PUBLIC NOTICE OF A MEETING FOR
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS'
APPLICATION TRACKING EQUIVALENCY AND MOBILITY
"ATEAM" COMMITTEE

May 12, 2023

1. Call to Order/Roll Call to Determine the Presence of a Quorum.

Call to Order: Chair Soseh Esmaeili called the meeting of the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners' Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) meeting to order at 10:03 a.m.

Roll Call: Committee Chair Dr. Soseh Esmaeili and Committee member Dr. Stephanie Holland were present. Committee member Dr. Catherine Pearson was absent. Despite Dr. Pearson's absence, the ATEAM Committee had a quorum.

Also present was the Board of Psychological Examiner's executive director, Laura Arnold, and members of the public Lisa Rhee and Lindsay Wray.

2. Public Comment.

NOTE: Public comment is welcomed by the Board and may be limited to three minutes per person at the discretion of the Committee Chair. Public comment will be allowed at the beginning and end of the meeting, as noted on the agenda. The Committee Chair may allow additional time to be given a speaker as time allows and in their sole discretion. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint. No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken (NRS 241.020).

There was no public comment at this time.

3. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Approval of the Meeting Minutes from the April 7, 2023, Meeting of the Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee.

The Committee had no changes or revisions to the proposed April 7, 2023, ATEAM meeting minutes. Dr. Stephanie Holland said she approved the minutes of the April 7, 2023, ATEAM meeting only as to form, not content, as she was absent at that meeting.

On Motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Soseh Esmaeili, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners' Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility

(ATEAM) Committee approved the meeting minutes of the ATEAM's April 7, 2023, Committee Meeting. (Yea: Soseh Esmaeili and Stephanie Holland.) Motion Carried: 2-0

4. **(For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on Applications for Licensure as a Psychologist or Registration as a Psychological Assistant, Intern or Trainee to Determine Equivalency with Nevada Requirements, Including Education and/or Training.** (See Attachment A for the List of Applicants for Possible Consideration).

Some of the following applicants were taken and discussed out of order, 4(a) and 4(d) being discussed first because Dr. Rhee and Dr. Wray were present and in attendance.

a. Rhee, Lisa

Dr. Holland noted that the Committee had discussed Dr. Rhee's application during the last meeting, and that she spent quite a bit of time re-reviewing Dr. Rhee's application. She told Dr. Rhee that Nevada so needs psychologists in its community with her expertise, so this review was very difficult because unfortunately our guidelines are very specific as it pertains to internships and the amount of time within which an internship needs to be completed, as well as the group supervision hours and having a supervising psychologist be licensed for the supervision during the internship.

Dr. Holland stated that Dr. Rhee's degree in educational psychology, while it has a clinical component, is really founded in research. She said that does not necessarily preclude licensure, but there were some questions about the courses during the last meeting. Dr. Holland did not do a deep dive into the coursework because the internship brings the application to a standstill. She explained that Dr. Rhee's internship spanned over 4+ years, and it looked like it was also potentially part of her practicum or there was not a formal practicum that she could see. She said that pursuant to the Board's guidelines, an internship needs to be done in 12 months if full time or 24 months if part time. The main reason for that is the Board's guidelines and the APA guidelines suggest that it is important that an internship happen after the bulk of the academic coursework is done because it is preparing psychologists for independent practice, so it is a concentrated effort. Dr. Holland also noted that Dr. Rhee's internship does not appear to have included group supervision. Dr. Rhee got a lot of individual supervision, but it did not look like her supervisor was licensed at the time. Dr. Holland said she does not know how to get around that – she did not know how the Committee can potentially set a precedent that the Board would have significant questions about without some kind of (for lack of a better word)

remediation, despite Dr. Rhee's deep qualifications and experience in so many areas. Dr. Holland did not know how to get creative without Dr. Rhee having to do another internship or work that is supervised, which would seem to be contradicted by the experience stated in her application, or how to get around policy and APA guidelines.

