

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

Meeting Minutes

July 14, 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 July 14, 2023, at 11:09 a.m.

Roll Call: Committee Chair, Soseh Esmaeili, Psy.D. and Committee Member, Dr. Catherine Pearson were present. Committee Member, Stephanie Holland, Psy.D., was not present. Despite Dr. Holland's absence, 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 Approval of the Meeting Minutes from the June 2, 2023, Meeting of the Application Tracking Equivalency and Mobility (ATEAM) Committee.

The Committee had no changes or revisions to the proposed June 2, 2023, meeting minutes.

On motion by Catherine Pearson, second by Soseh Esmaeili, the ATEAM approved the meeting minutes of the Regular Meeting of the ATEAM held on June 2, 2023. (Yea: Soseh Esmaeili, Catherine Pearson approved to form not content. According to DAG Ward there is quorum to approve the motion) Motion Carried: 2-0.

4. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on Applications for Licensure as a Psychologist or Registration as a Psychological Assistant, Intern or Trainee to Determine Equivalency with Nevada Requirements, Including Education and/or Training.

a. Smetana, DeAnn

The ATEAM took a minute to review the information Executive Director Arnold provided to the Committee.

Dr. Smetana sent an email indicating she would be out of the country and unable to attend today's meeting. Dr. Smetana provided that her DBH has been accepted before, and another practicing psychologist in the state has been approved (Christine Moninghoff). Further, Dr. Smetana stated she completed another doctorate (a Psy.D.) and has practiced successfully under LPB for 13 years.

Dr. Pearson reviewed some of her questions related to Dr. Smetana's application. Part of the questions revolve around Dr. Smetana's doctorate that she obtained in behavioral health in 2011, that degree is appears to be more of leadership roles integrated care. In terms of coursework and internship expectations, it was not a traditional psychology program. That coursework and internship does not typically match the psychology experience required. But then it appears Dr. Smetana also received a Psy.D. from Cal Southern University. The transcript was not received, however, and Dr. Smetana did not discuss her classes. Dr. Pearson reviewed the program online, and per the online review, the coursework was closer to being relevant to Nevada's licensure requirements. Yet, again, those classes were not included in Dr. Smetana's application, it appears she only included the ASU program from 2011. Dr. Pearson is unsure how the Cal Southern University classes may match up better to Nevada's equivalency. Also, all Dr. Smetana's internship clinic experience was prior to her getting a Psy.D., which Dr. Pearson notes was provided to Dr. Smetana in 2021. Dr. Pearson was not sure if the Psy.D. program was more applicable for equivalency since it was not addressed in Dr. Smetana's application. Further, another one of the programs (specifically the coursework) still states that it does not meet the criteria for licensure for the State of Nevada, and it does list the states it does meet the requirements for, but Nevada is not one of them.

Dr. Esmaeili believes Dr. Smetana may want to combine the ASU experience with the Psy.D. from Cal Southern University. Dr. Esmaeili believes they may need to review the Cal State University transcript, course catalogue, and additional information related to the program. With that, Dr. Pearson confirmed Cal Southern University is the online information that states it does not meet equivalency for the state of Nevada requirements.

Executive Director Arnold indicated she had previously discussed with Board President Dr. Owens that the State Examination was passed, despite it being a long time ago. This could be one consideration that Dr. Smetana did pass the examination, but Dr. Esmaeili believes that would be the least of the ATEAM's concerns. Dr. Pearson and Executive Director Arnold wonder if the requirements were different back when Dr. Smetana passed the Nevada State Exam.

Dr. Pearson would like to see more from the most recent program and would like more information regarding the prior license that was approved from the ASU program. According to Executive Director Arnold, Dr. Moninghoff was approved in March of 2014, almost 10 years ago. The review criteria may have been changed and Dr. Esmaeili is not sure if that doctor had other considerations that allowed her to meet equivalency. Executive Director Arnold will try to get more information regarding this applicant to compare as the ATEAM needs more information with respect to her licensure.

Executive Director Arnold will be requesting from Dr. Smetana's CSU transcript, course catalogue, description of school and where the information can be provided. Dr. Pearson's questions will also be sent to Dr. Smetana for review and consideration.

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

b. Grimes-Vawters, Jennifer

Dr. Esmaeili indicates Dr. Grimes-Vawters listed internships for 2011, 2013, and 2014, so it appears there is an abundance of hours provided but upon a closer review it seems the 2011-2015 doctoral internship is the only applicable internship. Dr. Grimes-Vawters only accrued 1375 hours in 4 years. Also, Dr. Esmaeili said that not all the internship hours were with psychologists, which means the hours do not meet the requirements as Dr. Grimes-Vawters has less than she needed, too. It appears some of the hours has Dr. Grimes-Vawters as CPC Counselor hours, which cannot be used for consideration as it would be double dipping.

