **Interstate compacts.** *If Nevada participates in more compacts, it could help increase worker mobility and combat the demand/shortages of licensed workers.*

✚ **Licensee information.** *In the interest of consumer safety and awareness, Nevada could consider making board disciplinary action information publicly available, such as on occupational licensing board websites.*

✚ **Special populations:**

❖ *Blanket bans for justice-involved individuals could be reconsidered, and more occupational licensing (OL) boards might want to consider including information about predetermination processes on their websites.*



- ❖ *Identifying provisions for immigrant populations and education and/experience equivalencies could help to improve workforce shortages in certain industries.*
- ❖ *In light of the financial burden that licensing fees place on applicants, and to increase the rate of employment, waivers and/or discounts for applicants who are economically disadvantaged could be considered.*

✚ **Board composition.** *Licensing boards should consider ensuring that fewer than 50% of voting board members are practitioners to reduce the risk of the board passing self-interested regulations. State boards composed of a majority of active market participants and not actively supervised by the state are subject to anti-trust laws, unlike other state agencies, which are usually exempt from such laws (North Carolina State Board of Dental Examiners v. Federal Trade Commission, 2015).*

**Difficulty Score.** In an effort to identify summary-level information across the many aspects of occupational licensing, AIR identified the most prominent data elements that contribute to the difficulty of obtaining and retaining a license in each state. Composite licensing difficulty scores were calculated for each state using 24 data elements that were considered the most relevant to difficulty. Across the 111 occupations, Nevada received a difficulty score of 2.84. Across the comparison states and Nevada, Nevada received the highest difficulty score (2.75). This reinforces the notion that obtaining and retaining a license in Nevada is more challenging than in states that are considered to have policies that reduce the burden on applicants.

Our team developed interactive data visualizations of the difficulty score in relation to salary for occupations in Nevada, the difficulty scores across comparison states and in three industries: Healthcare, Educational Services, and Professional Services. The Occupational Licensing Difficulty-Related Visuals can be found [here](#).

Occupational licensing boards in Nevada can use the data in this report to identify burdensome licensing requirements and initiate data-driven regulatory changes that lessen the burden on applicants and better support the state's workforce and industry. While regulatory changes are specific to individual boards, policymakers can use the findings in this report to drive legislation that impacts a broader range of boards within specific industries. State agencies, such as OWINN, may find this report helpful in understanding occupational licensing-related challenges within Nevada and the extent to which they contribute to broader workforce-related challenges in the state.

## Glossary & Acronyms

Listed below are the terminology and acronyms used in this report

### Glossary

<i>Nevada OL Database</i>	The Nevada OL Database refers to the database that contains occupational licensing (OL) requirement information gathered from publicly available sources for 111 licensed occupations in Nevada.
<i>Standard Deviation</i>	Standard Deviation is a metric that indicates the extent of deviation or variation within a set of values. A high standard deviation designates the values are dispersed over a wide range. A low standard deviation designates the values lie closer to the average of the set of values.

### Acronyms

<b>Acronym</b>	<b>Phrase</b>
<b>OL</b>	Occupational Licensing
<b>OWINN</b>	Office of Workforce Innovation
<b>AIR</b>	American Institutes for Research
<b>BLS</b>	Bureau of Labor Statistics
<b>GMC</b>	Good Moral Character
<b>NFA</b>	Nursing Facility Administrator
<b>RFA</b>	Residential Facility Administrator
<b>NCARB</b>	National Council of Architectural Registration Boards
<b>DORA</b>	Department of Regulatory Agencies
<b>GED</b>	General Educational Development
<b>CE</b>	Continuing Education
<b>STATES</b>	
<b>NV</b>	Nevada
<b>CO</b>	Colorado

<b>Acronym</b>	<b>Phrase</b>
<b>MT</b>	Montana
<b>SD</b>	South Dakota
<b>VT</b>	Vermont
<b>WY</b>	Wyoming
<b>COMPACTS</b>	
<b>eNLC</b>	Enhanced Nursing Licensure Compact
<b>PT Compact</b>	Physical Therapy Compact
<b>IMLC</b>	Interstate Medical Licensure Compact
<b>PSYPACT</b>	Psychology Interjurisdictional Compact
<b>APRN Compact</b>	Advanced Practice Registered Nurse Compact
<b>REPLICA</b>	Recognition of EMS Personnel Licensure Interstate Compact
<b>ASLP-IC</b>	Audiology & Speech-Language Pathology Interstate Compact
<b>ANALYSIS-SPECIFIC</b>	
<b>SD</b>	Standard Deviation
<b>NL</b>	No information located
<b>N/A</b>	Not applicable

## 1. Overview

The Nevada Governor’s Office of Workforce Innovation (OWINN) is in the process of reexamining the occupational licensing (OL) requirements for the state with a focus on efforts to better serve dislocated workers, transitioning service members, and veterans. The goal is to identify and understand the impact of OL policies and regulations and the extent to which they may create unnecessary barriers to the labor market. An additional goal is to develop an action plan that expands access to and improves the portability of and reciprocity for selected occupations. The American Institutes for Research (AIR) is working with OWINN to help accomplish these goals.

This report focuses on (1) the collection and analysis of publicly available occupational licensing information for Nevada and five comparison states, overall and by industry; (2) information collected during interviews with the board and staff members of 15 OL boards; and (3) actionable recommendations to reduce barriers to occupational licensing in Nevada.

The findings and discussion in this report draw on the quantitative data collection efforts on licensing requirements for 111 licensed occupations<sup>4</sup> in Nevada and a subset of 25 occupations in the five comparison states. We also leverage information gathered from the interviews with the 15 OL boards.





This report encapsulates the quantitative and qualitative analyses of all the data collected and highlights the differences in OL requirements between Nevada and the comparison states. In addition, the report looks at comparisons of licensed occupations across industries (e.g., healthcare, educational services). The data analysis is summarized in exhibits to show comparisons and snapshots by industry. In addition to the discussion of findings, we present actionable recommendations for removing barriers to occupational licensing.

The report is organized as shown in Exhibit 1.

---

<sup>4</sup> Most occupations researched as a part of this study are those for which an individual is granted a license. The Nevada State Board of Contractors does not license individuals—it licenses businesses. In order to receive a contractor’s license, a business is required to have at least one individual who is qualified to oversee the day-to-day business transactions and actual work being performed. As such, the AIR team gathered information on these requirements for contractor classifications.

## Exhibit 1. Organization of Report

 <b>Summary of Methodology</b>	Approach to the data collection and analysis for this study.
 <b>Findings &amp; Discussion</b>	Summary of select findings and discussion organized into five categories: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Nevada and comparison states</li><li>2. Populations of interest</li><li>3. Industry-level findings</li><li>4. Additional interview findings</li><li>5. Composite licensing difficulty scores</li></ol>
 <b>Conclusion</b>	Concluding remarks about the findings and discussion.
 <b>Appendices</b>	The appendices provide the following detailed information: Appendix A: Research method and approach Appendix B: List of 111 licensed occupations by industry Appendix C: List of subset of 25 occupations by industry Appendix D: Data elements and definitions Appendix E: Overall Nevada data analysis output Appendix F: Comparison state data analysis output

## 2. Summary of Methodology

To analyze the state of occupational licensing (OL) in Nevada and research OL barriers, we collected information on Nevada’s existing OL requirements and compared it to information on OL requirements in other states. The systematic collection of data allowed us to look closely at current OL policy and practice in Nevada and develop actionable recommendations for removing barriers to licensure. See Appendix A for a detailed description of the research method and approach.

### Data Collection Approach

We developed the Nevada OL Database of OL requirements, policies, and practice for licensed occupations in Nevada. The literature review conducted by the AIR team helped inform the data elements and categories to focus on for this study (Mitchel-Slantz et al., 2020). We identified 37 OL-related data elements across six categories as shown in Exhibit 2. [See Appendix D for a list of data elements and sub-elements, along with their definitions.]

#### Exhibit 2. Occupational Licensing Data Element Categories and Data Elements

Data Element Categories	Data Elements
<b>Entry Requirements</b>	Minimum age; Fingerprinting required; “Good moral character” clause; Initial fees; Fee waivers and discounts; Certification requirements; Licensing exam requirements; References; Frequency of application(s) review; Appeal process offered; Expedited processes; Insurance/surety bond; Additional fees
<b>Education &amp; Training Requirements</b>	Formal education requirements; Board-provided training program requirements; Supervised training requirements; Industry experience requirements; Policies that support access to licensure for target populations
<b>Renewal Requirements</b>	Renewal frequency; Renewal fees; Fee waivers and discounts; Continuing education (CE) requirements; Additional fees
<b>Justice-Involved Individuals</b>	Blanket bans; Predetermination process offered; Minimum wait period; Relationship between offense and occupation considered; Rehabilitation requirements
<b>Reciprocity &amp; Endorsement</b>	Reciprocity Provisions; Compact information; Endorsement Provisions

**Data Reported by OL Boards**

Total number of active licensees; Demographics; Names of licensees available; Licensee number available; Published mailing addresses of licensees available; Disciplinary action information

We worked with OWINN to prioritize a list of 111 licensed occupations<sup>5</sup> for inclusion in this study. [See Appendix B for list of occupations by industry.] Data related to the 111 occupations are referenced under the report as “NV OL 111.”

We also collected OL information from a sample of 25 occupations, which is a subset of the 111 occupations. These occupations were identified as those from in-demand industries (e.g., healthcare, education). OL information on the 25 occupations was collected for five comparison states: Colorado, South Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming, and Montana. The five comparison states were selected from a list of states that were recently identified as being the least burdensome with respect to occupational licensing (Carpenter II et al., 2017).

Information was collected from June through August 2020, and all data are based on information that was publicly available during this timeframe. Data was collected from licensing board websites and from other public sources when available (e.g., statutes, test administrator websites).

All data were confirmed through a quality assurance process that involved two additional team members reviewing the information against publicly available sources. It is important to note that when information was not found, the data element was coded as “no information available.” This could mean either that (1) the requirement exists, but it is not stated in a public format; or (2) the requirement does not exist, but we were not able to make that determination based on the information available.

Interviews were conducted with 15 board members and staff in Nevada. The interviews allowed for a deeper understanding of the board’s licensing processes, occupation and industry challenges, and regional differences among licensed occupations. Where relevant, this information is embedded in our analysis and findings.

In addition to the data collected on specific licensed occupations from public sources and the interviews conducted with 15 OL board representatives, we also leveraged findings from our previous OL-related work with OWINN. Specifically, the AIR team facilitated two Roundtable

---

<sup>5</sup> Most occupations researched as a part of this study are those for which an individual is granted a license. The Nevada State Board of Contractors does not license individuals—it licenses businesses. In order to receive a contractor’s license, a business is required to have at least one individual who is qualified to oversee the day-to-day business transactions and actual work being performed. As such, the AIR team gathered information on these requirements for contractor classifications.

events that have been informative to this study. Findings from Roundtable 1 are referenced in this report to supplement some parts of the discussion.<sup>6</sup>

- ❖ Roundtable 1, conducted virtually in May 2020, was attended by representatives of Nevada’s OL boards (Rege, Curnow, et al., 2020). During this roundtable, the first topic discussed focused on identifying the top barriers and challenges faced by potential licensees and legislative efforts to reduce barriers to occupational licensing. The second topic discussed focused on the process adopted when determining initial and renewal licensing requirements and policies, including fee structure.
- ❖ Roundtable 2, conducted in September 2020, was attended by representatives of Nevada’s OL boards and state agencies (Rege, Youngner, et al., 2020). During this roundtable, the first topic focused on identifying information about OL boards’ reporting requirements and the nature of these requirements. The second topic explored information sharing and solicited process-enhancement recommendations and suggestions from the participants.

### **Data Analysis Strategy**

Following the data collection process, the AIR team reviewed and analyzed the data for Nevada and the comparison states. We examined the differences in OL requirements between Nevada and the comparison states. Additionally, we looked at comparisons of licensed occupations across industries (e.g., healthcare, educational services). Information gathered from the board interviews was analyzed for themes. Qualitative information gathered from the board interviews was also incorporated to provide more context to the quantitative analysis of the data elements.

The team also determined a composite difficulty score for the licensed occupations, based on the most prominent factors that contribute to the difficulty of obtaining a license, based on previous literature and discussions with the OWINN team.

---

<sup>6</sup> Roundtable 2 focused on identifying information about OL boards’ reporting requirements and the nature of these requirements rather than on applicant licensing requirements. As such, findings from Roundtable 2 are not leveraged in this report.



### 3. Findings and Discussion

The most relevant findings on occupational licensing requirements from this study are presented and discussed in five sections in this chapter: Nevada and Comparison States, Populations of Interest, Industry-Level Findings, Additional Interview Findings, and Composite Licensing Difficulty Scores.<sup>7</sup>

#### Nevada and Comparison States

Findings from Nevada and the five comparison states are organized in this section by Entry Requirements, Education and Training Requirements, Renewal Requirements, Reciprocity & Endorsement Requirements, Data Reported by Licensing Boards, and Information Accessibility. All findings are presented in exhibits and discussed in the text. *Recommendations for the 111 occupations in Nevada are presented in green italics.*

As previously mentioned, we compared OL requirements for 25 occupations in Nevada and in the five comparison states. However, among these 25 occupations, not all of them are licensed occupations in the comparison states. Exhibit 3 shows the total number of these occupations that require licenses in the comparison states and that are accounted for in the analysis.

#### Exhibit 3. Number of Licensed Occupations in the Comparison States

Comparison State	Number of Licensed Occupations
Colorado	22
Montana	23
South Dakota	24
Vermont	23
Wyoming	23

Of note, the AIR team was unable to find licensing information for Veterinary Technicians in Montana, Colorado, Vermont, and Wyoming. Furthermore, Residential Facility Administrators (RFA) are not licensed in Colorado, South Dakota, and Vermont, and no information was found indicating licensure in Montana and Wyoming. This highlights a need to consider the necessity of licensing some of these occupations in Nevada. *We recommend looking closely at the job requirements for these occupations and their relationship to public health and safety when making these determinations.* No information was found indicating licensure of Practitioners of Respiratory Care in Colorado.

<sup>7</sup> For all findings, please see Appendices E and F.

## Entry Requirements

### Key Takeaways:

- *In the interest of aligning licensing requirements with job relevance, the need for a GMC requirement could be reassessed. In instances where it is determined that the requirement is relevant to the occupations, we encourage inclusion of the specific criteria on which applicants' character is assessed to promote transparency and clarity for applicants.*
- *Adjustments to licensing fee structures could reduce applicant financial burden.*

Data collected for entry-related licensing requirements include background information, exam scores, qualification requirements, and entry-related fees.

Exhibit 4A presents findings for entry-related licensing requirements for the full set of 111 occupations in Nevada as well as for the subset of 25 occupations within Nevada and the five comparison states.

### Exhibit 4A. Selected Entry-Related Licensing Requirements for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States<sup>8</sup>

Entry-Related Licensing Requirements	NV OL 111	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)					
		NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY
i. Minimum age (%)	77%	60%	32%	26%	21%	39%	44%
ii. Fingerprinting (%)	69%	68%	46%	35%	42%	13%	39%
iii. Good moral character (%)	84%	72%	0%	44%	42%	4%	NL
iv. References (%)	25%	32%	32%	26%	46%	48%	52%
v. Application review cycle (count)	27	7	2	9	2	4	9
vi. Appeal process (%)	56%	56%	100%	57%	79%	61%	91%

**Minimum age** is a requirement for 77% of the 111 licensed occupations in Nevada. When stipulated, these age requirements range from 16 to 21. For the subset of 25 occupations, a minimum age requirement is stated for 60% of the occupations in Nevada. This is high relative to the comparison states. *To minimize barriers for licensing applicants in Nevada, the need for a minimum age could be reassessed.*

**Fingerprinting** is a requirement for most of the 111 occupations (69%) in Nevada, as it is for 68% of the subset of 25 occupations in the state. In contrast, a minority of these occupations in

<sup>8</sup> All values in Exhibit 4A are rounded up to the nearest integer.

the comparison states stipulate a fingerprinting requirement. This highlights an additional requirement that applicants in Nevada have for the same occupations, and *the need for a fingerprinting requirement could be reassessed.*

**Good moral character (GMC)** clauses are often vague and do not specify the criteria against which an applicant's "good moral character" will be assessed. The degree to which boards decide to rely on a GMC statute in determining an applicant's acceptance into a licensed occupation can vary widely. While we were unable to find publicly available information on the boards' GMC assessment criteria, interviews with select Nevada OL board representatives revealed a broad scope of criteria used to determine an individual's character. While some boards rely on the applicant's criminal history, others rely on character references. Most of the representatives could not recall an instance when denial of licensure was based solely on the applicant's GMC. They shared that when their selection committee needs more information about an applicant, the board typically holds a hearing to discuss the applicant's criminal history or requests additional character references to substantiate the application.