Dr. Rhee stated that, for what it was worth, she is now licensed in New Mexico and Texas, and because she is licensed in Texas, she has also applied for PsyPact, in which Nevada is a participating state. She wondered if that makes a difference. She said she has not yet been approved under PsyPact, as that application had just been submitted. As for her internship, Dr. Rhee stated that it was not a formal practicum, but rather a part of her graduate training as her research and clinic work. She said she did work alongside psychologists and psychiatrists as part of the team on the research projects on which she worked and that there were many clinical components, including administering various diagnostic and cognitive assessments, and that she has 3,000 hours of supervised post doc experience. Dr. Rhee also stated that she was in the process of getting licensed in California before she moved to Texas. She said she completed all of her exams and other application requirements, but just has not paid the licensing fee because, based on her move out of state, she is not going to be practicing in California. She wondered if that helps with the concerns the Board might have.

Dr. Holland said she did see Dr. Rhee's post doc experience, noting that the requirement in Nevada is 1,750 hours and her experience clearly exceeds that, and that the Committee could offset some of the internship hours because she has so many post doc hours. However, Dr. Holland reiterated that she does not know how they get around Dr. Rhee's supervisor not being licensed, there being no group supervision, and that her internship was conducted alongside her education as opposed to being after the academic courses were taken and in a concentrated clinical experience. Dr. Holland inquired about Dr. Rhee's licensure in other states, in response to which Dr. Rhee reiterated that she is now licensed in Texas (May 2023) and New Mexico (January 2023), and that she only has to pay licensure fees to be licensed in California (having completed all other requirements). Dr. Rhee said that she would complete licensure in California if that would help her application in Nevada.

Dr. Holland said if Dr. Rhee had been licensed for five years, they could approve her that way. She also told Dr. Rhee that she is absolutely welcome to appeal and go to the Board, which may consider her experience in lieu of those requirements. Dr. Holland just did not think they could recommend approval at the Committee level because it would set a precedent on which the Board would not look kindly.

Dr. Esmaeili agreed with Dr. Holland, and added that if Dr. Rhee feels like she wants to appeal, that would be the next step. Dr. Esmaeili stated that, on a side note regarding PsyPact, the Board had just discussed PsyPact during its meeting and stated that in order to obtain an e-passport, Dr. Rhee would have to have come from an APA accredited program, as they have guidelines that are a little stricter.

Dr. Holland stated that there was some discrepancy about whether a PsyPact applicant can be approved without being from an APA accredited program because of some of the language PsyPact uses. She said that PsyPact does say APA or equivalent, but as Dr. Lenkeit explained during the Board hearing, the e-passport that is required for PsyPact does not have that "or equivalent" language, so the right hand and left hand are not consistent. Dr. Holland was not sure what PsyPact would do with that, but in its meeting earlier that day, the Board voted to stand by the language "or equivalent," and it would then go through a committee process on PsyPact's end.

Dr. Holland inquired with the executive director about Dr. Rhee's options if they deny her application. She asked if her only two options were to either conduct an internship of some kind or appeal to the Board. The executive director did not know off the top of her head because she had not yet encountered this scenario. She said she will look into it and will be in touch with Dr. Rhee with her options.

Dr. Esmaeili suggested that the communication to Dr. Rhee could be that the ATEAM is denying her application and listing what would be required for approval – not just the internship, but also the questions from the last meeting on the coursework. Dr. Esmaeili did not want Dr. Rhee to do something, come back in a year or two showing what she did, and then have the Board say she needed to do something else. She said to lay out what is required for the Board to approve. That way, Dr. Rhee can review those options and if she wants to appeal to the Board, she can do that with all of the information.

