

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

DATE OF MEETING: Friday, December 15, 2023 - TIME: 10:00 a.m.

This meeting will begin following the regular meeting of the Board of Psychological Examiners, but not earlier than 10:00 a.m.

This meeting will be conducted via remote technology, and with one physical meeting location at the Office of the Board of Psychological Examiners, 4600 Kietzke Lane, Suite B116, Reno, Nevada, 89502. Video- and teleconferencing will be conducted through "Zoom." To participate remotely, on the scheduled day and time, enter the meeting from the Zoom website at: <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/86477092219>. To access the meeting via audio only, dial 1-669-900-6833 and enter the meeting ID: **864 7709 2219**.

The Board office recommends that individuals unfamiliar with ZOOM visit the website in advance to familiarize themselves with the format by viewing the online tutorials and reading the FAQs. To learn more about Zoom, go to <https://zoom.us/>.

The Committee will receive public comment via email. Those wishing to make public comment should email their public comments to the Board office at nbop@govmail.state.nv.us. Public comments received before the meeting will be forwarded to the Committee for their consideration. Public comments received during the meeting will be provided to the Committee members but may not be available for consideration during the meeting. Public comments received will be included in the public record (meeting minutes) but will not necessarily be read aloud during the meeting. In compliance with Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) Chapter 241 (Open Meeting Law), the Committee is precluded from taking action on items raised by public comment which are not already on the agenda.

PLEASE NOTE: The Committee may take items out of order, combine items for consideration, and items may be pulled or removed from the agenda at any time. Public comment will be taken at the beginning and end of the meeting. The public may provide comment on any matter whether or not that matter is a specific topic on the agenda. However, prior to the commencement and conclusion of a contested case or quasi-judicial proceeding that may affect the due process rights of an individual, the Committee may refuse to consider public comment on that item. (NRS 233B.126) Public comment that is willfully disruptive is prohibited, and individuals who willfully disrupt the meeting may be removed from the meeting. (NRS 241.030(5)(b)) The Committee may convene in closed session to consider the character, alleged misconduct, professional competence or physical or mental health of a person (NRS 241.030). Once all items on the agenda are completed, the meeting will adjourn.

AGENDA

- 1. Call to Order/Roll Call to Determine the Presence of a Quorum**
- 2. Public Comment.** NOTE: Public comment is welcomed by the Committee 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).
- 3. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Approval of the Meeting Minutes from the September 8, 2023, October 13, 2023, and November 3, 2023, Meetings of the Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee.**
- 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. Paola Garcia Betancourt
 - b. Jennifer Grimes-Vawters
- 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.**
- 6. (For Possible Action) Discussion of Upcoming Meeting Dates for the ATEAM Committee**
 - a. The next ATEAM Committee meeting will be held on January 12, 2024, following the meeting of the regular Board meeting (10 a.m. or later)

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

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).

9. (For Possible Action) Adjournment

The public body is pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who are disabled and wish to participate in the meeting. If such arrangements are necessary, please contact the board office at (775) 688-1268 no later than 4 p.m. on Thursday, December 14, 2023.

For supporting materials, visit the Board's website at <http://psyexam.nv.gov/Board/> or contact the Board office by telephone (775-688-1268), e-mail (nbop@govmail.state.nv.us) or in writing at Board of Psychological Examiners, 4600 Kietzke Lane, Suite B-116, Reno, Nevada 89502.

In accordance with NRS 241.020, this public meeting notice has been properly posted at or before 9 a.m. on Tuesday, December 12, 2023, at the following locations:

- Board office located at 4600 Kietzke Lane, Bldg. B-116, Reno;
- Nevada Public Notice website: <https://notice.nv.gov/>; and
- Board's website at https://psyexam.nv.gov/Board/2023/2023_BOARD_MEETINGS/.

In addition, this public meeting notice has been sent to all persons on the Board's meeting notice list, pursuant to NRS 241.020(3)(c).

