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NOTE: The information presented in this webinar is not intended to provide legal advice or to substitute for the advice of an attorney, but rather to provide information about considerations when dealing with requests for ESA certifications.
Disclaimer:
This has nothing to do with liking or not liking animals
Learning Objectives

1. Describe the role conflicts that are created when a treating psychologist writes an ESA certification letter for a current patient/client.
2. Discuss what the law says about what ESAs can do and what they cannot do.
3. Identify ethically what should be considered when making an ESA determination.
4. Identify what should be evaluated as part of an adequate ESA needs assessment.
5. Analyze how the current disability laws impact ESA certification and the potential long-term impact of this type of certification.
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This article examines the role conflicts that psychologists may face in their practices related to the evaluation and certification of emotional support animals (ESAs). It reviews the legal differences between ESAs and service animals (SAs), outlines ethical guidelines and legal policies/regulations regarding the use of ESAs, and examines the potential role conflicts that exist when a treating psychologist is certifying the need for an ESA. Finally, it makes recommendations to assist psychologists in staying within the standards of practice in order to avoid the ethical and legal risks associated with certifying an ESA.
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What is a Service Animal (SA)?

• The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) definition of a Service Animal (SA):
  • Limited to dogs or miniature horses.
    • A dog or miniature horse that is *individually trained to perform tasks for the benefit of an individual with a disability*.
    • Tasks a dog or miniature horse has been trained to provide must be *directly related* to the person’s disability (ADA, 2011).
What is an Emotional Support Animal (ESA)?

- ESAs can be pets.
- Special accommodations must be afforded to individuals who need ESAs to assist them psychologically.
- ESAs do not require the training that is necessary to certify an animal as an ADA-compliant SA.
  - For example, with proper documentation ESAs can be kept in housing that prohibits pets. While this documentation does not allow the ESA access everywhere, it does require waiving a no-pet rule and also any related damage deposit.
ESAs in Action
Emotional Support Animals and Housing

• Housing that prohibits pets must allow ESAs, resulting in the waiving of a no-pet rule and any related damage deposit.

• Under the Fair Housing Act (FHA, 1968), an ESA is viewed as a *reasonable accommodation* in a housing unit that has a no pets rule.

• The imposition of a fee or deposit is considered contrary to the purpose of the law.
Emotional Support Animals and Air Travel

• The Air Carrier Access Act (ACAA, 2003) requires airlines to allow SAs and ESAs to accompany their handlers in the main cabin.

• Air carriers “shall not impose charges for providing facilities, equipment, or services that are required by this part [of the Act] to be provided to qualified individuals with a disability” (Federal Register, 2003).

• According to the Department of Transportation (DOT), passengers with a mental health disability can travel with their animal in the main cabin of an airplane if that animal is an emotional support animal (ESA).
Emotional Support Animals and Air Travel

• Passengers who have a disability may have to provide the airline with current documentation on the letterhead of a licensed mental health professional stating:
  (a) the passenger has a mental health-related disability listed in the DSM–IV;
  (b) having the animal accompany the passenger is necessary to the passenger’s mental health, treatment, or to assist the passenger;
  (c) the individual providing the assessment of the passenger is a licensed mental health professional and the passenger is under their professional care;
  (d) the date, type of the professional license, and the state or jurisdiction in which it was issued.

(Federal Register, 2003)
Problems with Providing ESA Letters to Patients

• Therapists have potential professional conflicts with dual roles.
• Letters are formal determinations/statements of a mental health disability.
• The presence of the animal must ameliorate the defined disability:
  • Little empirical support in literature.
  • Liking the animal around is not the amelioration of anything.
• Definitions of disability are quite varied.
• Presence of animal usually has nothing to do with therapy.
What is a Disability, Anyway?

• Disability is a legal concept.

• It is based upon six federal laws that have differing definitions.

• Consequently, for a mental health professional working with a patient, disability is not just a matter of discomfort, but a psychological disorder or problem that interferes with the patient’s ability to perform major life activities.

• Disability means “a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one of major life activities.”
  • (Note the word *substantially* in the definition.)
Richard Hunt, Esq.

• “...even with emotional support animals there must be a “disability related need” for the animal... a patient with mild depression may feel better when a pet cat is around... this does not mean there is a disability related need for the animal.”

• Mental health professionals need to be aware that certifying a patient is disabled requires a proper medical diagnosis and the application of the correct legal definition of disability. Otherwise the certification may simply be wrong and may lead to legal action.
The ESA Industry
Certification of ESAs
Who is Evaluating the Need For and Certifying Emotional Support Animals?

• Sampled 87 mental health practitioners who worked in a forensic or combined forensic/clinical (57.5%); or clinical (42.5%) practice.

• Participants instructed to read the DOT description and indicate which tools/techniques they would use to arrive at a conclusion or recommendation for the need for an ESA.

• Participants were also asked a series of questions about:
  1. Whether they have made a recommendation,
  2. Whether they believe it is appropriate for treating mental health professionals to offer opinions on the need for an ESA, and
  3. Whether they feel competent to provide such determinations.
## Logistic Regression Comparisons for ESA Recommendation

### Instruments/Techniques Across Types of Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Forensic (% endorsed; n = 50)</th>
<th>Clinical (% endorsed; n = 37)</th>
<th>Total (% endorsed; n = 87)</th>
<th>Odds Ratio for Forensic vs. Clinical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symptom Checklist</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>11.0**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Symptom Inventory</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>2.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malingering Assessment</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>0.3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAI or MMPI</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>0.2**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05 **p* < .01.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has made an ESA recommendation for one or more individuals</th>
<th>Forensic (% endorsed; n = 50)</th>
<th>Clinical (% endorsed; n = 37)</th>
<th>Total (% endorsed; n = 87)</th>
<th>Odds Ratio for Forensic vs. Clinical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>4.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes it is appropriate for a treating mental health professional to offer an opinion on the need for an ESA</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels qualified to make an ESA determination</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .01.
Summary of Results

• Forensic practitioners chose more complex and forensically-valid instruments (e.g. MMPI, malingering).

• Clinical practitioners make more recommendations, BUT many forensic practitioners believe it is appropriate for treating professionals to make recommendations.
  • Clarify WHO should be making these evaluations and HOW

• 64% feel competent to conduct ESA assessments despite lack of guidelines.
Ethical Issues and Concerns

• Role conflicts
• Competence
• Risk to the therapeutic alliance
• Objectivity
• Thoroughness
• Vicarious liability
Alaska Airlines ESA Attack
Recommended Evaluation Model

• Younggren, Boness, Bryant and Koocher (submitted)
  • A formal disability evaluation consistent with legal definitions of disability.
  • A thorough understanding of the laws that impact ESAs.
  • An evaluation of the animals ability to perform the function consistent with the animals abilities and temperament.
  • An evaluation of the interaction of the animal with the owner to support claim of amelioration.
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