



**STATE OF ARIZONA
BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGIST EXAMINERS
1740 W. ADAMS STREET, SUITE 3403
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007
PH: 602-542-8162 FX: 602-926-8095
WEBSITE: www.psychboard.az.gov**

DOUGLAS A. DUCEY
Governor

HEIDI HERBST PAAKKONEN, M.P.A.
Executive Director

MEETING MINUTES

April 3, 2020
7:45 a.m.
1740 W. Adams St.
Boardroom C (1st Floor)
Phoenix, AZ 85007

1. CALL TO ORDER

The regular session of the Arizona State Board of Psychologist Examiners was called to order by Madame Chair Shreeve at 7:47 a.m. on April 3, 2020. One Executive Session was held.

2. ROLL CALL

Board Members Present by Telephone:

Tamara Shreeve, MPA – Chair
Diana Davis-Wilson, DBH, BCBA, Ph.D. – Vice-Chair
Lynn L. Flowers, Ph.D. – Secretary
Bob Bohanske, Ph.D., FNAP
Bryan Davey, Ph.D., BCBA-D
Aditya Dynar, Esq.
Stephen Gill, Ph.D.
Matthew A. Meier, Psy.D.
Ramona N. Mellott, Ph.D.

Staff Present

Heidi Herbst Paakkonen, Executive Director (telephonic)
Jennifer Michaelsen, Deputy Director (telephonic)
Kathy Fowkes, Licensing Specialist (telephonic)
Krishna Poe, Programs and Projects Specialist

Assistant Attorneys General

Jeanne Galvin, Esq.
Lynette Evans, Esq.

3. REMARKS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

• Board Surveys

Ms. Shreeve encouraged meeting attendees to contact Board staff for assistance with completing the Board Meeting Assessment Survey.

• Board Member and Staff Appreciation

Ms. Shreeve acknowledged the many hours of time invested by Board members to prepare for and attend several additional meetings necessitated by the COVID-19 pandemic, noting it is a

challenging time to be asked to devote additional time to serve the public. Additionally she thanked Board staff and legal counsel for their extra efforts to prepare for these meetings.

4. COUNSEL UPDATE

Ms. Galvin updated the Board concerning the matter involving Dr. Steven Gray. She reminded the Board an anonymous complaint was submitted against Dr. Gray and as the matter was scheduled for review with the Complaint Screening Committee (CSC), Dr. Gray filed a special action challenging the Board's authority to process and adjudicate an anonymous complaint. Arizona Superior Court found in favor of the Board, and the Arizona Court of Appeals very recently upheld the lower court's decision. She advised that Dr. Gray will not appeal to the Superior Court and therefore the complaint will finally go before the CSC. Ms. Galvin also reminded the Board that it also prevailed in the Court of Appeals with respect to the case filed by Dr. John DenBoer challenging the Board's authority to adjudicate a court claim under A.R.S. 32-2081(C). However she has been advised that Dr. DenBoer will file an appeal of that decision with the Supreme Court of Arizona.

5. CONSENT AGENDA - DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- March 13, 2020 Regular Session Minutes
- March 13, 2020 Executive Session Minutes
- March 31, 2020 Regular Session Minutes

B. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

C. INVESTIGATIONS REPORT

D. DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING PSYCHOLOGIST APPLICATIONS

Requesting Approval to Sit for Examination (EPPP) & Licensure

- 1) Amy Leigh Becker, Psy.D.
- 2) Amy Marie Bissinger, Psy.D.
- 3) Angelica L. Parnell-Tann, Psy.D.
- 4) Heather Marie Holden, Ph.D.
- 5) Lori Wilson, Psy.D.
- 6) Marisa Sanchez, Psy.D.
- 7) Sue A. Moler, Psy.D.

Requesting Approval for Licensure by Waiver

- 1) Adam Frose, Ph.D.
- 2) Elisabetta Ambrosia, Psy.D.
- 3) Kimberly Howlett, Psy.D.

Requesting Approval of Supervised Experience for Licensure after EPPP

- 1) Kim Anh Ann Bui, Psy.D.
- 2) Ronald C. Bean, Ph.D.

