



STATE OF ARIZONA
BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGIST EXAMINERS
1740 WEST ADAMS STREET, SUITE 3403
PHOENIX, AZ 85007
PH: 602.542.8162 FX: 602.542.8279
WEBSITE: www.psychboard.az.gov

DOUGLAS A. DUCEY
Governor

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

Committee on Behavior Analysts

REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

July 1, 2021 - 9:30 a.m.

Held via Zoom

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Stenhoff, Committee Chair, at 9:32 a.m.

2. ROLL CALL - Ms. Fowkes

Committee Members Present

Donald Stenhoff, Ph.D., BCBA-D – Chair

Diana Davis-Wilson, DBH, BCBA

Tisha Denton, M.Ed., BCBA

Committee Members Absent

Bryan Davey, Ph.D., BCBA-D

Paige Raetz, Ph.D., BCBA-D

Staff Present

Heidi Herbst Paakkonen, Executive Director

Jennifer Michaelson, Deputy Director

Kathy Fowkes, Licensing Specialist

Attorney General's Office

Jeanne Galvin, Assistant Attorney General

A quorum of the Committee was confirmed.

3. REMARKS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

- **General Committee Remarks, Announcements and Updates**

Dr. Stenhoff thanked Board staff for assembling another record-breaking agenda in terms of the number of applications. He also acknowledged the efforts of the Committee members in preparing for this meeting given the volume of materials involved.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **May 28, 2021 Regular Session Minutes**
- **May 28, 2021 Executive Session Minutes – held for the next meeting due to lack of quorum**
- **June 11, 2021 Regular Session Minutes**

MOTION: Dr. Davis-Wilson moved to approve the regular session minutes as drafted. Ms. Denton seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: The Committee acknowledged that the Executive Session minutes cannot be approved at this time due to a lack of quorum. The minutes will be presented on the next meeting agenda for approval.

VOTE: The motion was approved 3-0.

5. DISCUSSION CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON BEHAVIOR ANALYTIC SERVICES CONSUMER INFORMATION VIDEO

Ms. Paakkonen reminded the Committee that Ms. Bronold was engaged to prepare a behavior analytic services consumer oriented video, having created a similar one for psychology service consumers while completing her student internship with the agency. The members responded very positively to the video, but requested a substitution to one of the images. Ms. Bronold and Ms. Paakkonen indicated that edits to video are relatively easy to make. The Committee members and others present provided some input on potential image options. Ms. Paakkonen noted that the video is lengthier than the psychology-focused version, but it was determined that all of the included content is essential.

6. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING POSSIBLE UNLICENSED SUPERVISION PROVIDED BY REBECCA HARTZELL, PhD, BCBA-D

Ms. Paakkonen noted that Dr. Hartzell was not in attendance in spite of having been noticed of this agenda item and confirming her participation.

MOTION: Dr. Stenhoff moved to meet in Executive Session for purposes of receiving legal advice. Dr. Davis-Wilson seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 3-0.

Upon resuming the meeting in public session, the Committee acknowledged that Dr. Hartzell had joined the meeting. Ms. Paakkonen summarized the matter, stating that on April 2, 2021 the Committee reviewed the application file of Chelsea Carr, and in the process observed that Dr. Hartzell had provided supervision to Ms. Carr in Arizona preceding having achieved licensure as a behavior analyst in this state. During the review, Dr. Hartzell estimated that she supplied Ms. Carr with approximately 247 hours of supervision prior to the granting of her license. Ms. Paakkonen noted the relevant statutes as including A.R.S. §32-2091.12.

Violations; classification which at (A) states "It is a class 2 misdemeanor for a person who is not licensed pursuant to this article to engage in the practice of behavior analysis" and also A.R.S. §32-2091 which defines "behavior analyst" as a person who is licensed pursuant to this article to practice behavior analysis, and a "supervisee" as a person who acts under the extended authority of a behavior analyst to provide behavioral services and includes a person who is in training to provide these services.

Dr. Hartzell reiterated that while she was working with Ms. Carr she was in the process of submitting her application documentation and that she was unaware of the requirement that she be licensed in order to provide supervision. She described the study in which she engaged with Ms. Carr for purposes of Ms. Carr completing her doctoral degree. She confirmed this was done under her employment with the University of Arizona.