ATTACHMENT A

PSYCHOLOGISTS

Robert Antonacci
John Barona
Leandrea Caver
Roman Dietrich
Nicole Flowers
Dehnad Hakimi
Courtney Hutchinson

Alberto Ibarra
Rachel Irish
Sair Jhorn
Lori Johnson
Natalie Jones
Ta Tanisha Jones
Christine Kim

Donald Kincaid
Laura Litynski-Vitencz
Viola MejiaAkira Olsen
David Shoup
DeAnn Smetana
David Shoup
DeAnn Smetana

PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSISTANTS

Ines Acevedo
Jennifer Grimes-Vawters

Jacquelyn Rinaldi
Farnaz Samavi

PSYCHOLOGICAL INTERNS

Shannon Colon
Mario De Souza

Michelle Harden
Jessica Jensen
Ruby Sharma

Erica Marino
Candice Thomas
Toi Williams

PSYCHOLOGICAL TRAINEE

Marissa Alvarez
Adaeze Chike-Okoli

Leila Gail

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

Meeting Minutes

September 8, 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 10:32 a.m.

Roll Call: Committee Chair Soseh Esmaeili, Psy.D., and Committee Members Dr. Stephanie Holland and Stephanie Woodard were present. Committee Member Catherine Pearson was not present. Despite Dr. Pearson's absence, the Committee had a quorum.

Also present was Laura M. Arnold, the Board of Psychological Examiner's Executive Director and two of the applicants being considered.

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 July 14, 2023, Meeting of the Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee.

The Committee had no changes or revisions to the proposed July 14, 2023, meeting minutes.

On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Soseh Esmaeili, the ATEAM approved the meeting minutes of the Regular Meeting of the ATEAM held on July 14, 2023. (Yea: Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland approved, and Stephanie Woodard approved to form not content.) 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.

a. Smetana, DeAnn

Dr. Smetana was not present. Dr. Pearson did a very thorough review of Dr. Smetana's application, although Dr. Pearson was not present for the meeting. She did, however, prepare notes for the ATEAM's review.

Dr. Esmaeili reviewed the responses from Dr. Smetana that responded to Dr. Pearson's questions, but she is concerned that Dr. Smetana did not properly answer the questions. For instance, Dr. Smetana states that her hours were from a licensed psychologist, but whoever was attesting stated clearly that there were not licensed psychologists at the time, which is a big discrepancy. Dr. Esmaeili did not feel like that was addressed.

Dr. Holland did not believe the ATEAM could move forward without Dr. Smetana's appearance as there are many questions. The executive director confirmed they would table this application and she will let Dr. Smetana know the same. The executive director stated an issue she anticipates Dr. Smetana will address regarding licensure of another licensee. Accordingly, Dr. Smetana's application was tabled for the next meeting.

Dr. Woodard added that as the meetings have been held, the ATEAM has been very conscientious about the precedent set when considering applications. She stated it would be helpful to have more information related to the other licensee. The executive director could only find what she has provided to the ATEAM due to the length of time that has elapsed, and indicated that it should be on Dr. Smetana to establish the parallels between with the licensee to whom she referred.

Dr. Smetana's application was tabled for the next meeting.

b. Grimes-Vawters, Jennifer

Dr. Grimes-Vawters was present before the ATEAM. Dr. Esmaili inquired with Dr. Grimes-Vawters regarding the hours that were provided from 2011 to 2015 that were identified as a doctoral intern while the other 2 were different types of internship (CPC and mental health counselor hours). The executive director interjected that Dr. Grimes-Vawters was previously approved by the Board and there are communications related to approving her as a psychological assistance, but with the question of equivalency not clearly resolved from the available information. The last communication she found was that the Board previously approved her as a psychological assistant, but that equivalency was not established and she would not be able to move forward with licensure.

Dr. Grimes-Vawters confirmed she received correspondence in 2018 that explained what was missing and she submitted additional information to the Board with clarification regarding the equivalency. It does say there was a subsection of her equivalency that was not on the transcripts, so Dr. Grimes-Vawters said she ensured the Board had everything it needed in 2018 so that she was previously approved by the Board by July 1, 2019, to be registered as a psychological assistant. The executive director notes that the lack of clarity related to the equivalency issue is what has Dr. Grimes-Vawters appearing today, especially considering the changes to regulations and policy since then.

Dr. Esmaili clarified that the ATEAM would be considering the application as a new application. The executive director stated it is a new application and that she was simply providing the history of what has previously occurred with this applicant. Dr. Esmaili also had a question she was not sure was resolved regarding from the 2011-2015 internship, that being that her supervisor did not appear to be a licensed psychologist. Dr. Grimes-Vawters indicated that was not correct as Dr. James Carter-Hargrove was her supervisor during that time. Dr. Esmaili clarified it was about someone attesting to her hours that there was not a licensed person at that time. Dr. Grimes-Vawters was not aware of that, but indicated it was put through the PLUS system at that time.