As shown in Exhibit 4A (iii), across the comparison states for the subset of 25 occupations, Nevada has the highest percentage of occupations with good moral character requirements, at 72%. The team did not find instances of a GMC requirement for the same 25 occupations in Colorado or Wyoming. Some states have taken concrete action to remedy the subjective nature of this type of licensing requirement by enacting legislation directing the removal of GMC requirements for all licensed occupations in the state. For example, Oklahoma and Mississippi both enacted this type of legislation in 2019 (Oklahoma House Bill 1373, 2019; Mississippi Fresh Start Act, 2019). *In the interest of aligning licensure requirements with job relevance, the need for a GMC requirement could be reassessed. In instances where it is determined that the requirement is relevant to the occupations, we encourage inclusion of the specific criteria on which applicants' character is assessed to promote transparency and clarity for applicants.*

**References** are often required for the purpose of providing the names and contact details of individuals with whom applicant have previously worked and who can share information about their qualities and/or experience. Of the 111 occupations in Nevada, 25% stipulated a requirement for references. For the subset of 25 occupations, the percentage in Nevada that required references (32%) was similar to the percentages across the comparison states. As previously mentioned, interviews with OL board members revealed that some boards use references to determine an applicant's good moral character. While some boards reported using references in addition to other information provided by the applicant to make GMC assessments, at least one interviewee shared that they make the GMC assessment based solely on references. This requirement can create a more challenging barrier for specific populations,

such as justice-involved individuals and immigrants/foreign-trained professionals. For more information on special populations, see page 27.

**Application review cycle** refers to the frequency with which licensing applications are reviewed. The AIR team was able to find this information for only 27 of the 111 occupations in Nevada. For the subset of 25 occupations, this information was found for only seven occupations in Nevada, which was higher than in most of the comparison states. In Colorado, South Dakota, and Vermont, the AIR team found this information for only two to four occupations. In Montana and Wyoming, this information was found for only nine occupations. *Given that the AIR team could not find application review information for more than 27 of the 111 occupations in Nevada, OL boards might consider including this information on their websites to help manage applicant expectations.*

Interviews with select board members revealed that the timeframes required to process licensing applications vary widely. Estimates for how long the licensing process may take for an application ranged from two to four days to six months to a year. Interviewees who communicated shorter time estimates for the licensing process shared that the application review process for their board involved staff members reviewing most applications, leaving only the applications requiring follow-up to the board's discretion. Roundtable 1 participants also shared that in an effort to shorten the waiting period for those who need new or renewed licenses, boards conduct monthly board meetings and allow board staff to issue licenses on the same day in cases where the applicants do not have a criminal history (Rege, Curnow, et al., 2020).

**Appeal processes** allow applicants to appeal the rejection of an initial or renewal licensure application. Often, appeal provisions indicate a specific window of time the applicant has to request reconsideration of their application after being notified of the decision. More than half of the occupations (56%) in Nevada provided information about an appeal process for applicants denied a new or renewed license. This representation is similarly highlighted in the subset of 25 occupations – 56% of these occupations in Nevada specified an appeal process. When found, information about the appeal process was most often located in statutes and not on OL board websites. For the subset of 25 occupations, the appeal process is available for 100% of the occupations in Colorado. This is because licensed occupations are regulated under the Department of Regulatory Agencies (DORA), and the appeal process applies to all occupations under DORA. Other comparison states offer an appeal process for more than half of the subset of 25 occupations.

*Applicants may benefit by being able to find appeal process information on OL board websites. Providing clear language on the board website or on the application would allow more*

*applicants to be aware of this opportunity, should they be denied. Additionally, the inclusion of an appeal processes could benefit all applicants.*

Exhibit 4B presents findings for licensing exam requirements for the full set of 111 occupations in Nevada as well as for the subset of 25 occupations within Nevada and the five comparison states.

#### **Exhibit 4B. Selected Licensing Exam Requirements for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States<sup>9</sup>**

Licensing Exam Requirements	NV OL 111	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)					
		NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY
i. Exam requirement (%)	86%	88%	86%	78%	83%	83%	83%
ii. Administration frequency (%)	23%	51%	56%	58%	81%	78%	50%
iii. Testing accommodations (%)	71%	81%	96%	85%	78%	89%	85%

**Exam requirement** refers to the stipulation that applicants for a license are required to pass at least one exam to be eligible for initial licensure. Most occupations in Nevada specified that applicants were required to pass at least one exam (86%). Across the comparison states, the range of occupations that stated this requirement is 78% to 88%, with Nevada having the most occupations that require at least one exam.

**Administration frequency.** Exams that are administered frequently (at least once a month) help ensure that applicants are not required to wait for the next exam administration for their initial or retake attempt. Of the 111 occupations in Nevada that require exams, 23% are offered at least once a month. Across the comparison states, more than half of the occupations stipulate exams that are offered at least once a month. *Increased frequency of exam administration could allow applicants to more swiftly complete licensing requirements.*

**Testing accommodations** allow those with a disability to request reasonable arrangements to demonstrate their knowledge and skills in a testing situation. Some examples of accommodations are extending the amount of time an exam taker is given to complete a test or having someone else write down test answers. Testing accommodation information was found for 71% of the occupations in Nevada that require exams. For the subset of 25 occupations, testing accommodation information was found for a similar majority of the occupations in Nevada that require exams (81%). Across the comparison states, the range of occupations for which the AIR team found testing accommodation information was 78% (South Dakota) to 96% (Colorado). The prevalence of accommodations offered to applicants creates a more inclusive, fair process in which all applicants may adequately demonstrate their knowledge and skills on a

<sup>9</sup> All values in Exhibit 4B are rounded up to the nearest integer.

licensing exam. When applicants are required to pass exams, test accommodation information should be provided by exam providers.

Exhibit 4C presents findings for entry-related licensing fees for the full set of 111 occupations in Nevada as well as for the subset of 25 occupations in Nevada and the five comparison states.

**Exhibit 4C. Selected Entry-Related Licensing Fees for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States<sup>10</sup>**

Entry-Related Licensing Fees	NV OL 111	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)					
		NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY
i. Average exam(s) cost (\$) (SD)	\$448 (\$514)	\$611 (\$508)	\$586 (\$571)	\$709 (\$611)	\$630 (\$567)	\$620 (\$548)	\$579 (\$553)
ii. Average initial cost (\$) (SD)	\$1,022 (\$678)	\$1,031 (\$852)	\$582 (\$576)	\$663 (\$694)	\$841 (\$676)	\$716 (\$524)	\$799 (\$667)

**Average exam(s) cost** reflects the total cost that applicants incur to take all required exams for a licensed occupation. The average cost of exams across the 111 occupations in Nevada was found to be \$448. This average cost of exams was higher for the subset of 25 occupations (\$611). Across the comparison states, the average exam cost ranged from \$579 (Wyoming) to \$709 (Montana). Exam fees create a barrier to entry into licensed occupations, especially for applicants who must take multiple exams in order to apply for licensure.

**Average initial cost** refers to the sum of the initial licensing fee, exam costs (if applicable), and any additional fees payable by the applicant (e.g., fingerprinting fees, background check fees, application processing fees) across occupations. For occupations in Nevada, the average initial cost to obtain a license was found to be \$1,022 (SD = \$678). For the subset of 25 occupations in Nevada, the average initial cost was slightly higher, at \$1,031 (SD = \$852). In comparison, the same occupations in the comparisons states were found to require less of an initial financial investment, with average initial costs ranging from \$582 (Colorado) to \$841 (South Dakota).

During Roundtable 1, 50% of the participants reported having adjusted their fee structure within the past year, while others reported their fee structure for initial fees had not changed in over 10 years (Rege, Curnow, et al., 2020). Large fees can deter applicants from pursuing a career in a licensed profession, since it places a financial burden on them, adding to any existing debt they may have as a result of education and training. This is a particular concern for individuals who are economically disadvantaged. [See the discussion on “Economically

<sup>10</sup> All values in Exhibit 4C are rounded up to the nearest integer.

disadvantaged individuals” in the Populations of Interest section, on page 30.] *Adjustments to licensing fee structures could help to reduce applicant financial burden on applicants.*

## Education and Training Requirements

### Key Takeaways:

- Consider conducting a comparative analysis of Nevada’s education and experience requirements to those in other states to determine the existing differences in current minimum education requirements. Then evaluate these requirements with respect to public safety.
- Consider identifying additional opportunities where industry experience may replace some or all of the education and training hour requirements.

Data collected for education and training requirements include minimum education requirements, training hour requirements, and industry experience requirements.

Exhibit 5A presents findings for the minimum education requirements for the full set of 111 occupations in Nevada as well as for the subset of 25 occupations within Nevada and the five comparison states.

### Exhibit 5A. Minimum Education Requirement for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States<sup>11</sup>

Minimum Education Requirement	NV OL 111	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)					
		NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY
i. Some high school, no degree (%)	3%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ii. GED/high school (%)	6%	16%	36%	22%	4%	13%	4%
iii. Associate degree (%)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4%	N/A	9%
iv. Bachelor’s degree (%)	27%	44%	18%	35%	42%	52%	39%
v. Master’s degree (%)	8%	12%	9%	4%	4%	4%	4%
vi. Degree higher than master’s (%)	7%	8%	14%	13%	13%	13%	13%
vii. No minimum (%)	32%	4%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
viii. No information located (%)	16%	16%	23%	26%	33%	17%	30%

**Minimum education requirement** refers to the minimum level of education required of all applicants in order to obtain licensure for an occupation. Of the 111 occupations in Nevada, 32% did not have a minimum education requirement.<sup>12</sup> The most common requirement among

<sup>11</sup> All values in Exhibit 5A are rounded up to the nearest integer.

<sup>12</sup> This percentage is comprised of the occupations regulated by the Nevada State Contractors Board.



all 111 occupations in Nevada was for a bachelor's degree (27%), which was required by a similar percentage of Nevada's subset of 25 occupations (44%). Across the comparison states, Nevada had the most occupations requiring a master's degree (12%), but the fewest requiring a degree higher than a master's degree (8%).

During Roundtable 1, the participants shared that an educational requirement is a top barrier for applicants obtaining a license for the occupations regulated by their boards (Rege, Curnow, et al., 2020). They also shared that while education requirements can be rigorous, they are a necessary barrier to licensing.

The AIR team found instances in which certain occupations in Nevada require higher levels of education than are required for the same licensed occupations in a comparison state. For example, licensed architects in Nevada are required to have a minimum of a master's degree, while in Vermont there are combinations of education and experience that can qualify applicants for licensure. The Vermont Board of Architecture states that an applicant can (1) have a GED and nine years of diversified practical experience working under the supervision of an experienced practicing architect who has been licensed for more than three years; or (2) have graduated from a school or college accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board and have three years of experience.<sup>13</sup> Similarly in Colorado, experience requirements vary depending on the applicant's degree. Applicants with no degree are required to have the most experience, which must be gained through the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards' (NCARB) Intern Development Program.<sup>14</sup>

Similarly, Nursing Facility Administrators (NFAs) in Nevada are required to have a minimum of a bachelor's degree as well as to fulfill some training requirements. On the other hand, the qualifications for licensure in Colorado involve a combination of education and experience, with higher degrees paired with lower experience requirements.<sup>15</sup> In Montana, the licensing requirements are based on a point system in which the applicant's education and experience should total a minimum of 1,200 points and the applicant is required to have a minimum of a high school diploma or the equivalent.<sup>16</sup>

Lastly, engineers in Nevada are required to have a minimum of a bachelor's degree, along with four years of industry experience. In Colorado, engineer licensure applicants are required to have a minimum of a high school diploma or GED, which is paired with a requirement for 12 years of industry experience.

---

<sup>13</sup> [https://sos.vermont.gov/media/qyejymse/arc\\_rules.pdf](https://sos.vermont.gov/media/qyejymse/arc_rules.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1j438jl1uXNQmKjn6-7kjhxd4LGtPbTP8/view>

<sup>15</sup> <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-K5DhxXxJZbUDVIVWVkbIZvNEE/view>

<sup>16</sup> <http://boards.bsd.dli.mt.gov/Portals/133/NHA%20APP%208-2020.pdf>

*Consider conducting a comparative analysis of education and experience backgrounds required by boards in other states to determine the existing differences in current minimum education requirements. Then evaluate these requirements with respect to public safety.*

*Alternate pathways to licensed occupations such as potential internships, apprenticeships, or industry experience requirements may also benefit applicants. If, for example, certain types of experience are coupled with a lower education requirement, it could allow potential licensees to enter the workforce sooner. This could alleviate the burden of education requirements upon entry into a licensed occupation, thus limiting the investment of time and money required of the applicant upfront.*

Exhibit 5B presents selected findings on the education and training requirements for the full set of 111 occupations in Nevada as well as for the subset of 25 occupations within Nevada and the five comparison states.

**Exhibit 5B. Selected Education and Training Requirements for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States<sup>17</sup>**

Education & Training Requirements	NV OL 111	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)					
		NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY
i. Total education & training (hours) (SD)	1,676 (1,662)	1,483 (1,632)	865 (712)	2,747 (1,141)	2,083 (3,928)	153 (2,079)	1,056 (1,167)
ii. Industry experience (%)	55%	24%	36%	35%	25%	74%	26%
iii. Average industry experience (months) (SD)	47 (6)	48 (0)	110 (54)	48 (0)	NL	NL	51 (7)

**Total education and training hours** is the sum of the required education hours, board-provided training hours, and supervised training hours. This number is indicative of the time investment in training required of applicants prior to applying for licensure. The average total education and training hours requirement found across the 111 occupations in Nevada is 1,676 hours (SD = 1,662). This average is slightly lower for the subset of 25 occupations in Nevada (1,483 hours). Across the comparison states, the average total education and training hours required range from 153 hours (Vermont) to 2,747 hours (Montana). For the subset of 25 occupations, the requirement in Nevada is lower than in two comparison states (Montana and South Dakota) and higher than in three (Colorado, Vermont, and Wyoming).

**Industry experience requirements** refer to the minimum amount of work experience that an applicant must have within the applicable industry prior to applying for licensure. Industry experience gives individuals the opportunity to enter the workforce and gain first-hand

<sup>17</sup> All values in Exhibit 5B are rounded up to the nearest integer.

experience while earning a wage. Industry experience requirements were found for 55% of occupations in Nevada, with an average industry experience requirement of three years and 11 months (47 months). Across the comparison states, Nevada has the lowest number of occupations that require industry experience (24%), with an average of four years' experience required.

For the subset of 25 occupations, while the education and training hour requirements are higher in Nevada than in most of the comparison states, the industry experience requirements are lower than in the comparison states. As such, *Nevada may consider reviewing education/training and industry experience licensing requirements to identify occupations where some industry experience may replace education/training hours.*

## Renewal Requirements

### Key Takeaway:

- Consider performing a renewal fee comparison analysis across states and potentially reconsider the fee structure of occupational licensing in Nevada.

Data collected for renewal licensing requirements include costs related to license renewal and continuing education requirements. Exhibit 6 presents selected findings on the renewal requirements for the full set of 111 occupations in Nevada as well as for the subset of 25 occupations within Nevada and the five comparison states.

### Exhibit 6. Selected Renewal Requirements for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States<sup>18</sup>

Renewal Requirements	NV OL 111	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)					
		NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY
i. Total renewal cost per year (\$) ( <i>SD</i> )	\$401 (\$329)	\$182 (\$183)	\$30 (\$0)	\$102 (\$99)	\$58 (\$49)	\$75 (\$25)	\$119 (\$121)
ii. Continuing education (%)	57%	84%	64%	87%	79%	96%	87%

**Total renewal cost per year** is the sum of the renewal fee and any additional fees (e.g., late renewal fees, continuous fingerprinting fees) that applicants may be required to pay per year across occupations. This sum does not include continuing education costs. The average total renewal cost per year for licensees in the 111 occupations in Nevada is \$401 (*SD* = \$329). For the subset of 25 occupations, the average cost of renewal per year is considerably lower (\$182), although it remains higher than in any of the five comparison states, where it ranges from \$30 (Colorado) to \$119 (Wyoming). Large fees place a burden on licensees who want to continue practicing, adding to their financial debt and deterring them from pursuing a career in a licensed profession. *As such, a renewal fee comparison analysis across states may be helpful for potentially reconsidering fee structures.*

**Continuing education** is required to renew licenses for some licensed occupations. Typically, this requirement needs to be completed by the licensee prior to applying for a renewal and can place a burden on the licensee's investment in time and money. Of the 111 occupations, 57% stated that licensees were required to complete a continuing education requirement. For the subset of 25 occupations, 84% of the occupations in Nevada were found to have a continuing education requirement. Across the comparison states, 64% to 96% of occupations had a

<sup>18</sup> All values in Exhibit 6 are rounded up to the nearest integer.

continuing education requirement, and the continuing education requirements in Nevada are in the same range as those in the comparison states.

## Reciprocity and Endorsement Requirements

### Key Takeaways:

- Nevada may benefit from identifying opportunities to engage in reciprocity agreements with states that have similar occupational qualifications.
- Nevada was found to offer licensure by endorsement provision more often than the comparison states.
- If Nevada participated in more compacts, it could help increase worker mobility and combat the demand of licensed workers.

OL requirements often vary across states, which can create barriers to worker mobility. To circumvent this issue, OL boards participate in reciprocity agreements, offer endorsement provisions, and/or participate in compacts.