Dr. Holland asked Dr. Rhee about her plans for practicing in Nevada and whether she had opportunities here. Dr. Rhee stated her opportunity here is to work alongside other agencies that provide ADA services to clients who also need diagnostic evaluations, meaning that some clients are not able to access ADA because they need a diagnosis first. She said that because of the huge waitlist that currently exists, they were going to bring her on board for that. She moved to and lives in Texas and is working with a few states to get licensed to provide the diagnostic evaluations. She said that is the training she had been getting in California, to be able to do that in California, but because she moved, she is not going to practice there, but there are needs in different states - New Mexico, Nevada, Texas, and a few other states – to provide the diagnostic support so that patients can get access to ADA care.

Dr. Holland noted that Dr. Rhee's work is hyperspecialized and, being familiar with having to put people on a waitlist, the service is so much needed. She said she did not know what the Board would do and she did not want to speak out of turn, but it has never considered a limited license to her knowledge because in Nevada, it is a generalist license. However, because there is such an immense need, she did not know if the Board would consider that because of Dr. Rhee's expertise and the need.

Dr. Esmaeili stated that perhaps the path forward is to appeal to the Board to review and consider that. Dr. Rhee asked if that is something that she initiates, to which Dr. Holland said yes.

Dr. Holland asked Dr. Rhee if she would consider redoing an internship. Dr. Rhee said that because she is currently working doing diagnostics, she does not know where she would fit in to do another internship. She explained that Nevada is one of the states that her contracting company wants her to go to because there is such a huge need, but there are other states with needs, like New Mexico and Texas, where she can practice. She stated that if she did not have the internship, she is not opposed to it, but to be honest, did not know if she has the bandwidth for it. Dr. Holland understood, and said she asked because, if so, then they also need to go through the exercise of a deep dive into the coursework, which may need to be remedied. She stated that the recommendation from ATEAM is that the request is denied for the reasons discussed, and that Dr. Rhee would be able to appeal that to the Board and then they could participate in the conversation and see if the Board would consider a limited license narrow in scope.

Dr. Rhee said she completely understood what was at issue, and asked if, in terms of considering a limited license, it would come after the appeal. Dr. Holland confirmed. She said the Board would have to approve the appeal and under the conditions that they were going to consider granting a limited license in a very specific narrow field to do diagnostic evaluations because of the immense need in the community and so many people not being able to access services. Dr. Holland could not speak for the Board, but thought there might be an opportunity for a conversation saying this is a very unique situation and one the Board might consider.

The executive director stated that she needed to look at the ATEAM policies and what happens next, as this was a new scenario to her. She told Dr. Rhee she would include that in her correspondence to her.

Dr. Holland thanked Dr. Rhee for coming and being so considerate. Dr. Rhee said she completely understood and appreciated the ATEAM's time, and hoped they could resolve this in some capacity.

On Motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Soseh Esmaeili, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners' Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee Denied Dr. Lisa Rhee's application for licensure. (Yea: Soseh Esmaeili and Stephanie Holland.) Motion Carried: 2-0

b. Thomas, Kelly

Dr. Esmaeili, who reviewed Dr. Kelly's application, noted that she was licensed since 2014 in two other states and then in 2017 in California, and that the five year exception applies. The only issue Dr. Esmaeili had was a small issue – that her pre-doctoral hours had only 3 hours of supervision a week instead of the required 4 hours. However, Dr. Kelly's coursework met all of the requirements, she has been licensed since 2014, and she passed her EPPP-1. Dr. Esmaeili said all Dr. Kelly needed was the State Exam, and she did not know if since it has been over five years, she needs to take the EPPP-2. The executive director explained that those licensed in another state are not required to take the EPPP-2. It is only required for new Nevada applicants who are not licensed elsewhere. The executive director also confirmed that Dr. Kelly has been licensed since 2014 in New York and Illinois, and since 2017 in California.

Dr. Esmaeili said it was easy case in her opinion and recommends Board approval.

On Motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Stephanie Holland, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners' Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee recommend that the Board approve Dr. Kelly Thomas's application for licensure. (Yea: Soseh Esmaeili and Stephanie Holland.) Motion Carried: 2-0.

c. Lynch, Suzette

Dr. Esmaeili reviewed Ms. Lynch's application to register as a Psychological Trainee. She said that Ms. Lynch is applying to become a practicum trainee, probably because her supervisor wants to apply to bill Medicaid. However, Dr. Esmaeili had concerns with the application for several reasons. First, her undergraduate and master's programs seemed to be combined into one, as she did not really see a Masters, and it came from the University of Phoenix, which is not accredited, so they would not be able to consider that coursework. Dr. Esmaeili noted that the University of Phoenix has had some issues with their accreditation and some legal issues. In reference to Ms. Lynch's doctoral program, which is also not accredited, Dr. Esmaeili stated that Ms. Lynch has not done any core area coursework, except maybe a biological one and assessment and treatment one. All the rest she would have to take as far as becoming licensed in

Nevada, and she did not know if that school is one that would have the coursework for her.

Dr. Holland stated that if the Committee voted to recommend her for approval as a practicum trainee, that does not necessarily mean they are recommending her for licensure. The executive director asked if they saw the notes she put in with this application because she had received some input and feedback that might help. Dr. Esmaeili remembered one of the biggest concerns is that her current school does not have a director of clinical training, so they could not complete one of the required forms that was required to be completed by a director of clinical training. Dr. Esmaeili thought it was concerning that she has graduated and has a Psy.D. with the deficiencies she has raised.

Dr. Holland asked what school she attended. Dr. Esmaeili said the University of Arizona Global Campus. Dr. Esmaeili also said her transcript did not look like an official transcript.

Dr. Esmaeili summed up that Ms. Lynch has not completed the coursework required, there is no director of clinical training, and if she had come in on an application to register as a Psychological Assistant or for licensure, the ATEAM would not recommend her application for approval, as there are too many areas not covered. She would not recommend allowing her to practice as a practicum without the required background and training.

The executive director added that, in the feedback she received, Nevada has an agreement with Medicaid that the Board is vetting those who are billing Medicaid as though they would ultimately be eligible for licensure, or at least on that path. Dr. Holland stated that another potential concern would be because practicum students are still covered by their program insurance-wise, and Post-Docs are covered by their supervisor or their site. She asked who is liable for Ms. Lynch if she has completed her program, stating there is potentially no coverage, and that would have to be addressed as well.

Dr. Esmaeili thought that Dr. Holland had a very good point, and reiterated that her recommendation is to not approve the application. Dr. Holland agreed, saying that they want to set people up for success and that there would be a lot of obstacles for her getting licensed in Nevada.

On Motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Stephanie Holland, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners' Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee denied Suzette Lynch's application to register as a psychological trainee. (Yea: Soseh Esmaeili and Stephanie Holland.) Motion Carried: 2-0.

d. Wray, Lindsay

Dr. Holland stated that Dr. Wray did not attend an APA accredited program, but she has been licensed in California for just over 4 years without any issues. She said that Dr. Wray could not be approved under the five year exception, however on the PLUS application, she has had an extra year of Post Doc experience.

Dr. Wray said she is technically still in her Post Doc experience, as she is still working with a supervisor on autism evaluations, and her supervisor reviews everything she does with that agency. She explained that she is not necessarily accruing hours, but is always seeking supervision.

Dr. Holland said just from what she looked at on the PLUS, she believes the committee can, in lieu of the extra year being licensed in California for a total of five years, take into consideration the extra year of Post Doc and potentially approve Dr. Wray's application. She stated that everything else – Dr. Wray's coursework, practicum, and internship – looked fine for meeting equivalency. Dr. Holland asked Dr. Wray to remind them how many hours of Post Doc experience she had. Dr. Wray said for licensing in California she needed to have 1,500 hours, but she had well over that at 2,500 hours, close to 3,000 hours all totaled. That is what Dr. Holland recalled as well, and she said she needs 1,750 hours in Nevada. With the weekly group and individual supervision and the post-doctoral experience that well exceeds Nevada's requirements, Dr. Holland's recommendation was to approve Dr. Wray's application.

On Motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Soseh Esmaeili, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners' Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee recommend that the Board approve Dr. Lindsay Wray's application for licensure. (Yea: Soseh Esmaeili and Stephanie Holland.) Motion Carried: 2-0

The executive director advised Dr. Wray that her application would be put on the agenda for the June 2, 2023, Board meeting for their approval of the ATEAM's recommendation. Dr. Wray asked if she should apply for the State Exam now, as she had been waiting for this determination. The said yes, stating she felt pretty confident the Board would approve the Board's recommendation, as they do not want to take time to reconsider the decision of the committee it put together to make that decision. Dr. Wray said she appreciated Dr. Holland's review.

e. Samavi, Farnaz

Dr. Esmaeili noted that the committee has previously discussed Dr. Samavi's application. The executive director said she left it here as a placeholder because she did not know if Dr. Samavi may return for further consideration, as a determination regarding her application has not been made. Dr. Holland said that she spoke with Dr. Samavi and it sounded like Dr. Samavi was going to hit pause on her application. The executive director said her application is still active, so to speak, so she will leave her as a placeholder, take that pause, and if she comes back and wants more consideration, she is there.

5. (For Possible Action) Discussion of ATEAM Committee Operating Procedures, including the Applicant Review Forms; and Possible Action to Propose Revisions to and/or Make Recommendations to the Board of Psychological Examiners for Adoption of the Revised Procedures and/or Review Forms.

The Committee did not have anything to discuss for this agenda item.

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

a. The next ATEAM Committee meeting will be held on June 2, 2023, following the meeting of the regular Board meeting (10 a.m. or later)

Dr. Esmaeili stated that the next meeting of the Committee will be June 2 after the Board meeting. Dr. Holland said she will be there. The executive director said that Dr. Pearson told her she would not be able to attend.

7. Items for Future Discussion. (No discussion among the Committee members will take place on this item.)

The Committee did not have any items for future discussion.

8. Public Comment. Public comment is welcomed by the Board and may be limited to three minutes per person at the discretion of the Committee Chair. Public comment will be allowed at the beginning and end of the meeting, as noted on the agenda. The Committee Chair may allow additional time to be given a speaker as time allows and in their sole discretion. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint. No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the

agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken (NRS 241.020).

There was no public comment at this time.

9. (For Possible Action) Adjournment

There being no further business before the Committee, Chair Esmaeili adjourned the meeting at 10:43 am.

Dr. Holland thanked the executive director for divvying up the applications so that one committee member was not tasked with more difficult applications than the other. The executive director said she is trying to be mindful of that now that she is getting a better sense of the applications, and with their being only two of them for this meeting, she tried to weight it as best she could.

ATTACHMENT A

PSYCHOLOGISTS

Ashley Arcoleo
Corby Bubp
Si Arthur Chen
Filippo Cieri
Roman Dietrich
Mary Dinerman
Daniel Fenton
Kalana Greer
Dehnad Hakimi
Alberto Ibarra
Sair Jhorn
Lori Johnson
Ta Tanisha Jones
Christine Kim
Donald Kincaid
Viola Mejia
Samuel Montano
Stephanie Orbon
Rhea Pobuda
Lisa Rhee
David Shoup
DeAnn Smetana
Nicole Steiner-Pappalardo
Lisa Rhee
David Shoup
DeAnn Smetana
LaTanya Takla
Kelly Thomas
Jennifer Wilcox
Michelle Wilkens
Wendy Worrell
Lindsay Wray

PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSISTANTS

Ines Acevedo
Jacquelyn Rinaldi
Farnaz Samavi

PSYCHOLOGICAL INTERNS

Shannon Colon
Mario De Souza
Michelle Harden
Ruby Sharma
Erica Marino
Candice Thomas

PSYCHOLOGICAL TRAINEE

Marissa Alvarez
Adaeze Chike-Okoli
Leila Gail
Suzette Lynch