Requesting Approval of Licensure by Credential

- 1) Janet C. Nicholson, Ed.D.
- 2) Nekeshia Hammond, Psy.D.

Requesting Approval for Licensure by Universal Recognition

- 1) Deborah Kaye Chatel, Ph.D.
- 2) Kenneth E. Christianson, Ph.D.

E. DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING BEHAVIOR ANALYST APPLICATIONS

- 1) Caitlin Carlon Welty, M.A.
- 2) Elizabeth Jordan, M.A.
- 3) Gina Marie Mastroianni, M.Ed.
- 4) Julie Tyma, M.A.
- 5) Kassandra Montijo, M.Ed.
- 6) Krishna Pungot Agatep, M.A.
- 7) Mayra A. Gayton, M.Ed.
- 8) Meagan Sullivan, M.Ed.
- 9) Morgan Brown-Chipley, M.S.
- 10) Patricia Egan, M.Ed.

F. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REQUEST FOR REACTIVATION OF INACTIVE LICENSE FROM KEVIN BLAKLEY, PSY.D.

G. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REQUEST FOR REACTIVATION OF INACTIVE LICENSE FROM ANGELA BRAMBLE, PH.D.

H. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND ACTION REGARDING FIRST REQUEST FOR EXTENSION TO TAKE THE EPPP FROM MOLLY GREGAN, PSY.D.

I. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND ACTION REGARDING FIRST REQUEST FOR EXTENSION TO TAKE THE EPPP FROM SAMARA CERVEN, PSY.D.

J. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND ACTION REGARDING REQUEST FOR EXTENSION TO TAKE THE EPPP FROM COMEL BELIN, PH.D.

MOTION: Dr. Davis-Wilson moved for the Board to approve the items as listed on the Consent Agenda. Dr. Flowers seconded the motion.

VOICE VOTE: The motion was approved 9-0.

TIMED ITEM – 8:00 a.m.

6. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON WHETHER TO OPEN A COMPLAINT FOR POTENTIAL UNLAWFUL PRACTICE REGARDING CAROL GANDOLFO, Psy.D.

Ms. Shreeve advised the Board that this matter appears on the agenda for purposes of determining whether to open a complaint to investigate whether Dr. Gandolfo has practiced psychology in Arizona without a license. Dr. Gill stated that he is recused from the consideration and vote on this matter.

Mr. Riches and Mr. Cohen were present representing Dr. Gandolfo. Mr. Riches stated to the Board that during this time of crisis, and given the increased need for mental health services, the Board should consider expanding access to psychology care to those in need. He further stated that Dr. Gandolfo has

not been practicing as a psychologist in Arizona; she is licensed in California as a psychologist where she practices on a limited basis, and she is also licensed by the Board of Behavioral Health Examiners as a marriage and family therapist in Arizona. Mr. Riches noted Dr. Gandolfo is only serving in a voluntary capacity for the Sedona Fire Department. He advised the Board that any finding of unlawful practice is pointless since the remedies for these actions are extremely limited. Mr. Riches indicated that Dr. Gandolfo is open to providing a written affidavit affirming that she is only engaging in professional activities permitted by her marriage and family therapist license until such time this Board grants her psychologist license.

Ms. Evans, in her capacity as independent legal advisor to the Board, affirmed that the Board should only consider whether to open a complaint, and that process can include directing staff to gather additional information if determined necessary. The members questioned whether Dr. Gandolfo's volunteer activities represent generic service on a volunteer board, or services that are predicated on professional expertise as a psychologist. The members also discussed whether the facts gathered thus far, such as in the news article supplied to the Board, are entirely accurate. Ms. Evans advised that questions can be posed to Dr. Gandolfo through the complaint investigation process. The members discussed the need for consistency when presented with possible allegations of unlicensed practice, and expressed the desire to afford Dr. Gandolfo the opportunity to submit a response and explanation concerning her activities.

MOTION: Dr. Flowers moved to open an investigation to ascertain whether Dr. Gandolfo is practicing psychology in Arizona without a license. Dr. Meier seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Ms. Shreeve – Yes
Dr. Davis-Wilson – Yes
Dr. Flowers – Yes
Dr. Bohanske – Yes
Dr. Davey – Yes
Mr. Dynar – No
Dr. Meier – Yes
Dr. Mellott – Abstain

The motion was approved with 6 affirmative votes, 1 no vote, 1 abstention and 1 recusal.