Due to a lack of shared vocabulary across OL boards, the AIR team relied on definitions and provisions for reciprocity and endorsement (outlined in Nevada Revised Statutes 622) to ensure consistency in the information being collected. When collecting information from licensing board websites and statutes, the AIR team assessed information against predetermined definitions. These definitions are:

- ❖ Reciprocity is a formal or informal agreement in which an OL board recognizes licensees of another state(s), if the board of that state (or states) extends reciprocal recognition of licensees from Nevada.
- ❖ Endorsement is defined as a provision in which the board determines whether an out-of-state license qualification is equivalent to its own state requirements on a case-by-case basis.

In addition to reciprocity agreements and endorsement provisions, there are interstate OL compacts, which typically adopt one of two models: mutual recognition or expedited licensure. Most compacts employ a mutual recognition model. Under this approach, licensees receive a multistate license if their state of residence is a compact member. The Interstate Medical Licensure Compact (IMLC) is the only OL compact that uses an expedited licensure method through which applicants request individual licenses from each state in which they intend to practice (The Council of State Governments, 2020). However, the compact adds efficiency to the application process efficient through data centralization and harmonized application requirements.

Exhibit 7 presents selected findings on the reciprocity, endorsement, and compact provisions for the full set of 111 occupations in Nevada as well as for the subset of 25 occupations within Nevada and the five comparison states.

**Exhibit 7. Selected Reciprocity, Endorsement, and Compact Provisions for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States<sup>19</sup>**

Reciprocity & Endorsement Provisions	NV OL 111	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)					
		NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY
i. Reciprocity Agreement (%)	1%	NL	23%	17%	13%	9%	4%
ii. Endorsement Provision (%)	89%	96%	91%	52%	79%	91%	96%
iii. Compact participation (count)	2 of 7	2 of 4	4 of 4	3 of 4	3 of 4	1 of 4	3 of 4

**Reciprocity agreements** were found for only one occupation (1%) in Nevada. Across the comparison states and Nevada, for the subset of 25 occupations, Nevada was the only state for which the AIR team was unable to identify any reciprocity agreements. Additionally, very few OL boards in Nevada stated their lack of participation in reciprocity agreements on their websites. In contrast, OL boards in the comparison states communicated their participation in reciprocity agreements through their websites and statutes. *There may be a need to prioritize and identify opportunities to engage in reciprocity agreements with other states that have similar qualifications. This would encourage mobility into Nevada for licensed professionals and would be particularly impactful for military spouses and occupations that face shortages in Nevada. In those instances where a licensing board excludes itself from participation in reciprocity agreements, it would benefit potential applicants to have clear information about this on the board’s website (e.g., as the Board of Psychological Examiners, State Bar of Nevada, and Chiropractic Physicians Board of Nevada do on their websites).*

**Endorsement provisions** were identified for 89% of the 111 occupations in Nevada. Across the comparison states, for the subset of 25 occupations, Nevada has one of the highest percentages of occupations that offered licensure by endorsement.

**Compact participation.** While seven interstate OL compacts<sup>20</sup> serve 10 of the 111 occupations<sup>21</sup> in Nevada, the state only participates in two compacts—the Psychology Interjurisdictional

<sup>19</sup> All values in Exhibit 7 are rounded up to the nearest integer.

<sup>20</sup> List of interstate compacts: Recognition of EMS Personnel Licensure Interstate Compact (REPLICA), Psychology Interjurisdictional Compact (PSYPACT), Interstate Medical Licensure Compact (IMLC), Enhanced Nurse Licensure Compact (eNLC), Advanced Practice Registered Nurse (APRN) Compact, Physical Therapy (PT) Compact, and Audiology & Speech-Language Pathology Interstate Compact (ASLP-IC).

<sup>21</sup> List of 10 occupations in Nevada served by compacts: Emergency Medical Technician (REPLICA); Psychologist (PSYPACT); Allopathic Physician and Osteopathic Physician (IMLC); Licensed Practical Nurse and Registered Nurse (eNLC); Advanced Practice Registered Nurse (APRN Compact); Physical Therapist (PT Compact); and Speech-Language Pathologists and Audiologist (ASLP-IC).

Compact (PSYPACT) and Interstate Medical Licensure Compact (IMLC). While previous attempts have been made to join the Enhanced Nurse Licensure Compact (eNLC) and the Physical Therapy (PT) Compact, these attempts have had limited success (Rege et al., 2019; Mitchell-Slantz et al., 2020).

For the subset of 25 occupations, four compacts serve six of the 25 occupations,<sup>22</sup> all of which are related to the healthcare industry. As shown in Exhibit 7, Nevada only participates in two of these four compacts. *If Nevada participated in more compacts, it could help increase worker mobility and combat the demand of licensed workers.*

As mentioned earlier, the AIR team identified a lack of shared vocabulary regarding reciprocity and endorsement across OL boards. It is the AIR team's experience that boards often referred to licensure by endorsement as reciprocity. *There is a need for a shared vocabulary to ensure licensing boards, applicants, and policymakers are referring to the same concepts.*

---

<sup>22</sup> The list of occupations in the subset of 25 occupations served by interstate compacts: Emergency Medical Technician (REPLICA); Allopathic Physician and Osteopathic Physician (IMLC); Licensed Practical Nurse and Registered Nurse (eNLC); and Physical Therapist (PT Compact).



## Data Reported by Licensing Boards

### Key Takeaway:

- *In the interest of consumer safety and awareness, Nevada could consider making board disciplinary action information publicly available, such as on OL board websites.*

Data were collected on the availability of demographic information, licensee names and addresses, and disciplinary action information. Information on the **number of active licensees** was found for 58 of the 111 occupations in Nevada. Licensee demographic information was only found for one occupation.

Exhibit 8 presents selected findings on the data reported by licensing boards for the full set of 111 occupations in Nevada as well as for the subset of 25 occupations within Nevada and the five comparison states.

### Exhibit 8. Selected Findings on the Data Reported by Licensing Boards for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States<sup>23</sup>

Data Reported by Licensing Boards	NV OL 111	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)					
		NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY
i. Licensee names (%)	77%	64%	100%	NL	NL	91%	83%
ii. Licensee addresses (%)	10%	16%	96%	N/A	N/A	91%	39%
iii. Disciplinary action information (%)	28%	52%	96%	NL	29%	91%	78%

**Licensee names** were located for most (77%) of the 111 occupations in Nevada. Across the comparison states, for the subset of 25 occupations, all occupations in Colorado reported licensee names. This is a function of Colorado’s centralized system, under which most licensed occupations are centralized under the DORA and an easy-to-navigate system where the website visitor can pull up licensee names by occupation.

**Licensee mailing addresses** were found for 10% of the 111 occupations in Nevada. Nevada has a much lower percentage of occupations reporting licensee addresses than do three of the comparison states. The AIR team was unable to identify information about the data reported by licensing boards for any of the subset of occupations in Montana and South Dakota.

<sup>23</sup> All values in Exhibit 8 are rounded up to the nearest integer.

**Disciplinary action** information was garnered from OL websites. This information was found for 28% of the 111 occupations in Nevada. The extent of information available varied across boards; while most published licensee names, fewer included details about the disciplinary action or the licensee’s employer at the time. *In the interest of consumer safety and awareness, Nevada could consider making board disciplinary action information publicly available, such as on OL board websites.*

## Information Accessibility

*Key Takeaway:*

- Presenting information in a more user-friendly format could benefit licensee applicants.

For each occupation for which data was collected, the team assessed the clarity, conciseness, and navigability of the information found on OL requirements. The ratings were scored on a 4-point scale, with 1 indicating that licensing information was vague (clarity), convoluted and verbose (conciseness), or difficult to locate and navigate (navigability) and 4 indicating that most of the information presented was clear and comprehensive (clarity), succinct and direct (conciseness), or easy to locate and navigate (navigability).

Information accessibility is calculated as the sum of the clarity, conciseness, and navigability ratings. As such, this score can range from 3 to 12. A score of 3 indicates that the licensing-related information was not clearly laid out, not concise, and not easily navigable. A score of 12 indicates that the information was very clearly laid out, concise, and easily navigable.

Exhibit 9 provides the average information accessibility scores of the data reported by licensing boards for the full set of 111 occupations in Nevada as well as for the subset of 25 occupations within Nevada and the five comparison states.

### Exhibit 9. Information Accessibility for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States<sup>24</sup>

	NV OL Database	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)					
		NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY
Information Accessibility Score (SD)	7.9 (1.7)	8.0 (1.9)	7.5 (0.9)	10.3 (1.2)	7.8 (2.9)	10.4 (1.0)	8.0 (0.9)

The information accessibility scores for the 111 occupations in Nevada is 7.9. For the subset of 25 occupations, Nevada’s average score is 8.0. Among the comparison states, Vermont ranked the highest for information accessibility, with an average of 10.4, followed by Montana, with an average of 10.3.

In terms of information clarity, it was the AIR team’s experience that most (61.2%) of the 111 occupations in Nevada were scored as 1 or 2, indicating that some or most of the licensing information was presented in a vague and/or confusing manner. In many instances, the data

<sup>24</sup> All values in Exhibit 9 are rounded up to the nearest integer.

collection team was unable to find OL requirement information on the OL board website and collected this information from statutes. Information presented in the statutes was not presented in a user-friendly manner and was sometime difficult for a layperson to understand. On occasion, licensing requirement information described on the website or application form conflicted with the information in the statutes, resulting in doubt about which information was accurate.

On the other hand, most occupations in Nevada scored a 3 or 4 for conciseness (77.4%), indicating that some or most of the licensing information was presented in a succinct and direct manner. For navigability, 49.5% of the occupations in Nevada scored a 3 or 4, indicating that some or most of the licensing information presented was easy to locate and navigate.

Most licensing information was identified through the licensing board website or statutes. However, in several instances, information was not found on the website or in the statutes. *Presenting information in a more user-friendly format could benefit licensee applicants.* One example of this was found in Colorado. The home page of each state licensing board website in Colorado has clearly labeled sections, and application checklists are provided under the “Applications” section. This allows the user to find information that is clearly presented in a straightforward manner.

## Populations of Interest

In this section, we present selected findings and discuss their implications for specific populations.

### Key Takeaways:

- *Blanket bans for justice-involved individuals could be reconsidered and OL boards might consider including information about predetermination processes on their websites.*
- *Identifying provisions for immigrant populations and education and/experience equivalencies could help to improve workforce shortage in certain industries.*
- *Licensing boards could consider offering waivers and/or discounts for applicants who are economically disadvantaged.*

### Justice-involved Individuals

Exhibit 10A presents selected findings on the data elements relevant to justice-involved individuals for the full set of 111 occupations in Nevada as well as for the subset of 25 occupations within Nevada and the five comparison states.

**Exhibit 10A. Data Elements Related to Justice-Involved Individuals for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States<sup>25</sup>**

Justice-Involved Individuals Provisions	NV OL 111	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)					
		NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY
i. Blanket ban for felonies (%)	5%	16%	0%	0%	NL	NL	4%
ii. Predetermination Process (%)	12%	20%	0%	NL	8%	13%	0%
iii. References (%)	25%	32%	32%	26%	46%	48%	52%

**Blanket bans** automatically disqualify applicants with felony convictions. As such, boards that implement blanket bans have no discretion to grant a license if an individual has a disqualifying conviction. While an automatic ban against anyone with a “violent” felony or a “sex offense” for an occupational license may seem reasonable, allowing boards to look more closely at the specifics of a crime and determine if an applicant poses a risk to public safety in a particular occupation could allow a greater number of people to enter an occupation while still protecting public safety (Rodriguez & Avery, 2016). For example, if a person’s criminal record includes an “assault,” it may imply a propensity for violence, but without knowing the circumstances of the offense—such as age and/or context—an automatic ban has the potential to unfairly exclude

<sup>25</sup> All values in Exhibit 10A are rounded up to the nearest integer.

strong applicants. Additionally, unreliable background checks can also present challenges in applying blanket bans in licensing decisions (Yu & Dietrich, 2012).

As shown in exhibit 10A, 5% of the 111 occupations in Nevada have blanket bans for felonies. For the subset of 25 occupations, 16% of the occupations in Nevada have blanket bans for felonies. The only comparison state that has blanket bans for felonies is Wyoming, at 4% of occupations. The AIR team found that none of the occupations in Colorado or Montana implement blanket bans for felonies. Information on blanket bans was not found for South Dakota or Vermont. *Nevada could consider alternatives to blanket bans for justice-involved individuals.*

**Predetermination process** allows an applicant with a criminal history to get a determination on eligibility prior to the completion of any education and/or training requirements. This process helps to ensure that people with criminal records are able to devote their time and resources to pursuing occupations that will lead to gainful employment (Umez & Pirius, 2018). Nevada Assembly Bill 319 (2019) allows applicants to petition a professional or OL board for a determination of whether their criminal history will disqualify them from obtaining a license. It also requires the board to implement a process for such a petition and establish requirements for that process. The AIR team was able to find information about a predetermination process for only 12% of the 111 occupations in Nevada. For the subset of 25 occupations, 20% of the occupations in Nevada include provisions that allow applicants to pursue a predetermination process. *OL boards might consider including information about predetermination processes on their websites to help inform applicants, since they may not find the bill itself.*

Apart from Nevada, South Dakota (8%) and Vermont (13%) are the only comparison states for which the AIR team could find predetermination process information, and in both cases the percentage of occupations offering a predetermination process is lower than in Nevada.

**References** are often required for the purpose of providing the names and contact details of individuals with whom applicants have previously worked and who can share information about their qualities and/or experience. [See the section on “Entry Requirements” in the Nevada and Comparison States section (page 7)]. While this may seem a common request for individuals seeking employment, it has the potential to create a barrier for justice-involved individuals and immigrants/foreign-trained professionals. These populations may not have a network from whom they can select references. As discussed in the section on “Entry Requirements” (page 7), interviews with OL board members revealed that some boards use references to determine an applicant's good moral character. Given the prevalence of GMC requirements among occupations in Nevada, *reconsidering the need and usefulness of reference requirements and*

*offering alternate requirements for those who may have limited reference options could increase access to licensed occupations.*

**Foreign-Trained Professionals and Immigrant Population**

AIR collected information relevant to foreign-trained professionals and immigrants. Exhibit 10B presents selected findings for data elements relevant to foreign-trained professionals and immigrants for the full set of 111 occupations in Nevada as well as for the subset of 25 occupations within Nevada and the five comparison states.

**Exhibit 10B. Data Elements Relevant to Foreign-Trained Professionals and Immigrant Population for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States<sup>26</sup>**

Foreign-Trained Professionals and Immigrant Population Provisions	NV OL 111	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)					
		NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY
i. Exams offered in more than one language (%)	3%	2%	0%	4%	8%	0%	8%
ii. Allowance of Interpreters (%)	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Provisions such as **offering licensing exams in languages other than English and the allowance of interpreters for exams** are particularly important for non-English speakers and/or foreign-trained professionals. However, in Nevada, only 3% of the exams required for all 111 occupations are offered in more than one language. For the subset of 25 occupations, only 2% of the exams required in Nevada are offered in more than one language. Some of the comparison states offer a higher percentage of exams in more than one language (up to 8% in South Dakota and Wyoming), but these numbers are still relatively low. Similarly, for the 111 occupations in Nevada, interpreters are allowed for only 3% of exams. For the subset of 25 occupations, no information was found about the allowance of an interpreter across the comparison states or Nevada.

During the interviews with boards, some interviewees shared that the licensing process for foreign-trained professionals is similar to the licensing process by endorsement. With the exception of the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners and Nevada State Board of Nursing, the AIR team was unable to locate detailed information regarding the licensing process for foreign-trained professionals on the OL websites or in statutes. In most cases, information for foreign-trained professionals was not clearly presented. *Provisions for immigrant-populations and education and/experience equivalencies could be considered, especially in industries where there are workforce shortages, which, in turn, could help minimize risks to public health and safety.*

<sup>26</sup> All values in Exhibit 10B are rounded up to the nearest integer.

**Military-Related Populations**

AIR collected information relevant to military-related populations (i.e., active military members, veterans, and military spouses). Exhibit 10C presents selected findings for the full set of 111 occupations in Nevada as well as for the subset of 25 occupations within Nevada and the five comparison states.

**Exhibit 10C. Data Elements Related to Military-Related Populations for Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States<sup>27</sup>**

Military-Related Population Provisions	NV OL 111	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)					
		NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY
i. Expedited process for military spouses	45%	32%	100%	NL	29%	NL	NL
ii. Initial fee waivers	20%	32%	NL	NL	25%	NL	NL
a. Active-duty military members	100%	100%	N/A	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
b. Veterans	23%	50%	N/A	N/A	NL	N/A	N/A
c. Military Spouses	23%	50%	N/A	N/A	33%	N/A	N/A
iii. Initial fee discount	17%	44%	NL	NL	NL	13%	NL
a. Active-duty military members	95%	91%	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	N/A
b. Veterans	74%	64%	N/A	N/A	N/A	NL	N/A
c. Military Spouses	100%	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	NL	N/A
iv. Licensure by endorsement	89%	96%	91%	52%	79%	91%	96%
a. Active-duty military members	26%	33%	10%	NL	21%	NL	NL
b. Veterans	26%	33%	10%	NL	NL	NL	NL
c. Military Spouses	29%	46%	NL	NL	21%	NL	NL
d. Surviving spouse of a veteran	23%	29%	NL	NL	NL	NL	NL

**Expedited application process** for military spouses in licensed occupations is important since military families tend to move every two to three years, often to different states. Of the 111 occupations in Nevada, 45% stated that they offer expedited processes for military spouses. For the subset of 25 occupations, 32% of the occupations in Nevada stated they offer expedited processes for military spouses. For Colorado, all of the subset occupations offer expedited application processes, as a result of being a part of a centralized system. This information was not found for Montana, Vermont, or Wyoming. *Additional expedited licensing processes for military spouses could be beneficial in Nevada.*

**Initial fee waivers and discounts** were found for military-related populations. Of the 111 occupations in Nevada, 20% offered initial fee waivers, all of which applied to active-duty military applicants. Twenty-three percent of the occupations offered initial fee waivers that applied to military spouses and veterans.

