



STATE OF ARIZONA
BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGIST EXAMINERS
1740 WEST ADAMS STREET, SUITE 3403
PHOENIX, AZ 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

Regular Session Meeting Minutes

Held virtually via Zoom on April 8, 2022

Board Members

Diana Davis-Wilson, DBH, BCBA – Chair
Bryan Davey, Ph.D., BCBA-D – Vice-Chair
Linda Caterino, Ph.D., ABPP – Secretary
Aditya Dynar, Esq.
Matthew A. Meier, Psy.D.
Ramona N. Mellott, Ph.D.
Tamara Shreeve, MPA
Todd Wynn, M.A.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson called the Board's meeting to order at 8:33 a.m.

2. ROLL CALL

The following Board members participated in the virtual meeting: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson, Vice-Chairman Davey, Dr. Caterino, Mr. Dynar, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve, and Mr. Wynn.

Dr. Mellott left the meeting at 11:59 a.m.

ALSO PRESENT

The following Board staff participated in the virtual meeting: Heidi Herbst Paakkonen, Executive Director; Jennifer Michaelson, Deputy Director; Jeanne Galvin, Assistant Attorney General (AAG); Kathy Fowkes, Licensing Specialist, and Efa Mallas, Licensing Specialist.

3. REMARKS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

- **Board Survey**

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson encouraged meeting attendees to provide feedback by contacting Board staff and completing a Board Meeting Assessment Survey.

- **Board Member and Staff Appreciation**

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson acknowledged and thanked Board members and staff for their hard work and efforts in facilitating the Board's meetings.

- **Continuing education credit for Board meeting attendance**

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson announced that meeting attendees were eligible for continuing education credit if the meeting exceeded four hours.

4. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

No members of the public requested to speak.

5. COUNSEL UPDATE

Ms. Galvin indicated she does not have an update for the Board at this time.

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

MOTION: Mr. Dynar moved for the Board to approve the items listed under the Consent Agenda.

SECOND: Dr. Davey

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson, Dr. Davey, Dr. Caterino, Mr. Dynar, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve, and Mr. Wynn.

VOTE: 8-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- January 14, 2022 Regular Meeting Minutes
- January 14, 2022 Executive Session Minutes
- February 11, 2022 Regular Meeting Minutes
- February 11, 2022 Executive Session Minutes
- March 11, 2022 Regular Meeting Minutes

B. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

C. DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING PSYCHOLOGIST APPLICATIONS

Requesting Approval to Sit for EPPP & Licensure

- 1) Andrea Annibale, Psy.D. (REAPP)
- 2) Collin McFadden, Psy.D. (REAPP)
- 3) Ester S. Stevens, Psy.D. (ANEW)
- 4) Michael Reyes Medrano, Ph.D. (REAPP)
- 5) Naudia Jakubowski, Psy.D.
- 6) Samantha Blake Jacobson, Psy.D. (REAPP)
- 7) Veronica Poore, Ph.D. (REAPP)

EPPP Required – Part 1 or Parts 1 & 2

Part 1 & 2
Part 1 & 2
Part 1 & 2
Part 2 Only (Passed Part 1)
Part 1 & 2
Part 2 Only (Passed Part 1)
Part 2 Only (Passed Part 1)

Requesting Approval of Supervise Temporary Licensure and to Sit for the EPPP

- 1) Jacqueline Hansberger, Psy.D.

EPPP Required – Part 1 or Parts 1 & 2

Part 1 & 2

Requesting Approval for Licensure by Credential (ABPP, CPQ, or National Register)

- 1) Ellen Crouse, Ph.D.
- 2) Donna Johnson, Ph.D.

D. DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING BEHAVIOR ANALYST APPLICATIONS

- 1) JeniLee Newman, M.Ed.
- 2) Katherine Moody, M.S.
- 3) Sydney Bardelli, M.Ed.

