

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

Meeting Minutes

October 13, 2023

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

Call to Order: Committee Chair Soseh Esmaeili called the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners' Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility ("ATEAM") Committee to Order on September 8, 2023, at 11:04 a.m.

Roll Call: Committee Chair, Dr. Soseh Esmaeili, Committee Member, Dr. Catherine Pearson, and Board approved substitute Committee Member Dr. Whitney Owens were present. Committee Members Dr. Stephanie Woodard was not present. Despite Dr. Woodard's absence, the Committee had a quorum.

Also present was Laura M. Arnold, the Board of Psychological Examiner's Executive Director and some of the applicants identified on the agenda.

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 September 8, 2023, Meeting of the Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee.

The Committee did not have quorum to approve the minutes due to Dr. Pearson and Dr. Owens not being present during the September 8, 2023 Meeting. Accordingly, this topic was tabled for the next ATEAM Committee Meeting.

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.

a. Caver, Leandrea

Dr. Esmaeili reviewed Dr. Caver's application and she recommended approval of the application. She did question if the Committee also thought the fundamentals of psychology was equivalent to the biological basis and if the internship that Dr. Caver had weekly 4 hours of supervision (it appeared to be broken up and not continuous). Dr. Pearson indicated she did have Dr. Caver as satisfying the coursework but did not closely review the supervision other than notating the hours and cannot attest to the second question. Dr. Owens stated that while reviewing the application, it appears on average Dr. Caver had 3-4 hours per week. Dr. Pearson noticed that there was some discrepancy with the APA accreditation, but Dr. Esmaeili confirmed that the school was likely preparing for accreditation, which would have required all the accreditation requirements when Dr. Caver graduated. The Committee and the executive director talked about PLUS applications often having the accreditation information verified on the wrong area of the report, which can cause confusion. Dr. Owens believes it is substantially equivalent and would recommend that the Board approve Dr. Caver's application.

On motion by Whitney Owens, second by Catherine Pearson, the ATEAM approved Dr. Caver's application to be recommended to the Board. (Yea: Soseh Esmaeili, Catherine Pearson, and Whitney Owens.) Motion Carried: 3-0

b. Jensen, Jessica

Dr. Owens conducted Dr. Jensen's review. Dr. Jensen went to Waldon University and studied in the clinical psychological program. Upon her review, it appears Dr. Jensen met the 3 years of full-time study, the residency requirement from the institution, and the core course areas. As Dr. Jensen's application is for internship, she has not completed her post doc, but based on education and training per Dr. Owens Dr. Jensen meets the requirements at this time. As such, Dr. Owens recommended approval of Dr. Jensen's application to register as a Psychological Intern.

On motion by Catherine Pearson, second by Whitney Owens, the ATEAM approved the application of Dr. Jessica Jensen. (Yea: Soseh Esmaeili, Catherine Pearson, and Whitney Owens) Motion Carried: 3-0.

c. Smetana, DeAnn

Dr. Pearson reviewed Dr. Smetana's application, which was a complicated application. After reviewing the application, Dr. Pearson indicated there were more questions than answers. Dr. Pearson noted that Dr. Smetana originally applied for licensure in 2014, and there was some difficulty in finding elements of that application. The executive director confirmed that Dr. Smetana's application for licensure was 10 years ago, so this is a new application.

Dr. Pearson stated that Dr. Smetana's degree was in behavioral health from 2011 obtained through ASU, but it looks like the person attesting to that indicated it was not a psychology degree and Dr. Smetana does not have three years of full-time study nor does it look like it was an identified program in psychology nor did it require a supervised practicum or supervised internship. Further, Dr. Smetana did not have the required full-time residency. Dr. Pearson also noted Dr. Smetana's coursework may not match up with the core requirements. There were transcripts from another program (master's from CSU), so Dr. Pearson was confused by that, yet Dr. Smetana's follow up advised not to look at anything completed with CSU because it was confusing. Also, in terms of internship hours, Dr. Pearson stated Dr. Smetana completed 2,472 internship hours at two different sites but 0 hours of licensed psychologist and group supervision hours. There was also a discrepancy between Dr. Smetana's information that indicated she was supervised by a licensed psychologist yet the facility indicated there was no licensed psychologist supervision. With that, Dr. Pearson was hopeful Dr. Smetana would be present to answer the questions the Committee has, which the executive director confirmed she did offer and suggest to Dr. Smetana. Without Dr. Smetana's presence to answer the questions and based upon her review, Dr. Pearson recommended to not approve the application at this time. Dr. Esmaeili confirmed she does not see an avenue for approval either.