<sup>27</sup> All values in Exhibit 10C are rounded up to the nearest integer.



Seventeen percent of the 111 occupations offered initial fee discounts, all of which applied to military spouses. Ninety-five percent of these occupations offered initial fee discounts for active-duty military and 74% for veterans. The AIR team was unable to find information about initial fee waivers and discounts for military populations in most of the comparison states.

**Licensure by endorsement.** As previously discussed under “Reciprocity and Endorsement” in the Nevada and Comparison States section (page 19), endorsement provisions were identified for 89% of the 111 occupations in Nevada. Across the comparison states, for the subset of 25 occupations, Nevada has one of the highest percentage of occupations that offer licensure by endorsement. Of the 111 occupations in Nevada that offer endorsement provisions, 26% cater to active-duty military members and veterans, 29% to military spouses, and 23% to surviving spouses of veterans. Across the comparison states, for the subset of 25 occupations, most of the instances of endorsement provisions for military-related populations were found in Nevada, with this information not being found for most comparison states.

### ***Economically disadvantaged individuals***

The AIR team found that none of the 111 occupations in Nevada had provisions that catered to economically disadvantaged populations. This aligns with the AIR team’s findings during the Roundtable 1 event. During the event, the board members did not have input on whether their board’s fee structure made allowances for economically disadvantaged individuals (Rege et al., 2020). With the exception of exam-related waivers for economically disadvantaged applicants for teaching occupations in Colorado, the AIR team did not find evidence of provisions for this population in the comparison states either. However, other states have made progress on this front. By way of example, to help with lowering unemployment for economically disadvantaged individuals, Wisconsin Act 319 (2017) set a reduced fee for individuals with household incomes below 180% of the poverty line. *In light of the financial burden that licensing fees place on applicants, and to increase the rate of employment, waivers and/or discounts for applicants who are economically disadvantaged could be considered.*

## Industry-Level Findings

In this section, we present industry-level findings for the 111 occupations in Nevada. We also present findings by industry across the comparison states for the subset of 25 occupations and the discussion is limited to the Health Care and Social Assistance; Educational Services; and Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services industries.<sup>28</sup>

### *Nevada Overall*

#### *Key Takeaways:*

- *Within the Educational Services industry, no occupations state a good moral character requirement. However, they do state a blanket ban for felonies.*
- *Across the industries, the occupations in Manufacturing require the highest costs associated with obtaining and retaining a license.*

The 111 occupations in Nevada represent a total of 10 industries. In this section, we report selected findings for industries that are of particular interest to OWINN: Health Care and Social Assistance; Construction Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services; Educational Services; and Manufacturing. Exhibit 11A presents selected findings for the 111 occupations in Nevada across the five industries of interest, after which we discuss these findings.

---

<sup>28</sup> Within the subset of 25 occupations, there is only one occupation that represents the Construction industry. Since information on this occupation may not be representative of the entire industry in the comparison states, we will not discuss those findings. Additionally, the findings for the Manufacturing industry will not be discussed across the comparison states, since none of the occupations in the subset of 25 represent that industry.

**Exhibit 11A. Comparison of Data Elements Across Industries of Interest in Nevada<sup>29</sup>**

<i>Licensing Requirement/Provision</i>	Health Care & Social Assistance	Construction	Professional, Scientific, & Technical Services	Educational Services	Manufacturing
<b>1. Entry Requirements</b>					
i. Good moral character (%)	78%	97%	92%	0%	100%
ii. Exam requirement (%)	73%	100%	96%	100%	100%
iii. Average exam(s) cost (\$) (SD)	\$810 (\$867)	\$144 (\$48)	\$595 (\$228)	\$509 (\$62)	\$143 (\$55)
iv. Average initial cost <sup>30</sup> (\$) (SD)	\$968 (\$1,048)	\$1,244 (\$214)	\$1,019 (\$369)	\$694 (\$62)	\$1,279 (\$55)
v. Appeal process (%)	47%	97%	4%	100%	100%
<b>2. Education &amp; Training Requirements</b>					
i. Average training hours <sup>31</sup> (hours) (SD)	2,130 (1,518)	NL	2,540 (2,087)	22 (17)	NL
ii. Industry experience (months, number of occupations)	24, 1	47.25, 32	45.6, 20	N/A	48, 4
<b>3. Renewal Requirements</b>					
i. Average renewal cost per year <sup>32</sup> (\$) (SD)	\$177 (\$103)	\$292 (\$44)	\$91 (\$83)	\$30 (\$0)	\$300 (\$0)
ii. Total renewal cost per year <sup>33</sup> (\$) (SD)	\$228 (\$174)	\$777 (\$133)	\$208 (\$221)	\$30 (\$0)	\$800 (\$0)
<b>4. Justice-Involved Individuals</b>					
i. Blanket bans for felonies (%)	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
ii. Predetermination process (%)	33%	3%	NL	NL	NL
<b>5. Reciprocity &amp; Endorsement</b>					
i. Endorsement provisions (%)	89%	97%	84%	100%	100%

<sup>29</sup> All values in Exhibit 11A are rounded up to the nearest integer.

<sup>30</sup> Average initial cost is the sum of the initial application fee, exam fees, and additional entry fees across the 111 occupations in the Nevada OL Database.

<sup>31</sup> Average training hours is the sum of educational training, board-provided training, and supervised training hours across the 111 occupations in the Nevada OL Database.

<sup>32</sup> Average renewal cost per year is the renewal fee that applicants may be required to pay per year across occupations.

<sup>33</sup> Total renewal cost per year is the sum of the renewal fee and any additional fees (e.g., late renewal fees, continuous fingerprinting fees) that applicants may be required to pay per year across occupations.

**Entry Requirements.** With the exception of the Educational Services industry, most occupations across industries in Nevada stipulate a good moral character requirement. Most, if not all, occupations across industries require applicants to pass at least one licensing exam. The AIR team was able to find appeal-related information for occupations across most industries, allowing applicants to most occupations to appeal the rejection of an initial or renewal licensure application. In terms of costs related to entry requirements, average initial costs range from \$694 to \$1,279, with the highest average initial costs for occupations in Manufacturing (\$1,279) and Construction (\$1,244). Contrary to the average initial costs, average exam costs—which range from \$143 to \$810—are the highest for Health Care and Social Assistance (\$810), Professional, Scientific, & Technical Services (\$595), and Educational Services (\$509).

**Education & Training Hours.** Average training hours were found to be the highest for occupations in the Professional, Scientific, & Technical Services industry (2,540 hours), followed by the Health Care and Social Assistance industry (2,130 hours). While no information about average training hours was located for Manufacturing occupations, industry experience requirements were found to be the highest for this industry (48 months), followed by Construction (47.25 months) and Professional, Scientific, & Technical Services (45.5 months).

**Renewal Requirements.** There is much variability in renewal-related costs across industries in Nevada. The average renewal cost per year and total renewal costs are the highest for occupations in the Manufacturing (\$300 and \$800, respectively) and Construction (\$292 and \$777, respectively) industries. As such, across industries, occupations in Manufacturing have the highest costs associated with retaining a license.

The average renewal cost per year and total renewal costs are considerably lower for occupations in the Health Care and Social Assistance (\$177 and \$228, respectively) and Professional, Scientific, & Technical Services (\$91 and \$208, respectively) industries. These costs were lowest for occupations in the Educational Services industry, at \$30 each.

**Justice-Involved Individuals.** With the exception of the Educational Services industry, occupations across industries in Nevada do not stipulate blanket bans for felonies. Additionally, the AIR team was unable to find information about a predetermination process for occupations in most industries. It was found for only a third of the occupations in the Health Care and Social Assistance industry and 3% of the occupations in Construction.

**Endorsement Provisions.** All of the occupations in the Educational Services and Construction industries offer licensure by endorsement. Information about licensure by endorsement was not found for a small number of occupations in the other industries.

## Health Care & Social Assistance

### Key Takeaways:

- Across the comparison states and Nevada, the costs associated with obtaining/retaining a license in the Health Care and Social Assistance occupations are highest in Nevada.
- The average training hour requirements for occupations in the Health Care and Social Assistance industry in Nevada are lower than in three comparison states.
- Only in Nevada and Wyoming do all occupations in this industry offer licensure by endorsement.

Within the subset of 25 occupations, 13 occupations represent the Health Care and Social Assistance industry in Nevada. Exhibit 11B presents selected findings for this industry across Nevada and the comparison states.

### Exhibit 11B. Comparison of Data Elements Across Nevada and the Five Comparison States for Health Care and Social Assistance<sup>34</sup>

Licensing Requirement/Provision	NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY
<b>1. Entry Requirements</b>						
i. Good moral character (%)	77%	0%	42%	75%	8%	NL
ii. Exam requirement (%)	77%	73%	67%	67%	67%	67%
iii. Average initial cost <sup>35</sup> (\$) (SD)	\$1,130 (\$1,155)	\$574 (\$716)	\$823 (\$823)	\$1,122 (\$849)	\$731 (\$702)	\$930 (\$897)
iv. Appeal process (%)	69%	100%	42%	100%	75%	92%
<b>2. Education &amp; Training Requirements</b>						
i. Average training hours <sup>36</sup> (hours) (SD)	1,352 (1,506)	548 (639)	3,000 (0)	500 (0)	1,944 (1,493)	1,750 (1,768)
<b>3. Renewal Requirements</b>						
i. Average renewal cost per year <sup>37</sup> (\$) (SD)	\$159 (\$106)	NL	\$142 (\$99)	\$247 (\$212)	\$294 (\$215)	\$167 (\$141)
ii. Total renewal cost per year <sup>38</sup> (\$) (SD)	\$220 (\$142)	NL	\$152 (\$111)	\$102 (\$55)	\$78 (\$33)	\$147 (\$101)
<b>4. Justice-Involved Individuals</b>						
i. Blanket bans for felonies (%)	0%	0%	0%	NL	0%	8%
ii. Predetermination process (%)	39%	0%	NL	8%	8%	0%

<sup>34</sup> All values in Exhibit 11B are rounded up to the nearest integer.

<sup>35</sup> Average initial cost is the sum of the initial application fee, exam fees, and additional entry fees across the 111 occupations in the Nevada OL Database.

<sup>36</sup> Average training hours is the sum of educational training, board-provided training, and supervised training hours across the 111 occupations in the Nevada OL Database.

<sup>37</sup> Average renewal cost per year is the renewal fee that applicants may be required to pay per year across occupations.

<sup>38</sup> Total renewal cost per year is the sum of the renewal fee and any additional fees (e.g., late renewal fees, continuous fingerprinting fees) that applicants may be required to pay per year across occupations.

Licensing Requirement/Provision	NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY
<b>5. Reciprocity and Endorsement</b>						
i. Endorsement provisions (%)	100%	82%	42%	75%	92%	100%

**Entry Requirements.** Across the comparison states, most occupations in Health Care and Social Assistance require applicants to take at least one entry exam.

**Good moral character** requirements are stipulated for most occupations in this industry in Nevada and South Dakota. In contrast, very few occupations in Vermont and no occupations in Colorado stipulate this requirement. The average initial cost, which ranges from \$574 to \$1,130, is highest in Nevada (\$1,130), followed by South Dakota (\$1,122). As such, across the comparison states and Nevada, the costs associated with obtaining a license in the Health Care and Social Assistance occupations are the highest in Nevada. Not all occupations across the comparison states stipulate provisions for appeal processes. With the exception of Colorado and South Dakota, at least some occupations across the states do not have appeal process provisions.

**Education & Training Hours.** The average number of training hours for occupations in the Health Care and Social Assistance industry ranges from 500 to 3,000 hours, with Nevada averaging 1,352 hours, which is lower than in three comparison states.

**Renewal Requirements.** Ranging from \$78 to \$220, the total renewal cost per year is highest in Nevada and is similar to the average initial cost. As such, across the comparison states and Nevada, the costs associated with retaining a license in the Health Care and Social Assistance occupations are highest in Nevada.

The average renewal cost per year ranges from \$142 to \$294 across all comparison states, with an average renewal fee per year of \$159 in Nevada.

**Justice-Involved Individuals.** Across the comparison states and Nevada, Nevada has the highest percentage of occupations that offer a predetermination process (39%).

**Endorsement Provisions.** All occupations within this industry in Nevada and Wyoming offer licensure by endorsement.

## Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services

### Key Takeaways:

- Across the comparison states and Nevada, good moral character requirements were only found for occupations in Nevada for the Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services industry.
- The costs associated with obtaining and retaining a license in the Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services occupations are highest in Nevada.
- Education and training requirements in Nevada are comparable to the requirements across the comparison states where this information was found.

Within the subset of 25 occupations, there are six occupations in Nevada that represent the Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services industry. Exhibit 11C presents selected findings for this industry across Nevada and the five comparison states.

### Exhibit 11C. Comparison of Data Elements Across Nevada and the Five Comparison States for Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services<sup>39</sup>

Licensing Requirement/Provision	NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY
<b>1. Entry Requirements</b>						
i. Good moral character (%)	100%	0%	NL	NL	0%	NL
ii. Exam requirement (%)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
iii. Average initial costs <sup>40</sup> (\$) (SD)	\$991 (\$369)	\$767 (\$419)	\$920 (\$426)	\$915 (\$556)	\$943 (\$366)	\$828 (\$330)
iv. Appeal process (%)	NL	100%	80%	17%	20%	100%
<b>2. Education &amp; Training Requirements</b>						
i. Average training hours <sup>41</sup> (hours) (SD)	3735 (375)	NL	3740 (N/A)	3740 (N/A)	NL	NL
ii. Industry experience (months, number of occupations)	48, 4	144, 4	48, 4	N/A	N/A	48, 4
<b>3. Renewal Requirements</b>						
i. Average renewal fee per year <sup>42</sup> (\$) (SD)	\$76 (\$52)	NL	\$51 (\$2)	\$34 (\$14)	\$76 (\$1)	\$49 (\$8)
ii. Total renewal cost per year <sup>43</sup> (\$) (SD)	\$139 (\$34)	NL	\$57 (\$13)	\$38 (\$6)	\$76 (\$1)	\$49 (\$8)

<sup>39</sup> All values in Exhibit 11C are rounded up to the nearest integer.

<sup>40</sup> Average total initial fees is the sum of the initial application fee, exam fees, and additional entry fees across the 111 occupations in the Nevada OL Database.

<sup>41</sup> Average training hours is the sum of educational training, board-provided training, and supervised training hours across the 111 occupations in the Nevada OL Database.

<sup>42</sup> Average renewal cost per year is the renewal fee that applicants may be required to pay per year across occupations.

<sup>43</sup> Total renewal cost per year is the sum of the renewal fee and any additional fees (e.g., late renewal fees, continuous fingerprinting fees) that applicants may be required to pay per year across occupations.

Licensing Requirement/Provision	NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY
<b>4. Reciprocity &amp; Endorsement</b>						
i. Endorsement provisions (%)	83%	100%	100%	83%	100%	100%

**Entry Requirements.** Good moral character requirements are stipulated for all occupations in the Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services industry in Nevada. Across the comparison states, this requirement was either not stipulated or this information was not found. The average initial costs range from \$767 to \$991, with the highest average cost in Nevada. As such, the costs associated with obtaining a license in the Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services occupations are highest in Nevada. With the exception of Nevada, appeal process-related information was found for at least some occupations in this industry across the comparison states. This information was not found for Nevada.

**Education and Training Hours.** The average training hours and industry experience requirements in Nevada are comparable to these requirements in the comparison states where this information was found.

**Renewal Requirements.** Ranging from \$38 to \$139, the total renewal cost per year is highest in Nevada and is similar to the average initial cost. The average renewal cost per year ranges from \$34 to \$76, with the highest fee in Vermont and Nevada. As such, the costs associated with retaining a license in the Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services occupations are highest in Nevada.

### **Educational Services**

*Key Takeaways:*

- *Only Nevada and Colorado have no occupations within the Educational Services industry that stipulate a good moral character requirement.*
- *Blanket bans for felonies were only found in Nevada for occupations within the Educational Services industry.*
- *Across the comparison states and Nevada, the average cost of obtaining a license in the Educational Services occupations is highest in Nevada. However, the average cost of retaining a license per year is lower in Nevada than in most of the comparison states.*

Within the subset of 25 occupations, there are four occupations in Nevada that represent the Educational Services industry. Exhibit 11D presents selected findings for this industry across Nevada and the comparison states.



