



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

September 24, 2021 - 9:30 a.m.

Held via Zoom

1.	CALL TO ORDER Dr. Stenhoff, Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m.
2.	ROLL CALL - Ms. Paakkonen <u>Committee Members Present</u> Donald Stenhoff, Ph.D., BCBA-D Bryan Davey, Ph.D., BCBA-D Diana Davis-Wilson, DBH, BCBA Tisha Denton, M.Ed., BCBA Paige Raetz, Ph.D., BCBA-D <u>Staff Present</u> Heidi Herbst Paakkonen, Executive Director Jennifer Michaelson, Deputy Director Zakiya Mallas, Licensing Specialist Kathy Fowkes, Licensing Specialist <u>Attorney General's Office</u> Jeanne Galvin, Assistant Attorney General A quorum of the Committee was confirmed.
3.	REMARKS/ANNOUNCEMENTS <ul style="list-style-type: none">● General Committee Remarks, Announcements and Updates Dr. Stenhoff thanked staff for preparing materials in such a way to effectively facilitate the Committee members' review, and also acknowledged the many hours of preparation the members invested into this meeting. He also articulated the Committee's appreciation for the attendance of stakeholders, partners, and parties to the agenda item.

<p>4.</p>	<p>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● August 27, 2021 Regular Session Minutes <p>MOTION: Dr. Raetz moved to approve the minutes as drafted. Dr. Davey seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● August 27, 2021 Executive Session Minutes - Part 1 <p>MOTION: Dr. Raetz moved to approve the minutes as drafted. Dr. Davey seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 3-0.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● August 27, 2021 Executive Session Minutes - Part 2 <p>MOTION: Dr. Raetz moved to approve the minutes as drafted. Dr. Davey seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING COMPLAINTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD</p> <p>A. Complaint No. 21-28, Ryan Glasgow</p> <p>Dr. Raetz provided a summary of the complaint noting that it was a self-report involving possible ethical code and statute violations stemming from an incident of alleged unprofessional conduct involving communications exchanged at work constituting a potential dual-relationship. It was noted that the respondent has also reported the matter to the BACB, and the documentation indicates that board has resolved the matter. Mr. Glasgow was present, introduced himself to the Committee, and affirmed that he made the self-report concerning a personal relationship with a co-worker. He admitted that it was against his better judgment to not disclose this or to otherwise discontinue it. He acknowledged that he used agency communications where the relationship was concerned. He stated he recognized the importance of taking responsibility for the situation; it scared him, and he recognizes the ramifications of his conduct and the implications to his career. Mr. Glasgow affirmed that he reported this matter to his new employer.</p> <p>The Committee asked him to speak to some inconsistencies between his written response and the communications he exchanged with the former colleague in the context of the relationship. Mr. Glasgow explained that he had met her previously while he was an RBT and learned they had shared interests and they knew people in common. He explained that the relationship gradually escalated to involve some electronic communications. He further noted that he needed an RBT for a case; upon learning she was available, he made the recommendation to his leadership team. The Committee also requested Mr. Glasgow explain what he has learned from this situation and the potential implications of this kind of behavior where client services and billing can be concerned. He admitted this type of situation could be very unethical with respect to client service delivery. He stated he is ashamed of his behavior which compelled him to self-report. Finally he admitted that he realized exploring a relationship in a work setting could compromise both client care as well as his integrity.</p> <p>The Committee deliberated the case, noting that the licensee made some misjudgments and missteps, but that he appropriately self-reported the matter. It was noted that Mr. Glasgow appears to have learned from this experience.</p>

MOTION: Dr. Davey offered a motion to forward a recommendation to the Board to dismiss the case. Dr. Davis-Wilson offered a friendly amendment to add that Mr. Glasgow be issued a Letter of Concern, noting that had the communications not been caught, the matter may have become an insurance fraud issue and compromised client care. Dr. Davey respectfully rejected the friendly amendment given that the communications spanned a short amount of time, the matter was appropriately addressed by human resources, and the BACB closed the matter.