TIMED ITEM – 8:30 a.m.

7. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATING TO INITIAL CASE REVIEWS OF THE FOLLOWING COMPLAINTS

a) Complaint No. 20-20 Connie Pyburn, Ph.D.

Dr. Flowers summarized the allegations of the complaint filed by R.C. for Dr. Pyburn's alleged failure to obtain her written consent to treat Son, which R.C. believes is unprofessional conduct and violates a court ruling. He also summarized Dr. Pyburn's response consisting of statements that she was not treating or giving therapy to Son, and that Son merely participated as a collateral to the client Father's therapy for two sessions. Dr. Flowers stated that the CSC review of the complaint found evidence of possible violations including but not limited to Arizona Revised Statute ("A.R.S.") §32-2061(16)(h), for possibly failing or refusing to maintain and retain adequate business, financial or professional records pertaining to the psychological services provided to a client or patient; A.R.S. § 32-2061(16)(o), for possibly providing services that are unnecessary or unsafe or otherwise engaging in activities as a psychologist that are unprofessional by current standards of practice; and A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(dd), for possibly violating an ethical standard adopted by the Board as it pertains to section 3.10 (Informed Consent) of the American Psychological Association's Ethical Principles of Psychologist and Code of Conduct.

The complainant R.C. was present and stated that she refutes Dr. Pyburn's representation of her minor child's role in the treatment provided to the child's father.

Flynn Carey, the respondent's counsel, and Dr. Pyburn were present for the review of the case. Mr. Carey stated that at no time did Dr. Pyburn supply treatment to the child, that her only client was Father, and that she fully documented the child's role as collateral. Mr. Carey further indicated that there is no requirement that informed consent from both parents is required in an instance where a collateral child is involved in a parent's treatment. He noted the instances in the clinical records where this is documented. He asserted that Dr. Pyburn is not a party to the child custody court order, and the law does not require her to be. Mr. Carey requested the complaint be dismissed as there is no basis in the law upon which to find a violation. The Board members questioned Dr. Pyburn relative to the timing of her notation of the child's role. She stated she indicated as such when completing the intake with father and she did not have a separate collateral form.

With respect to her notations of play therapy and family treatment, she explained she was using these from a theoretical perspective. Mr. Carey stated that there is no evidence to support that therapy was provided to the child, and that the delivery of services was exactly as it is represented in the documentation which is confirmed by father.

The Board deliberated the case relative to the documentation and the role of the child in the therapeutic arrangement.

MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to meet in Executive Session to obtain legal advice. Dr. Flowers seconded the motion.

VOICE VOTE: The motion was approved 9-0.

Upon resuming the meeting in public session, the Board members discussed the fact that the documented goals and objectives in the client record appropriately identifies who is the client, and effectively identifies Son as functioning in a collateral role.

MOTION: Dr. Mellott moved to dismiss the case. Dr. Bohanske seconded the motion

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Ms. Shreeve – Yes
Dr. Davis-Wilson – Yes
Dr. Flowers – No
Dr. Bohanske – Yes
Dr. Davey – Yes
Mr. Dynar – Yes
Dr. Gill – No
Dr. Meier – Yes
Dr. Mellott – Yes

The motion was approved by a vote of 7-2.

b) Complaint No. 20-18 Ashley Hart, Ph.D.

Dr. Flowers stated for the record that he is recused from the consideration of this case.

Dr. Davis-Wilson summarized the background of the complaint submitted by H.S. explaining that Dr. Hart provided a custody evaluation during the course of H.S.'s and Father's divorce and was requested by Father's attorney in 2016 to provide reconciliation services for the family. Dr. Davis-Wilson noted an August 3, 2016 motion filed by Father's attorney states Dr. Hart refused to provide such services, citing a

