



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 May 6, 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
Joseph Stewart, Ed.D.
Todd Wynn, M.A.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson called the Board's meeting to order at 8:37 a.m.

2. ROLL CALL

The following Board members participated in the virtual meeting: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson, Vice-Chairman Davey, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve and Dr. Stewart. The following Board members were not present: Mr. Dynar and Mr. Wynn.

Dr. Mellott left the meeting at 10:26 a.m. and rejoined the meeting at 12:01 p.m. Dr. Mellott left the meeting again at 1:20 p.m.

ALSO PRESENT

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

- **New Board Member Introduction - Joseph Stewart, Ed.D.**

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson welcomed Dr. Stewart to the Board. He provided a brief summary of his professional background and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to serve on the Board.

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

Dr. Meier requested to remove Consent Agenda item 6. E. for independent discussion

MOTION: Ms. Shreeve moved for the Board to approve the items listed under the Consent Agenda.
SECOND: Dr. Meier.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- April 8, 2022 Regular Meeting Minutes
- April 8, 2022 Executive Session Minutes

B. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

C. DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING PSYCHOLOGIST APPLICATIONS

Requesting Approval to Sit for EPPP & Licensure

- 1) Alicia Miller, Psy.D.
- 2) Anna Alkozei, Psy.D.
- 3) John M. Czaplewski, Psy.D. (REAPP)
- 4) Nicole Lebowitz, Psy.D.
- 5) Greg A. Loebel, Ph.D.
- 6) KaylaJ arred, Psy.D.
- 7) Juanita Maria Sibayan, Ph.D.
- 8) Amanda Hass, Psy.D. (REAPP)
- 9) Abigail Ngayan, Psy.D. (REAPP)

EPPP Required – Part 1 or Parts 1 & 2

- 2/23/2022 – Part 1 & Part 2
3/16/2022 – Part 1 & Part 2
4/06/2022 – Part 1 & Part 2
1/31/2022 – Part 1 & Part 2
7/31/2022 – Part 1 & Part 2
3/07/2022 – Part 1 & Part 2
12/28/2021 – Part 1 & Part 2
04/22/2022 – Part 1 & Part 2
01/31/2022 – Part 1 & Part 2

Requesting Approval of Supervised Experience for Licensure (A.A.C. R4-26-203.02(D))

- 1) Sally Grady McGregor, Psy.D. 08/12/2020 – Part 1 Only

Requesting Approval for Licensure by Waiver (A.R.S. §§ 32-2071, 2071.01 and 2072)

- 1) Danielle DiPaolo, Psy.D.

Requesting Approval for Licensure by Credential (ABPP, CPQ or HSP) (A.R.S. §§ 32-2071 and 2072)

- 1) Stephanie Davidson, Psy.D. n/a
- 2) Summer Garcia, Ph.D. n/a

Requesting Approval for Licensure by Universal Recognition (A.R.S. § 32-4302)

- 1) Armando Garcia, Ph.D. n/a
- 2) Carlos Quezada-Gomez, Ph.D. n/a
- 3) Daniel Hudak, Ph.D. n/a
- 4) Jane Pile, Ph.D. n/a
- 5) Kari Haws, Ph.D. n/a

D. DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING BEHAVIOR ANALYST APPLICATIONS

- 1) Ryan Bable, Ph.D.
- 2) Sarah Robinson, M.Ed.
- 3) Kelly Teague, M.A.
- 4) Janey C. Pulzello, M.A.
- 5) Stephanie Buchler, M.A.
- 6) Ahtziry S. Nazario, M.S.
- 7) Janet Carrillo, M.S.
- 8) Elizabeth Gressard, M.Ed.
- 9) Renee Joines, M.A.
- 10) Hailty Cottle Plautz, M.Ed.
- 11) Leighana Villicana, M.A.
- 12) Chelsea Darby, M.Ed.
- 13) Yenny Nannar, M.A.
- 14) Janel Schovan, M.S.
- 15) Sheena Piehota, Ph.D.

E. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REQUEST FOR ACCOMMODATIONS FROM ESTER STEVEN, PSY.D.

This item was removed from the Consent Agenda for independent discussion. Dr. Meier expressed concern with Dr. Steven’s accommodations request: eight hours to sit for the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP), to take the EPP at an alternative location, and to have hand written notes while taking the EPPP. Additionally, Dr. Steven is requesting to sit for only the EPPP Part 1 and not be required to sit for the EPPP Part 2. Dr. Mellott explained that the Board does not have authority as to where an applicant sits for the exam as that is ASPPB’s purview. Dr. Mellott further explained that the proctoring site (Prometric) determines where the exam will be proctored.

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

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

The Board met in Executive Session from 8:49 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.

MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to grant Dr. Steven’s eight-hour request to sit for the EPPP Part 1 and to deny all other requests. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson clarified that Dr. Steven will need to arrange the testing site with Prometric.

SECOND: Dr. Caterino.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

TIMED ITEM – 8:45 a.m.

7. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND ACTION REGARDING BRIAN SCHAFFER’S INTERIM CONSENT AGREEMENT, STATUS OF CRIMINAL CHARGES IN COLORADO, AND PROPOSED CONSENT AGREEMENT FOR VOLUNTARY SURRENDER OF LICENSE FOR CONSIDERATION

Ms. Michaelsen provided a summary stating that the Board held a special meeting on November 2, 2021, due to Mr. Schaffer being arrested in Colorado regarding the alleged assault of a nine-year old child and client of the agency where he was employed. At the November 2, 2021, meeting, the Board accepted an Interim Consent Agreement for suspension of Mr. Schaffer’s license. Ms. Michaelsen stated that Mr. Schaffer’s attorney recently contacted her, indicating that Mr. Schaffer entered into a plea agreement on April 5, 2022, for 1 count of assault in the second degree and that he is scheduled to be sentenced by the Colorado Court on July 19, 2022. Ms. Michaelsen noted that the assault charge is a Class 5 Felony in Colorado. Ms. Michaelsen stated that, in consultation with the Board’s Assistant Attorney General, Jeanne Galvin, Board staff negotiated a Consent Agreement for voluntary surrender of Mr. Schaffer’s behavior analyst license. Mr. Schaffer’s attorney, Flynn Carey, Esq., was present. Mr. Carey introduced himself and had no comments at this time.

MOTION: Ms. Shreeve moved to accept the signed Consent Agreement for voluntary surrender of Mr. Schaffer’s license.

SECOND: Dr. Davey.

Dr. Davey confirmed with Ms. Galvin that Mr. Schaffer would have to apply anew if he wished to practice in Arizona in the future.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

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

a) Complaint No. 22-09 Karen Hawk, Psy.D.

Dr. Meier summarized the complaint indicating that this Complaint was filed by R.O. as his daughter began receiving therapy with Dr. Hawk in May 2021. R.O. attested that daughter was going to spend the summer with him in California. After Daughter’s first therapy session, Mother of Daughter filed a petition with the Court to modify parenting time and legal decision making wherein the Mother refused to release Daughter to R.O. to spend the summer in California for the Court Ordered parenting time. In June 2021, R.O. asked Dr. Hawk to explain Daughter’s treatment goals. Dr. Hawk responded that Daughter is old enough to know what she needs in therapy. R.O. then confided to Dr. Hawk he was concerned that Mother was recording private conversations with children. Additionally, Mother disclosed an email from Dr. Hawk to the Court. The email alleged that Daughter felt emotionally unsafe with R.O. Subsequently, Dr. Hawk notified

Daughter's parents that she no longer wanted R.O. to be a part of Daughter's therapy due to the open custody case, although Mother continued to participate in Daughter's therapy. R.O. claims that Dr. Hawk knowingly allowed Mother to be a part of Daughter's therapy even though Mother was building a Court case against him to modify custody and withhold children from him. In July 2021, Dr. Hawk sent an email to R.O. stating that she no longer wanted to be involved in the ongoing custody case and only wanted to communicate with Mother going forward. In August 2021, Mother sent correspondence to Dr. Hawk indicating that she would be sending Dr. Hawk a subpoena compelling her testimony in Court. R.O. claims Dr. Hawk refused to see his position in the Court case. After Mother withheld Daughter for approximately three months, R.O. and Daughter had their first therapy session in Mid-August. During this session, R.O. requested that the session only involve him and the Daughter but, Dr. Hawk allowed Mother to participate for 10 minutes of the session. Dr. Hawk provided good feedback regarding R.O. during the August session. Subsequently, Mother was deposed and stated that Daughter and Dr. Hawk developed a safety plan for the times Daughter spent with R.O. The safety plan involved Daughter exiting out of a window in R.O.'s home and running to the park for help. Subsequently, Daughter attempted to exit a moving vehicle to get away from her Stepmother. When R.O. questioned Daughter regarding her actions, Daughter responded indicating that she and Dr. Hawk have been developing her safety plan and Dr. Hawk stated that if Daughter ever felt unsafe around Stepmother, or R.O., she could exit the situation. In September 2021, Dr. Hawk testified to the court and stated that she and Daughter discussed a safety plan but the plan was not in writing. R.O. deems that Daughter could have been injured during the course of her trying to enact her safety plan. In August 30, 2021, R.O. requested that Dr. Hawk provide him with Daughter's treatment plan. Dr. Hawk responded indicating that she will let Daughter decide what her treatment plan is. R.O. and Daughter had their second therapy session with Dr. Hawk and Dr. Hawk did not allow R.O. in session. R.O. attested that Dr. Hawk continually allowed Mother in therapy sessions. In September 2021, Dr. Hawk testified that some interactions between Daughter, R.O. and Stepmother are emotionally abusive. Dr. Hawk accepted payment from Mother to testify in Court. R.O. alleges that Dr. Hawk did not obtain his consent to testify in Court regarding confidential information. On September 16, 2021, R.O. withdrew his consent for Dr. Hawk to provide therapy to Daughter. Dr. Hawk responded to the Complaint in a timely manner. Dr. Hawk states that R.O. sought her services. Dr. Hawk claims that R.O. and Daughter had multiple issues prior to her therapy sessions. Dr. Hawk attests that she indicated to both parents that she would not testify in Court short of a subpoena or Court Order. Dr. Hawk offered to submit a treatment summary in lieu of testifying. Dr. Hawk attests that both parents were aware that she received a subpoena to testify in Court. Dr. Hawk summarized the Daughter's treatment which included nine sessions from May 2021 to September 2021. Dr. Hawk states that R.O. and Mother could not participate in therapy together without arguing. Dr. Hawk indicated that her goal was to provide Daughter with tools to cope with parents and to help her feel safe with both R.O. and Stepmother. Dr. Hawk confirms R.O. and Mother were copied on most emails. Dr. Hawk believes that R.O. blames her for Mother denying Daughter to spend time with him over the summer. Dr. Hawk did explain that she communicated with Mother alone one time after Daughter attempted to exit the moving car. Dr. Hawk attests that R.O. did not request a treatment plan until September 2021. Dr. Hawk claims that she did not encourage Daughter to leave either parents' house but rather attempted to create a safety plan. Dr. Hawk claims that she reported Daughter's attempt to exit a moving vehicle to the Department of Child Safety. Dr. Hawk claims that she witnessed R.O. putting Daughter in the middle of his conflict with Mother. In September 2021, the Court ruled that R.O. is preventing Daughter from obtaining the treatment she needs as he has interfered with Daughter's prior treatment. Dr. Hawk confirms that after this complaint she has been consulting with a forensic psychologist and she has completed continuing education. Dr. Meier stated that a forensic psychologist, Robert DiCarlo, Ph.D., was retained to provide an expert opinion in this complaint. Dr. DiCarlo expressed concerns with the following:

