

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

February 10, 2023

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 was called to order by Committee Chair Soseh Esmaeili, Psy.D., at 11:03 a.m. online via "zoom" and physically at the office of the Board of Psychological Examiners, 4600 Kietzke Lane, Suite B-116, Reno, Nevada 89502.

Roll Call: Committee Chair Soseh Esmaeili, Psy.D., and members Stephanie Holland, Psy.D., and Catherine Pearson, Ph.D., were present, and constituted a quorum.

Also present was staff member Laura Arnold, Executive Director, and member of the public Lisa Scurry.

2. Public Comment

There was no public comment at this time.

3. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Approval of the Meeting Minutes from the January 13, 2023, Meeting of the Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee.

There were no comments or changes suggested for the minutes of the January 13, 2023, meeting. Member Dr. Pearson stated she approved of the minutes.

On Motion by Catherine Pearson, second by Stephanie Holland, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners' Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee approved the meeting minutes of the ATEAM's January 13, 2023, Committee Meeting. (Yea: Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 3-0

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)

a. Jessica Patel

Dr. Pearson, who reviewed Jessica Patel's application, addressed the main points at issue, namely a couple of discrepancies in the PLUS that needed to be corrected and the number of Dr. Patel's supervised hours. The executive director confirmed that the discrepancies in the PLUS have been corrected and the PLUS has been updated. Dr. Pearson noted that Dr. Patel is licensed in 2 different states – Illinois and California – and that she has been licensed for more than five years in a different state. Dr. Pearson stated that Dr. Patel only had 1,000 internship hours, although she had over 200 hours of supervision, and that for her post doc, she had 2,400 supervised hours, and 80 hours of individual supervision. Because Dr. Patel has been licensed for more than five years, Dr. Pearson explained that she needs a total of 3,000 hours combined, and that she has a total of 3,400 hours. Exceeding the 3,000 hour requirement and having 280 hours of supervision, and despite the internship is less than what is required, Dr. Pearson stated that Dr. Patel has met the requirements for licensure.

Dr. Esmaeili asked if Dr. Patel's other licenses are in good standing. Executive Director Laura Arnold stated that has been verified through the PLUS system.

Dr. Holland inquired if Dr. Patel has been licensed in both other states for five years. Dr. Pearson stated that she has been licensed in Illinois since 2010, and the information about the California license is where the discrepancy was. Director Arnold stated that Dr. Patel has been licensed in California since 2019, and that the PLUS had previously noted the expiration date of the license for the effective date.

Dr. Esmaeili asked if Dr. Patel's situation would be one where she automatically is approved if she is licensed over five years in another state, in response to which the executive director generally agreed, but because the supervised hours did not match up with the requirements, the office erred on the side of caution and submitted the application for review and confirmation. The executive director being new, she said it was good practice for her, it gave her and the committee the chance to explore the administrative code and walk through the process, and that she did not feel she had the authority to approve without Committee review. Dr. Esmaeili noted that, because she is also new to the process, she just wanted to know for herself.

On Motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Dr. Pearson, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners' Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee approved recommending Jessica Patel to the Board for approval for licensure. (Yea: Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, and Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 3-0

b. Farnaz Samavi

Dr. Esmaeili inquired as to who was next on the agenda for review. The executive director noted that Dr. Farnaz Samavi is on the agenda and that Dr. Holland was reviewing her, but there was some information on her PLUS that the Committee requested she correct and/or include, so her name is on the agenda as a placeholder in case it came in. The executive director stated that she did not think the information was yet completely updated for a full and meaningful review. Dr. Holland asked if the Board office has had any correspondence with her, to which the executive director said that it had, and that Dr. Samavi was working with a representative at ASPPB to get the information in her PLUS that we have requested.

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. Esmaeili inquired if there was anything to discuss on the committee operating procedures. There was no discussion on this item. The executive director stated that this is a standing item in the event there is anything the Committee Members want to review.

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

- a. The next ATEAM Committee meeting will be held on March 10 following the meeting of the regular Board meeting (10 a.m. or later)

There were no changes to the meeting schedule.

7. Items for Future Discussion.

There were no suggestions for future agenda items.

While not a future agenda item, Dr. Pearson inquired about to whom she should direct her questions in reviewing an application. The executive director said to start with her, and they would work together. The executive director also told the Committee Members not to go to other Committee or Board members with questions, as it would create a subcommittee and violate open meeting laws. Dr. Esmaeili added that it is OK to ask the applicant to do some of his/her own work, as the information that the applications seek is information the applicant needs to provide. The executive director

noted that the Board office is in contact with the applicants and can request information that is needed. Dr. Holland said that the most challenging is when there are a lot of questions on courses and how they are labeled, the applicants often determining themselves where the courses should go. Dr. Esmaeili stated in situations where she did not know or have an opinion, the committee members talk during their meetings and figure it out.

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 Esmaeili adjourned the meeting at 11:18 a.m.