MOTION: Dr. Davey moved to meet in Executive Session for purposes of obtaining legal advice. Dr. Raetz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.

The Committee resumed the meeting in public session and Dr. Raetz seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Donald Stenhoff, Ph.D., BCBA-D – Nay
Bryan Davey, Ph.D., BCBA-D – Aye
Diana Davis-Wilson, DBH, BCBA – Nay
Tisha Denton, M.Ed., BCBA – Nay
Paige Raetz, Ph.D., BCBA-D – Aye

The motion failed on a 2-3 vote.

MOTION: Dr. Davey offered a motion to forward a recommendation to the Board to dismiss the case, and to also issue to Mr. Glasgow a non-disciplinary Letter of Concern to address the inappropriateness of dual relationships and the necessity to focus on supervisory duties; the motion included the provision that Mr. Glasgow be ordered to complete non-disciplinary continuing education concerning each of those topics. Ms. Denton seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: The Committee questioned whether the continuing education requirement is necessary under the circumstances. Dr. Davey agreed to accept the friendly amendment offered by Dr. Raetz to remove the non-disciplinary continuing education completion requirement. Ms. Denton agreed to the modified motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Donald Stenhoff, Ph.D., BCBA-D – Aye
Bryan Davey, Ph.D., BCBA-D – Aye
Diana Davis-Wilson, DBH, BCBA – Aye
Tisha Denton, M.Ed., BCBA – Aye
Paige Raetz, Ph.D., BCBA-D – Aye

The motion was approved 5-0.

Board staff advised Mr. Glasgow that he will be notified of the scheduling of this matter on a future Board meeting agenda at which time the Board will review the Committee's recommendation.

The Committee noted that Mr. Glasgow should carefully review the questions presented to him on future applications and respond to them appropriately with respect to this complaint and the final outcome.

6.	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) Nicole Steele, M.S. (2nd FAIR**)	
	<p>MOTION: Dr. Stenhoff moved to meet in Executive Session for purposes of obtaining legal advice. Dr. Davis-Wilson seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.</p> <p>Upon resuming the meeting in public session Dr. Stenhoff reminded the Committee that a second formal request for additional information was issued to Ms. Steele in an effort to obtain clarity relative to the specific number of hours of supervision obtained by her that are qualifying for purposes of meeting Arizona’s licensure requirements. The issue pertains to the fact that one of her supervisors, Kelsey Isom, provided supervision to Ms. Steele for approximately two months prior to becoming licensed in Missouri which does not comply with Arizona’s requirements, and which may constitute a violation of Missouri law. The Committee conducted calculations from the documentation submitted by Ms. Steele, verified Ms. Isom, to arrive at a deficiency of 188.2 hours.</p> <p>MOTION: Dr. Stenhoff moved to find Ms. Steele’ application deficient by 188.2 hours and to issue her a FAIR letter reflecting this. Dr. Davey seconded the motion</p> <p>DISCUSSION: The Committee acknowledged that this process has been very arduous and drawn-out for Ms. Steele, and noted that much of this has to do with the reticence on the part of her former supervisors to be forthcoming with the information Arizona requires to determine whether Ms. Steele meets the qualifications for licensure. The Committee indicated that ideally the former supervisors would be more engaged in this process, providing coaching and guidance to Ms. Steele with respect to the situation.</p> <p>Board staff advised the Committee that by issuing another FAIR letter and granting the available time extensions appear to allow Ms. Steele sufficient time with which to complete the deficient hours before her application must be administratively closed due to incompleteness.</p> <p>Ms. Steele was present for the review of her application and requested whether she can complete continuing education in order to remedy the deficit of hours which will permit her to start the position that she came to Arizona to accept. The Committee advised Ms. Steele that, in addition to the fact that some of Ms. Isom’s hours are disqualifying, the hours she submitted are not the same as those she supplied to the BACB.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.</p> <p>MOTION: Dr. Stenhoff moved to direct Board staff to notify the BACB and the Missouri Board of Behavior Analysts of the conduct of Misty Oppenheim-Leaf, Justin Leaf, and Kelsey Isom. Dr. Davey seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.</p> <p>The Committee asked whether the professional association might have resources to support Ms. Steele. Ms. Paakkonen affirmed that she will reach out to their leadership with such a request.</p>	