- Dr. Hawk provided testimony to the Court after receiving a subpoena but did not obtain consent from both parents
- Dr. Hawk's policies and procedures utilizes a personal gmail account for sharing treatment information
 - Failure to consider multiple alternative hypothesis
 - Sharing of confidential information without consent from both parents
 - Bias of Dr. Hawk against Dr. R.O.

- Email security
- Not sharing treatment plan with R.O. in a timely manner

Dr. DiCarlo was present and provided a summary of his findings to the Board. Dr. DiCarlo summarized the work and challenges of forensic psychologists providing services for the family Court. Dr. DiCarlo explained that it was requested that he provide an opinion as to whether Dr. Hawk practiced within the standard of care. Dr. DiCarlo opined that his greatest concern is Dr. Hawk's inability to consider the multiple hypothesis the Daughter was experiencing specifically, Dr. Hawk concluded that the Daughter was suffering from emotional abuse. Dr. DiCarlo explained that forensic psychologists have to consider all factors when opining on a custody issue. Dr. DiCarlo believes that Dr. Hawk's opinion did not consider all situations. Dr. DiCarlo opined that Dr. Hawk gave more weight to Mother and never admonished Mother or tried to educate Mother as she did with R.O. Dr. DiCarlo expressed concern that Dr. Hawk allowed Daughter to direct treatment goals which is different than providing an unbiased custody evaluation. Dr. DiCarlo expressed concern that Dr. Hawk did not obtain written consent from both parents to testify in Court. Dr. DiCarlo expressed concern as to whether Dr. Hawk has any policies or procedures regarding electronic transmission of confidential healthcare information. Dr. DiCarlo provided educational information regarding providing psychological forensic services to the family Court. Dr. DiCarlo summarized Dr. Hawk's strengths in providing services in this case. Dr. Caterino asked Dr. DiCarlo whether a psychologist can request that a subpoena be quashed. Dr. DiCarlo opined that a psychologist can request a subpoena be quashed. Dr. Stewart asked Dr. DiCarlo whether a psychologist can request that the Court Order a psychologist to testify rather than comply with a subpoena. Dr. DiCarlo opined that a psychologist can request that the Court Order the testimony.

The Complainant, R.O., was present, requested to speak, made a statement and answered Board members' questions. R.O. stated that his Daughter is now in therapy with a forensic psychologist and is doing well. R.O. stated that on September 3, 2021, Dr. Hawk testified that she made a report to the Department of Child Safety (DCS) due to a situation that happened in August 2021. R.O. stated that when he was contacted by DCS regarding the August situation, the DCS officer said the report was made on September 3, 2021. R.O. attested that Dr. Hawk's treatment plan was created on the first day that Daughter started therapy which he believes is not correct. Dr. Meier asked R.O. the dates he requested the treatment plan. R.O. said that he is unable to recall specific dates but that it was prior to September 2021. Dr. Meier confirmed with R.O. that he did not sign for the release of a treatment plan. Dr. Meier asked R.O. if Dr. Hawk discussed his options regarding her being subpoenaed to testify. R.O. said Dr. Hawk did not discuss his options.

Dr. Hawk and her attorney, Mandi Karvis, Esq., were present, requested to speak, made statements and answered Board members' questions. Ms. Karvis reiterated that working with families involved in Court matters is very difficult. Ms. Karvis explained that Dr. Hawk was issued a subpoena by Mother and R.O. was aware of her testifying in Court. Ms. Karvis pointed to the fact that R.O. was represented by an attorney in which the attorney should have been knowledgeable in these matters. Ms. Karvis stated that Dr. Hawk has modified her policies regarding informed consent since this matter. Ms. Karvis explained that Dr. Hawk believes she provided the best care and she stands by her Court testimony regarding emotional abuse. Ms. Karvis attested that Dr. Hawk informs patients/clients about the confidentiality of email. Ms. Karvis denies that Dr. Hawk perjured herself in Court. Ms. Karvis addressed R.O.'s concern as to when Dr. Hawk's treatment plan was produced. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Hawk to address her responsibilities to provide informed consent. Dr. Hawk responded and stated that she has modified her intake form. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Hawk which forensic psychologist she has been consulting with since this Complaint. Dr. Hawk answered. Ms. Shreeve asked Dr. Hawk when she submitted the Complaint to DCS. Dr. Hawk stated that she contacted DCS the day before the Court hearing. Dr. Caterino asked Dr. Hawk the timeframe in which she submitted the treatment plan to R.O. Dr. Hawk answered stating that she verbally discussed the treatment plan with R.O. throughout treatment. Dr. Hawk explained when R.O. submitted a written request for the treatment plan she provided the treatment plan to R.O. the next day. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Hawk to explain why she believed Daughter was suffering emotional abuse by R.O. and Stepmother. Dr. Hawk answered. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Hawk if she discussed safety plans with R.O. or the Stepmother. Dr. Hawk indicated that she did notify Mother and Father of the safety plan via email but was never able to meet with Stepmother due to