The executive director indicated another licensed psychologist was approved previously with a similar degree (same name of the degree), which was an argument Dr. Smetana had made. Dr. Esmaeili advised that the Committee cannot base a recommendation off Dr. Smetana's suggestion that a prior psychologist was approved under those terms. Dr. Owens believed it would be safe to assume that, at the time of that purported approval, the ATEAM had not yet been established, which would not have allowed the Board to have a way to establish equivalency. Accordingly, the Board would have moved forward with the skills and tools available to them at the time to evaluate applications. However, now there is a method to evaluate substantial equivalency to ensure the Board upholds standards in the licensure process and ensure protection of the public through ensuring that substantial equivalency. Dr. Pearson noted that Dr.

Smetana applied for licensure in Hawaii, whose licensure requirements are similar to Nevada's, and was denied.

On motion by Whitney Owens, second by Catherine Pearson, the ATEAM denied Dr. Smetana's application. (Yea: Soseh Esmaeili, Catherine Pearson, and Whitney Owens.) Motion Carried: 3-0

d. Hutchinson, Courtney

Dr. Pearson conducted Dr. Hutchinson's application for a psychological assistant. Dr. Hutchinson has her doctoral degree in school psychology, which was conferred in June 2018. Her program was not APA accredited at that time, but it did have an accreditation on contingency (or a temporary accreditation) in 2019, but this was after Dr. Hutchinson graduated. In terms of the requirements, Dr. Hutchinson did have the full-time residency at an institution and satisfied the course areas.

Dr. Pearson had one question related to the number of intern hours completed by Dr. Hutchinson. Per Dr. Hutchinson's application, she satisfied the 4 hours of supervision per week and the remainder being in group supervision, but Dr. Pearson noted the total number of hours as 1,523, which appears to be deficient of the 2,000 hours required. Dr. Hutchinson said that at the time the requirement was 500 practicum hours and 1,500 internship hours, but understands that there may be different requirements now due to the APA accreditation that was not present at the time she attended. Dr. Hutchinson indicated she would be happy to make up hours, if possible. Dr. Pearson posed a question to the ATEAM Committee related to Dr. Hutchinson being able to make up the additional 400-ish hours to satisfy the requirement or if the application needs to be denied, which would then require Dr. Hutchinson to reapply once those hours are satisfied. Dr. Owens asked Dr. Hutchinson where the postdoc was going to be completed. Dr. Hutchinson stated she is currently a school psychologist within the Clark County School District and the School District does have licensed psychologists within the School District that she has been speaking with, or she has afterschool and weekends available to put in extra time to get the additional supervision and/or post doc. Dr. Hutchinson confirmed that the application is for registration as a Psychological Assistant. Dr. Hutchinson was waiting to see if she would get outright denied or if there was a pathway to move forward and does not have a plan for post doc set up just yet, but will if that is an option. She said that during her two internship settings, she was supervised by multiple licensed psychologists.

Dr. Owens indicated that, historically, the applicant would have to complete the rest of the hours, which would require that of those hours, the applicant would have to have 4 hours of supervision per week (or equivalent) then after those hours are completed, then the applicant would be eligible to complete post doc that requires 1 hour per week

of supervision. As Dr. Hutchinson has completed the educational training, she would then just have to complete those supervision requirements. Dr. Hutchinson clarified the hours of supervision required. The amount of supervision should be substantially as equivalent as possible per Dr. Owens. The executive director asked if the hours are completed within that two years her application is open, and Dr. Hutchinson submitted a revised PLUS report, then would the ATEAM be able to move forward with the application (assuming everything else has been submitted and meets the criteria to be passed)? Dr. Owens responded that they would have to convert her application to an internship application and then once Dr. Hutchinson completed that, assuming she meets the requirements for internship, then if the Committee approved her education and her intern, then technically the Committee could approve her application for psychology assistant contingent upon completion of internship requirements. The executive director confirmed that Dr. Hutchinson would not have to be registered as an intern unless she is billing for Medicaid, which was confirmed by Dr. Owens. Dr. Owens confirmed what the Committee would be deciding is if they are okay with recommending that Dr. Hutchinson needs to complete the internship hours with the understanding that those internship hours would require the 2 hours of supervision for a 20-hour work week or 4 hours of supervision for a 40-hour work week. If so, then the Committee could keep the psychology assistant application open and then Dr. Hutchinson could have two years from the time she applied to complete it, which would be July 2025. The Committee discussed the process of registration for internship and those requirements, as well as the path moving forward that would not require Dr. Hutchinson to reapply. Dr. Hutchinson confirmed it made sense and does not believe she would obtain an internship that billed Medicaid that would require her to be registered. Dr. Pearson asked if there are benefits for approving Dr. Hutchinson's application contingent upon her completing those internship hours versus holding off on her application and reviewing it in another year when the satisfied hours have been completed? The executive director confirmed that if the Committee moved to approve it now, then once the internship hours are in, it would not require Dr. Hutchinson to appear again as the Committee could then move the application forward with recommendation to the Board for approval. This would allow Dr. Hutchinson until July 2025 to get everything wrapped up.