	<p>2) Madison V. Williams, M.Ed., M.S. (FAIR*)</p>	
<p>Dr. Davey abstained from the consideration and vote of this application. The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application and of the additional information requested, consisting of non-client-facing hours completed in order to arrive at an accurate accounting of her hours of supervision. The documentation reflects that 380 hours were accrued with a licensed behavior analyst in Arizona; 1,238 hours were also submitted that were non-client in nature for a total of 1,618.</p> <p>The Committee discussed whether the nature of some of the activities listed are behavior analytic and are therefore qualifying for purposes of meeting the supervised hours requirements. Ms. Williams was present for the review of her application and clarified that the school at which she is employed placed her in a self-contained classroom with students with autism. She described the activities she completed in this capacity as being highly engaged with the students.</p> <p>MOTION: Dr. Raetz offered a motion to forward the application to the Board with a recommendation for approval. Dr. Davis-Wilson seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 4-0.</p> <p>Board staff advised Ms. Williams relative to what to anticipate once her application is presented to, and reviewed by, the Board.</p>		
	<p>3) Darby Nason, M.Ed. (FAIR)</p>	
<p>MOTION: Dr. Stenhoff moved to meet in Executive Session for purposes of obtaining legal advice. Dr. Davis-Wilson seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 4-0.</p> <p>Upon resuming the meeting in public session, the Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application and of the additional information requested, noting that Jim Matthews, Ms. Nason's former supervisor, did follow up with some additional information to support the application. However, one area of concern reflects the fact that Holly Schwartz is listed on the Multiple Supervisors at the Same Location form, but does not appear on the documentation submitted by Mr. Matthews. Ms. Nason was present for the review of her application and explained the supervisory arrangements under which she worked for the two organizations listed in the documentation. The Committee noted that the BACB was supplied with information indicating that Ms. Schwartz provided supervision, however that information was not supplied with this FAIR, rendering this as unclear. Ms. Nason explained that Ms. Schwartz supervised her, but not in the context of a licensed behavior analyst and not for purposes of accruing hours toward licensure. She also affirmed that Ms. Schwartz was supervised by Mr. Matthews. The Committee discussion reflected that further clarification from Mr. Matthews could satisfactorily explain this matter.</p> <p>MOTION: Dr. Stenhoff moved the application for Ms. Nason move forward to the Board with a recommendation to approve licensure contingent upon receipt of clarification from Mr. Matthews of the discrepancy in the documentation describing the nature of the supervision Ms. Schwartz supplied to Ms. Nason, and confirmation that Ms. Schwartz was supervised by Mr. Matthews. Dr. Davis-Wilson seconded the motion.</p> <p>DISCUSSION: The Committee directed staff to ask Mr. Matthews to clarify the final statement he made in his most recent reply which was that Ms. Schwartz was a supervisor, but not a BCBA supervisor.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.</p>		

	4) Louis Alexander Marull, M.A. (FAIR)	
This item was removed from the agenda as the file was not complete in time for review.		
	5) Danielle Braun, 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.		
	6) Jennifer Bacigalupo, 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.		
	7) Abberdeen Ariam Avelar, 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.		
	8) Sydney Alexandra Applewhite, 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.		
	9) Adrianna Marie Quinones, 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 question 21 was left blank. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval once the correction is received.		
	10) Anna Stocking, M.A.	
Dr. Raetz disclosed for the record that she works at the same company as the applicant, but not to the extent that would render her to be non-objective. 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.		
	11) Brittany Olsen, M.Ed.	
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 her application reflects that for a certain employment position, "BCBA" was listed in her job title, but she was not licensed in Arizona at that time.		