conflict of interest as his role was solely to provide a custody evaluation. She further noted that despite this representation, in a letter dated May 29, 2019, Dr. Hart stated that he provided reconciliation services and recommended that Daughters continue visitation with Father despite a pending DCS investigation against Father and a protective order. Dr. Davis-Wilson stated H.S. further represents that Daughters have made disclosures to their current therapists, teachers and DCS caseworkers regarding physical and sexual abuse by Father during visits, and that Dr. Hart failed to contact her Daughters' therapists prior to making his recommendation that visitation continue. Dr. Davis-Wilson noted that H.S. alleges that Dr. Hart misrepresented his role in the divorce case and made a reckless recommendation regarding visitation. She reported that the CSC voted to forward this case to the Board for possible violations of A.R.S. § 32-2061(16)(h), for possibly failing or refusing to maintain and retain adequate business, financial or professional records pertaining to the psychological services provided to a client or patient; and A.R.S. § 32-2061(16)(o), for possibly providing services that are unnecessary or unsafe or otherwise engaging in activities as a psychologist that are unprofessional by current standards of practice;

The complainant was not present for the review of the case. Dr. Hart was present and admitted that when he composed the letter for Father he did misspeak but that he subsequently clarified that his role in this case was as an evaluator. He described the case as involving a team approach, noting that his colleague did not find any signs of abuse of eldest Daughter. With the agreement of both parties he performed an extended bonding assessment and his role was as a witness of fact.

The committee felt the documentation was a problem in that the misrepresentation made was made in the letter issued by Dr. Hart, and whether it rises to the level of a violation of law. The members discussed that while a mistake has been acknowledged, the licensee appropriately corrected the record and rectified the situation in the process. The members advised Dr. Hart that this complaint serves as a reminder to carefully review documentation for errors and to make corrections when errors are identified

MOTION: Dr. Bohanske moved to dismiss the complaint. Dr. Meier seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 8-0-1, with Dr. Flowers recusing.

THE FOLLOWING AGENDA ITEMS ARE UNTIMED AND MAY BE DISCUSSED AND DECIDED UPON AT VARIOUS TIMES THROUGHOUT THE MEETING AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIR

8. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CONSENT AGREEMENT FOR SURRENDER OF LICENSE FOR ALEXIA KEVONIAN, PSY.D. IN CASE NO 20-26.

Ms. Michaelsen summarized the matter stating that the Board had received a complaint concerning Dr. Kevonian containing allegations that she instigated and engaged in a dual relationship with a client and that she inappropriately terminated services to that client. Ms. Michaelsen explained that Dr. Kevonian did not renew her license by her December 31, 2019 expiration date but the license remained in suspension status by operation of law while the investigation was pending. She advised that the CSC reviewed the complaint and voted to refer the matter to the Board for further review based on potential violations of A.R.S. § 32-2061(16)(g), 16(o), 16(v), and 16(dd) as it relates to section 3.05 (multiple relationships) of the APA code of ethics. Ms. Michaelsen also noted that Dr. Kevonian's attorney indicated that she does not intend to renew her license or practice psychology in Arizona as her sole purpose in obtaining Arizona licensure was to practice telepsychology in this state as an employee of Doctor on Demand for whom she no longer works and that Dr. Kevonian would be receptive to surrendering the license. Ms. Michaelsen called to the Board's attention the draft consent agreement negotiated between the parties presented to the Board for consideration and possible approval.

Ms. Jodi Mullis, attorney for Dr. Kevonian, was present and in response to questions advised the Board that other states where Dr. Kevonian is licensed are also investigating this matter.

MOTION: Dr. Davis-Wilson moved to accept the consent agreement. Dr. Flowers seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Ms. Shreeve – Yes
Dr. Davis-Wilson – Yes
Dr. Flowers – Yes
Dr. Bohanske – Yes
Dr. Davey – Yes
Mr. Dynar – Yes
Dr. Gill – Yes
Dr. Meier – Yes
Dr. Mellott – Yes

The motion was approved 9-0.

9. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REQUEST TO TERMINATE PROBATION FOR CASE NO. 18-11 FOR MICHAEL JOHNSON, PH.D.

Ms. Michaelsen summarized the status of Dr. Johnson's completion of his probation terms pursuant to the term of the Consent Agreement constituting the disposition of Complaint 18-11. She affirmed that he has submitted materials in support of this request, and noted that his practice monitor states in her final report that she has no concerns relative to terminating Dr. Johnson's probation.