Stepmother's schedule. Ms. Shreeve confirmed with Dr. Hawk that she met R.O. and Daughter jointly three times. Dr. Davey asked Dr. Hawk to explain whether Daughter attempted to exit a moving car. Dr. Hawk stated that Stepmother was in a line at school to pick up children therefore the car would stop and move slowly. Dr. Stewart asked if Dr. Hawk contacted Daughter's previous therapist. Dr. Hawk answered.

The Board deliberated. Dr. Meier acknowledged Dr. Hawk's effort in responding to this complaint. Dr. Meier opined that there are clear violations which may include informed consent, record keeping, failure to provide records and potential bias against R.O. Dr. Mellott commented that Dr. Hawk's progress notes are very thorough but may lack a few signatures. Ms. Shreeve opined that informed consent was not a violation. Dr. Caterino expressed concern that Dr. Hawk did not make a report to DCS immediately.

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson expressed concern that Dr. Hawk made the report to DCS the same day of her Court testimony.

Dr. Mellott left the meeting at 10:26 a.m.

MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to forward Complaint No. 22-09; Karen Hawk, Psy.D., to an Informal Interview for possible violations of A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(e) Gross negligence in the practice of a psychologist; 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)(r) for possibly failing to obtain a client's or patient's informed and written consent to release personal or otherwise confidential information to another party unless the release is otherwise authorized by law; A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(cc) for possibly failing to make available to a client or patient or the client's or patient's designated representative, on written request, a copy of the client's or patient's record, including raw test data, psychometric testing materials and other information as provided by law and A.R.S. 32-2061(16)(dd) for possibly violating an ethical standard adopted by the board as it pertains to the American Psychological Association Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct 4.01 Maintaining Confidentiality, 4.02 Discussing the Limits of Confidentiality, 4.05 Disclosures and 6.01 Documentation of Professional and Scientific Work and Maintenance of Records.

SECOND: There was no second as Chairwoman Davis-Wilson motioned to go into Executive Session.

MOTION: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson moved to meet in executive session for purposes of receiving legal advice.

SECOND: Dr. Meier.

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

VOTE: 6-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

The Board met in Executive Session from 10:32 a.m. to 10:37 a.m. Upon return to public session the Board continued deliberations on the motion.

Board members deliberated whether A.R.S. §32-2061(e) be included in Dr. Meier's motion. Board members concurred that A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(e) is appropriate. Board members agreed to add A.R.S. §32-2061(j) to Dr. Meier's motion. Ms. Galvin suggested adding A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(o) to Dr. Meier's motion. Board members agreed to Ms. Galvin's suggestion.

MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to forward Complaint No. 22-09; Karen Hawk, Psy.D., to an Informal Interview for possible violations of A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(e) Gross negligence in the practice of a psychologist; 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)(j) for possibly making a fraudulent or untrue statement to the board or

its investigators, staff or consultants; A.R.S. §32-2061(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; A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(r) for possibly failing to obtain a client's or patient's informed and written consent to release personal or otherwise confidential information to another party unless the release is otherwise authorized by law; A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(cc) for possibly failing to make available to a client or patient or the client's or patient's designated representative, on written request, a copy of the client's or patient's record, including raw test data, psychometric testing materials and other information as provided by law and A.R.S. 32-2061(16)(dd) for possibly violating an ethical standard adopted by the board as it pertains to the American Psychological Association Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct 4.01 Maintaining Confidentiality, 4.02 Discussing the Limits of Confidentiality, 4.05 Disclosures and 6.01 Documentation of Professional and Scientific Work and Maintenance of Records.

SECOND: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson.

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

VOTE: 6-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

The Board recessed at 10:40 a.m. and resumed public session at 10:50 a.m.

b) Complaint No. 22-20 Jeanette Higgins, Psy.D.

