

**STATE OF NEVADA BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS'
APPLICATION TRACKING EQUIVALENCY AND MOBILITY (ATEAM)
COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

July 20, 2021

1. Call to order/roll call to determine the presence of a quorum.

Call to Order: The meeting of the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners' Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee was called to order by President Dr. Whitney Owens at 5:05 p.m. The physical meeting location was the Office of the Board of Psychological Examiners, 4600 Kietzke Lane, Suite B116, Reno, Nevada, 89502. This meeting was also conducted online via Zoom.

Roll Call: Board President Whitney Owens, PsyD, and Members Stephanie Holland, PsyD, and Stephanie Woodard, PsyD, were present.

Also present were Lisa Scurry, Executive Director, and member of the public Tawnya Ayim.

2. Public Comment

There was no public comment at this time. Lisa Scurry, Executive Director, stated that no public comment had been received in the Board office via email in advance of the meeting.

3. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Approval of the Meeting Minutes from the June 22, 2021, Meeting of the Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee.

President Owens requested a change to the minutes. The minutes indicated that Dr. Sharma had requested the Board allow for an equivalency review by the National Register. Dr. Owens stated she believe it was the Board that made that recommendation.

As she was absent from the last meeting, member Stephanie Holland approved the minutes as to form and not content.

On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Stephanie Woodard, the Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee approved the minutes of the June 22, 2021, meeting of the ATEAM Committee with the stated revision. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Stephanie Holland, and Stephanie Woodard)
Motion Carried Unanimously: 3-0

4. (For Possible Action) DISCUSSION OF APPLICANTS WHO ATTENDED NON-APA ACCREDITED PROGRAMS; AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO PROVIDE DIRECTION TO AN APPLICANT(S) OR MAKE RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS.

A. Tawnya Ayim

Member Dr. Woodard presented the review of Dr. Tawnya Ayim's application for registration as a psychological assistant. Her submitted transcript indicated a master's degree in Educational Psychology and a doctorate in Educational Psychology from UNLV. As the PLUS application had not been received, other needed pieces of information were not available to complete the review. That included the educational groupings and confirmation of the internship.

Dr. Ayim provided some background on her education and internship. She indicated that the internship information in the PLUS report was pending attestation by the supervisor. Dr. Ayim stated she completed a 40-week internship at 45 hours per week, with 2 hours of weekly supervision. She added that there was only occasional group supervision.

There was discussion that the APA recommendation is for 2 hours of individual supervision and 2 hours of group supervision during internship.

Review of this applicant will return to a future meeting.

B. Shweta Sharma

President Owens provided an update of Dr. Shweta Sharma's application for licensure. At the June meeting of the Committee, it was decided that Dr. Sharma would need to have her education reviewed by the National Register of Health Service Psychologists (National Register) to determine equivalency with an APA-accredited program. Additionally, there was question about her internship, which was completed in India.

Director Scurry contacted ASPPB to see if any records exist in the previous application file but had not received a response by the time of the meeting. President Owens also expressed concern regarding the number of years since Dr. Sharma had practiced or had any training as a psychologist.

This application will return for further discussion at a future meeting.

5. (For Possible Action) DISCUSSION OF APPLICANTS FOR LICENSURE BY ENDORSEMENT; AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO PROVIDE DIRECTION TO AN APPLICANT(S) OR MAKE RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS.

A. Timothy Law

Director Scurry presented the application of Dr. Timothy Law. Dr. Law was originally licensed in California in 1975 but the license expired in 1998. In or about 1998, Dr.

Law left the United States to work in Hong Kong until 2012, working in psychiatric services. There was no record of professional employment since 2014.

Member Dr. Holland inquired as to his intentions once he becomes licensed. Ms. Scurry explained that her understanding was that he intends to see patients.

President Owens asked for clarification on whether or not he is currently licensed. As Ms. Scurry confirmed that he was not currently licensed, President Owens suggested Dr. Law's application be treated similar to a license reinstatement from inactive status. That would include confirmation of continuing education courses.