- 4) Mayzie Rogers, M.A.
- 5) Alexa Abalos, M.S.
- 6) Tracy Mock, M.S.
- 7) Alexis Prinslow, M.S.
- 8) Allison LaRocca, M.Ed.
- 9) Anna Crooker, M.A.
- 10) Hanna Azzaon, M.Ed.
- 11) Alexis Pascarella, M.A.
- 12) Connie Jo Grilley, M.Ed.
- 13) Sarah Boyd, M.A.
- 14) Sarah Boyd, M.A.

TIMED ITEM – 8:45 a.m.

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

a) Complaint No. 22-08 Alicia Abby Garcia, Ph.D.

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson summarized the complaint indicating that it was filed by M.G. (mother) because Dr. Garcia provided sworn testimony in M.G.'s family court case. It is alleged that Dr. Garcia wrote two letters for the Court on behalf of the father (M.G.'s ex-husband). Dr. Garcia opined to the Court that father can have unsupervised visitation with the son. It is alleged that Dr. Garcia is not a court appointed evaluator. Dr. Garcia allegedly did not consult with other professionals involved in the Court matter prior to submitting an opinion to the Court. Dr. Garcia provided a response to the Complaint through her attorney, Sara Stark, Esq. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson summarized Dr. Garcia's response stating that Dr. Garcia began treatment with father in 2011, which was prior to father's marriage to M.G. Dr. Garcia attested that once father and M.G. married she continued to treat father. When father and M.G. divorced she continued to treat father. Dr. Garcia indicated that she wrote a letter to the Court based on the nine years that she treated father. Dr. Garcia testified in Court in September 2021 regarding father's treatment.

M.G. was present, requested to speak and made a statement. M.G. stated that father has a history of mental health issues and has missed several of his mental health appointments. Additionally, she stated that Dr. Garcia should not have made a recommendation regarding custody because she was not a Court appointed custody evaluator and, because she has never been present during father's visitation with son.

Dr. Garcia and her attorney, Sara Stark, Esq., were present, requested to speak and made a statement. Ms. Stark stated that Dr. Garcia acknowledged that she should not have provided testimony in Court regarding custody as it is not within the scope of her expertise. Ms. Stark explained that Dr. Garcia has taken corrective action in which she revised her Informed Consent procedures and forms, and that she obtained six hours of continuing education in this topic area. Additionally, Ms. Stark indicated that Dr. Garcia is prepared to consult with colleagues when necessary. Dr. Garcia summarized her professional experience. Dr. Garcia acknowledged that she should not have made an opinion on supervision or custody. Dr. Garcia stated that during her time treating father she did not have any indication that father would harm son. Dr. Garcia stated that moving forward she will not render an opinion regarding custody or supervision. She summarized the corrective action she has taken.

Board members questioned Dr. Garcia. Dr. Caterino asked Dr. Garcia if she has reviewed the custody guidelines recommended by the American Psychological Association. Dr. Garcia affirmed that she reviewed all of the guidelines. Dr. Caterino asked if Dr. Garcia has ever provided an opinion to the Court regarding custody or supervision before. Dr. Garcia affirmed that she has not. Dr. Caterino noted that Dr. Garcia did not use the most current DSM when providing a diagnosis of father. Mr. Dynar asked Dr. Garcia to explain

what prompted her to write the letter she submitted to the Court. Dr. Garcia indicated that father requested the letter on behalf of his attorney.

The Board deliberated the case. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson expressed appreciation that Dr. Garcia acknowledged her errors in this matter. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson expressed concern that there are potential violations as Dr. Garcia practiced outside the scope of her expertise which could have caused potential harm. Dr. Caterino expressed concern that there may have been a dual relationship. Dr. Mellott expressed concern that Dr. Garcia did not have education or training to provide a custody opinion. Dr. Meier expressed concern that Dr. Garcia overstepped her boundaries. Ms. Shreeve and Mr. Dynar agreed that Dr. Garcia practiced outside of the scope of her expertise.