**Exhibit 11D. Comparison of Data Elements Across Nevada and the Comparison States for Educational Services<sup>44</sup>**

<i>Licensing Requirement/Provision</i>	NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY
<b>1. Entry Requirements</b>						
i. Good moral character (%)	0%	0%	100%	NL	NL	NL
ii. Number of exams (%)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
iii. Average initial cost <sup>45</sup> (\$) (SD)	\$685 (\$66)	\$229 (\$24)	\$66 (\$60)	\$352 (\$20)	\$362 (\$37)	\$389 (\$22)
<b>2. Education &amp; Training Requirements</b>						
i. Average training hours <sup>46</sup> (hours) (SD)	27 (18)	NL	NL	1 (0)	60 (0)	2 (0)
<b>3. Renewal Requirements</b>						
i. Average renewal cost per year (\$) (SD)	\$23 (\$5)	\$30 (\$0)	\$6 (\$0)	\$12 (\$0)	\$75 (\$29)	\$40 (\$0)
ii. Total renewal cost per year (\$) (SD)	\$23 (\$5)	\$30 (\$0)	\$6 (\$0)	\$12 (\$0)	\$75 (\$29)	\$40 (\$0)
<b>4. Justice-Involved Individuals</b>						
i. Blanket bans (%)	100%	0%	0%	NL	0%	0%
ii. Predetermination process (%)	NL	0%	NL	NL	50%	0%
<b>5. Reciprocity &amp; Endorsement</b>						
i. Endorsement provisions (%)	100%	100%	NL	100%	100%	100%

**Entry Requirements.** No occupations in the Educational Services industry in Nevada or Colorado stipulate a good moral character requirement. The average initial cost ranges from \$66 to \$685, with the cost being the highest in Nevada. As such, across Nevada and the comparison states, the average cost of obtaining a license in the Educational Services occupations is highest in Nevada.

**Education & Training Hours.** Across Nevada and the comparison states, the average number of training hours for occupations in the Educational Services industry ranges from 1 to 60 hours, with the requirement in Nevada being 27 hours.

**Renewal Requirements.** The total renewal cost per year ranges from \$6 to \$75 across Nevada and the comparison states, with the cost in Nevada being at the lower end, at \$23. The average yearly cost of retaining a license is lower in Nevada than in most comparison states, with the highest cost in Vermont and the lowest in Montana.

<sup>44</sup> All values in Exhibit 11D are rounded up to the nearest integer.

<sup>45</sup> Average total initial fees is the sum of the initial application fee, exam fees, and additional entry fees across the 111 occupations in the Nevada OL Database.

<sup>46</sup> Average training hours is the sum of educational training, board-provided training, and supervised training hours across the 111 occupations in the Nevada OL Database.

**Justice-Involved Individuals.** All Educational Services occupations in Nevada were found to have blanket bans for felonies. In comparison, no blanket bans for felonies were found across the comparison states (this information was not located for Vermont). Information about a predetermination process was not located for some comparison states or Nevada. In Vermont, 50% of occupations offered this process. No occupations in Colorado or Wyoming offered a predetermination process.

## Additional Interview Findings

As previously mentioned, the AIR team interviewed board and staff members of 15 OL boards. The findings from these interviews that were relevant to the OL requirement information collected from public sources have been discussed in previous sections, specifically in the context of GMC requirements, references, application review cycles, and foreign-trained professionals and Immigrant populations.

In this section, we share additional interview findings that are not directly related to the OL requirements. Most of the boards that participated in the interviews regulated occupations that were included in the subset of 25 occupations.<sup>47</sup> An interview with the Nevada State Barbers' Health and Sanitation board was specifically requested by Nevada's OL Working Group. Exhibit 12 lists the names of the participating OL boards.

### Exhibit 12. Occupational Licensing Boards That Participated in The Interviews Conducted by the AIR Team in November 2020

Occupational Licensing Boards
1. The State of Nevada Department of Education
2. The Nevada State Board of Dental Examiners
3. The Nevada State Board of Examiners for Long Term Care Administrators
4. The Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners
5. The Nevada State Board of Nursing
6. The Nevada State Board of Osteopathic Medicine
7. The Nevada State Board of Pharmacy
8. The State of Nevada Board of Examiners for Social Workers
9. The Nevada State Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners
10. The State of Nevada Board of Occupational Therapy
11. The State of Nevada Board of Physical Therapy
12. The Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors
13. The Nevada State Contractors Board
14. The Nevada State Board of Architecture, Interior Design and Residential Design
15. The Nevada State Barbers' Health and Sanitation Board

<sup>47</sup> The AIR team was unable to secure an interview with a representative from the Division of Public and Behavioral Health of the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services.

### **Board Member Composition**

Interviewees shared that the total number of board members for this subset of OL boards ranges from 5 to 11. All interviewees shared that their board has a professional member majority and includes at least one member of the public.

For OL boards that regulate licensing for multiple occupations, shared board member composition is reflective of the distribution of licensed members, ensuring representation of all occupations impacted. For example, the representative from the Nevada State Board of Architecture, Interior Design and Residential Design shared that its board has nine members: five architects, two interior designers, one residential designer, and one member of the public. Similarly, the Nevada State Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners representative shared that its board has eight members: six veterinarians, one veterinary technician, and one member of the public.

McLaughlin et al. (2018) suggest ensuring that fewer than 50% of voting board members are practitioners to reduce the risk that the board would pass self-interested regulations. This recommendation is consistent with the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in 2015 in *North Carolina State Board of Dental Examiners v. Federal Trade Commission*, in which the court established that state boards composed of a majority of active market participants and not actively supervised by the state are subject to antitrust laws, unlike other state agencies, which are usually exempt from such laws.

### **Current and Future Challenges**

The 15 OL boards were asked about challenges that are currently being experienced by potential and current licensees. Two broad themes of COVID-19–related challenges emerged during these interviews. One related to the challenges related to the implementation of licensing processes due to COVID-19 and the techniques used by boards to adapt and help applicants. The second related to COVID-19–related challenges and changes to the practice of licensed professions.

**Licensing processes.** The most common COVID-19–related impact that interviewees shared was associated with delayed timelines. For example, OL boards are experiencing delays in background checks and fingerprint processing, in turn affecting how long it takes the board to issue a license. Additionally, the frequency with which applicants can sit for exams has been reduced—or, in some cases, halted altogether—due to exam site closures.

In addition to exam delays, applicants' testing experiences have evolved due to COVID-19. For example, due to social distancing measure, the dental examiners' exam administrator is temporarily administering mannequin-based exams, in lieu of utilizing live patients, for the

licensing exam. Due to the change in testing arrangements, applicants who pass the mannequin-based exam are granted temporary licenses, and a permanent license will be issued after COVID-19 restrictions are lifted and licensees retake and pass the exam with live patients. Temporary or provisional licenses have also been introduced as a method to meet the high demand of certain occupations in the state, such as those in the medical industry, due to the pandemic.

Throughout the pandemic, timely communication with applicants, existing licensees, and consumers whom boards serve has become increasingly important. Interviews revealed proactive communication strategies that leverage OL board websites and e-newsletters. In some cases, boards shared they renovated their website or created a new communication method at the beginning of COVID-19, while others stated they were thankful they had moved the paper licensing process to an online format in recent years.

**Practice of licensed occupations.** As a result of stay-at-home or shelter-in-place orders, many professionals have transitioned to working from home. With many schools closed as a result of COVID-19, educators were met with the challenge of instructing virtually. For professionals in the medical industry, on the other hand, working from home meant meeting the need for telehealth with physicians, nurses, social workers, dentists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, and veterinarians.

The sharp rise in demand for licensed medical professionals amid the global pandemic is taking its toll on these front-line workers. The Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners reported increasing levels of stress, burnout, and suicide among licensed physicians. For these individuals, who must continue to travel into work, changes can be seen in how they operate in their workspace. For example, some boards reported modifying workplace guidelines in order for professionals to safely reenter the workforce, while others reported clinical rotations and internships being offered less frequently.

The Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors shared concerns about revenue to fund future projects, particularly in the public sector. Because the economy relies heavily on gaming, development, and construction, there is a question as to what will happen to public-sector projects when tax revenues are depleted and there is less money for public agencies to complete them. The interviewee shared concerns about Nevada losing licensed Engineers and Land Surveyors if development projects halt, similar to the board's experience during the 2008 recession.

The Nevada State Board of Nursing shared a foreseeable challenge related to the nursing shortage and the impending need for nurses as the United States (and Nevada) prepare to enter an era of COVID-19 vaccination. Nurses are the largest group of vaccinators, making this

challenge even more pertinent. Participating in the enhanced Nursing Licensure Compact (eNLC) would help Nevada combat this challenge effectively. Through the compact, nursing professionals from other compact states would be allowed to easily enter and practice in Nevada. Our previous work with Nevada revealed pushback from the labor unions with regard to participation (Rege, Youngner, et al., 2020). The Nevada State Board of Nursing, at the time, expressed a strong desire to revisit the compact legislation in 2021. Another way to combat the nursing shortage is by establishing selection criteria that will readily recognize the credentials of foreign-trained professionals (Rege & Curnow, 2020).

### **Regional Differences**

Board representatives were asked about region-specific challenges for the occupations regulated by their OL board. Some boards emphasized that the southern part of Nevada has a larger population, which in turn leads to higher demand. Most boards highlighted the differences between rural and urban areas over differences between areas in southern and northern Nevada.

Boards shared that rural areas, which are more remote and isolated, experience challenges related to access to care for consumers. Some boards shared that it is a struggle to fill positions and meet demand in rural Nevada. On the other hand, for some occupations there is often sufficient manpower to fill comparatively fewer positions in remote areas. In urban locations such as Clark County, the high volume required to serve such a large population has been met with difficulty in filling positions. In the education field, for example, substitutes may be utilized in these situations, but these individuals are often educators outside of the needed area of expertise. This is particularly true in the areas with the biggest vacancies: special education and elementary education.

The Nevada State Teacher Recruitment and Retention Advisory Task Force identified a lack of resources for licensees and their families as another challenge facing rural areas. For example, some teachers must bus for hours to remote areas in order to reach the populations they serve because closer housing is unavailable. To mitigate this challenge, the Task Force recommends that the legislature “work with appropriate entities and developers to conduct a feasibility study and cost analysis for providing affordable or subsidized housing to educators” (Nevada State Teacher Recruitment and Retention Advisory Task Force, 2020).

During Roundtable 1, board members highlighted the importance of national boards. These spaces give board members a place to network and discuss common occupation-related issues or challenges and mitigation techniques (Rege, Curnow, et al., 2020). Additionally, interviews with board members and board staff revealed commonalities across boards in the type of challenges facing the rural workforce. Accessibility of care was a challenge, for instance, mentioned by the nursing, dentistry, and medical examiner boards. These commonalities indicate a need for inter-board communication in the OL space, particularly within the same

industry. This would allow boards to communicate, network, and unify to find practical solutions to common problems.

### Composite Licensing Difficulty Scores

In an effort to identify summary-level information across the many aspects of occupational licensing, AIR identified data elements that contribute to the difficulty of obtaining and retaining a license in each state. Composite licensing difficulty scores were calculated for each state using 24 data elements that were considered the most relevant to difficulty. Scores were assigned for each data element with a range from -1 to +1, with positive numbers representing greater difficulty and negative numbers represented decreased difficulty. The data elements were equally weighted in these calculations, resulting in a potential range of scores from -8 (indicating the lowest possible difficulty score) to +14 (indicating the highest possible difficulty score).

Exhibit 13 provides additional details on the data elements used for this composite score.

#### Exhibit 13. Data Elements Used to Calculate Composite Licensing Difficulty Scores

Data Element Categories	Data Elements
<i>Entry Requirements</i>	Minimum Age; Fingerprinting; Good Moral Character; Average Initial Cost; Appeal Process Offered; Licensee Mailing Addresses
<i>Education &amp; Training Requirements</i>	Minimum Education; Training Hours; Industry Experience; Number of Exams; Total Cost of Exams; Certification
<i>Renewal Requirements</i>	Renewal Fee Per Year; Total Additional Fees; Continuing Education
<i>Special Populations</i>	Blanket Bans; Predetermination Process; Initial Fee Waiver; Initial Fee Discount; Military Endorsement
<i>Reciprocity &amp; Endorsement</i>	Licensure by Endorsement; Reciprocity Agreement Compact Participation; Total Endorsement Fees

Exhibit 14 shows composite licensing difficulty scores for the 111 occupations in Nevada and for the subset of 25 occupations within Nevada and the five comparison states.

#### Exhibit 14. Difficulty Scores for Occupations in the Nevada (Overall and the Subset of 25) and the Five Comparison States

	NV OL 111	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)					
		NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY
Composite Difficulty Score	2.84	2.75	0.84	1.66	0.72	1.77	1.26

The composite difficulty score was calculated across occupations for the 111 occupations in Nevada and across comparison states and Nevada for the subset of 25 occupations. Across the



111 occupations, Nevada received a difficulty score of 2.84. Across the comparison states and Nevada, Nevada received the highest difficulty score (2.75). This reinforces the notion that obtaining and retaining a license in Nevada is more challenging than in states that are considered to have policies that reduce the burden on applicants.

## 4. Conclusion

The percentage of employed Americans working in jobs that require an occupational license has steadily grown over time, from just 5% in the 1950s to 24.1% in 2018 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018), owing to the increase in OL laws. Given the increase in occupational licensure, there is value in identifying and understanding the impact of OL policies and regulations at the state level and the extent to which they may create unnecessary barriers to the labor market. The findings of this study on the state of occupational licensing in Nevada highlight areas where legislative and regulatory changes to licensing requirements may serve to remove or reduce unnecessary requirements that can often create burden and barriers for applicants.

The data in this report can be used by OL boards to identify burdensome licensing requirements and initiate data-driven regulatory changes that lessen the burden on applicants and better support the workforce and industry. While regulatory changes are specific to individual boards, policymakers can use the findings in this report to drive legislation that impacts a broader range of boards within specific industries. State agencies, such as OWINN, may find this report helpful to understand OL-related challenges within Nevada and the extent to which they contribute to broader workforce-related challenges in the state.

---

We thank the occupational licensing board members for their time and cooperation during AIR's interviews. We would also like to thank Mayita Sanchez, Isla Young, Ansara Martino, Andres Feijo, and the Nevada Office of Workforce Innovation for their partnership on and sponsorship of this work.

From AIR, we thank Dr. Robert Calderón for his valuable insight and guidance through the data analyses and development of this report. We also thank Martin Hahn for his editorial review.

## References

- Carpenter II, D. M., Knepper, L., Sweetland, K., & McDonald, J. (2017, November). *License to work: A national study of burdens from occupational licensing*. <https://ij.org/wp-content/themes/ijorg/images/ltw2/License to Work 2nd Edition.pdf>
- McLaughlin, P. A., Mitchell, M. D., Philpot, A., & Winter, T. (2018, March). *The state of occupational licensure in Nevada*. Arlington, VA: Mercatus Center at George Mason University. <https://www.mercatus.org/publications/corporate-welfare/state-occupational-licensure-nevada>
- Mississippi Fresh Start Act, SB 2781, 470 Mis. Stat. (2019). <http://billstatus.ls.state.ms.us/documents/2019/html/SB/2700-2799/SB2781PS.htm>
- Mitchel-Slantz, B., Rege, G., Dumani, S., Youngner, T., & Curnow, C. (2020). *Nevada occupational licensing study: Literature review report*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
- Nevada Assembly Bill 319, 491 Nev. Stat. (2019). <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019/Bill/6580/Overview>
- Nevada State Teacher Recruitment and Retention Advisory Task Force. (2020, June). *June 2020 Report*. [http://www.doe.nv.gov/Boards\\_Commissions\\_Councils/TeacherRet\\_RecruitAdv/Teacher\\_Recruitment\\_and\\_Retention\\_Advisory\\_Task\\_Force/](http://www.doe.nv.gov/Boards_Commissions_Councils/TeacherRet_RecruitAdv/Teacher_Recruitment_and_Retention_Advisory_Task_Force/)
- North Carolina State Board of Dental Examiners v. Federal Trade Commission, 135 S.Ct. 1101 (2015). [https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/14pdf/13-534\\_19m2.pdf](https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/14pdf/13-534_19m2.pdf)
- Oklahoma House Bill 1373, 59 Okl. Stat. 2011, § 15.8 (2019). <http://www.oklegislature.gov/BillInfo.aspx?Bill=hb1373&Session=1900>
- Rege, G., & Curnow, C. (2020, October). *Recommendations to address the nursing shortage*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. <https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/Recommendations-Nursing-Shortage-Workforce-October-2020rev.pdf>
- Rege, G., Curnow, C., Riley, T., & Youngner, T. (2020, June). *Nevada occupational licensing study: Roundtable event 1 summary*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
- Rege, G., Riley, T., Mitchel-Slantz, B. W., Yibass, S., & Curnow, C. (2019, November). *NCSL occupational licensing consortium case study reports*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. <https://www.air.org/system/files/NCSL-Case-Study-ReportNov-2019-rev2.pdf>

- Rege, G., Youngner, T., & Curnow, C. (2020, September). *Nevada occupational licensing study: Roundtable event 2 summary*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
- Rodriguez, M. N., & Avery, B. (2016, April). *Unlicensed & untapped: Removing barriers to state occupational licenses for people with records*. National Employment Law Project. <http://stage.nelp.org/wp-content/uploads/Unlicensed-Untapped-Removing-Barriers-State-Occupational-Licenses.pdf>
- The Council of State Governments. (2020, January). *Occupational licensure: Interstate compacts in action*. [https://licensing.csg.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/OccpationalInterstateCompacts\\_InAction\\_Update\\_Jan\\_2020\\_2.0.pdf](https://licensing.csg.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/OccpationalInterstateCompacts_InAction_Update_Jan_2020_2.0.pdf)
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018). *Data on certifications and licenses*. <https://www.bls.gov/cps/certifications-and-licenses.htm#highlights>
- Umez, C., & Pirius, R. (2018). *Barriers to work: Improving employment in licensed occupations for individuals with criminal records*. National Conference of State Legislatures. [https://www.ncsl.org/Portals/1/Documents/Labor/Licensing/criminalRecords\\_v06\\_web.pdf](https://www.ncsl.org/Portals/1/Documents/Labor/Licensing/criminalRecords_v06_web.pdf)
- Wisconsin Act 319, 440 W.S. 2017 § 45.44 (2017). <https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/2017/related/acts/319>
- Yu, P. S., & Dietrich, S. M. (2012, April). *Broken records: How errors by criminal background checking companies harm workers and businesses*. National Consumer Law Center. <https://www.nclc.org/images/pdf/pr-reports/broken-records-report.pdf>

## Appendices

### Appendix A. Research Method and Approach

The objective of this occupational licensing (OL) research was to collect and analyze existing OL information from Nevada, compare Nevada’s licensing requirements with those in other states, and analyze the information by industry. In this appendix, we detail our data collection approach and data analysis strategy.

