

By Jazmine Craig

o I have seen two women get granted 3 to 6 months of probation for soliciting sex work while doing massage w/ no regard to the nuanced fact, that sex work is an occupational lifestyle that does not get addressed solely by a probational period.

- Esp. a probational period that does nothing to offer or stipulate conditions in which there is true accountability + transformation by the therapist that last beyond the probational period.

o I have seen a recovering addict + future inmate w/ a clear substance abuse pattern + only 18 mo sobriety, appeal to the board w/ an intellectual + emotional argument for her license + get approved. Although nowhere was it taken into consideration that she was arrested only 3 days before her last drink - meaning she has only been sober over the last year + 1/2 that she has been involved + monitored because of her pending + current litigation. ~~It~~ It also did not take into account that her longest

period of sobriety at any point was only 3 yrs according to her. There was also no consideration to what her relapse might look like while massaging the general public.

- Then I bore witness to a man w/ an undeniably tumultuous past, who has been out of trouble for 5 solid years, get denied a license because " " we are not here to rehabilitate. This completely undermines his own self growth + efforts it has taken to stay out of trouble for the last 5 years. It also took no consideration of his journey + commitment to licensure that spanned over these 5 years, having to ^{re-}enroll in programs + pursue his education. Nor does this highlight that there is no need for rehabilitation by the NV board due to his own track record of staying out of trouble, w/ no one monitoring him, for the last 5 years. I would also like to point out that in a 16 yr period there was only 1 offense that involved A substance. The

citation that was referenced for marijuana, was not an arrest, nor was it even listed on his massage application. This means 2 of the 17 counts, actually involved a substance - this hardly defines a ^{substance abuse} pattern, as was inferred.

- All of this is deeply troubling to see, because to me this signifies a board that can be swayed by emotion + personal biases/experiences rather than having a clear defined path to licensure + approval + disapproval.
- If a person pleading guilty to sexual misconduct while performing a massage, can reapply for licensure after 5 yrs - then surely Mr. Bailey's 5 year clean track record should count for something, regardless of his inability to be as articulate + emotionally compelling as the other applicants.

- At the very least, I would hope that you all leave here + question if the standard you use to approve or disapprove licensure is purely subjective + if that is truly the best way when it comes to deciding someone else's future + the ability they have to pursue their dreams.
- Having a completely subjective application review process does not protect applicants that may get flustered, be less articulate, or have a less emotionally compelling narrative + I feel this is highly problematic + may discredit someone's hard work + personal achievement.
- If your true mission is to serve + protect the public, then I feel having a concrete review process that is not subject to your emotions or subjective lens would serve us + the public better.

The contradictory notion of your stance when it comes to comparing the two

cases of Mrs. McMilian + Mr. Bailey
is highly alarming. And although
we have had the privilege of hearing
Mrs. McMilian "story" - a client on
her table does not have that same
privilege. And the possibility that
a client could see an ankle bracelet
or monitor ^{on their therapist} while lying prone on the
table is far more alarming to me
for the sanctity of our profession
than a police record that ended
5 years ago.