MOTION: Ms. Shreeve moved for the Board to offer Dr. Garcia a disciplinary Consent Agreement for continuing education and consultation with a Board approved forensic psychologist. The consultation with a Board approved forensic psychologist shall consist of four hours. Dr. Garcia shall complete three hours of Board approved continuing education in diagnosis/psychopathology and three hours in psychological assessment. The consultation and continuing education shall be completed within six months of the effective date of the Consent Agreement. The continuing education shall not count toward the renewal of Dr. Garcia's license. Possible violations include A.R.S. §32-2061(g) Engaging or offering to engage as a psychologist in activities that are not congruent with the psychologist's professional education, training and experience; A.R.S. §32-2061(o) 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(dd) Violating an ethical standard adopted by the Board as it relates to sections 2.01 and 9.01 of the American Psychological Association Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct. The Informal Hearing will be vacated if the Consent Agreement is accepted.

SECOND: Dr. Meier.

Mr. Dynar opined that there is no statute that requires the Board to discipline a licensee in this instance.

MOTION: Dr. Mellott moved to meet in executive session for purposes of receiving legal advice.

SECOND: Dr. Caterino.

VOTE: 8-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

The Board met in Executive Session from 9:30 a.m. to 9:43 a.m. Upon return to the open session Board members voted on the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson, Dr. Davey, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Meier, and Ms. Shreeve. The following Board members voted against the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Mellott and Mr. Wynn.

VOTE: 5-yay, 3-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

b) Complaint No. T-22-05

Gloria Malone, Ph.D.

Ms. Shreeve provided a summary to the Board stating that Dr. Malone was previously licensed with the Board. In 2019 the Board received a complaint which resulted in Dr. Malone voluntarily surrendering her license. Approximately 2 ½ years after Dr. Malone surrendered her license she responded to a social media request in which Dr. Malone indicated that she is a psychologist. Dr. Malone responded to the allegation through her attorney, Mr. Howe. Dr. Malone indicated that she is not practicing as a psychologist but was unaware that she cannot refer to herself as a psychologist. Dr. Malone indicated that she is in full compliance with Arizona Revised Statutes 32-2084 at this time.

Dr. Malone's attorney, Harry Howe, Esq., was present on her behalf. Mr. Howe made a statement and answered Board members' questions. Mr. Howe clarified the steps that he and Dr. Malone have made to delete her profile on the Nextdoor app. He attested that the Nextdoor app is the only app on which Dr. Malone created a profile. Mr. Howe attested that Dr. Malone has kept in contact with a few of her clients since she surrendered her license. Mr. Howe attested that Dr. Malone told those clients that she was no longer licensed as a psychologist. Ms. Shreeve asked Mr. Howe if Dr. Malone was accepting payment from the clients. Mr. Howe affirmed that she was accepting a reduced fee but only if the client offered to pay for services rendered. Dr. Meier asked if Dr. Malone was keeping records on the clients. Mr. Howe affirmed that Dr. Malone was taking notes.

The Board deliberated. Ms. Shreeve asked Ms. Galvin to clarify the Board's options. Ms. Galvin indicated that Dr. Malone has indicated that she is willing to accept a Cease and Desist Order.

MOTION: Ms. Shreeve moved for the Board to issue a Cease and Desist Order to Dr. Malone.
SECOND: Dr. Meier.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson, Dr. Davey, Mr. Dynar, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Meier, Mr. Dynar, Ms. Shreeve and Mr. Wynn.

VOTE: 8-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

The Board recessed at 10:03 a.m. and resumed public session at 10:14 a.m.

8. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATING TO INITIAL CASE REVIEW OF COMPLAINT NO. 22-07 AGAINST JERI GENTRY, PSY.D. AND HER PENDING RENEWAL APPLICATION