MOTION: Dr. Flowers moved to grant termination of Dr. Johnson's probation and that his license be restored to unrestricted status. Dr. Gill seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 9-0.

10. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATING TO THE RESULTS OF THE FITNESS FOR DUTY EVALUATION COMPLETED BY DR. RACHELE "BARRIE" WAGNER IN ACCORDANCE WITH HER 12/13/2019 INTERIM CONSENT AGREEMENT FOR COMPLAINT NO. 20-09

Ms. Michaelsen reminded the Board that this matter was on the March 13, 2020 meeting agenda but that Dr. Wagner failed to appear as she was ill. She further noted that she recently received another notification from the licensee stating that she was still too unwell to attend this meeting. Ms. Michaelsen affirmed that Dr. Wagner's license remains suspended and that the next step is for the Board to review and take action on the licensee's fitness for duty evaluation; Dr. Wagner is requesting a continuation of that review until such time that she is able to attend.

MOTION: Dr. Flowers moved the matter be tabled until the next board meeting. Dr. Gill seconded the motion

VOTE: The motion was approved 9-0.

11. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RENEWAL APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY DAVID WALSH, PSY.D.

Ms. Poe advised the Board that on March 18, 2020 the Board office received Dr. Walsh's application for renewal of his psychologist license. She noted that Dr. Walsh reported on question #9 that he was the subject of a regulatory agency or board investigation, and he submitted a written explanation of the matter along with documents from the California Board of Psychology indicating the case was dismissed without any disciplinary action. Ms. Poe stated that Dr. Walsh is available on the call to address any questions.

MOTION: Dr. Flowers moved to approve the application and renew Dr. Walsh's license. Dr. Gill seconded the motion.

VOICE VOTE: The motion was approved 9-0

12. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CATHERINE O'CONNELL, PH.D. TO INCLUDE POTENTIAL FINDING OF NON COMPLIANCE WITH 2015 – 2017 CONTINUING EDUCATION (CE) REQUIREMENTS

Ms. Poe summarized the findings of the Continuing Education Committee audit noting that Dr. O'Connell was found out of compliance with the requirements, supplied with notice and opportunity to remedy the identified deficiencies, but no documentation has been received. Ms. Poe noted that Dr. O'Connell has not responded to the deficiency letter, and to date, she remains out of compliance.

Dr. O'Connell was present and stated that she never received the deficiency letter. She further stated she has identified a certificate that she had inadvertently omitted from her continuing education submission. The Board advised Dr. O'Connell which of her completed courses were qualifying based on the time frames and explained to the licensee where her documentation was deficient.

It was the consensus of the Board to table this item to allow Dr. O'Connell to submit all of her documentation to the Board office. This item will appear on a future meeting agenda.

13. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION CONCERNING GRANTING EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO GRANT APPLICATION TIME FRAME EXTENSIONS UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES AT A.R.S. §36-787 (PUBLIC HEALTH AUTHORITY DURING STATE OF EMERGENCY)

Ms. Herbst Paakkonen advised the Board that a request to adopt waivers for the various application processing time frames was inadvertently omitted from the Board's March 31, 2020 meeting agenda and are therefore presented on this agenda for consideration and possible action.

Time to Respond to Notice of Application Deficiency – 240 Days pursuant to A.A.C. R4-26-208

MOTION: Dr. Mellott moved to grant applicants an additional 2 months beyond the lifting of the state of emergency or in the event of a disaster being declared. Dr. Flowers seconded the motion.

VOICE VOTE: The motion was approved 9-0.

Administrative Completeness Time Frame – 240 Days pursuant to A.A.C. R4-26-208

MOTION: Dr. Davis-Wilson moved to grant an additional 30 days for Board staff to issue notices of administrative completeness. Dr. Flowers seconded the motion.

VOICE VOTE: The motion was approved 9-0.

Time to Respond to Request for Additional Information – 240 Days pursuant to A.A.C. R4-26-208

MOTION: Dr. Flowers moved to grant an additional 60 days to this time frame following the lifting of the emergency. Dr. Bohanske seconded the motion.

VOICE VOTE: The motion was approved 9-0.