#### ***Data Collection Approach***

The data collection approach consisted of (1) identifying and compiling occupational licensing information for occupations in datasets for Nevada and the comparison states; and (2) conducting interviews with OL board representatives.

**Database Development.** AIR worked with OWINN to develop a list of 111 licensed occupations and their associated OL boards within Nevada. Next, AIR identified OL-related data elements that impact applicants, licensees, and consumers. For example, elements included aspects related to applicant entry requirements, reciprocity and endorsement requirements, and licensee information provided for consumers. The AIR team collected information on data elements for the 111 occupations in the Nevada OL Database. All information was collected from OL board websites and other public sources (e.g., statutes, exam administrator websites).

We also collected OL information from a sample of 25 occupations, which is a subset of the 111 occupations. These occupations were identified as those from in-demand industries (e.g., healthcare and education). OL information for the 25 occupations was collected for five comparison states—Colorado, South Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming, and Montana—as well as for Nevada. The decision to utilize these five states as a comparison was informed by the Institute of Justice's report, *License to Work: A National Study of Burdens from Occupational Licensing* (Carpenter II et al., 2017). Within the report, states were ranked by their analysis of the average burden of licensing requirements and the five comparison states chosen were ranked as least burdensome.

All data collected for Nevada and the comparison states was verified through a quality assurance process that involved two team members reviewing the information against publicly available sources.

**Interviews.** To achieve a deeper level of understanding about some of the more detailed and nuanced information that could not be gleaned from publicly available data, the AIR team

conducted one-hour interviews with a subset of 15 boards in occupations of interest to learn more about their processes. Most of the boards that participated in the interviews regulated occupations that were included in the subset of 25 occupations.<sup>49</sup> An interview with the Nevada State Barbers' Health and Sanitation board was specifically requested by Nevada OL Working Group.

Interviews were conducted virtually over GoToMeeting in November 2020. Interviewees were asked about the current and anticipated challenges facing licensees and the industry as a whole, regional differences in the supply and demand of the occupations, and the licensing process for new applicants and renewing licensees. Examples of questions asked include the following:

- ❖ What challenges do you think the occupations regulated by your board might face in the near future?
- ❖ What sort of differences in demand are there for the occupations regulated by your board between northern and southern Nevada, or urban and rural Nevada?
- ❖ What does the licensing process look like for someone who is already licensed from another state, but wants to practice in Nevada?

In addition to creating the Nevada OL Database and interviewing board members and staff, AIR leveraged information from prior activities with OWINN. The team conducted a literature review of OL publications, board audits, and Sunset Committee Review reports to identify best practices and initial recommendations related to occupational licensing in Nevada. Also, AIR had previously facilitated two Roundtable events with board members and state agencies on topics such as licensing processes and barriers to licensing. This information, in conjunction with the quantitative and qualitative data that were gathered, informed the findings and discussion in this report on the state of occupational licensing in Nevada.

### **Data Analysis Strategy**

Data management and analyses were done using the latest version of the IBM SPSS® software. The team entered and cleaned the data, recoded the relevant data based on the predetermined categories, and assigned specific value labels to missing values (including both “system missing” and “no information located” values). A few specific decisions regarding the data analysis process are listed below:

---

<sup>49</sup> The AIR team was unable to secure an interview with a representative from the Division of Public and Behavioral Health of the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services.

- ❖ For data elements that had a minimum and maximum value (e.g., fees), the data were averaged. Exception: Renewal frequency. When a range existed for renewal frequency, we considered the minimum value of that range.
- ❖ Specific codes were also assigned in instances where a particular occupation was not licensed in a comparison state, or no information indicating the occupation was licensed was found. [See Appendix C for more information on which occupations were not licensed in comparison states.] This allowed the data analysis team to filter out this information before analyzing OL data for comparison states.
- ❖ The team coded new variables to inform the analysis. For example, a Sum of Initial Costs variable was created to combine the initial licensing fee, total exam fees, and any additional fees expected of applicants (e.g., fingerprinting, background check, application fee). Similarly, a Training and Education Hours variable was created to combine the education hours, board-provided training hours, and supervised training hours required.

Once the data cleaning was complete, we ran and compared descriptive statistics (e.g., frequencies, means, medians) across all states and by industry. For categorical variables, cross-tabulations were run on the industry sector by licensing information for each occupation to look more closely at industry trends across occupations and states.

We also computed difficulty scores to assess the difficulty that boards may place on applicants to obtain and maintain a license for the occupations in this study. The current data elements considered for the difficulty score computations are provided in Exhibit 13. The team is currently in the process of determining the specific criteria for the scoring approach and exploring the relationship between the difficulty score and other important components (e.g., specific occupations, national wage information for certain populations).

## Appendix B. List of 111 Occupations by Industry

This is a list of occupations for which OL data was gathered in the Nevada OL database.

Occupation	Industry
Landscape Contractor (C-10)	Administrative and Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services
Carpentry Contractor (C-3)	Construction
Concrete Contractor (C-5)	Construction
Drilling Wells and Installing Pumps, Pressure Tanks, and Storage Tanks Contractor (C-23)	Construction
Electrical Contractor (C-2)	Construction
Equipment to Treat Water Installation Contractor (C-30)	Construction
Fencing and Equipping Playground Contractor (C-25)	Construction
Finishing Floors Contractor (C-16)	Construction
Fire Protection Contractor (C-41)	Construction
General Building Contractor (B)	Construction
Glass and Glazing Contractor (C-8)	Construction
Heater Installation Contractor (C-39)	Construction
Individual Sewerage Contractor (C-27)	Construction
Installing Industrial Machinery Contractor (C-33)	Construction
Installing Terrazzo and Marble Contractor (C-19)	Construction
Institutional Contractor (C-26)	Construction
Lathing and Plastering Contractor (C-17)	Construction
Liquefied Petroleum and Natural Gas Equipment Installation Contractor (C-38)	Construction



<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Industry</b>
<b>Masonry Contractor (C-18)</b>	Construction
<b>Mixtures Containing Cement Spraying Contractor (C-11)</b>	Construction
<b>Movement of Buildings Contractor (C-9)</b>	Construction
<b>Painting and Decorating Contractor (C-4)</b>	Construction
<b>Plumbing and Heating Contractor (C-1)</b>	Construction
<b>Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Contractor (C-21)</b>	Construction
<b>Roofing and Siding Contractor (C-15)</b>	Construction
<b>Scaffold and Bleacher Erection Contractor (C-24)</b>	Construction
<b>Sign Erection (C-6)</b>	Construction
<b>Solar Contractor (C-37)</b>	Construction
<b>Steel Reinforcing and Erection Contractor (C-14)</b>	Construction
<b>Tiling Contractor (C-20)</b>	Construction
<b>Unclassified Specialty Contractor (C-40)</b>	Construction
<b>Well Driller</b>	Construction
<b>Wrecking Contractor (C-31)</b>	Construction
<b>Early Education Teacher</b>	Educational Services
<b>Elementary Education Teacher</b>	Educational Services
<b>Middle/Jr. High School Teacher</b>	Educational Services
<b>Secondary Education Teacher</b>	Educational Services
<b>Special Education Teacher</b>	Educational Services
<b>Advanced Practice Registered Nurse (APRN)</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Alcohol and Drug Counselor</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance

<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Industry</b>
<b>Audiologist</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Behavior Analyst</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Chiropractor</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Clinical Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counselor</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Clinical Professional Counselor (CPC)</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Clinical Social Worker (LCSW)</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Dental Hygienist</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Dental Therapy</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Dentist</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Dietitian</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Emergency Medical Technician</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Health Services Executive (HSE)</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Independent Social Worker (LISW)</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Licensed Practical Nurse (LPN)</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Massage Therapist</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Nuclear Medicine Technologists</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Nursing Facility Administrator (NFA)</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Occupational Therapist</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Optometrist</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Osteopathic Physician</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Perfusionist</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Physical Therapist</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Physician Assistant</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance

<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Industry</b>
<b>Physician Assistants</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Podiatrist</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Practitioner of Respiratory Care</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Psychologist</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Radiology Technologist</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Registered Nurse (RN)</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Residential Facility Administrator (RFA)</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Rotating Resident</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Social Worker (LSW)</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Speech-Language Pathologists</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Allopathic Physician</b>	Health Care and Social Assistance
<b>Elevation and Conveyance Contractor (C-7)</b>	Manufacturing
<b>Polyurethane or Similar Products and Coatings Installation and Application Contractor (C-36)</b>	Manufacturing
<b>Sheet Metal Contractor (C-13)</b>	Manufacturing
<b>Tank Fabrication Contractor (C-28)</b>	Manufacturing
<b>Barber</b>	Other Services (except Public Administration)
<b>Cosmetologist</b>	Other Services (except Public Administration)
<b>Shampoo Technologist</b>	Other Services (except Public Administration)
<b>Accountant</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Agricultural Engineer (AGE)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Architect</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Attorney</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Chemical Engineer (CHE)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services

<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Industry</b>
<b>Civil Engineer (CE)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Control Systems Engineer (CSE)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Electrical Engineer (EE)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Environmental Engineer (ENVE)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Fire Protection Engineer (FPE)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>General Engineering Contractor (A)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Geological Engineer (GEOE)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Industrial Engineer (INDE)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Interior Designer</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Mechanical Engineer (ME)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Metallurgical and Materials Engineer (METE)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Mining and Mineral Processing Engineer (MINE)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Naval Architecture and Marine Engineer (NAME)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Nuclear Engineer (NUE)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Petroleum Engineer (PETE)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Professional Land Surveyor (PLS)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Radiation Therapist</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Representatives of Investment Advisers</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Structural Engineer (SE)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Veterinary Technician</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Pharmacist</b>	Retail Trade
<b>Pharmacist Intern</b>	Retail Trade
<b>Pharmacy Technician</b>	Retail Trade

<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Industry</b>
<b>Ophthalmic Dispenser</b>	Wholesale Trade
<b>Manufactured &amp; Mobile Home General Serviceperson</b>	Wood Product Manufacturing

## Appendix C. List of Subset of 25 Occupations by Industry

This is a list of occupations for which OL data was gathered in the comparison state databases.

Occupation	Industry
Electrical Contractor (C-2)	Construction
Early Education Teacher	Educational Services
Elementary Education Teacher	Educational Services
Secondary Education Teacher	Educational Services
Special Education Teacher	Educational Services
Allopathic Physician	Health Care and Social Assistance
Clinical Social Worker (LCSW)	Health Care and Social Assistance
Dentist	Health Care and Social Assistance
Emergency Medical Technician	Health Care and Social Assistance
Licensed Practical Nurse (LPN)	Health Care and Social Assistance
Nursing Facility Administrator (NFA)	Health Care and Social Assistance
Occupational Therapist	Health Care and Social Assistance
Osteopathic Physician	Health Care and Social Assistance
Physical Therapist	Health Care and Social Assistance
Physician Assistants	Health Care and Social Assistance
Practitioner of Respiratory Care	Health Care and Social Assistance
Registered Nurse (RN)	Health Care and Social Assistance
Residential Facility Administrator (RFA)	Health Care and Social Assistance
Architect	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
Industrial Engineer (INDE)	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
Mechanical Engineer (ME)	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services

Occupation	Industry
<b>Structural Engineer (SE)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Veterinary Technician</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Civil Engineer (CE)</b>	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
<b>Pharmacist</b>	Retail Trade

Note: Some occupations that are licensed in Nevada, are not licensed in the comparison states.

- Veterinary Technicians are not licensed in Montana, Colorado, Vermont, and Wyoming.
- Residential Facility Administrators (RFA) are not licensed in Colorado, South Dakota, and Vermont, and no information was found indicating licensure in Montana and Wyoming.
- No information was found indicating licensure of Practitioners of Respiratory Care in Colorado.

## Appendix D. Data Elements and Definitions

This is a list of the data elements and sub-elements (and definitions) for which OL data was gathered in the Nevada and comparison state databases.

Data Element Name	Definition
<b><u>Entry Requirements</u></b>	
<b>Minimum Age</b>	The minimum age an applicant must be to obtain licensure.
<b>Fingerprinting</b>	The requirement for applicants to get official fingerprinting completed and submitted to the state board as a consideration for their occupational license application.
<b>Good moral character</b>	
<b><i>“Good moral character” clause</i></b>	The inclusion of a discretionary requirement for individuals to possess “good character” or a “good moral standing” to obtain and maintain licensure. This is often located in governing statute produced by the state legislation but may also be referenced on the board’s website.
<b><i>“Good moral character” clause</i></b>	The exact quote of the “good moral character” clause mandated by Nevada legislative statute or the state board.
<b><i>Source of “good moral character” clause</i></b>	Source of the “good moral character” clause.
<b>Initial fees</b>	
<b><i>Initial fee charged</i></b>	The dollar amount a state board charges applicants for initial licensure, often referred to as an application fee.
<b><i>Maximum initial fee charged</i></b>	The maximum dollar amount a state board may charge applicants for initial licensure, provided as the maximum allowable fee in the statutes.
<b>Fee waivers and discounts</b>	
<b><i>Initial fee waiver offered</i></b>	The inclusion of a provision to waive initial fees for certain populations of applicants.



<b>Data Element Name</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b><i>Initial fee waiver population(s)</i></b>	The population(s) of applicants whose initial fees for licensure are waived. Examples of these populations include applicants who hold an equivalent license in another state, active-duty military members and/or their spouses, economically disadvantaged individuals, and immigrants.
<b><i>Prorated initial fee offered</i></b>	The inclusion of a prorated initial fee.
<b><i>Initial fee discount offered</i></b>	The inclusion of a discounted initial fee for certain populations of applicants.
<b><i>Initial fee discount population(s)</i></b>	The population(s) of applicants whose initial fees for licensure are discounted. Examples of these populations include applicants who hold an equivalent license in another state, active-duty military members and/or their spouses, economically disadvantaged individuals, and immigrants.
<b><i>Initial fee discount (%)</i></b>	The percentage of the initial fee cost discounted. If the amount is not published by percentage, we asked coders to calculate this by dividing the initial fee by the dollar amount discounted.
<b>Certification requirement</b>	
<b><i>Certification requirement</i></b>	Indicating whether a certification is required or optional
<b><i>Name of certification</i></b>	Name of certification.
<b>Licensing exam requirements</b>	
<b><i>Number of entry exams required</i></b>	The total number of exams the state board requires applicants to pass in order to qualify for licensure.
<b><i>Entry exam 1 name</i></b>	The name of any required exam applicants must pass to be eligible for licensure. This data element should be repeated for each entry exam required.
<b><i>Entry exam 1 fee</i></b>	The cost for the exam listed in the “Entry exam 1 name” column. This data element will be repeated for each entry exam required in the order they are recorded. This data element will be repeated for each entry exam required.
<b><i>Entry exam 1 format</i></b>	The method or format of examination for the first exam listed in the “Entry exam name(s)” column. This data element will be repeated for each entry exam required.

<b>Data Element Name</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b><i>Administration Frequency of entry exam 1</i></b>	The frequency which the first exam listed in the “Entry exam name(s)” column is offered. This data element will be repeated for each entry exam required.
<b><i>Maximum attempts of entry exam 1</i></b>	Maximum number of attempts allowed for entry exam 1. This data element will be repeated for each entry exam required.
<b><i>Administration method for entry exam 1</i></b>	The method of exam administration for the first exam listed in the “Entry exam name(s)” column. This data element will be repeated for each entry exam required.
<b><i>Languages in which exam 1 is made available</i></b>	A list of the languages in which the first exam listed in the “Entry exam name(s)” column is made available for applicants. This data element will be repeated for each entry exam required.
<b><i>Allowance of interpreters for entry exam 1</i></b>	A policy by the state board that allows the use of an interpreter for applicants whose native language isn’t English. This data element will be repeated for each entry exam required.
<b><i>Testing accommodations for entry exam 1</i></b>	The state board’s offer to grant ADA and testing accommodations as needed. This data element will be repeated for each entry exam required.
<b><i>Exam retake waiting period for entry exam 1</i></b>	The waiting period a test taker needs to observe if they want to retake the exam. This data element will be repeated for each entry exam required.
<b><i>Exam waiver(s) offered</i></b>	The inclusion of a provision to waive exams for certain populations of applicants.
<b><i>Exam waiver population(s)</i></b>	The population(s) of applicants whose exams for licensure are waived. Examples of these populations include applicants who hold an equivalent license in another state, active-duty military members and/or their spouses, economically disadvantaged individuals, and immigrants.
<b><i>Exam waiver details</i></b>	Details on the criteria for waiver of entry exam requirements. This may include meeting a certain minimum years of experience, submitting records of a recognized equivalent exam that the applicant has passed, etc.
<b>References</b>	
<b><i>References required</i></b>	The requirement for applicants to submit references to apply for licensure.