Dr. Meier provided information regarding Dr. Higgins' professional background. Dr. Meier stated that Dr. Higgins is currently employed with McGady and Associates. The Complainant, J.L., is a consulting psychologist for the Department of Child Services (DCS). J.L., requested that a seven year old child (Child) undergo a psychological evaluation after the Court Ordered therapeutic interventionist made the request. The parents (Mother and Father) of Child are undergoing a contentious custody evaluation, and there is an open DCS claim due to claims of domestic violence and sexual abuse by Father. The Child was hospitalized in a psychiatric institution twice in 2021. In March 2021, a referral from the agency that Child receives psychological services was submitted to McGady and Associates for the psychological evaluation. The Psychological evaluation was conducted by Dr. Higgins in August 2021, and she submitted her report on August 30, 2021. In January 2022, J.L., submitted the complaint against Dr. Higgins for concerns that Dr. Higgins did not have consent from all legal guardians before conducting the evaluation on Child. Dr. Higgins did not interview Mother, Father or other collaterals. J.L. complains that Dr. Higgins did not review records from other providers. Additionally, Mother was interviewed in front of the Child. J.L. alleges that Dr. Higgins did not reference any collateral records she reviewed in her report. J.L. expressed concern with how Dr. Higgins administered some of the psychological tests. J.L. claims that Dr. Higgins' report was based solely on Mother's interview. Additionally, Dr. Higgins did not provide records to other professionals caring for the Child in a timely manner. Dr. Higgins responded to the complaint in a timely manner, providing background information and claims that she has extensive experience in conducting psychological evaluations on children. Dr. Higgins states that she has performed several evaluations since being employed with McGady and Associates. Dr. Higgins admits that she has never conducted an evaluation on a child in which both parents were involved. Dr. Higgins explains that her prior evaluations on children have involved children living in a group home where neither parent was involved in the child's life. Dr. Higgins admits that she has never conducted a psychological evaluation on a child where the parents are in a contentious custody case. Dr. Higgins attests that she consulted with another psychologist in this matter. Dr. Higgins claims that she was unaware that the evaluation would be used in a custody case. Dr. Higgins attests that both Mother and Father signed for the evaluation. Dr. Higgins summarized the evaluation. Dr. Higgins was not aware that she was required to consult with collaterals in this matter. Dr. Higgins claims that DCS sent her 40 pages of records and 15 questions to answer. Dr. Higgins states that she was not given the 600 pages that was submitted to the Board as part of this complaint. Dr. Higgins did not consider herself a custody evaluator and attests that her report was not meant to be a determining factor in the custody evaluation. Dr. Higgins states that no feedback session was requested after her report was submitted. Dr. Higgins states that

she is not involved in record requests. Dr. Higgins admits that she is not familiar with Arizona's process therefore she is seeking continuing education in custody evaluations and has been consulting with Dr. McGady on a regular basis. Upon Board staff's request, Dr. McGady submitted a corrective action plan for Dr. Higgins which entails weekly supervision and additional consultation.

The Complainant was not present. Dr. Higgins and her attorney, Mandi Karvis, Esq., were present, requested to speak, made a statement and answered Board members' questions. Ms. Karvis clarified that at the Board's Complaint Screening Committee it was determined that Dr. Higgins did not interview Child in front of Mother. The Mother was only present initially to allow the Child to become comfortable with the situation. Ms. Karvis reiterated that Dr. Higgins reviewed all of the records that were provided. Ms. Karvis acknowledged that Dr. Higgins could have requested additional records. Ms. Karvis acknowledged that Dr. Higgins is not familiar with custody evaluations. Ms. Karvis summarized Dr. Higgins' corrective action in that she has completed continuing education and is undergoing supervision and consultation with Dr. McGady. Ms. Karvis confirmed that Dr. Higgins is not currently conducting custody evaluations. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Higgins to explain her decision making on who would be interviewed. Dr. Higgins stated that her decision making was based on which caregiver was present with the Child. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Higgins why she chose not to interview other collaterals. Dr. Higgins answered. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Higgins how she was able to answer DCS questions, specifically the question regarding custody, without interviewing the Father. Dr. Higgins acknowledged that she should have evaluated the Father but was not under the impression that her evaluation would be used for custody purposes. Dr. Meier asked to explain her employment with McGady and Associates. Dr. Higgins stated that she is contracted with McGady and Associates. Ms. Shreeve asked if Dr. McGady reviewed the report before it was submitted. Ms. Higgins stated that she is required to submit her reports to McGady and Associates for approval before submitting the report to the requesting agency. Dr. Caterino asked Dr. Higgins if she contacted previous therapists. Dr. Higgins stated she did not contact previous therapists. Dr. Caterino asked Dr. Higgins how she made her diagnosis of Child. Dr. Higgins stated her diagnosis was based on her interview with Child and Mother and the test results. Dr. Caterino asked how many sessions she conducted with the Child. Dr. Higgins said she had one session with Child. Dr. Caterino asked Dr. Higgins to clarify whether she conducted the interview of the Mother with the Child present. Dr. Higgins stated that Child was very uncomfortable in the waiting room and would not go to Dr. Higgins' office therefore Dr. Higgins chose to start the clinical interview with the Mother in the waiting room until the Child was comfortable going to Dr. Higgins' office. Dr. Higgins clarified that the short time that the Child was with Mother during the Mother's interview, Dr. Higgins did not ask any questions that would have harmed the Child. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson asked Dr. Higgins if she intends to continue contracting with McGady and Associates. Dr. Higgins said yes but that her workload has been reduced so she can consult more.