Substantive Review Time Frame – 90 Days pursuant to A.A.C. R4-26-208

MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to grant an additional 60 days to this time frame following the lifting of the emergency. Dr. Bohanske seconded the motion.

VOICE VOTE: The motion was approved 9-0.

14. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION CONCERNING GRANTING PROVISIONAL LICENSES TO QUALIFIED INDIVIDUALS PURSUANT TO EXECUTIVE ORDER 2020-17 "CONTINUITY OF WORK"

Ms. Herbst Paakkonen updated the Board on the guidance received from the Governor's office, specifically that a failed examination renders an applicant ineligible for a provisional license. Additionally she explained that the Governor's office advised that the temporary license the Board approves for EPPP Approval Plus Licensure applicants is not equivalent to the provisional license as the temporary license has practice supervision requirements and the provisional license is intended to be unrestricted.

MOTION: Dr. Mellott moved to direct staff to process temporary licenses as has been done in the past, but to develop the provisional license application. Dr. Davis-Wilson seconded the motion.

The Board discussion affirmed that the provisional license applications will come before the Board for substantive review in accordance with established procedure.

VOTE: The motion was approved 9-0.

15. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION CONCERNING A.R.S. §32-2061(15) DEFINITION OF TELEPRACTICE, A.A.C. R4-26-110 PROVIDING PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICE BY TELEPRACTICE, AND A.A.C. R4-26-111 PROVIDING SUPERVISION THROUGH TELEPRACTICE

Ms. Herbst Paakkonen reminded the Board that this item was on the March 31, 2020 meeting agenda, and that the Board requested it be placed on a future agenda for discussion.

Dr. Meier stated that in the language for the descriptions of therapy services, it does not indicate what modes of supervision can be used, however the language for telepractice does provide specification. Dr. Meier further noted that R4-26-111(D)(1)(a) mentions that the supervisee could be identified by phone suggesting that a supervision could be provided by telephone. He questioned whether this language enables the Board to conclude that telephonic supervision can be done under typical instances (as in those not under the current declared emergency). Ms. Galvin affirmed that there appears to be some conflict in the rules and advised that under the current state of emergency telephonic supervision can be provided, but after the emergency is lifted the Board will need to correct this conflict of language. She further suggested this matter be placed on a future meeting agenda.

MOTION: Dr. Bohanske moved to direct the Executive Director to seek a waiver to allow supervision and psychology services to be conducted without restriction via any electronic means to include audio and video for the duration of the declared emergency. Dr. Meier seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 9-0.

16. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CONTINUATION OF THE ARIZONA BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGIST EXAMINERS, AND PROPOSED LEGISLATION INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, SB1054, HB2224, HB2184, HB2288, HB2809, SB1211, SB1212, AND SB1507

Ms. Herbst Paakkonen advised the Committee that the Arizona State Legislature voted to recess for at least 3 weeks given the public health and safety risks associated with the COVID-19 virus outbreak. She stated that prior to the recess, the Board's continuation bill SB1054 passed through the Legislature and was signed by Governor Doug Ducey thus extending the agency through June 30, 2028. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen also reported that the fate of HB2224 is uncertain as the recess initiated just before the bill's final 2 floor votes in the Senate. She assured the Committee that she will continue to monitor this situation in the coming weeks and report updates. Dr. Bohanske raised the possibility for the Board to explore whether its licensure waiver authority might be a temporary solution to open the pathway to licensure for the former students of Argosy University who were forced to transfer to other programs when the institution closed in 2019.

17. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON BOARD MEMBER APPOINTMENTS TO LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Ms. Herbst Paakkonen advised the Board that with recent changes to the composition of the Board, and given the Board's recent discussions reflecting possible interest in pursuing revisions to certain statutes in the 2021 Arizona legislative session, this matter has been placed on the agenda for discussion and possible action. Ms. Galvin affirmed that as Board Chair, Ms. Shreeve is authorized to make appointments to the Legislative Committee. Ms. Shreeve appointed Dr. Bohanske, Dr. Meier, Dr. Davey, Mr. Dynar and herself to serve on the Legislative Committee going forward.

18. NEW AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

The Board requested a future meeting agenda item specific to discussion, consideration and possible action on regulation of Independent Medical Examinations (IMEs).

19. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:39 a.m.