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson provided a summary to the Board stating that Dr. Gentry was escorted off of a prison complex due to inappropriate inmate fraternization, specifically, inappropriate photographs of Dr. Gentry were in the possession of an inmate. Dr. Gentry is employed by a third party agency, Centurion, that is contracted with the Arizona Department of Corrections (DOC). After the investigation of the allegations Centurion revoked Dr. Gentry's security clearance and she was subsequently terminated from DOC. Dr. Gentry's response to the allegations was received timely. Dr. Gentry denied the allegations stating that she resigned because she felt her concerns were not being addressed by her employer. Dr. Gentry does affirm that the photographs obtained by the inmate were of her. Dr. Gentry explained that the photographs were meant for her husband and does not know how the inmate obtained them. The employer's investigation concluded that inappropriate behavior did occur which led to Dr. Gentry's termination, but no criminal charges were brought against Dr. Gentry. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson stated that Dr. Gentry was under investigation by a previous employment in California for similar allegations, prior to moving to Arizona and applying for licensure. Board staff obtained employment records from the California agency, Sharper Future, and it was noted that Dr. Gentry was terminated for "overfamiliarity and boundary violations". Chairwoman Davis-Wilson stated that when Dr. Gentry supplied her licensure application to the Board in 2020, she answered "no" to the question that asks whether the licensee had ever resigned in lieu of termination or been terminated from employment. Additionally, Dr. Gentry answered "no" to the question that asks whether the licensee has ever resigned in lieu of termination or been terminated from employment on her 2022 renewal application.

Ms. Michaelsen provided a summary of additional information from Dr. Gentry's employment file with Centurion that was recently received. Ms. Michaelsen clarified that it reflects that Dr. Gentry did not resign but was terminated.

A representative from Centurion, S.W., was present for questions. Ms. Shreeve asked S.W. why the photographs in question were not provided. Ms. Michaelsen clarified that Centurion did not have the photos, rather DOC, and that they have not been provided to Board staff despite multiple requests for this

information. Ms. Shreeve acknowledged that S.W. does not represent DOC but asked whether Centurion is familiar with DOC's email system. S.W. answered. Ms. Shreeve asked whether inmate emails are reviewed by DOC staff. S.W. affirmed that emails are reviewed by DOC staff. Dr. Meier asked about the emails between Dr. Gentry and Centurion regarding her resignation. S.W. answered. Dr. Davey clarified that a termination meeting took place according to employment records. Ms. Shreeve asked S.W. to confirm whether there was a document that was given to Dr. Gentry regarding her termination. S.W. stated that the only document in the record was the termination report.

Dr. Gentry and her attorney, Bretton Barber, Esq., were present, requested to speak, made a statement and answered Board members' questions. Mr. Barber questioned why Centurion or DOC did not submit the photographs in question. He opined that this entire investigation revolves around the photographs in question. Mr. Barber described Dr. Gentry's office situation at DOC. He opined that Dr. Gentry's termination was "retroactive". Dr. Davey asked Dr. Gentry about the photographs in question and whether she identified herself in one of the photographs. Dr. Gentry affirmed that she did identify herself in one of the photos. Dr. Caterino asked if security footage was reviewed. Ms. Michaelson indicated that she does not recall that security footage revealed relevant information. Dr. Caterino asked Dr. Gentry how inmates are restrained during sessions. Dr. Gentry responded indicating that she never met with an inmate in a room that did not have a video camera. Dr. Meier asked why Dr. Gentry did not report why she was terminated from employment with Sharper Future. Dr. Gentry answered. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Gentry if she had a relationship with a client. Dr. Gentry stated she has not had a relationship with a client. Ms. Shreeve asked Dr. Gentry if she was aware of inappropriate photographs of herself and if she gave any inmates the photographs. Dr. Gentry affirmed that she printed the photographs but denied releasing the photographs to any inmate. Dr. Mellott asked Dr. Gentry where she printed the photographs. Dr. Gentry stated she printed the photographs at Walgreens. Ms. Shreeve asked Dr. Gentry to explain the security involved in entering the prison. Dr. Gentry answered. Dr. Davey asked Dr. Gentry if she was notified of her security clearance revocation. Dr. Gentry affirmed that the DOC warden notified her that her security clearance was revoked. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson asked Dr. Gentry why she omitted her termination from an agency in California on her Centurion application. Dr. Gentry responded. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson asked Dr. Gentry if she is currently providing forensic services. Dr. Gentry attested that she is not providing forensic services.

The Board deliberated. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson expressed concern that Dr. Gentry did not disclose her termination from Sharper Future on her licensure application to the Board. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson expressed concern that inmates possessed pictures of Dr. Gentry. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson expressed concern that it appears Dr. Gentry has violated boundaries with clients at multiple employments. Board members echoed Chairwoman Davis-Wilson's concerns.

MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to forward Complaint No. 22-07 to an Informal Interview.

SECOND: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson.

MOTION: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson moved to meet in executive session for the purpose of obtaining legal advice.

SECOND: Mr. Dynar.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson, Dr. Davey, Dr. Caterino, Mr. Dynar, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve, and Mr. Wynn.

VOTE: 8-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

The Board met in Executive Session from 11:12 a.m. to 11:40 a.m.

Upon resuming the meeting in public session, the Board revisited this motion:

MOTION: Dr. Meier withdrew his motion to forward Complaint No. 22-07 to an Informal Interview.

SECOND: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson withdrew her second.

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

10. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPLICATION FOR EPPP AND LICENSURE FROM QUENTIN BROWN, PH.D.

Dr. Mellott provided a summary stating Dr. Brown did not submit the requested materials. Dr. Mellott suggested forwarding Dr. Brown's application back to the Application Review Committee for a thorough review.

MOTION: Dr. Mellott moved to forward Dr. Brown's application back to the Application Review Committee.

SECOND: Dr. Caterino.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson, Dr. Davey, Dr. Caterino, Mr. Dynar, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve and Mr. Wynn.

VOTE: 8-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

11. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING LIFE COACHING PAPER PREPARED BY THE ARIZONA PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

Ms. Paakkonen provided a brief summary stating that the Board has heard cases regarding individuals providing life coaching services. The Arizona Psychological Association (AzPA) researched life coaching and issued a paper on the subject.

Melissa Flint, Psy.D., AzPA liaison to the Board, provided a summary of the paper. AzPA consulted with several organizations regarding life coaching. The subject matter consisted of whether an individual can have a psychology practice and a life coaching practice. It was found that there could be misrepresentation if an individual provides psychology and life coaching services. There is no accrediting agency for life coaches. The Department of Defense has started to use the term "coaching" as a specific subset of psychological interventions that are practiced by psychologists and licensed mental health providers and are subject to their regulations. AzPA provided guidelines such as keeping documentation separate and having different names for each practice.

Dr. Davey asked Ms. Flint how AzPA is disseminating the information to constituents. Ms. Flint answered. Board members thanked Ms. Flint for her presentation.

12. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REPORT OF THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST LICENSURE EXEMPTION COMMITTEE

Dr. Caterino provided a summary stating that the Licensure Exemption Committee (Committee) has had four meetings thus far. The Committee expanded its members to include other stakeholder organizations. The goal of the Committee is to develop a Substantive Policy Statement (SPS) regarding exemptions for a school psychologist. Dr. Caterino asked the Board to consider the following questions and to bring input back to a future Board meeting:

- Independent Educational Evaluations – can an outside person who is qualified conduct an evaluation if the parent does not agree with the outcome?
- Can school psychologists call themselves a "psychologist"?
- Should a non-licensed school psychologists have a private practice?

Dr. Caterino indicated that the Committee agreed upon the following:

- School psychologists are covered by licensure exemption
- Certified school psychologists can be contracted but can only conduct evaluations within the school

Dr. Caterino summarized the Board's options regarding unlicensed practice.

The Board deliberated. Dr. Davey highlighted the current legislation regarding exemptions for school psychologists. Dr. Caterino clarified that current legislation now includes a "contracted school psychologist". Ms. Shreeve asked whether a school psychologist that is contracted with a school is authorized to conduct an evaluation outside of the school. Dr. Caterino stated that the evaluation has to be conducted in the school setting. Mr. Dynar opined that because the statute states "school setting" that could expand the location of where a school psychologist conducts an evaluation. Ms. Paakkonen suggested that the Board consider drafting a SPS and to possibly include stakeholders in drafting the SPS. It was the consensus of the Board to address the questions posed by Dr. Caterino at a future meeting.

13. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REPORT ON THE 2022 ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOR ANALYSTS

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson provided a summary to the Board. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson stated that Ms. Paakkonen and Ms. Michaelsen also attended the meeting. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson highlighted the fact that Arizona was the only jurisdiction that had Board staff in attendance. Ms. Michaelsen summarized that there were questions from licensees regarding the difference between the Behavior Analyst Certification Board and the State Board. She also indicated that there are efforts to continue to educate licensees. Ms. Paakkonen stated that Arizona is positioned to serve in a leadership role in the behavior analyst regulation community. She also highlighted that behavior analyst students are not receiving education in regulatory matters and that she will be researching this topic further.

14. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REPORT ON ASPPB BOARD MEMBER TRAINING

Ms. Paakkonen indicated that Mr. Wynn will provide a summary. Mr. Wynn stated that the webinar for new Board members was a great resource. Mr. Wynn stated that the Association for State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) webinar provided a history of psychology and regulation. Responsibilities of Board members was a highlight as well as the responsibility of the Board. Dr. Caterino stated that ASPPB highlighted that Board members should have a separate email for Board business. She also stated if a Board member recuses from an item, the Board member should completely leave the meeting until the recused item is completed. Ms. Galvin clarified that it is not necessary for a Board member to leave the meeting if the Board member recuses from the Board's consent agenda.

15. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING PROPOSED LEGISLATION INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO: HB2070, HB2145, HB2147, HB2162, HB2178, HB2196, HB2260, HB2294, HB2371, HB2412, HB2587, HB2599, HB2612, SB1035, SB1045, SB1090, SB1127, SB1158, SB1550, SB1568

Ms. Paakkonen summarized HB2178 which amends the Board's exemption statute for school psychologists. HB2178 was signed by the Governor. HB2612 strikes "good moral character" and was signed by the Governor. SB1309 was a strike everything bill that extended the emergency temporary licenses. SB1309 was signed by the Governor. SB1568 imposes additional requirements on investigations. SB1568 has not moved due to additional fact gathering regarding how the bill will impact Boards.

Dr. Meier asked Ms. Paakkonen to give an update on the Board's draft rules. Ms. Paakkonen indicated that the draft rules have been published in the Secretary of State's Register. Ms. Paakkonen indicated she will keep the Board apprised with the rulemaking process.

16. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING ASPPB CALL FOR AWARD NOMINATIONS

- a. State-Provincial Service Award Nomination**
- b. Norma P. Simon Award Nomination**
- c. Ming Fisher Award Nomination**
- d. ASPPB Fellow Nomination**

Ms. Paakkonen briefly summarized stating that the Association for State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) has asked for nominations. It is not required that the Board forward nominations. The Board deliberated. Dr. Mellott opined that the Board has no nominations to recommend this year. It was the consensus of the Board to not forward any nominations to ASPPB.

Dr. Mellott left the meeting at 11:59 a.m.

17. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING LICENSURE AND REGULATORY ISSUES RELATIVE TO COVID-19, AND RESUMING IN-PERSON MEETINGS

Ms. Paakkonen noted that the state of emergency was lifted March 30, 2022. Some requirements have been discontinued whereas other requirements remain in effect. Staff is diligently working to track the requirements and remove certain content from the Board's website. Ms. Paakkonen addressed resuming in-person meetings. Ms. Paakkonen discussed issues with equipment in the Boardrooms.

Board members discussed resuming in-person Board meetings. Mr. Dynar opined that hybrid meetings can be challenging. Board members discussed meeting in-person once a quarter and conducting the other Board meetings virtually. Board members directed staff to compile a calendar of in-person and virtual Board meetings.

18. NEW AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

Dr. Davey requested that a discussion regarding email addresses for Board members be placed on a future Board agenda.

Ms. Paakkonen indicated that a draft Substantive Policy Statement pertaining to A.R.S. §32-2075(A)(1) will be placed on a future Board agenda.

19. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to adjourn the meeting.

SECOND: Mr. Wynn.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson, Dr. Davey, Dr. Caterino, Mr. Dynar, Dr. Meier, Ms. Shreeve, and Mr. Wynn. The following Board member was absent: Dr. Mellott

VOTE: 7-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

The meeting adjourned at 1:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Linda C. Caterino Ph.D., A.B.P.P." The signature is written in dark ink on a light-colored background.

Linda C. Caterino, Ph.D. A.B.P.P.
Secretary