Dr. Holland stated that the questions from the ATEAM historically and present were to caution Dr. Grimes-Vawters because of the equivalency questions from the program. Dr. Woodard followed up by asking if there are questions of substantial equivalency up to this point and the ATEAM was to authorize moving forward with the required clinical hours for licensure, was the word of caution was that Dr. Grimes-Vawters could get those hours and the ATEAM would revisit the application and due to the substantial inequivalency the ATEAM would then be unable to license her? The executive director confirmed that was what the Board stated to Dr. Grimes-Vawters last time. She also

indicated that the current policy is that unless there is a path to licensure, they do not want to send applicants down that path.

Dr. Holland asked whether part of the work to be completed by the ATEAM to establish substantial equivalency and to provide if there is a separate pathway to get to a place of substantial equivalency so the applicant can understand all of the requirements to be considered for licensure. The executive director confirmed. Dr. Holland asked when the ATEAM or Board reviewed the application previously related to course work that was determined to be needed. The executive director said she did not see that reflected in the meeting minutes.

Dr. Grimes-Vawters stated she was confused because she had all of her equivalency and coursework submitted to the Board, Dr. Papa originally, before the ATEAM was a committee for it to be reviewed. She was never told there was any issue with the class, except for something in August of 2018 that says there was an issue with no clarification of what the issue was, but that she received confirmation back that she did everything she was supposed to for approval. She said that the June 10, 2019, meeting minutes showed everything was approved and Dr. Grimes-Vawters was approved to move forward.

Dr. Esmaeili stated she did not see any issues with her coursework, she thought the coursework was complete when she reviewed the transcript, the question was on the PLUS application - the individual she mentioned that signed off on her hours that was a licensed psychologist (Dr. Hargrove) and that individual was a different designation (not mental health). Dr. Esmaeili asked who her supervisor was in 2011-2015, to which Dr. Grimes-Vawters stated it was Dr. Don Huggins. Dr. Esmaeili asked about supervision provided by a psychiatrist and social worker. Dr. Grimes-Vawters stated she had secondary supervision by a licensed psychologist and she believed Dr. Huggins was also a licensed psychologist. The PLUS application confirmed her successful completion of supervision. Dr. James Hargrove was the supervisor that was attesting to the application for 2011-2015 internship, but when he attested to the hours, it listed 3 psychiatrists and 3 social workers as Dr. Grimes-Vawters' supervisors. The PLUS later indicated a difference so Dr. Esmaeili wanted clarification that he was a licensed psychologist and he attested to her hours. Dr. Grimes-Vawters confirmed.

Dr. Holland asked Dr. Grimes-Vawters what her title was an intern – Dr. Grimes-Vawters responded with uncertainty due to that title being used so long ago. Dr. Holland indicated from what she can see the title was a CP intern and asked if it sounded correct, to which Dr. Grimes-Vawters confirmed it did. Dr. Woodard believed that is what is causing part of the confusion to determine substantial equivalency. She posed a question of the other ATEAM members' thoughts on removing that information from the PLUS so they can do a clean review of all the education training and experience towards licensure as a psychologist in the state. Dr. Esmaeili indicated she