On motion by Whitney Owens, second by Catherine Pearson, the ATEAM approved Dr. Hutchinson's application for a psychological assistant to be recommended to the Board contingent upon completing the internship hours and the requirements for registration. (Yea: Soseh Esmaeili, Catherine Pearson, and Whitney Owens.) Motion Carried: 3-0

e. Chike-Okoli, Adaeze

Dr. Esmaeili reviewed Ms. Chike-Okoli's application for a practicum training position. With the information provided, Dr. Esmaeili indicated the school itself met the requirements and the coursework meets the requirements. She did not have any concerns for the training position. Dr. Owens confirmed Ms. Chike-Okoli is a clinical psychology student from Walden.

On motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Catherine Pearson, the ATEAM approved Ms. Chike-Okoli's application for registration as a psychological trainee to be recommended to the Board. (Yea: Soseh Esmaeili, Catherine Pearson, and Whitney Owens.) Motion Carried: 3-0

f. Litynski-Vitencz, Laura

Dr. Owens reviewed Dr. Litynski-Vitencz's application. As she was reviewing, Dr. Owens indicated that Dr. Litynski-Vitencz's doctorate was in organization psychology and as Dr. Owens was reviewing she noted the statement on the residency requirement and that the program did not require a practicum. Dr. Litynski-Vitencz confirmed it required a residency that she basically took care of the clinical hours by doing them onsite as a registered psychological assistant in California. So the internship and practicum was completed with her supervisor (a licensed school psychologist and also a marriage and family therapist) there. She was required to attend in person at the time, but the clinical aspect she had to take into her own hands as Walden did not have a practicum. Dr. Owens discussed the APA practicum requirements that ensures adequate training and supervision. At present, Dr. Owens is not sure there is substantial equivalency for Dr. Litynski-Vitencz's application given the discrepancy of training/supervision.

Dr. Esmaeili and Dr. Pearson reviewed the application. Dr. Litynski-Vitencz stated that for the past five years, she has been working as a school counselor with 1,760 hours of post doc completed in California. Dr. Owens stated that the Committee would require Walden to attest to a residency requirement, if there was that requirement versus just a statement from Dr. Litynski-Vitencz. Dr. Litynski-Vitencz said she believed it was in Walden's program requirements since the University would not let her graduate without it. Dr. Owens indicated that the materials submitted need to be primary source verified and that someone from Walden stated that the residency requirement was not required, so from that source verification it is saying that Dr. Litynski-Vitencz does not meet the residency requirement. With that, if the University did not have a residency requirement and Dr. Litynski-Vitencz completed it, then someone from the University would need to verify that.

Dr. Pearson confirmed that the PLUS indicates the residency requirement was not met. Dr. Litynski-Vitencz confirmed that she needs a statement from the University that it was a requirement to graduate so she believes there is a miscommunication. The executive director suggested Dr. Litynski-Vitencz contact the ASPPB to confirm that the University answered the residency question accurately.

In terms of practicum, Dr. Owens stated that the NRS requires practicum as part of the training but she is unsure how the Committee has been handling this particular part of Dr. Litynski-Vitencz's application. Dr. Esmaeili is unsure if it has come up previously wherein someone was not required to complete a practicum but went out on their own to complete the practicum. Dr. Owens believed that Dr. Litynski-Vitencz should focus on resolving the residency requirement through the ASPPB to clarify that with Walden. This would in turn allow the Committee to think about past applications and review prior applications related to the practicum and how it was previously handled.

Dr. Litynski-Vitencz indicated she was hired by Renown as a fellow with 30 days to complete her application. Because the Committee is not meeting until December 8, she asked if there is something she can do to expedite the process so she does not lose her employment. Dr. Owens stated there is nothing that can be done as the information is required to fully review her application. She said if the information required is received, then the Committee could meet quickly during the Board's November meeting. The executive director confirmed the committee could convene a special meeting for Dr. Litynski-Vitencz if the information is received during the Board's November meeting.

Dr. Litynski-Vitencz inquired about whether the 2,000 hours of pre doc were satisfactory, to which Dr. Owens said she thought they may be. However, Dr. Litynski-Vitencz confirmed she does not have a practicum. She said she completed the pre and post doc hours for licensure in California, but a practicum was not required through her organizational degree. Dr. Pearson asked if the 2,000 hours that Dr. Litynski-Vitencz submitted for clinical hours are based on internship experience, to which Dr. Litynski-Vitencz stated she has pre and post doc hours submitted with a year of practicum and internship for her master's degree.

