

**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.