<b>Data Element Name</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b><i>Number of references required</i></b>	The number of references required for completion of one's application for licensure.
<b><i>Frequency of application(s) review</i></b>	The frequency with which the board reviews applications for licensure.
<b><i>Appeal process</i></b>	The existence of a process that offers applicants the ability to appeal to the board if their initial or renewal application is rejected.
<b><i>Expedited process</i></b>	The provision to expedite the initial entry process for military spouses.
<b>Insurance/Surety bond</b>	
<b><i>Insurance/surety bond required</i></b>	The requirement for an applicant to acquire a consumer protection or license bond in order to be eligible for licensure.
<b><i>Minimum insurance/surety bond amount</i></b>	The minimum amount of money required to be secured in a consumer protection or license bond in order to be awarded a professional license in certain occupations.
<b><i>Maximum insurance/surety bond amount</i></b>	The maximum amount of money required to be secured in a consumer protection or license bond in order to be awarded a professional license in certain occupations. If there is no range offered, the amount reflects the only amount required to be secured in a bond.
<b>Additional fees</b>	
<b><i>Specification of the additional fee at entry</i></b>	Details about the additional fee requirement at entry. For example, fingerprinting fee or fee processing charges.
<b><i>Additional fee amount (at entry)</i></b>	The amount for the additional fee.
<b><u>Education and Training Requirements</u></b>	
<b>Formal education requirements</b>	
<b><i>Minimum formal education level</i></b>	The minimum level of formal education an applicant must have completed to be eligible for licensure.
<b><i>Formal education program name</i></b>	The name(s) of any formal degrees, accredited programs, or educational background required for applicants to be eligible for licensure.

<b>Data Element Name</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b><i>Formal education hours</i></b>	The total number of hours an applicant must complete under the instruction of a formal training program to be eligible for licensure.
<b><i>Formal education credits</i></b>	The total number of credits an applicant must complete under the instruction of a formal training program to be eligible for licensure.
<b>Board-provided training program requirements</b>	
<b><i>Board-provided training program required</i></b>	The requirements for applicants to complete a training program provided by the state board to be eligible for licensure.
<b><i>Board-provided training program hours</i></b>	The total number of hours applicants must complete as a part of their board-provided training program to be eligible for licensure.
<b><i>Board-provided training program fees</i></b>	The total amount of money charged to applicants for enrollment in and completion of the board-provided training program.
<b><i>Board-provided training program duration</i></b>	The length of time the board-provided training program extends from start to finish.
<b>Supervised training requirements</b>	
<b><i>Supervised training required</i></b>	The requirement for an applicant to train under the supervision of a licensed professional within the applicable industry to be eligible for licensure. This includes any supervised training requirement for interns to be eligible to apply for the professional license.
<b><i>Supervised training hours</i></b>	The total number of hours an applicant must train under the supervision of a licensed professional within the applicable industry to be eligible for licensure.
<b><i>Supervised training duration</i></b>	The total length of time an applicant must train under the supervision of a licensed professional within the applicable industry to be eligible for licensure.
<b>Industry experience requirements</b>	
<b><i>Industry experience required</i></b>	The requirement for an applicant to have completed a minimum amount of work experience within the applicable industry to be eligible for licensure. This includes any industry experience requirement for interns to be eligible to apply for the professional license.

<b>Data Element Name</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b><i>Length of industry experience required</i></b>	The total number of months an applicant must work within the applicable industry to be eligible for licensure.
<b><i>Policies that support access to licensure for target populations</i></b>	Description of any policies, supports, or resolutions that enhance access to licensure for target populations (e.g., supports for foreign-trained applicants).
<b><u>Renewal Requirements</u></b>	
<b><i>Renewal frequency</i></b>	The number of years a license is active before it needs to be renewed or otherwise expires.
<b><i>Renewal fees</i></b>	
<b><i>Minimum renewal fee</i></b>	When a range of fees is provided, this data element reflects the minimum amount a state board may charge an applicant to renew their occupational license, as stated in the board statutes.
<b><i>Maximum renewal fee</i></b>	The maximum amount a state board may charge an applicant to renew their occupational license, as stated in the board statutes. When a fee range is not provided, the charge fee is listed in this data element.
<b><i>Fee waivers and discounts</i></b>	
<b><i>Renewal fee waiver offered</i></b>	The inclusion of a provision to waive renewal fees for certain populations of applicants.
<b><i>Renewal fee waiver population(s)</i></b>	The population(s) of applicants whose renewal fees for licensure are waived (e.g., active-duty military members and/or their spouses, economically disadvantaged individuals, immigrants).
<b><i>Renewal fee discount offered</i></b>	The inclusion of a provision to discount renewal fees for certain populations of applicants.
<b><i>Renewal fee discount population(s)</i></b>	The population(s) of applicants whose renewal fees for licensure are discounted (e.g., active-duty military members and/or their spouses, economically disadvantaged individuals, immigrants).
<b><i>Renewal fee discount (%)</i></b>	The percentage of the renewal fee cost discounted. If the amount is not published by percentage, we asked coders to calculate this by dividing the initial fee by the dollar amount discounted.

<b>Data Element Name</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b><i>Prorated renewal fee offered</i></b>	The inclusion of a prorated renewal fee offered.
<b>Continuing education</b>	
<b><i>Continuing education hours</i></b>	The total number of hours licensees must engage in CE and/or training related to their profession to qualify for licensure renewal.
<b><i>Frequency of continuing education hours requirement</i></b>	The frequency with which licensees must complete their CE hours in order to qualify for licensure renewal. Frequency should be measured as total months allotted to complete CE hours.
<b><i>Continuing education credits</i></b>	The total number of credits that licensees are required to attain through CE and/or training related to their profession to qualify for licensure renewal.
<b><i>Frequency of continuing education credits requirement</i></b>	The frequency with which licensees must complete their CE credits in order to qualify for licensure renewal, measured as total months allotted to complete CE credits.
<b><i>Continuing education mandated topics</i></b>	Whether specific CE topics are mandated for a certain licensed occupation.
<b>Additional fees</b>	
<b><i>Specification of the additional fee at renewal</i></b>	Details about the additional fee requirement at renewal (e.g., surety bond renewal fee).
<b><i>Additional fee amount (at renewal)</i></b>	The amount for the additional fee (at renewal).
<b><u>Justice-Involved Individuals</u></b>	
<b>Blanket bans</b>	
<b><i>Blanket ban for felony conviction</i></b>	The ineligibility for licensure of any applicant previously convicted of a felony.
<b><i>Blanket ban for misdemeanor</i></b>	The ineligibility for licensure of any applicant previously convicted of a misdemeanor.
<b><i>Predetermination process offered</i></b>	The existence of a process that allows potential applicants to request a review of their criminal background in advance of applying to determine if it would disqualify them from licensure.

<b>Data Element Name</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>Minimum wait period</b>	
<i>Minimum wait period</i>	The existence of a mandated, specific timeframe for which certain crimes disqualify an applicant from licensure. For example, no licenses shall be granted to applicants convicted of a felony within the past 5 years.
<i>Minimum wait period criteria</i>	Description of the crimes and any accompanying criteria for which the minimum wait period applies. Criteria may include completion of required community service, participation in a workforce re-entry program, etc.
<i>Years of minimum wait period</i>	The specific timeframe for which crimes disqualify an applicant from licensure. For example, no licenses shall be granted to applicants convicted of a felony within the past 5 years.
<b>Relationship between offense and occupation considered</b>	The existence of a provision that only disqualifies applicants who have committed crimes deemed to be related to the licensed occupation.
<b>Rehabilitation requirement</b>	The existence of a policy that mandates applicants with a specific criminal history to participate in a rehabilitation program to qualify for licensure.
<b><u>Reciprocity &amp; Endorsement</u></b>	
<b>Reciprocity provisions</b>	
<i>Reciprocity Agreement</i>	A formal or informal agreement that this board recognizes licensees of another state (or states), if the board of that state (or those states) extends reciprocal recognition of licensees.
<i>Reciprocity States</i>	A list of the states with which this board has reciprocity agreements.
<i>Specification of any reciprocity fees</i>	Details about fees charged specifically for applicants who seek to practice their profession via reciprocity.
<i>Reciprocity fee amount paid to NV state board</i>	The amount charged to applicants seeking licensure via reciprocity, payable to the occupational licensing board.
<i>Reciprocity fee waiver offered</i>	The inclusion of a provision to waive the reciprocity fee.
<i>Reason for reciprocity fee waiver</i>	Reason or circumstances under which a reciprocity fee waiver is applied.

<b>Data Element Name</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b><i>Application fee, in addition to the reciprocity fee</i></b>	The nonreciprocity application fee charged to applicants seeking licensure via reciprocity, payable to the occupational licensing board.
<b><i>Exam Requirements</i></b>	The existence of exam requirements for those applying for licensure via reciprocity.
<b><i>Exam Specifications</i></b>	Details about exam requirement for those applying for licensure via reciprocity.
<b><i>Exam Waiver Details</i></b>	Details on the criteria for a waiver of exam requirements. This may include meeting a certain minimum years of experience, submitting records of a recognized equivalent exam which the applicant has passed, etc.
<b><i>Fingerprinting Required</i></b>	The requirement for applicants to get official fingerprinting completed and submitted to the state board as a consideration for their application for licensure via reciprocity.
<b><i>References Required</i></b>	The requirement for applicants to submit references to apply for licensure via reciprocity.
<b>Compact information</b>	
<b>Name of National Compact</b>	The name of the national compact.
<b>National Compact Participation</b>	Participation by the state board in a national compact, which is a national multi-state agreement to recognize and honor occupational licenses granted by partner states.
<b>Participation Date – National Compact</b>	The date the state joined the national compact.
<b>Name of Regional Compact</b>	The name of the regional compact.
<b>Regional Compact Participation</b>	Participation by the state board in a regional compact, which is an agreement of states within a geographic region to recognize and honor occupational licenses granted by partner states.
<b>Participation Date – Regional Compact</b>	The date the state joined the regional compact.
<b>Endorsement provisions</b>	



<b>Data Element Name</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b><i>Endorsement Provision</i></b>	A provision where the board determines whether an out-of-state license qualification is equivalent to their own state requirements.
<b><i>Endorsement Populations</i></b>	The existence of a policy that expedites the license application process for certain populations.
<b><i>Other Endorsements Offered</i></b>	A description of the policy, criteria, and specific populations who are eligible to receive an expedited license application process, other than those previously covered.
<b><i>Specification of any endorsement fees</i></b>	Details about fees charged specifically for applicants who seek to practice their profession via endorsement.
<b><i>Endorsement fee amount</i></b>	The amount charged for applicants seeking licensure via endorsement.
<b><i>Endorsement fee waiver offered</i></b>	The inclusion of a provision to waive the endorsement fee.
<b><i>Reason for endorsement fee waiver</i></b>	Reason or circumstances under which an endorsement fee waiver is applied.
<b><i>Application fee, in addition to the endorsement fee</i></b>	The non-endorsement application fee charged to applicants seeking licensure via endorsement, payable to the occupational licensing board.
<b><i>Exam Requirements</i></b>	The existence of exam requirements for those applying for licensure via endorsement.
<b><i>Exam Specifications</i></b>	Details about exam requirements for those applying for licensure via endorsement.
<b><i>Exam waiver details</i></b>	Details on the criteria for waiver of exam requirements. This may include meeting a certain minimum years of experience, submitting records of a recognized equivalent exam which the applicant has passed, etc.
<b><i>Fingerprinting Required</i></b>	The requirement for applicants to get official fingerprinting completed and submitted to the state board as a consideration for their application for licensure via endorsement.
<b><i>References Required</i></b>	The requirement for applicants to submit references to apply for licensure via endorsement.
<b><u>Data Reported by Licensing Board</u></b>	

<b>Data Element Name</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>Total number of active licensees</b>	The total number of individuals holding an active license within the state.
<b>Demographics</b>	
<b>Breakdown by gender (%)</b>	The distribution of active licensees by gender (i.e., female, male, other).
<b>Breakdown by race and ethnicity (%)</b>	The distribution of active licensees by race and ethnicity.
<b>Breakdown by education level (%)</b>	The distribution of active licensees by their highest level of education (i.e., postgraduate degree, undergraduate degree, completion of an accredited program, undergraduate degree with accreditation, GED/ high school degree, less than a high school degree).
<b>Breakdown by years of experience (%)</b>	The distribution of active licensees by their years of experience. Years of experience are categorized as less than 5 years, 5-10 years, 10-20 years, and 20+ years.
<b>Other demographic breakdown</b>	Any other demographic information on active licensees provided by the state board (e.g., nation of origin, marital status).
<b>Date demographic data was collected</b>	The date that demographic data provided by the state board was collected.
<b>Names of licensees available</b>	The availability to access first and/or last names of active licensees.
<b>Licensee numbers available</b>	The availability to access licensee numbers.
<b>Published mailing addresses of licensees available</b>	The availability to access published mailing addresses of active licensees.
<b>Disciplinary action information</b>	
<b>Disciplinary action information available</b>	The availability to access past disciplinary action initiated by the state board in response to complaints issued against active licensees.
<b>Description of disciplinary action</b>	Whether the information provided includes a description of the disciplinary action.
<b>Licensee name</b>	Whether the information provided includes licensee names.

<b>Data Element Name</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<i>Licensee address</i>	Whether the information provided includes licensee addresses.
<i>Employer name</i>	Whether the information provided includes employer names.
<i>Employer address</i>	Whether the information provided includes employer addresses.
<i>Other information</i>	Other information provided that is related to disciplinary action.
<b><u>Overall Assessment</u></b>	
<b>Clarity of Data Reported by Licensing Board</b>	This data element aims to assess how coherent and legible the Data Reported by Licensing Board is on the board website.
<b>Conciseness of Data Reported by Licensing Board</b>	This data element aims to assess how succinctly and directly the Data Reported by Licensing Board is communicated on the board website.
<b>Navigability of Data Reported by Licensing Board</b>	This data element aims to assess how intuitively the Data Reported by Licensing Board is laid out on the board website.
<b>Data Reported by Licensing Board Notes</b>	Notes on any additional information that doesn't fall into any of the other data elements is in this data element category.

## Appendix E. Overall Nevada Data Analysis Output

This is an overall list of data output from analyses completed for the 111 Nevada licensed occupations, organized by data element categories.