Dr. Owens reviewed Walden's PLUS report responses and indicated that there are boxes that it did not check that it generally checks for is graduates, which further confirms that the attestation from Walden is required with the precedent needing to be determined by the Committee. Dr. Owens read several questions related to equivalency to which Walden answered "No" when it typically answers "Yes." Dr. Litynski-Vitencz said she will work with her current employer, Renown, given her 30 days to get approval for a psychological assistant is up. Dr. Owens explained that employment matters are outside of the Committee's purview. However, she confirmed that the Committee can attempt to meet in November to clear up some of the missing

information in order to adequately evaluate Dr. Litynski-Vitencz's application. Dr. Owens clarified the equivalency requirements and their purpose for a comprehensive model for training and supervision as it relates to Walden and Dr. Litynski-Vitencz. With that, Dr. Litynski-Vitencz's application was stayed until next month pending submission of the discussed information being received by the Committee.

g. Williams, Toi

Dr. Esmaeili reviewed Dr. Williams' application. She had questions for which she wanted the Committee's opinion prior to making a recommendation. The first question is related to the doctoral program not being in clinical psychology and that there was no residency requirement – the program description on the PLUS application was not filled out or completed and there was no practicum or internship required because it was not a clinical psychology program. Dr. Williams did provide course descriptions on her transcript, which was very helpful, but some of the courses that were marked as clinical did not appear to be clinical according to Dr. Esmaeili after reading the course description. She is concerned the clinical experience and residency requirement may not have been met by Dr. Williams, but wanted the Committee's thoughts on recommendations as after her initial review, as she was inclined to deny Dr. Williams' application.

Dr. Owens confirmed. Dr. Williams indicated that the executive director had been extremely helpful in assisting Dr. Williams with figuring out how her application could meet the requirements of the Committee for approval, as well as Pia with the ASPPB, which is why Dr. Williams completed the course descriptions. Dr. Williams went to Torro not knowing the institute was not APA accredited, as well as other issues that came about. With that, Dr. Williams asked if there was anything that the Committee would recommend to help her move forward with her application to be approved. Dr. Owens stated there are re-specialization programs available throughout the country that Dr. Williams can look into and clarified that UNLV has accepted students for re-specialization if Dr. Williams is Nevada bound, which re-specialization certificate is what Dr. Owens recommended for Dr. Williams to obtain.

On motion by Whitney Owens, second by Catherine Pearson, the ATEAM denied Dr. William's application. (Yea: Soseh Esmaeili, Catherine Pearson, and Whitney Owens.) Motion Carried: 3-0

h. Grimes-Vawters, Jennifer

The PLUS has not been received yet. The executive director reiterated the requirements imposed upon Dr. Grimes-Vawters by the Committee during the last meeting related to the prior PLUS application being unclear. Dr. Grimes-Vawters is

working on the requirements imposed by the Board and the executive director anticipates this application being brought up again during the December meeting.

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.

Dr. Owens noticed the review sheets being used to differentiate between individuals who graduated before 2018 and after are the same, and stated that the form for those who graduate after 2018 should be revised because the equivalency review should be not based on coursework solely but also could be obtained through other activities. Individuals may come from institutions that may be creating other kinds of training opportunities that would fit into those areas but not creating a particular course around it. Dr. Owens stated that Dr. Paul created a spreadsheet, which the executive director has (and provided to the Committee in their review material), and Dr. Owens believes the form should be based upon that spreadsheet and revised. Examples were provided by Dr. Owens and she stated she is happy to consult with the Committee, if needed. In conclusion, Dr. Owens stated that the APA was changed in 2018 to include those other competencies, which will require the Committee's form to be revised. Dr. Esmaili confirmed this will be addressed.

Dr. Esmaili posed a question: if someone were to apply for a pre doctoral internship (not requiring Board registration), but their school does not have the requirements necessary for licensure in Nevada (such as not requiring residency and the coursework not matching the equivalency), would the supervisor be recommended to not allow the internship to happen if the individual is moving to Nevada? Dr. Owens said she believed so because the supervisors have the ethical responsibility to ensure the individuals they are supervising are going to be license-eligible. Dr. Esmaili specified that she knows an individual in Hawaii who meets this scenario as the individual would not be eligible for licensure or a post doc in Nevada, but the individual still is interested in moving to Nevada for an internship that has presented this predicament. Dr. Owens suggested advising the individual to discuss the equivalency process with the Board to determine if that individual will be license-eligible, but believes that given the individual's education and training not meeting the requirements it is likely she will not be eligible for licensure.

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

The next ATEAM Committee meeting will be held on December 8, 2023, following the meeting of the regular Board meeting (10 a.m. or later).

7. Items for Future Discussion.

The Committee did not have any items for future discussion.

8. Public Comment.

There was no public comment at this time.

9. (For Possible Action) Adjournment

There being no further business before the Committee, Chair Esmaili adjourned the meeting at 12:16 p.m.