believes the hours at Kids Cottage for a doctoral intern would be the only applicable hours as the others were for CP intern or mental health counselor designation. Dr. Grimes-Vawters thought that was separated as she recalls prior discussions regarding the same. She then read a letter received from the Board dated February 19, 2019, and a subsequent letter indicating the hours were verified and confirmed. Dr. Holland asked if a new PLUS application was resubmitted, and Dr. Grimes-Vawters confirmed it was resubmitted 3 times total. The executive director confirmed the one Dr. Holland has was the most recent PLUS Application submitted in April. Dr. Holland asked if Dr. Esmaili did the PLUS application review and wanted to know, aside from the clinical experience that is still on the application, if she was able to find internship hours that would meet the requirements for licensure and if they were sufficient. Dr. Esmaili referred to her notes and advised that her biggest question was about supervision and the total number of hours that totaled 1,375 for the internship with the individual supervision being 624 and no group supervision. She said that would be the only hours that the ATEAM could consider from Dr. Esmaili's review that was under a doctoral level training. Dr. Holland stated that from the PLUS Application of the 1,375 hours completed at Kid's Cottage under the supervision of Dr. Carter Hargrove who is a licensed psychologist that the time of the internship was almost 5 years (4 years and 10 months), but Dr. Holland believed internship equivalency required that it be no more than 2 years. She then asked Dr. Grimes-Vawters to expand and clarify why her internship took longer than normal. Dr. Grimes-Vawters referred to her logs that included the group supervision from March 2011 through May 2012. She did work for them longer, but everything that was completed was done between March 2011 and May 2012. She said she would be happy to provide that to the Board if that is not available to them at this time, but it breaks down the hours. Dr. Holland thought maybe the PLUS Application should be redone again and having the information removed that is not necessary for their review because the dates on the application may include employment dates versus just the internship. Also, the total number of hours as reflected on the PLUS system over the span of 4 years and 10 months is 1,375 and she is not sure if that is accurate, but if it is, then there is another question of equivalency as the requirement is 2,000 hours. Dr. Holland said she was not sure how many hours were acquired as part time or full time and Dr. Grimes-Vawters confirmed it was full time and the log she had broke down the hours and it totaled over the 2,000 hours needed.

Dr. Grimes-Vawters stated that she did previously confirm she was complying with the Board's requirements and worked hard to ensure the same. Dr. Holland suggested that the PLUS Application be resubmitted and updated for clarity now and for the future to clean up and take out the hours that are related to the CPC and other hours that are not specific to the internship in the state to make the record much cleaner. Dr. Holland discussed one more point of clarification regarding the degree from Walden was in counseling psychology and that there is a place on the PLUS system that says clinical

psychology and it may be helpful for Dr. Grimes-Vawters to be mindful for her to keep the information consistent to clarify (on page 6 in two different places).

The executive director clarified that the coursework update is fine, but the further discussion is related to the internship for the amount of time and the number of hours. Dr. Esmaili confirmed the supervisor should be clarified for the ATEAM. The executive director also confirmed that pursuant to Dr. Holland's suggestion, Dr. Grimes-Vawters should be consistent in stating clinical or counseling psychology. Dr. Grimes-Vawters confirmed it was counseling psychology. Dr. Holland also stated that Dr. Grimes-Vawters should remove the other hours so it is solely and consistently regarding psychology hours. As such, Dr. Grimes-Vawters' Application was tabled to the next meeting.

Dr. Grimes-Vawter wanted to know what was different moving forward if the application was approved before, and if she is clear in understanding that she could go through this and not be approved again moving forward. Dr. Holland sought clarification on Dr. Grimes-Vawters' comment regarding approval. Dr. Grimes-Vawter stated a previous executive director informed her that the Board approved Dr. Grimes-Vawters' psychological assistance in 2018 (as confirmed by Dr. Esmaili) and by the ATEAM at the time. She said it was reapproved on June 6, 2019, and she has that certificate of approval as a psychological assistant. There was prior acknowledgment of the discrepancy in the hours. The executive director stated she did mention this issue to Dr. Owens and Dr. Owens advised her recollection was about approving Dr. Grimes-Vawters for registration but the ATEAM had still a question of equivalency. However, the executive director could not tell from the June 2019 meeting is if the equivalency issue was ever answered. According to Dr. Grimes-Vawters, however, the executive director stated there is understanding there was a resolution of the equivalency issue, but there is no documentation of that despite her searching for the same. Per the May 6, 2019, meeting minutes as read by Dr. Grimes-Vawters, it indicated that a prior executive director recommended the Board move forward with the registration, to which Dr. Holland specified that moving forward with registration does not necessarily mean equivalency. The executive director believed that at the time, they gave Dr. Grimes-Vawters registration, but the policy has changed since then, which creates a difference and concern related to the equivalency issue being satisfied or determined. Dr. Esmaili thought the internship hours clarification will help the ATEAM further determine the equivalency issue. Dr. Grimes-Vawters confirmed she will clean that up and resubmit through the PLUS system, which the executive director stated she will send to the ATEAM immediately upon notice from PLUS that it is available. Dr. Esmaili asked to put Dr. Grimes-Vawters on the agenda for the next meeting, which the executive director confirmed she would do.