The Board deliberated. Dr. Meier opined that much of the issues have been addressed but still believes that there are potential violations, specifically providing services that are outside the scope of practice. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson echoed Dr. Meier but did acknowledge that Dr. Higgins did seek consultation on this case. Dr. Davey recognizes that Dr. Higgins has taken corrective action and is not convinced that moving this case to an Informal Interview will reveal additional information. Ms. Shreeve asked Ms. Galvin if the Board can issue a Letter of Concern. Ms. Galvin indicated that the Board can issue a Letter of Concern or, if it believes Dr. Higgins requires additional education, the Board can issue a non-disciplinary Order for continuing education. Dr. Caterino opined that there is a violation and that discipline is warranted. Dr. Meier stated that he believes a violation occurred. Dr. Caterino asked if the Board received any consultation documentation regarding Dr. McGady's corrective action plan and if there is documentation regarding Dr. Higgins consulting with Dr. McGady on this case. Dr. Higgins stated that she did not document the consultation with Dr. McGady and is unclear as to whether Dr. McGady documented the consultation. Dr. Caterino asked if Dr. Higgins asked Dr. McGady which tests should be administered. Dr. McGady affirmed she did not ask for additional information from Dr. McGady. Board members deliberated as to whether the matter should be forwarded to an Informal Interview. Dr. Meier reiterated that Dr. Higgins is now receiving consultation, is under supervision and has reduced her caseload. Board members agreed that a violation did occur in this matter. Ms. Galvin opined that without a Board Order Dr. Higgins can discontinue consultation and supervision at any time. Dr. Davey asked if the Board moved this to an Informal Interview can the

Board request the supervision and consultation documentation. Ms. Galvin said yes, the Board can request the information/documentation.

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

SECOND: Ms. Shreeve.

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

VOTE: 6-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

The Board met in Executive Session from 11:41 a.m. to 11:50 a.m. Upon return to open session the Board considered a motion.

MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to forward Complaint No. 22-20; Jeanette Higgins, Psy.D., to an Informal Interview for possible violations of A.R.S. 32-2061(16)(g) for possibly engaging or offering to engage as a psychologist in activities that are not congruent with the psychologist’s professional education, training and experience and A.R.S. 32-2061(16)(dd) for possibly violating an ethical standard adopted by the Board as it pertains to the American Psychological Association Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct 2.01 Boundaries of Competence and 9.01 Basis for Assessment. In lieu of an Informal Interview Board staff is directed to pursue a Consent Agreement to include one year probation with the option to be released at six months, a Board approved Practice Monitor and seven hours of continuing education focusing on assessments and forensic evaluations.

SECOND: Dr. Caterino.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Dr. Davey, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Meier, Ms. Shreeve and Dr. Stewart. The following Board member(s) voted not in favor of the motion: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson.

VOTE: 5-yay, 1-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

Board members continued discussion in this matter regarding whether there should be concern with Dr. McGady’s part in this complaint as his company is ultimately responsible for psychological reports that are submitted.

MOTION: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson motioned to open a Complaint against M. David McGady, Psy.D., for further investigation.

SECOND: Ms. Shreeve.

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

VOTE: 6-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

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

- 9. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CORRESPONDENCE FROM FAREN AKINS, PH.D., ESQ. CONCERNING A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(cc) AND THE ETHICAL PRINCIPLES OF PSYCHOLOGISTS AND CODE OF CONDUCT AT 9.04 RELEASE OF TEST DATA AND 9.11 MAINTAINING TEST SECURITY**

Ms. Paakkonen summarized this matter stating that Mr. Faren Akins contacted Board staff due to questions he has received regarding A.R.S. §32-2061(cc). Ms. Paakkonen clarified that the correspondence from Mr. Akins noted that there may be a discrepancy between A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(cc) and the American Psychological Association (APA) Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (Ethical Code) 9.04 release of Test Data and 9.11 Maintaining Test Security. Mr. Akins was present and noted that test data is typically released as part of a client file. Mr. Akins explained that Ethical Code 9.11 specifically states that it is not appropriate to release test materials. Mr. Akins clarified that the APA Ethical Code is incorporated into the Board statutes pursuant to A.R.S. §32-2061(dd). Mr. Akins noted that A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(cc) contradicts APA Ethical Code 9.11 Maintaining Test Security. Dr. Caterino noted that this issue has been discussed amongst the school psychologist community and there are articles regarding this subject. Dr. Stewart opined that there is a contractual obligation to keep test materials confidential with the publishing company. Ms. Galvin noted that A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(cc) states “as provided by law”. Ms. Shreeve suggested a Substantive Policy Statement to clarify the statute. Dr. Meier opined that there is psychometric test material that should be released and the statute is written clearly as psychometric test material is appropriate to release in certain situations. Dr. Mellott requested to read the articles that Dr. Caterino referenced on this subject. Dr. Meier asked Ms. Paakkonen if the new version of the APA Ethical Code is reflected in the Board’s draft rule package. Ms. Paakkonen said the Board did not arrive at a consensus to revise the rule R4-26-303. It was the consensus of the Board to put this agenda item on a future meeting of the Board.

10. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE REGARDING INTERPRETATION OF A.R.S. § 32-2075(A)(1) EXEMPTION TO LICENSURE FOR SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

Dr. Caterino summarized stating this item was discussed at the April 8, 2022, Board meeting and it was requested that Board members submit responses or suggestions to Ms. Paakkonen. Dr. Caterino indicated that no responses were included in the Board materials. Dr. Mellott summarized the following:

- Can a school psychologist contract with a District through an agency or independently? Dr. Mellott indicated that this is a moot point as a school psychologist is authorized to do both.