	<p>MOTION: Ms. Denton offered a motion directing staff to obtain written clarification from Ms. Olsen as to whether she was providing services in Arizona without a license; her application may be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation to approve licensure if her explanation indicates she was working under the supervision of a licensed behavior analyst. Dr. Raetz seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.</p>	
	<p>12) Laurie Kristine Tarter, Psy.D</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 with the exception of the fact that question 19 on the application was left blank. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval once she makes that correction. Dr. Tarter was present for the review of her application and provided her assurance that she will make the correction immediately.</p>	
	<p>13) Jennifer Vannarath, M.Ed.</p>	
	<p>Dr. Stenhoff and Ms. Denton indicated they have worked previously at the same organization as that of the applicant, but can review and vote on the application objectively. 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 once she makes that correction.</p>	
	<p>14) Eva-Marie Velez, M.A.</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>	
	<p>15) Brittney Wagner, M.A.</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 with the exception of the fact that the California supervisors mistakenly indicated licensure status and dates; these will need to be corrected. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval once those corrections are received.</p>	
	<p>16) Victoria J. Williams, M.Ed.</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 except she did not make a selection for her addresses, and the supervisor needs to correct the date supervision concluded. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.</p>	
	<p>17) Ashley Caroline Gisting, M.A.</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>	

	18) Korynn Burnett, 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>		
	19) Crystal R. Diaz, 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 with the exception of the fact that there is a typographical error on the date that one of the supervisors received their supervisory training. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.</p>		
	20) Brittany Rene' Gonzalez, 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 with the exception of the fact that the answers on 18 and 19 do not reconcile and therefore require correction. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval once the correction is received.</p>		
	21) Megan Deffenbaugh, 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 there is conflicting information relative to when the supervisors completed the required supervisory training. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval once the corrections to the Multiple Supervisors form is received.</p>		
	22) Alexa Leininger, M.A.	
<p>Dr. Raetz disclosed that she works at the same organization as the applicant, but they do not work together and therefore she can review and vote on the application objectively. 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>		
	23) Christina Lant, 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>		
	24) Shaela M. Bruce, 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>		

	25) Elise Escobar, 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.	
	26) Jacquelyn Lanphear, 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.	
	27) Natalie M. Klein, 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.	
	28) Merry D. Janssen, 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> <p>MOTION: Dr. Stenhoff moved the applications be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval as reflected by the discussion to include all corrections and requests for clarification from the applicants where noted. Dr. Raetz seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.</p>	
	<p><i>*First Formal Additional Information Request</i> <i>** Second Formal Additional Information Request</i></p>	
7.	<p>DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING POTENTIAL UNLICENSED SUPERVISION PROVIDED BY:</p> <p>A. Lauren Nemer-Kaiser, MA, BCBA, LBA B. Kristen Jones, BCBA, LBA</p> <p>Ms. Paakkonen reminded the Committee that the application for Madison Williams was first reviewed by the Committee on July 1, 2021, and in doing so noted that the applicant was supervised while in Tempe, Arizona, but her supervision contract was signed by Lauren Nemer-Kaiser who has never been licensed in Arizona. Additionally the file reflected that none of the supervision forms were signed by Ms. Nemer-Kaiser; however, the majority of her hours were signed off on by Kristen Jones (who also has never been licensed in Arizona). Ms. Paakkonen indicated that Ms. Jones informed her that she would not be present for this meeting, but Ms. Nemer-Kaiser confirmed she would attend this discussion.</p> <p>Ms. Nemer-Kaiser addressed the Committee and explained that her company employs supervisors around the country for purposes of providing supervision to BCBA's, and that in every instance those individuals are licensed where it is required. She admitted that at the time Ms. Williams obtained her supervision through the company, they were not aware of Arizona's licensure requirement. Once they realized this, they immediately changed her supervision to an Arizona licensed behavior analyst in order to be in compliance. She explained the matching process, and the fact that she signs off on all contracts.</p>	

