

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

July 21, 2020

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. Due to COVID-19 and Governor Sisolak's Emergency Mandate to Stay at Home for Nevada, this meeting was conducted online via Zoom.

Roll Call: Board President Whitney Owens, PsyD, and Members Stephanie Holland, PsyD, and Stephanie Woodard, PsyD, were present. Board Member Tony Papa, PhD, was present in a non-voting capacity.

Also present was Lisa Scurry, Executive Director.

2. Public Comment

There was no public comment at this time.

3. Discussion and Possible Approval of the Meeting Minutes from the June 23, 2020 Meeting of the Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee. (For Possible Action)

There were no discussion of or suggested changes to the minutes.

On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Whitney Owens, the Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee approved the minutes of the June 23, 2020 meeting of the ATEAM Committee. (Yea: Whitney Owens and Stephanie Holland. Abstain: Stephanie Woodard) Motion Carries Unanimously: 2-0

4. Discussion of Applicants Requiring Education and Application Review. (For Possible Action)

A. Tracy Moore

Lisa Scurry, Executive Director, explained that this candidate's registration is on hold until obtains a new supervisor.

B. Sharon Simington

Lisa Scurry, Executive Director, explained that this candidate's registration is on hold until obtains a new supervisor.

C. Anna Welsh

Ms. Scurry explained there was no update on this applicant.

D. Erik Welsh

Ms. Scurry explained there was no update on this applicant.

E. Heywood Barash

Ms. Scurry explained there was no update on this applicant. The committee previously requested supporting documents from the applicant, but they had not been received by the time of the meeting.

F. Luz Robles Gonzalez

This being a new applicant, the application packet was not available for review.

G. Barbara Sommer

This being a new applicant, the application packet was not available for review.

H. Leslie Bautista

This being a new applicant, the application packet was not available for review.

I. Leah York

This being a new applicant, the application packet was not available for review.

5. Meeting Schedule for the Committee. (For Possible Action)

The next ATEAM Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 22, 2020.

A. Review of Proposed ATEAM Committee meeting dates for the remainder of 2020.

The committee reviewed the proposed list of dates for the remainder of 2020. No changes were suggested.

6. Discussion of the Development of the Step By Step Manual (Similar To The ASPPB Mobility Procedure And Policies Manual). Discussion May Include Development of Tools; Making A Clear Checklist and Review Sheets; And Possible Action to Approve A Draft of The Step By Step Manual To Be Sent To The Nevada Board Of Psychological Examiners For Final Approval. (For Possible Action)

There was no discussion on this item. The policy manual was previously reviewed and approved. It will be removed from future agendas.

7. Discussion and Development of Endorsement Language Changes Made in the 2019 Legislative Session. (For Possible Action)

A. Review R0158-19: the NAC draft language to address the endorsement language and

B. How to handle endorsement applications received in the board office during the new NAC 641 language

C. Review and discuss the red light/green light language to provide guidance to the Board when reviewing applicants from different jurisdictions applying for licensure by endorsement.

Ms. Scurry explained that the proposed regulation related to licensure by endorsement is pending final adoption by the State.

The Committee reviewed the application and licensure process for such applicants, including the Committee's role in reviewing applications. The licensure process is divided into three types depending on the state/jurisdiction in which the applicant is currently licensed. The different types are based on if that state/jurisdiction's licensure requirements are equal to, equivalent to, or not equal/equivalent to the requirements for licensure in Nevada.

The committee discussed the process whereby applicants from states that are equal to Nevada's requirements (referred to as "green" states) will follow an expedited application process; applicants from states that are equivalent to Nevada's requirements (referred to as "yellow" states) will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the ATEAM Committee; and applicants from states that are not equal or equivalent to Nevada's requirements (referred to as "red" states) will utilize the Psychology Licensure Universal System (PLUS) application process through the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards.

It was recommended that at the August meeting, the Committee would begin reviewing applicants from "yellow" states.

8. Discussion of Expectations and Need for Requesting Further Information in Psychological Internships. (For Possible Action)

A. Determine criteria needed to establish equivalency for non-APA accredited internships.

B. Establish language/questions needed to add to applications to determine internship equivalency for non-APA accredited internships.

C. Add language to the Non-APA Application File Equivalency Review Form

Dr. Holland reviewed the comparison of internship sites in the state. Discussion included accreditation equivalency standards established by the American Psychological Association (APA) and the Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC).

Ms. Scurry presented a draft supervisor checklist and attestation document. The document was created to provide to intern supervisors to ensure the internship opportunity is APA equivalent, as required by state administrative code.

Dr. Holland asked if the intention is that the Board (or the Board Office) would review each internship site's submitted attestation and documentation that the provisions are being met, such as the site's policies. Dr. Papa suggested that the attestation would fulfill that requirement as the supervisor would be stating that all of the components are in place. Dr. Owens added that the Board (or Board Office) can request specific documents if needed.

There was discussion about whether or not current internship sites should be sent the document for attestation of the checklist or only those from the date of the document's adoption. It was added that, as the requirements outlined in the checklist are from Nevada Administrative Code, there is an assumption that all sites are at least APA equivalent.

Dr. Papa suggested revising the form to have the supervisor initial each provision rather than only signing at the end. This would help ensure the document has been reviewed by the internship supervisor.

Dr. Holland inquired about the length of time a supervisor must be licensed prior to supervising an intern and suggested it be added to the attestation form.

Dr. Papa stated that three years of licensure may not be necessary for the supervisor of an intern as there are checks and balances built into the program, including the availability of other individuals to supplement supervision. Dr. Owens suggested that while that may be true of an accredited internship site, the same checks and balances may not be in place for a non-APA accredited program. Dr. Holland added that there are differences in the requirements established by APPIC and APA.

The form will be revised pursuant to the committee's suggestions and will return to a future meeting.

9. Items for Future Discussion.

President Owens suggested that the Committee begin discussion of potential issues to be considered, such as face-to-face supervision, if the post-doctoral hours requirement is eliminated.

10. Public Comment.

There was no public comment at this time.

11. Adjournment (For Possible Action)

There being no more business President Owens recommended adjournment of the meeting at 5:57 p.m.

On motion by Stephanie Holland, seconded by Stephanie Woodard, the Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee

adjourned the meeting at 5:57 p.m. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Stephanie Holland, and Stephanie Woodard) Motion Carries Unanimously: 3-0