The Committee discussed the matter, and in the process cited the licensure exemption that exists in statute that allows university program personnel to perform their work. The discussion noted that any hours of supervision under this arrangements are non-qualifying for purposes of licensure of the supervisee.

MOTION: Ms. Denton moved to take no action with respect to this matter given Dr. Hartzell's conduct is addressed by the licensure exemption. Dr. Davis-Wilson seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 3-0.

7. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD PERTAINING TO APPROVAL OF BEHAVIOR ANALYST APPLICANTS

A. Behavior Analyst Applications for Licensure	
Applicant Name	
1) Abigail Barnes, M.S.	
The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.	
2) Amber Crosby, M.S.	
The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.	
3) Barbara Wimberly, M.A.	
The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.	
4) Candace Curran Robertson, M.A.	
The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.	
5) Chanel Deann Kingan, M.A.	
The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee directed staff to obtain correction to what is clearly an incorrect date on her Multiple Supervisors at Same Site form. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.	
6) Chelsa Christy, M.S.	
The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee directed staff to obtain a correction to a missing answer on question #5. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval contingent on the correction.	
7) Cinda Atwood, M.S.	
The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules with the exception of the fact that the documentation reflects one supervisor may not have been licensed in Tennessee for a period of time during which supervision was provided. The Committee directed Board staff to obtain clarification of the supervisor's initial date of licensure through the issuance of a FAIR letter.	

	8) Darby Nason, M.Ed.	
	<p>The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules with the exception of the fact that the documentation reflects multiple supervisors may not have been licensed in Washington for a period of time during which supervision was provided. The Committee directed Board staff to obtain clarification in the form of the copy of the supervision contract reflecting the supervision start dates for all supervisors through the issuance of a FAIR letter. Additionally the applicant recorded an incomplete business address which will need to be corrected.</p>	
	9) Elisabeth Diane Quiebras, M.S.	
	<p>The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.</p>	
	10) Elizabeth Rios, M.A.	
	<p>The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.</p>	
	11) Evelyn Holy, M.S.	
	<p>Dr. Stenhoff and Dr. Davis-Wilson both disclosed that they were previously instructors of this applicant but can review and vote on the application without bias.</p> <p>The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.</p>	
	12) Gema Castillo, M.Ed.	
	<p>The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee directed staff to seek a correction to one of the supervision verification forms as the individual erroneously indicated she is licensed in California. The Committee determined the application once corrected can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.</p>	
	13) Holly Ann Bjerkestrand, M.A.	
	<p>The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee directed staff to seek a correction to the application in that she needs to complete question 6. The Committee determined the application once corrected can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.</p>	
	14) Katherine Quick, M.A.	
	<p>The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.</p>	

	15) Kourtney Gay, M.S.	
<p>The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.</p>		
	16) Nichole Maria Hart, M.A.	
<p>The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules with the exception of the fact that the applicant will need to fix a typographical error on the dates listed for supervision acquired at Trumpet Behavioral Health. The Committee determined the application once corrected can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.</p>		
	17) Nicole Steele, M.S.	
<p>Ms. Steele was present for the review of her application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules with the exception of the fact that supervision was provided to the applicant by an unlicensed person. Ms. Steele explained that her documentation does not allocate the hours to specific supervisors. She indicated that her supervision contract was recently submitted for purposes of providing clarity. The Committee asked Ms. Steele to explain the status of the supervisor who was not licensed in Missouri. The applicant indicated that while that person's application for licensure was pending. She was receiving supervision by others.</p> <p>The Committee member discussed the fact that these discrepancies require the applicant to submit clarification and documentation concerning the onset of Ms. Steele's supervision; this could include the signed supervision contract reflecting the start date, or the monthly supervision verification forms. Ms. Steele indicated that her documentation is currently inaccessible.</p> <p>MOTION: Dr. Davis-Wilson moved to meet in Executive Session for purposes of obtaining legal advice. Dr. Stenhoff seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 3-0.</p> <p>Upon resuming the meeting in public session the Committee discussion reflected that the additional documentation is necessary in order to ascertain whether Ms. Steele meets the qualifications for licensure. The members concurred that a signed statement that provides the missing information and that attests to the accuracy of the supervision contract will be acceptable.</p>		
	18) Nilvia Leonor Rodriguez Zaldivar, M.S.	
<p>Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules with the exception of the fact that attaining 30 hours per week of supervision is a challenge during normal circumstances, and would be even more so during a global pandemic.</p> <p>MOTION: Dr. Stenhoff moved to meet in Executive Session to receive legal advice. Dr. Davis-Wilson seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 3-0.</p> <p>The meeting resumed in public session following the Executive Session:</p> <p>MOTION: Dr. Davis-Wilson moved to issue a FAIR letter to the applicant requesting completion of the COVID version of the supervision form, an explanation of the nature of the supervision she received, and how that supervision was accrued during a pandemic. The motion included the provision that the letter also request an explanation relative to how she is listed as a BCBA on the website. Ms. Denton seconded the motion.</p>		