c. Mejia, Viola

Dr. Mejia was present before the ATEAM. The executive director provided an overview of her notes for the ATEAM, stating that Dr. Mejia is an applicant for licensure and is a current licensed psychologist in California since April 2022, having obtained her Psy.D. from a non-APA accredited school (California Institute of Integral Studies) in 2019. She said that the education included one year of fulltime residency (fulfilled between 2011-2019), just over 2,700 internship hours between 2018-2019 and 2,700 post doc hours (between 2019-2022). Her application is nearly a year old, but she has another year to complete everything. The executive director noted that the Waivers and background checks are still needed for licensure, as well as taking and passing the State Exam, but the PLUS report provided enough information for the initial ATEAM review.

Dr. Holland wondered if Dr. Mejia did not meet equivalency in Nevada due to the internship hours taking multiple years, should the ATEAM look at the state equivalency related to her licensure with California, which Dr. Holland believed to be two years to meet that requirement. The executive director thought it was 5 years to bypass the ATEAM process and Dr. Mejia was only licensed for a little over a year. She added that another reason Dr. Mejia is before the ATEAM is because California is not a state that is equivalent with Nevada's requirements (it is considered a red state) and the fact that her school was not APA accredited. In order to make everything "clean", Dr. Holland specified that Dr. Mejia would need to be licensed in California for 5 years. The executive director confirmed.

Dr. Woodard indicated that unless someone from the ATEAM can determine that there was substantial equivalency with a non-APA accredited program and her pre/post doc hours were equivalent, then she could not move forward with her application for licensure. Dr. Woodard asked if there has been an individual review of Dr. Mejia's application to determine the equivalency. The executive director noted that the application was sent out to the ATEAM members prior to the meeting and Dr. Esmaeili stated she did briefly review the application prior to the meeting. She advised she did not see any major issues with the coursework, but there were 2 issues with the internship: the supervision times may not be enough (1 supervision a week for both sites and the second site did not have a group supervision). Dr. Esmaeili's questions concerned the supervision. Dr. Holland also noticed that, as well as the number of weeks of supervision, the number, type, and time that expanded related to supervision are in question. The Committee members continued their review of the application.

Dr. Holland asked if Dr. Mejia wanted to clarify on those questions at this time and further confirmed that Nevada requires that to meet equivalency, internships need to expand not over more than 2 years, be a minimum of 2000 hours, have 2 hours of individual supervision by a licensed psychologist, and an additional 2 hours of group supervision by a licensed psychologist. Dr. Mejia stated that is not how it is in

California. Dr. Holland specified that the only way to get around that to meet equivalency in Nevada would be to be licensed in another state, like California, in good standing for 5 years. Dr. Mejia asked if she waited to reapply after 5 years of licensure in California, would she then have equivalency. The executive director stated that she believes 5 years is the minimum number and she confirmed with the policy. Dr. Mejia asked if the 2 hours of individual supervision and 2 hours of group supervision per week were for a pre or pre and post-doctoral internship. Dr. Holland confirmed it was just for pre doctoral internship. Dr. Mejia then confirmed that the ATEAM is looking for 2,000 hours of pre doctoral internship, which was confirmed by Dr. Holland not to expend more than 2 years. The executive director stated the policy reads that California equivalency would require at least 5 years of active licensure, no disciplinary or adverse actions taken against them towards their license, and not less than 1,500 hours in each of the internship and post-doctoral years. Dr. Mejia confirmed the 1,500 hours for pre- and post-doctoral hours. The executive director said she believed after 5 years of licensure in California, the hours are reduced to 1,500 hours each and Dr. Mejia would bypass the ATEAM with the other conditions satisfied as mentioned above. Dr. Esmaeili asked what the ATEAM's decision for today would be – for Dr. Mejia to reapply after 5 years? Per the executive director, she is not sure there is any action required of the ATEAM unless they want to deny the application but the other option is to let the application ride and for Dr. Mejia to reapply once she has satisfied the bypass requirements. Dr. Esmaeili, Dr. Holland agreed that is where Dr. Mejia's application stands right now. Dr. Mejia clarified that she would have to go through the application process again once the 5 years passes. The executive director indicated she would essentially need to reapply. Further discussions related to Dr. Mejia's options were discussed by the ATEAM and Dr. Mejia. No action was taken on Dr. Mejia's application.