Ms. Galvin opined that there may be an issue or concerns with the Board answering the questions as factual situations could vary and Board action may vary depending on situations. Ms. Galvin indicated that these are hypothetical questions. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson suggested to have a discussion regarding the revised statute language in general. Dr. Caterino indicated that the biggest concern to her is who can perform independent educational evaluations. Dr. Caterino indicated that other jurisdictions allow a school psychologist to conduct independent educational evaluations (IEEs). Board members expressed concern that it cannot take a position on hypothetical situations. Board members determined that contractual situations have been addressed by the HB2178 but not the IEE. Dr. Meier stated that certified school psychologists are performing IEE’s and if they are not performing IEE’s within a school setting then it could be determined that the school psychologist is practicing outside of their scope. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson agreed with Dr. Meier but believes that the Board’s statutes address that type of situation. Dr. Meier addressed concerns that there may be school psychologists that believe that IEE’s outside of a school setting are within their scope of practice. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson asked Ms. Galvin whether it would be appropriate for the Board to issue a Substantive Policy Statement on IEE’s. It was the consensus of the Board to direct Board staff to draft a Substantive Policy Statement regarding IEE’s and to bring the Substantive Policy Statement to a future Board meeting.

11. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING PROPOSED LEGISLATION INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO: HB2070, HB2145, HB2162, HB2178, HB2196, HB2260, HB2294, HB2371, HB2412, HB2587, HB2599, HB2612, SB1035, SB1045, SB1090, SB1127, SB1158, SB1309, SB1550, SB1568

Ms. Paakkonen provided a brief summary stating that most of the listed bills will not be enacted. Ms. Paakkonen summarized SB1309 that extends the temporary emergency licenses until January 2023, HB2178

regarding the school psychologist licensure exemption statute language, and HB2612 that strikes “good moral character” in the behavior analyst statute. Ms. Paakkonen stated that both newly appointed public members were moved to the full Senate for confirmation.

Dr. Mellott rejoined the meeting at 12:01 p.m.

12. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REPORT ON ASPPB’S MID-YEAR MEETING

Dr. Mellott provided a summary stating that fee waivers and criminal backgrounds were among the topics discussed at the meeting. Dr. Mellott stated that the question regarding “good moral character” was also discussed. Dr. Mellott stated that different ethnicities and Ph.D. vs. Psy.D. in regards to gaining licensure was discussed. Dr. Mellott stated that all jurisdictions are striving to be more inclusive and striving to reduce licensure requirements. Dr. Mellott stated that master level degree programs are a future topic of interest. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson provided a summary stating that accredited programs for master degrees were discussed as well as barriers to licensure. Pros and cons regarding different pathways to licensure were also explored. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson recognized Dr. Mellott for being presented with the Fellow award. Ms. Michaelsen stated that it was a great opportunity to meet with other administrators at the BARC meeting. Ms. Michaelsen summarized that the ASPPB’s attorney made a presentation. Ms. Paakkonen summarized stating that this was the first in-person meeting since COVID. Ms. Paakkonen touched on master level accreditation programs and will be presenting ideas to the Board’s Legislative Committee. Ms. Paakkonen further addressed pressing regulatory issues. Ms. Fowkes summarized the Canadian presentation regarding a National standard for all Boards.

Dr. Mellott left the meeting at 1:20 p.m.

13. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RATIFICATION OF REQUEST FOR NOMINATION OF RAMONA MELLOTT, PH.D. AS A CANDIDATE FOR THE MEMBER-AT-LARGE BOARD POSITION WITH THE ASSOCIATION OF STATE AND PROVINCIAL PSYCHOLOGY BOARDS

Ms. Paakkonen noted that at its April 8, 2022, meeting, the Board did not forward any nominations to the Association for State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB). Ms. Paakkonen explained that at ASPPB’s mid-year meeting it was announced that the Member-At-Large position on the Board will be open in 2023. The Member-At-Large position is focused on training and education which is Dr. Mellott’s area of expertise. It was determined at the ASPPB meeting that Dr. Mellott would submit a nomination form for the position and to ask that the Board ratify the nomination at its May 6, 2022, meeting.

MOTION: Dr. Meier motioned to ratify the nomination for Dr. Mellott as ASPPB’s Member-At-Large.
SECOND: Ms. Shreeve.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson, Dr. Davey, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Meier, Ms. Shreeve and Dr. Stewart. The following Board member(s) abstained from this item; Dr. Mellott.

VOTE: 6-yay, 0-nay, 1-abstain, 0-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

14. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING BOARD MEMBER AND STAFF PARTICIPATION IN THE NATIONAL OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING MEETING OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES (JUNE 19-21, 2022 IN LAS VEGAS, NEVADA), AND PARTICIPATION IN ASPPB’S ANNUAL MEETING (OCTOBER 26-30, 2022 IN NATIONAL HARBOR, MARYLAND)

Ms. Paakkonen provided a summary and explained the purpose and content of the National Conference of

State Legislatures meeting. Ms. Paakkonen noted that the registration fee is waived for Board staff and Board members. Ms. Paakkonen asked that the Board approve her to attend the conference. Ms. Paakkonen indicated that there is room in the budget for a Board member to attend. Dr. Caterino expressed interest in attending the conference.

MOTION: Ms. Shreeve motioned to send Ms. Paakkonen and a Board member to the National Conference of State Legislatures.

SECOND: Dr. Meier.