Data Element/Variable	Value	Location in report (if applicable) <sup>50</sup>
<b><u>Entry Requirements</u></b>		
Minimum age	76.6%	Exhibit 4A
Fingerprinting	68.5%	Exhibit 4A
Good moral character	83.8%	Exhibit 4A
Average current fee	\$250	N/A
Average maximum fee	\$400	N/A
Initial fee waiver offered	19.8%	Exhibit 10C
<i>Active duty military members</i>	100%	Exhibit 10C
<i>Veterans</i>	22.7%	Exhibit 10C
<i>Military Spouses</i>	22.7%	Exhibit 10C
Initial fee discount offered	17.1%	Exhibit 10C
<i>Active duty military members</i>	94.7%	Exhibit 10C
<i>Veterans</i>	73.7%	Exhibit 10C
<i>Military Spouses</i>	100%	Exhibit 10C
Exam requirement	86%	Exhibit 4B
Average fee for first exam (SD)	\$310.87 (\$521.64)	N/A
Average exam cost (SD)	\$447.71 (\$190)	Exhibit 4C
Average initial cost (SD)	\$1,021.77 (\$677.49)	Exhibit 4C
Additional entry fees (SD)	\$484.78 (\$325.16)	N/A

<sup>50</sup> We have indicated data that is not located in the Findings and Discussion section of this report with N/A

Data Element/Variable	Value	Location in report (if applicable) <sup>50</sup>
Administration Frequency	22.6%	Exhibit 4B
Exam offered in more than one language	2.9%	Exhibit 10B
Allowance of Interpreters	2.4%	Exhibit 10B
Testing accommodations	71.2%	Exhibit 4B
Exam waivers offered	62.2%	N/A
References	25.2%	Exhibit 4A; Exhibit 10A
Application review at least once a month	5.4%	N/A
Expedited licenses offered for military spouses	45%	Exhibit 10C
Insurance/surety bond required	33.3%	N/A
Insurance bond range	\$1,000 - \$500,000	N/A
Appeal process	55.9%	Exhibit 4A
<b><u>Education &amp; Training Requirements</u></b>		
Minimum Education Requirement		Exhibit 5A
<i>No minimum</i>	32.4	Exhibit 5A
<i>Some HS, No degree</i>	2.7	Exhibit 5A
<i>GED</i>	6.3	Exhibit 5A
<i>BS/BA</i>	27	Exhibit 5A
<i>MA/MA</i>	8.1	Exhibit 5A
<i>Advanced Degree</i>	7.2	Exhibit 5A
<i>No information located</i>	16.2	Exhibit 5A
Average Formal Education hours* (SD)	912.43 (1,475.35)	N/A
Board-Provided Training Required*	3.6%	N/A
Average Board-Provided Training hours (SD)	28.5 (23.69)	N/A

<b>Data Element/Variable</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Location in report (if applicable)<sup>50</sup></b>
Supervised training required	35.1%	N/A
Average Supervised Training hours* (SD)	1,966.22 (1,489.63)	N/A
Total Training and Education Hours (SD)	1,675.72 (1,661.57)	Exhibit 5B
Industry experience	55.0%	Exhibit 5B
Average industry experience (months) (SD)	46.58 (6.34)	Exhibit 5B
Average renewal years (SD)	1.97 (.76)	N/A
Average current renewal fee (SD)	\$342.56 (\$232.60)	N/A
<b><u>Renewal Requirements</u></b>		
Renewal fee per year (SD)	\$184.69 (\$118.75)	Exhibit 6
Average maximum renewal fee (SD)	\$529.84 (\$372.54)	N/A
Total additional renewal fees (SD)	\$580.25 (\$425.20)	N/A
Total renewal cost (SD)	\$762.29 (\$660.88)	N/A
Total renewal cost per year (SD)	\$400.68 (\$329.14)	N/A
Renewal fee waiver offered	NIL	N/A
Renewal fee discount offered	NIL	N/A
Average CE credits for renewal (SD)	21.06 (16.59)	N/A
Average CE credits per year (SD)	18.00 (9.68)	N/A
Average CE hours for renewal (SD)	28.20 (12.07)	N/A
Average CE hours per year (SD)	13.87 (4.03)	N/A
<b><u>Justice-Involved Individuals</u></b>		
Blanket Ban for Felony Conviction	4.5%	Exhibit 10A
Blanket Ban for Felony Misdemeanor	0%	N/A
Predetermination Process	11.7%	Exhibit 10A

<b>Data Element/Variable</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Location in report (if applicable)<sup>50</sup></b>
Minimum wait period	8.1%	N/A
Average years waiting period (SD)	6.56 (2.88)	N/A
Nature of offense considered	46.8%	N/A
Rehabilitation requirement	2.7%	N/A
<b><u>Reciprocity &amp; Endorsements</u></b>		
Reciprocity Agreement	0.9%	Exhibit 7
Total reciprocity fee (SD)	\$325.00 (N/A)	N/A
Reciprocity exam waiver	NIL	N/A
Compact Participation	2 out of 7	Exhibit 7
Endorsement Provision	89.2%	Exhibit 7; Exhibit 10C
<i>Active duty military members</i>	26.3%	Exhibit 10C
<i>Veterans</i>	26.3%	Exhibit 10C
<i>Military Spouses</i>	29.3%	Exhibit 10C
<i>Surviving spouse of a veteran</i>	23.2%	Exhibit 10C
Total endorsement fee (SD)	\$290.81 (\$166.12)	Exhibit 7
Endorsement exam waivers	15.3%	N/A
<b><u>Data reported by licensing boards</u></b>		
Active licensees (SD)	1,950.16 (5,984.02)	N/A
Public availability of licensee names	76.6%	Exhibit 8
Public availability of licensee addresses	9.9%	Exhibit 8
Disciplinary action availability	27.9%	Exhibit 8
Disciplinary licensee name	24.3%	N/A

<b>Data Element/Variable</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Location in report (if applicable)<sup>50</sup></b>
<b>Disciplinary licensee address</b>	9.0%	N/A
<b>Disciplinary employer name</b>	2.7%	N/A
<b>Disciplinary employer address</b>	1.8%	N/A
<b>Accessibility (SD)</b>	7.87 (1.73)	Exhibit 9



## Appendix F. Comparison State Data Analysis Output

This is a list of data output from analyses completed for the 25 licensed occupations across five comparison states and Nevada, organized by data element categories.

Data Element/Variable	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)						Location in report (if applicable) <sup>51</sup>
	NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY	
<b><u>Entry Requirements</u></b>							
<b>Minimum age</b>	60%	31.8%	26.1%	20.8%	39.1%	43.5%	Exhibit 4A
<b>Fingerprinting</b>	68%	45.5%	34.8%	41.7%	13.0%	39.1%	Exhibit 4A
<b>Good moral character</b>	72%	0%	43.5%	41.7%	4.3%	NL	Exhibit 4A
<b>Average current fee (SD)</b>	\$333.16 (\$524.79)	\$109.00 (\$62.40)	\$159.09 (\$149.79)	\$97.35 (\$65.15)	\$125.63 (\$69.45)	\$215.91 (\$160.30)	N/A
<b>Average maximum fee (SD)</b>	\$360.00 (\$318.09)	NL	\$185 (\$152.80)	\$146.46 (\$128.80)	\$117.11 (\$33.89)	\$223.86 (\$157.283)	N/A
<b>Initial fee waiver offered</b>	32%	NL	NL	25%	NL	NL	Exhibit 10C
<b>Active duty military members</b>	100%	N/A	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A	Exhibit 10C
<b>Veterans</b>	50%	N/A	N/A	NL	N/A	N/A	Exhibit 10C
<b>Military Spouses</b>	50%	N/A	N/A	33%	N/A	N/A	Exhibit 10C

<sup>51</sup> We have indicated data that is not located in the Findings and Discussion section of this report with N/A

Data Element/Variable	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)						Location in report (if applicable) <sup>51</sup>
	NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY	
Initial fee discount offered	44%	NL	NL	NL	13%	NL	Exhibit 10C
<i>Active duty military members</i>	90.9%	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	N/A	Exhibit 10C
<i>Veterans</i>	63.6%	N/A	N/A	N/A	NL	N/A	Exhibit 10C
<i>Military Spouses</i>	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	NL	N/A	Exhibit 10C
Exam requirement	88%	86.4%	78.3%	83.3%	82.6%	82.6%	Exhibit 4B
Average fee for first exam (SD)	\$444.05 (\$567.80)	\$507.12 (\$608.27)	\$586.43 (\$646.70)	\$488.37 (\$575.68)	\$471.67 (\$606.90)	\$485.63 (\$576.99)	N/A
Average exam cost (SD)	\$611 (\$508)	\$585.6 (\$571.41)	\$709 (\$611)	\$630 (\$567)	\$620 (\$548)	\$579 (\$553)	Exhibit 4C
Average initial cost (SD)	\$1,031.26 (\$851.54)	\$581.60 (\$576.17)	\$662.78 (\$694.17)	\$841.45 (\$675.69)	\$716.07 (\$523.86)	\$798.96 (\$667.32)	Exhibit 4C
Additional entry fees (SD)	\$209.98 (\$202.31)	\$145.69 (\$123.01)	\$111 (\$122.83)	\$229.50 (\$229.79)	\$127.39 (\$38.16)	\$165.91 (\$163.4)	N/A
Administration Frequency	50.9%	56%	57.7%	80.6%	78.4%	50%	Exhibit 4B
Exam offered in more than one language	1.9%	0%	3.9%	8.3%	0%	7.7%	Exhibit 10B
Allowance of Interpreters	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	Exhibit 10B

Data Element/Variable	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)						Location in report (if applicable) <sup>51</sup>
	NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY	
Testing accommodations	81.1%	96%	84.6%	77.8%	89.2%	84.6%	Exhibit 4B
Exam waivers offered	80%	90.9%	43.5%	54.2%	39.1%	100%	N/A
References	32%	31.8%	26.1%	45.8%	47.8%	52.2%	Exhibit 4A; Exhibit 10A
Application review at least once a month	8.9%	9.1%	39.1%	4.2%	17.4%	26.1%	N/A
Expedited licenses offered for military spouses	32%	100%	NL	29.2%	NL	NL	Exhibit 8C
Insurance/surety bond required	4%	NL	NL	4.2%	NL	NL	N/A
Insurance bond range	\$1,000 - \$500,000	N/A	N/A	NL	N/A	N/A	N/A
Appeal process	56%	100%	56.5%	79.2%	60.9%	91.3%	Exhibit 4A
<b><u>Education &amp; Training Requirements</u></b>							
Minimum Education Requirement							Exhibit 5A
<i>No minimum</i>	4%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Exhibit 5A
<i>Some HS, No degree</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Exhibit 5A
<i>GED</i>	16%	36.4%	21.7%	4.2%	13%	4.3%	Exhibit 5A

Data Element/Variable	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)						Location in report (if applicable) <sup>51</sup>
	NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY	
<b>Associates Degree</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.2%	N/A	8.7%	Exhibit 5A
<b>BS/BA</b>	44%	18.2%	34.8%	41.7%	52.2%	39.1%	Exhibit 5A
<b>MA/MA</b>	12%	9.1%	4.3%	4.2%	4.3%	4.3%	Exhibit 5A
<b>Advanced Degree</b>	8%	13.6%	13%	12.5%	13%	13.3%	Exhibit 5A
<b>No information located</b>	16%	22.7%	26.1%	33.3%	17.4%	30.1%	Exhibit 5A
<b>Average Formal Education hours (SD)</b>	1,483 (1,631.6)	865.3 (711.6)	2,746.7 (1,141.3)	2,082.7 (3,928.3)	1,530 (2,078.9)	1,055.6 (1,167.3)	N/A
<b>Board-Provided Training Required</b>	8%	9.1%	52.2%	16.7%	NL	4.3%	N/A
<b>Average Board-Provided Training hours (SD)</b>	28 (28.3)	1,000 (-)	NL	1 (0)	N/A	500 (-)	N/A
<b>Supervised training required</b>	56%	40.9%	73.9%	50%	34.8%	34.8%	N/A
<b>Average Supervised Training hours (SD)</b>	1,654.3 (1,655.14)	798 (992.78)	2,746.67 (1,141.29)	3,748 (4,802.35)	1,316 (1,516.01)	1,400.7 (1,509.04)	N/A
<b>Total Training and Education Hours (SD)</b>	1,483 (1,631.57)	865.3 (711.62)	2,746.7 (1,141.29)	2,082.7 (3,928.27)	1,530 (2,078.9)	1,055.6 (1,167.3)	Exhibit 5B
<b>Industry experience</b>	24%	36.4%	34.8%	25%	73.9%	26.1%	Exhibit 5B

Data Element/Variable	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)						Location in report (if applicable) <sup>51</sup>
	NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY	
Average industry experience (months) (SD)	48 (0)	110 (53.89)	48 (0)	NL	NL	51.2 (7.16)	Exhibit 5B
<b>Renewal Requirements</b>							
Average renewal years (SD)	2.5 (2.025)	2.2 (0.528)	2.2 (1.38)	2.2 (1.35)	2.1 (0.344)	2.1 (1.443)	N/A
Average current renewal fee (SD)	\$204.39 (\$155.78)	\$90 (0)	\$150.04 (\$140.84)	\$98.82 (\$63.97)	\$166.88 (\$25.42)	\$156.82 (\$88.86)	N/A
Renewal fee per year (SD)	\$114.61 (\$100.44)	\$30 (\$0)	\$95.65 (\$90.63)	\$120.33 (\$168.96)	\$206.80 (\$198.55)	\$126.28 (\$130.22)	N/A
Average maximum renewal fee (SD)	\$379.69 (\$332.32)	NL	\$175.32 (\$142.71)	\$126.67 (\$126.84)	\$229.75 (\$46.86)	\$166.14 (\$85.34)	N/A
Total additional renewal fees (SD)	\$244.91 (\$255.52)	NL	\$54 (\$13.42)	\$22 (\$16.43)	\$20 (-)	\$42 (\$35.46)	N/A
Total renewal cost (SD)	\$326.84 (\$326.76)	\$90 (\$0)	\$161.78 (\$158.66)	\$105.29 (\$64.48)	\$158.24 (\$43.3)	\$166.36 (\$103.53)	N/A
Total renewal cost per year (SD)	\$182.30 (\$183.1)	\$30 (\$0)	\$102.17 (\$99.06)	\$57.82 (\$48.57)	\$74.71 (\$24.57)	\$118.86 (\$120.85)	Exhibit 6
Renewal fee waiver offered	NL	45.5%	NL	NL	NL	NL	N/A
Renewal fee discount offered	NL	NL	NL	NL	13%	NL	N/A

Data Element/Variable	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)						Location in report (if applicable) <sup>51</sup>
	NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY	
Average CE credits for renewal (SD)	18.2 (23.7)	27 (3.5)	54 (14.7)	7.2 (2.7)	NL	15.3 (16.5)	N/A
Average CE credits per year (SD)	35 (-)	13.5 (1.7)	13.33 (3.3)	2.2 (2.2)	N/A	6.66 (8.9)	N/A
Average CE hours for renewal (SD)	24.8 (10.2)	46.6 (38.9)	23.6 (10.6)	26.5 (24.1)	25 (11.7)	29.8 (15.9)	N/A
Average CE hours per year (SD)	15 (3.9)	12.1 (6.7)	14.8 (4.2)	13.1 (9.1)	11.7 (5.1)	12.8 (6.6)	N/A
<b><u>Justice-Involved Individuals</u></b>							
Blanket Ban for Felony Conviction	16%	0%	0%	NL	NL	4.3%	Exhibit 10A
Blanket Ban for Felony Misdemeanor	0%	0%	0%	NL	NL	NL	N/A
Predetermination Process	20%	0%	NL	8.3%	13%	0%	Exhibit 10A
Minimum wait period	4%	NL	NL	NL	NL	17.4%	N/A
Average years waiting period (SD)	7 (-)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.4 (0.8)	N/A
Nature of offense considered	32%	77.3%	100%	0%	13%	95.7%	N/A

Data Element/Variable	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)						Location in report (if applicable) <sup>51</sup>
	NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY	
Rehabilitation requirement	4%	NL	26.1%	NL	NL	NL	N/A
<b><u>Reciprocity &amp; Endorsements</u></b>							
Reciprocity Agreement	NL	22.7%	17.4%	12.5%	8.7%	4.3%	Exhibit 7
Total reciprocity fee (SD)	N/A	NL	500 (0)	100 (0)	150 (-)	NL	N/A
Reciprocity exam waiver	N/A	NL	NL	NL	NL	NL	N/A
Compact Participation	2 out of 4	4 out of 4	3 out of 4	3 out of 4	1 out of 4	3 out of 4	Exhibit 7
Endorsement Provision	96%	90.9%	52.2%	79.2%	91.3%	95.7%	Exhibit 7; Exhibit 10C
<i>Active duty military members</i>	33.3%	10%	NL	21.1%	NL	NL	Exhibit 10C
<i>Veterans</i>	33.3%	10%	NL	NL	NL	NL	Exhibit 10C
<i>Military Spouses</i>	45.8%	NL	NL	21.1%	NL	NL	Exhibit 10C
<i>Surviving spouse of a veteran</i>	29.2%	NL	NL	NL	NL	NL	Exhibit 10C
Total endorsement fee (SD)	\$325.50 (\$249.44)	\$147 (\$123.04)	\$227.92 (\$153.61)	\$190 (\$144.91)	\$225 (\$265.92)	\$255.75 (\$188.64)	Exhibit 7
Endorsement exam waivers	16%	NL	NL	NL	4.3%	NL	N/A
<b><u>Data reported by licensing boards</u></b>							

Data Element/Variable	Comparison States (Subset of 25 occupations)						Location in report (if applicable) <sup>51</sup>
	NV	CO	MT	SD	VT	WY	
Active licensees (SD)	5,849.3 (12,895.73)	3,768 (0)	NL	NL	1,396.27 (1,540.66)	4,060.33 (4,850.93)	N/A
Public availability of licensee names	64%	100%	NL	NL	91.3%	82.6%	Exhibit 8
Public availability of licensee addresses	16%	95.5%	N/A	N/A	91.3%	39.1%	Exhibit 8
Disciplinary action availability	52%	95.5%	NL	29.2%	91.3%	78.3%	Exhibit 8
Disciplinary licensee name	44%	95.5%	N/A	25%	91.3%	78.3%	N/A
Disciplinary licensee address	20%	95.5%	N/A	NL	65.2%	52.2%	N/A
Disciplinary employer name	4%	0%	N/A	NL	91.3%	39.1%	N/A
Disciplinary employer address	4%	0%	N/A	NL	65.2%	34.8%	N/A
Accessibility (SD)	8.00 (1.94)	7.45 (0.91)	10.35 (1.15)	7.83 (2.93)	10.4 (0.95)	8.04 (0.93)	Exhibit 9





Established in 1946, with headquarters in Arlington, VA, the American Institutes for Research® (AIR®) is a nonpartisan, not-for-profit organization that conducts behavioral and social science research and delivers technical assistance, both domestically and internationally, in the areas of education, health, and the workforce. For more information, visit [www.air.org](http://www.air.org).

## MAKING RESEARCH RELEVANT

AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH  
1400 Crystal Drive, 10th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22202-3239 | 202.403.5000  
[www.air.org](http://www.air.org)