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. Woodard, Dr. Holland, and the executive director discussed options moving forward that may be helpful while reviewing these applications. The executive director also suggested specific assignments being made related to these applications.

Dr. Owens and the executive director have discussed a spreadsheet that deciphers the difference between those who graduated before and after 2018 from non-APA accredited programs. For instance, the post 2018 graduates are more of a competency review rather than strictly the coursework. The executive director stated that the spreadsheet is basically for the applicant, but may be helpful for the ATEAM to review, too, so she will forward that to the applicants and ATEAM moving forward for post 2018

non-APA program graduates. Dr. Holland thinks highlighting or flagging the pre or post 2018 will also be helpful.

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

The next ATEAM Committee meeting will be held on October 13, 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 Esmaeili adjourned the meeting at 11:37 a.m.

**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.

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

Meeting Minutes

November 3, 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 November 3, 2023, at 12:57 p.m.

Roll Call: Committee Chair, Soseh Esmaeili, Psy.D., and Committee Members, Dr. Catherine Pearson and Dr. Stephanie Woodward were present, and the Committee had a quorum.

Also present was Laura M. Arnold, the Board of Psychological Examiner's Executive Director.

- 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 Action on the Continued Review of Dr. Laura Litynski-Vitencz's Application to Register as a Psychology Assistant.

This is a continuation of this Committee's review of Dr. Laura Litynski-Vitencz's application to register as a Psychological Assistant.

During the October 13, 2023, ATEAM meeting, the Committee addressed issues regarding whether Dr. Litynski-Vitencz's Organizational Psychology doctoral program at Walden University was substantially equivalent to APA accreditation standards. At issue was how Walden answered several questions in its attestation on Dr. Litynski-Vitencz's PLUS report that went to substantial equivalency, and the Committee postponed making a decision to permit Dr. Litynski-Vitencz to clarify those answers with Walden.

After the last meeting, Dr. Litynski-Vitencz advised the executive director that Walden's answers to the questions on the PLUS report were correct and would not be changed. Dr. Litynski-Vitencz asked that the Committee review her application based on the information provided and that it consider approving her application contingent on her doing whatever this Committee says she would need to do to meet substantial equivalency.

Dr. Esmaili indicated that both her and Dr. Woodard reviewed the Application and Dr. Owens had previously reviewed Dr. Litynski-Vitencz's Application. Dr. Woodard stated that it took her awhile to go through the entire PLUS report to crosscheck all the necessary requirements to see if Dr. Litynski-Vitencz's Application met equivalency. While doing so, several things stood out to Dr. Woodard as concerning. There was still concern regarding Walden being able to attest to a residency component because it is clear on the transcript some residency credits were provided, but Dr. Woodard is concerned there is a conflict between the information provided on the transcript or there is consistency and even though Dr. Litynski-Vitencz did get some credits for residency training, it was not a full year credit of training. Dr. Woodard also cross checked the degrees required prior to 2018, as there are differences prior to and after 2018. The coursework on Dr. Litynski-Vitencz's Application did appear to be missing on the transcripts and the PLUS report may have had some credits accounted from a different degree, which can account for some of the Committee's confusion. Lastly, Dr. Woodard noted that Dr. Litynski-Vitencz's internship did not meet all the requirements, as well as some being uncertain as to whether or not the internship was commensurate with what is required. At the request of Dr. Woodard, the executive director read NAC 641.061(3) into the record. Dr. Woodard said she believes the NAC is clear, and if there is a request for a formal appeal submitted to the Committee regarding the program not meeting substantial equivalency as reflected in the PLUS application, then the applicant has the ability to seek out the director of clinical training from an APA approved program that the Board also endorses to have a third party review the information to determine substantial determination. From there, that decision from the

director of clinical training program would then come back before the Committee in consideration for the Committee to make a final determination. The executive director confirmed that is also her understanding. Dr. Esmaeili asked if the applicant was the one to pursue that, which Dr. Woodard confirmed and that was Dr. Woodard's recommendation because Dr. Litynski-Vitencz is requesting a formal review for her request. Dr. Woodard stated that the Committee should rely upon NAC to make their decision moving forward.