	<p>In response to questions concerning how they ensure that both title and practice requirements are understood with this process, Ms. Nemer-Kaiser explained that every new supervisee is tasked with reviewing and confirming these requirements for their state, and indicated most of their clients are coming to them for supplemental activities.</p> <p>The Committee asked Ms. Nemer-Kaiser to do their due-diligence with respect to knowing licensure and practice laws in more than 35 states beyond merely requiring the supervisee to do that research. She expressed gratitude for that feedback, and clarified that she does review state requirements with potentially matched supervisors. The Committee noted that there are sections of the BCBA Professional and Ethical Compliance Code for Behavior Analysts that are germane to this situation. Ms. Nemer-Kaiser stated that her company's goal is to ensure their client supervisees have the most positive experience possible.</p> <p>The Committee thanked Ms. Nemer-Kaiser for supplying information and addressing questions.</p> <p>MOTION: Dr. Davis-Wilson moved to take no action on item 7.A. Dr. Stenhoff seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.</p> <p>With respect to 7.B., the Committee noted that the record reflects Ms. Jones was providing supervisory services to Ms. Williams for a period of time while she was not licensed in Arizona, contrary to the parameters outlined by Hoom House.</p> <p>MOTION: Dr. Davis-Wilson moved to recommend to the Board opening a complaint against Ms. Kristen Jones for unlicensed practice as a behavior analyst in Arizona. Ms. Denton seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.</p>
8.	<p>DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING TELEHEALTH ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TELEHEALTH BEST PRACTICES</p> <p>Dr. Davey reported that this committee meets next on September 30, 2021 so he will have a report to the CBA on the next agenda. He indicated that the committee is discussing allowing telephone-only coding for purposes of billing for services as it is currently precluded from reimbursement.</p>
9.	<p>DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RECENT UPDATES FROM, AND CORRESPONDENCE WITH, THE BEHAVIOR ANALYST CERTIFICATION BOARD (BACB)</p> <p>Ms. Paakkonen briefly summarized the recent communique from the BACB that provides some information and context relative to other certification and credentialing organizations. She also reported that she contacted BACB for purposes of discussing the challenges that Arizona has encountered with respect to obtaining information from former supervisors to support applications reviewed by the CBA. Ms. Paakkonen was advised that the BACB does, indeed, require all supervisors to be identified on supervision contracts. She also reported that Misty Bloom advised that the only way this information could be discovered by the BACB would be through an audit, and that Arizona could request such an audit if concerns emerged from the review of an application.</p> <p>MOTION: Dr. Davis-Wilson moved to direct Board staff to inform the BACB of the concerns that emerged from the review of applications where Hoom House was involved in that all supervisors were not listed on the contract. Dr. Stenhoff seconded the motion.</p>

	<p>DISCUSSION: The Committee discussed the fact that the purpose of this effort is not to be punitive, but it is intended to enlighten supervisors as to the documentation requirements.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.</p>
10.	<p>DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE OUT-OF-STATE TELEHEALTH PRACTICE REGISTRY ESTABLISHED AT A.R.S. §36-3606</p> <p>Ms. Paakkonen reported that she does not have an update for the Committee. At last report, the website for the Registry intake was still under construction.</p>
11.	<p>DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REVISIONS OF THE STATUTES THAT REGULATE THE PRACTICE OF BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS IN ARIZONA (A.R.S. TITLE 32, CHAPTER 4, ARTICLE 4)</p> <p>The Committee directed staff to poll the Committee members for an available date and time for a special meeting during which to address this item. Ms. Paakkonen advised the Committee that she will invite the leaders of AzABA to the scheduled meeting.</p>
12.	<p>DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REVISIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE RULES THAT REGULATE THE PRACTICE OF BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS IN ARIZONA (A.A.C. TITLE 4, CHAPTER 26, ARTICLE 4)</p> <p>The Committee directed staff to poll the Committee members for an available date and time for a special meeting during which to address this item. Ms. Paakkonen advised the Committee that she will invite the leaders of AzABA to the scheduled meeting.</p>
13.	<p>NEW AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS</p> <p>No additional items were requested.</p>
14.	<p>ADJOURNMENT</p> <p>MOTION: Ms. Denton moved to adjourn the meeting. Dr. Raetz seconded the motion,</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 12:37 p.m.</p>