Further, Dr. Esmaeili states Dr. Grimes-Vawters was reviewed previously by Dr. Owens, who questioned two of Dr. Grimes-Vawter's coursework: (1) cognitive affected basis of behavior – Dr. Owens wasn't sure if the cognitive psychology course was equivalent to cognitive affected basis of behavior); and (2) the bio psychology course whether its

equivalent to biology basis for Nevada. The hours were also a question previously posed by Dr. Owens. According to Dr. Esmaeili, it does not appear anything has really changed from Dr. Grimes-Vawters past review. Executive Director Arnold confirmed Dr. Grimes-Vawters was deemed not equivalent, however, she was allowed to register as a PA but could not be approved for licensure. Executive Director Arnold questioned this approach. Dr. Esmaeili believes allowing Dr. Grimes-Vawter to be registered as a PA because there is no road to licensure for her. Dr. Esmaeili does not want to give Dr. Grimes-Vawter any false hope. Dr. Pearson is not sure if there were discussions regarding Dr. Grimes-Vawter incurring clinical hours or another avenue to address the deficiencies while she was registered as a PA. Should the ATEAM allow Dr. Grimes-Vawter to be a PA, she would need to do the remaining doctorate internship hours. Executive Director Arnold questions how Dr. Grimes-Vawter was registered as a PA when it was pointed out by Dr. Owens previously that there was no equivalency justifying the same. July 2019 was when Dr. Grimes-Vawter was previously approved. There are no additional notes for consideration, but Executive Director Arnold will review the Board files again.

Further discussions were held to discuss the appropriate next steps. Executive Director Arnold expressed her sentiment that the Board policy is clear that the minimum requirements must be met for consideration and licensure. Regardless, Dr. Esmaeili's recommendation to the ATEAM is that the Board deny Dr. Grimes-Vawter's request because of the internship issue expressed above (while she has 1375 hours, they were not all psychologist hours and there is question about the coursework that remain). Dr. Owens also previously indicated that the school residency may not have been equivalency at the time Dr. Grimes-Vawter attended. It appeared to Dr. Esmaeili the residency may also be a concern. With all of those, Dr. Esmaeili has concerns. Dr. Pearson believes because the Board previously approved Dr. Grimes-Vawter as a PA does require more clarification as it would appear there were discussions or considerations to allow her to be licensed. Dr. Pearson is not comfortable denying her without further looking into that. Dr. Esmaeili proposed discussing this with the Board due to the conflict related to her PA registration and the inability of the Board to approve her for licensure. Executive Director Arnold will attempt to get more information from Dr. Grimes-Vawter and the Board files, too. The course catalogue should be provided and Dr. Grimes-Vawter should confirm her residency per Dr. Esmaeili. Dr. Pearson questions if the ATEAM can check in with Dr. Owens to see if she may recall the situation and details surrounding Dr. Grimes-Vawter's previous application. Since it appears Dr. Grimes-Vawter is not equivalent, the ATEAM will further review her application to determine the prior situation that allowed her to register as a PA without future promise of licensure.

This application was tabled for the next meeting.

c. Key, Ashley

Dr. Esmaili has not had the opportunity to review Dr. Key's application yet. Executive Director Arnold reviewed some notes that Dr. Key has communicated with the Board for several months. Dr. Key applied for a PA but has not been licensed as a PI. There is a supervisor, Dr. Norensberg. Dr. Key went to National University and to be a registered PI, she has to get sign off from director of psychological clinical training. Yet, the program did not have a director of psychological training.

Dr. Esmaili indicated Dr. Key does not have residency, practicum, or internship either as it was not required by the program. In Executive Director Arnold's experience, this indicates an online school, which generally is not equivalent. Dr. Esmaili notes a couple of concerns with this application such as: residency, not having a clinical training director, not having internship, and possibly not having practicum. Dr. Esmaili does not believe ATEAM has approved National University previously.

Without a track to licensure, this may violate the agreement with Medicaid. If Dr. Key is listed as an intern, there is some concern to protect the public. If identified as an intern, there should be some clinical experience and background, but the practicum appears to have none.

Dr. Esmaili questions the Waldon University transcript, which Dr. Esmaili believes may have been Dr. Key's attempt to obtain equivalency. The application indicates Dr. Key's attendance dates were 2007 to 2018 per Dr. Esmaili's review.

Executive Director said she provided information for Dr. Key, and all the doctors, to attend after Dr. Esmaili asked if Dr. Key wanted to appear today.

Dr. Esmaili's initial thought would be to deny for equivalency. Dr. Pearson confirmed there is enough that does not meet the requirements needed.

On motion by Catherine Pearson, second by Soseh Esmaili, the ATEAM will deny Dr. Ashley Key's Application for Licensure. (Yea: Soseh Esmaili, Catherine Pearson.) Motion Carried: 2-0

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

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

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

The next ATEAM Committee meeting will be held on August 11, 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 11:43 a.m.