The executive director sought clarity from Dr. Woodard in asking if the Committee should maintain Dr. Litynski-Vitencz's application file as open while Dr. Litynski-Vitencz pursues it and brings it back before the Committee, or according to Dr. Esmaeili does the Committee have to vote and not accept the application for her then to appeal, move to the next step? Dr. Woodard inquired with the executive director about the ATEAM's last meeting and if they made a determination or if a request was made for the Committee to identify any missing coursework on Dr. Litynski-Vitencz's application for a recommendation for completion. The decision was not made, but the application was tabled to check in with Walden to ensure their answers to the equivalency were correct and see if they could obtain any clarity. Dr. Litynski-Vitencz had said she would do that, but then Dr. Litynski-Vitencz reconsidered and stated the information is correct and that Walden would not change their answers, so she requested that the Committee review the application based on the documents she had submitted.

Dr. Esmaeili recommended that the Committee vote and make a decision so that Dr. Litynski-Vitencz can decide what to do if she wants to pursue the third party review or not. Dr. Woodard was not sure a decision has to be made in order for a third party to review the Application and make a recommendation back to the Committee. Dr. Pearson wanted to know how long an Application can remain open for Dr. Litynski-Vitencz to go obtain the third party review. Dr. Pearson also reviewed the application and Dr. Woodard mirrored Dr. Woodard's concerns, which also reflect Dr. Owen's concerns from her review as discussed during the last meeting. According to the executive director, if the Committee's decision is to leave the application open while Dr. Litynski-Vitencz seeks a third-party review of the information, the application was first submitted in May of 2023, and she has 2 years to complete the requirements and for the Committee to hold the Application open. The Committee discussed potential pros and cons regarding making a recommendation to leave the application open versus denial and making it a part of the denial process. Dr. Esmaeili was thinking that if the denial was the route the Committee wanted to go with Dr. Litynski-Vitencz's application,

then the Committee could make the denial extremely clear with the regulations and requirements that are missing that are not equivalent. However, she also believed this can be done without an official denial to avoid the cons of emotions involved with a denial.

Dr. Pearson wanted to know if there was a financial cost associated with denial and having to reapply, which the executive director confirmed there is an application fee that would have to be repaid should the Committee deny the Application and Dr. Litynski-Vitencz need to reapply. The executive director reminded the Committee that the Application was submitted by Dr. Litynski-Vitencz but she did not move forward with it until after she retained employment with RENOWN, which provided her 30 days to get approval from the Committee regarding her Application – not expecting any problems with the Application. Maybe with a third-party review, the job can remain open to her, if substantial equivalency is determined preventing Dr. Litynski-Vitencz from having to reapply. Dr. Pearson wondered if the Committee were to provide the option to the Dr. Litynski-Vitencz and she decided not to move forward, could they take action or would it then allow her to keep the application open and move forward at that time. Dr. Woodard clarified that if the Committee were to move forward with a motion, the motion would include ensuring there was enough time for the review to occur and the recommendation to come before the Committee, and potentially in front of the entire Board, before her application expires in May 2025. The executive director stated that the Application would be subject to renewal at that time, too. Dr. Woodard believed an end date would be ideal, so there is not an extended period of uncertainty/time for this application. She thought it would be helpful to allow the Applicant between now and May of 2025 to have the Application reviewed. Dr. Esmaili also wanted the motion to include the Committee providing clear details regarding why the Application does not meet equivalency.

On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Catherine Pearson, the ATEAM, being informed by NAC 641.061 make the recommendation to Dr. Litynski-Vitencz to have her Application thoroughly reviewed by the director of clinical training at an APA approved training site that or other third party approved by the Board to make a determination of substantial equivalency that includes, but is not limited to, the coursework completed, Walden's answers on the PLUS report related to residency, and any experienced gained through internship, and that the review by the director of clinical training at an APA approved training site also approved by the Board is obtained with enough time for the ATEAM to review and make a recommendation on

*substantial equivalency by the time that her Application is set to expire in May of 2025. (Yea: Soseh Esmaili, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.)
Motion Carried: 3-0*

4. Public Comment.

There was no public comment at this time.

5. (For Possible Action) Adjournment

There being no further business before the Committee, Chair Esmaili adjourned the meeting at 1:19 p.m.