Member Dr. Woodard asked for clarification that he was previously licensed in California for 24 years and Dr. Law has indicated that there no disciplinary issues. Verification had not been received from the California Board but their website did not indicate any past issues, only stating the license was voluntarily canceled or had been expired for at least three years.

There was discussion about whether proof of continuing education courses would be required. Generally, that requirement is made of those who are licensed but, as Dr. Law was not currently licensed, it could not be expected that he would have any continuing education credits.

President Owens suggested the full Board discuss the application and the process to be followed under the presented circumstances.

It was decided that Director Scurry would get additional information such as what his intentions are once licensed, what types of continuing education he has engaged in to maintain competency, etc.

B. Jodi Lovejoy

Director Scurry explained that the PLUS report for Dr. Lovejoy had not been received by the date of the meeting. Through her application and verbal conversations, Ms. Scurry shared that Dr. Lovejoy attended a non-APA school. Once the report is received, the application will return to the Committee for review.

6. (For Possible Action) DISCUSSION OF PROCEDURES RELATED TO LICENSURE BY ENDORSEMENT AND THE ATEAM COMMITTEE; AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO PROPOSE REVISIONS TO AND/OR MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS OF THE PROCEDURES.

- A. Process for review of applicants with 20 or more years' experience but who did not attend an APA-accredited educational program
- B. Process for review of applicants with 5 or more years' experience whose license is from a state with substantially equivalent licensure requirements

- C. Review of the State-by-State jurisdiction comparison and the “red light/green light” language when reviewing applicants from different jurisdictions applying for licensure by endorsement.

Lisa Scurry, Executive Director, presented proposed revisions to the procedures for applications for licensure by endorsement and the ATEAM Committee. She asked for feedback but suggested no action should be taken until the incoming new members of the Committee also reviewed the documents.

Proposed revisions to the Licensure by Endorsement procedure included adding reference to the EPPP Part-2. Other changes included removing the requirement that “yellow” state applicants who comply with NAC 641.080 and “red” state applicants who comply with NAC 641.080 and/or have 20 years’ experience will not be referred to the ATEAM unless requested by a Board member or the executive director. NAC 641.080 requires that the applicant had been licensed in another jurisdiction for at least 5 years, had completed 1,500 hours of internship and 1,500 hours of post-doctoral experience, and had no complaints in the state(s) of licensure.

Proposed revisions to the ATEAM Committee procedure occurred in the section related to the equivalency review process. The procedure listed three options for applicants to have their information reviewed. One of the options, a review of the program by ASPPB, is not currently available. Ms. Scurry suggested removing the line to prevent any confusion.

The second option in that section would allow an applicant to have their information reviewed by their director of clinical training or another outside party approved by the Board. There was discussion about whether the Committee should continue the practice of allowing such outside review.

Dr. Woodard asked if applicants are informed that they can have their information reviewed by an outside party. President Owens stated that review by an outside party would not take the place of the primary source verification through ASPPB’s PLUS report process.

Dr. Holland stated concern with allowing review by an outside party. She added that it could create unintended consequences as the reviewer may not be qualified or experienced in conducting such a review. President Owens agreed and added that applicants do have a way to appeal the decision of the Committee by going to the full Board. Director Scurry stated that independent review by an outside party could be an option for a candidate whose application is denied.

It was recommended that Director Scurry further review and bring the documents to a future meeting.

President Owens discussed the upcoming training of the new members of the Committee in ATEAM procedures and the important points to review. The training will

include a review of the scope of the ATEAM and discussion on how to review an application.

It was suggested that an addendum be created to the ATEAM procedures to document examples of situations the Committee has addressed with past applicants. Although not every situation would be included in the written procedures, documenting examples could increase consistency in setting undocumented precedents.

7. (For Possible Action) Discussion of Upcoming Meeting Dates for the ATEAM Committee

- A. The next ATEAM Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, August 24, 2021, at 5:05 p.m.

As new members will be joining the committee for the August meeting, the date and time is subject to change. Any change will be posted to the Board's website.

8. Items For Future Discussion.

There were no suggestions for items for future meetings.

9. Public Comment.

There was no public comment at this time.

10. (For Possible Action) Adjournment

There being no further business, President Owens adjourned the meeting at 6:18 p.m.