	VOTE: The motion was approved 3-0.	
	19)	Paul Ettinger, M.A.
	The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules with the exception of the fact that the applicant left one question blank. The Committee determined the application once corrected can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.	
	20)	Ruth Gluck, M.S.
	The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.	
	21)	Sara M. West, M.A. (FAIR*)
	The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.	
	22)	Tranessa Waters, M.Ed. (FAIR*)
	The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.	
	23)	Carley Nelson-Smith, M.S.
	Dr. Stenhoff and Dr. Davis-Wilson both disclosed that they were previously instructors of this applicant but can review and vote on the application without bias. The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.	
	24)	Rahimil Vazquez, M.S.
	The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.	
	25)	Korey Taylor, M.S.
	The applicant was present for the review of her application; she indicated she would answer any questions concerning the “yes” answer on her application. In response to a question Ms. Taylor clarified that her probation was extended for purposes of allowing extra time to complete her community service as she was concurrently working two jobs. When asked about her current relationship with alcohol Ms. Taylor explained that she made a regrettable decision to work in the brewing industry; since leaving that field her consumption has diminished significantly. She further stated that the incident led her to make better decisions including pursuing a career in behavior analysis and giving her purpose in the form of serving individuals and their families. MOTION: Ms. Denton moved to forward the following applications to the Board with a recommendation for approval: Abigail Barnes, M.S.; Amber Crosby, M.S.; Barbara Wimberly, M.A.; Candace Curran Robertson, M.A.; Elisabeth Diane Quiebras, M.S.; Elizabeth Rios, M.A.; Evelyn Holy, M.S.; Katherine Quick, M.A.;	

Kourtney Gay, M.S.; Ruth Gluck, M.S.; Sara M. West, M.A.; Tranessa Waters, M.Ed.; Carley Nelson-Smith, M.S.; Rahimil Vazquez, M.S.; and Korey Taylor, M.S. The motion included the provision that the following applications be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval upon satisfactory receipt of the corrections noted in the discussion: Chanel Deann Kingan, M.A.; Chelsa Christy, M.S.; Gema Castillo, M.Ed.; Holly Ann Bjerkestrand, M.A.; Nichole Maria Hart, M.A.; and Paul Ettinger, M.A. Finally, the motion included the provision that the following applicants be issued FAIR letters as reflected in the discussion: Cinda Atwood, M.S.; Darby Nason, M.Ed.; Nicole Steele, M.S.; and Nilvia Leonor Rodriguez Zaldivar, M.S. Dr. Davis-Wilson seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 3-0.

**First Additional Information Request*

8. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE OUT-OF-STATE TELEHEALTH PRACTICE REGISTRY ESTABLISHED AT A.R.S. §36-3606

This item was tabled and will appear on the July 30, 2021 meeting agenda.

9. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPLICATION EFFICIENCIES WORKGROUP

This item was tabled and will appear on the July 30, 2021 meeting agenda.

10. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING PRACTICE MONITOR DEVELOPMENT PLAN

This item was tabled and will appear on the July 30, 2021 meeting agenda.

11. DISCUSSION CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON AGENCY'S NEW TEAM MEMBER

This item was tabled and will appear on the July 30, 2021 meeting agenda.

12. DISCUSSION CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON PROMOTING AWARENESS OF THE REHABILITATION AND MONITORING PROGRAM (RAMP)

This item was tabled and will appear on the July 30, 2021 meeting agenda.

13. NEW AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

Ms. Paakkonen affirmed that the representatives of the BACB were confirmed to attend the July 1, 2021 meeting of the Committee.

14. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Ms. Denton moved to adjourn the meeting. Dr. Davis-Wilson seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 3-0. The meeting adjourned at 11:52 a.m.