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

VOTE: 6-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

Ms. Paakkonen provided a summary stating that the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) annual meeting is being held in the next fiscal year, in October 2022. Ms. Paakkonen explained that she would like to know how many Board members and staff are interested in attending the meeting so she can budget for it. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson noted that Mr. Wynn expressed interest in attending the meeting. Ms. Michaelsen expressed interest in attending the meeting. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson indicated that she will attend if necessary. Ms. Paakkonen indicated that Dr. Mellott will likely attend the meeting.

15. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING LEGISLATION TO BE PROPOSED BY THE ARIZONA PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION TO EXPAND THE SCOPE OF PRACTICE OF PSYCHOLOGY WITH PRESCRIPTIVE AUTHORITY

Ms. Paakkonen provided a summary stating that the Arizona Psychological Association (AzPA) contacted Board staff requesting to be placed on the agenda to discuss possible legislation for the 2023 legislative session. A representative from AzPA, Ryan House, Psy.D., was present and explained that the Board requested if there is interest in the community to have prescriptive authority. Dr. House stated that 188 individuals participated in a survey regarding prescriptive authority. Dr. House stated that approximately 75% percent of the participants were in support of prescriptive authority. Additionally, Dr. House stated that the approximately 50% of the participants were in supportive of additional education to obtain prescriptive authority. Dr. Meier asked Dr. House who sent the survey. Dr. House stated it was posted on AzPA's list serve. Dr. Davey asked which of the participants were not licensed. Dr. House explained that some of the survey participants are postdoctoral individuals and doctoral students.

16. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPLICATION FOR LICENSURE BY UNIVERSAL RECOGNITION FROM REBECCA BLAIS, PH.D.

Dr. Meier recused from this agenda item and exited the virtual meeting.

Dr. Caterino provided a summary of Dr. Blais' application to the Board. Upon review, the Board noted that Dr. Blais' application meets requirements of statute and rule.

MOTION: Dr. Caterino motioned to approve Dr. Blais' application for licensure.

SECOND: Dr. Mellott.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson, Dr. Davey, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve and Dr. Stewart. The following Board member(s) recused from this item: Dr. Meier.

VOTE: 6-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 1-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

17. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPLICATION FOR LICENSURE BY UNIVERSAL RECOGNITION FROM ABIGAIL GEWIRTZ, PH.D.

Dr. Meier recused from this agenda item and exited the virtual meeting.

Dr. Caterino provided a summary of Dr. Gewirtz’s application to the Board. Upon review, the Board noted that Dr. Gewirtz’s application meets requirements of statute and rule.

**MOTION: Dr. Caterino motioned to approve Dr. Gewirtz’s application for licensure.
SECOND: Dr. Mellott.**

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson, Dr. Davey, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve and Dr. Stewart. The following Board member(s) recused from this item: Dr. Meier.

VOTE: 6-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 1-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

18. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPLICATION FOR BEHAVIOR ANALYST LICENSURE FROM GABRIELLA GIBBS, M.ED.

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson recused from this agenda item and exited the virtual meeting.

Dr. Davey provided a summary of Ms. Gibbs’ application to the Board. Upon review, the Board determined that Ms. Gibbs application meets the requirements of statute and rule.

**MOTION: Dr. Davey motioned to approve Ms. Gibbs’ application for licensure.
SECOND: Ms. Shreeve.**

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Dr. Davey, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve and Dr. Stewart. The following Board member(s) recused from this item: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson.

VOTE: 6-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 1-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

19. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPLICATION FOR BEHAVIOR ANALYST LICENSURE FROM KENDALL BRUNETT, M.S.

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson recused from this agenda item and exited the virtual meeting.

Dr. Davey provided a summary of Ms. Brundett’s application to the Board. Upon review, the Board determined that Ms. Brundett’s application meets the requirements of statute and rule.

**MOTION: Dr. Davey motioned to approve Ms. Brundett’s application for licensure.
SECOND: Dr. Meier.**

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Dr. Davey, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve and Dr. Stewart. The following Board member(s) recused from this item: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson.

VOTE: 6-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 1-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

20. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPLICATION FOR BEHAVIOR ANALYST LICENSURE FROM LAURA MURRAY, M.S.

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson recused from this agenda item and exited the virtual meeting.

Dr. Davey provided a summary of Ms. Murray’s application to the Board. Upon review, the Board determined that Ms. Murray’s application meets the requirements of statute and rule.

**MOTION: Dr. Davey motioned to approve Ms. Murray’s application for licensure.
SECOND: Dr. Meier.**

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Dr. Davey, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve and Dr. Stewart. The following Board member(s) recused from this item: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson.

VOTE: 6-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 1-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

21. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPLICATION FOR BEHAVIOR ANALYST LICENSURE FROM SHAWN MCCORMACK, M.S.

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson recused from this agenda item and exited the virtual meeting.

Dr. Davey provided a summary of Mr. McCormack’s’s application to the Board. Upon review, the Board determined that Mr. McCormack’s application meets the requirements of statute and rule.

**MOTION: Dr. Davey motioned to approve Mr. McCormack’s application for licensure.
SECOND: Dr. Meier.**

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Dr. Davey, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve and Dr. Stewart. The following Board member(s) recused from this item: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson.

VOTE: 6-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 1-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

22. NEW AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

No items were suggested in addition to those noted previously.

23. ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to adjourn the meeting.
SECOND: Dr. Davey**

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

VOTE: 6-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.

MOTION PASSED.

The meeting adjourned at 1:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Linda C. Caterino Ph.D., ABPP

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