



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](http://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 July 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  
Joseph Stewart, Ed.D.  
Todd Wynn, M.A.

### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson called the Board's meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

### **2. ROLL CALL**

The following Board members participated in the virtual meeting: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Davey, Mr. Dynar, Dr. Meier, Ms. Shreeve, Dr. Stewart and Mr. Wynn. Dr. Mellott joined at 8:35 a.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, Zakiya Mallas, Licensing Specialist, and 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.

#### 4. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

There were no calls to the public.

#### 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 that Consent Agenda item E. be removed from the Consent Agenda for independent discussion.

**MOTION: Mr. Dynar 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. Caterino, Dr. Davey, Mr. Dynar, Dr. Meier, Ms. Shreeve, Dr. Stewart and Mr. Wynn.**

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

**MOTION PASSED.**

#### A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- June 3, 2022 Regular Session Minutes
- June 3, 2022 Executive Session Minutes

#### B. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

#### C. DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING PSYCHOLOGIST APPLICATIONS

##### Requesting Approval to Sit for the EPPP (A.R.S. §§32-2071, 2071.01 & 2072)

- |   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| 1) Nessa Zeesel Feinstein Gulik, Psy.D.   | Part 1 & Part 2 |
| 2) Andrea Hsai Gory Munoz, Psy.D. (REAPP) | Part 1 & Part 2 |

##### Requesting Approval to Sit for EPPP & Licensure (A.R.S. §§32-2071, 2071.01 & 2072)

- |                                     |                        |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1) Ashley Renee McWaters, Ph.D.     | Part 1 & Part 2        |
| 2) Colette Wilcoxon, Psy.D.         | Part 1 & Part 2        |
| 3) Julia Hammett, Ph.D.             | Part 1 & Part 2        |
| 4) Kourtney Crier, Psy.D.           | Part 1 & Part 2        |
| 5) Kristin Michelle Million, Psy.D. | Part 1 & Part 2        |
| 6) Michael Nash Clark, Ph.D.        | Part 1 & Part 2        |
| 7) Randi Phelps, Ph.D.              | Part 2 (Passed Part 1) |
| 8) Joseph C. Murthy, Psy.D. (REAPP) | Part 2 (Passed Part 1) |

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

- |                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| 1) Charlotte Iurino, Ph.D. |  |
|----------------------------|--|

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

- |                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| 1) Cyndy Guadalupe Soto-Lopez, Ph.D. |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|

- 2) Felicia Mueller, Psy.D.
- 3) John Geddes, Ph.D.

**Requesting Approval of Supervised Temporary Licensure and to Sit for the EPPP (A.R.S. §§32-2073 & 2072)**

- |                            |                 |
|----------------------------|-----------------|
| 1) Maricela Smith, Psy.D.  | Part 1 & Part 2 |
| 2) Maddison Savage, Ph.D.  | Part 1 & Part 2 |
| 3) Yolanda Estrada, Psy.D. | Part 1 & Part 2 |
| 4) Adam Worley, Psy.D.     | Part 1 & Part 2 |

**Requesting Approval for Licensure by Credential (ABPP, CPQ or National Register) (A.R.S. §§32-2071.01 & 2072)**

- |                           |     |
|---------------------------|-----|
| 1) Karen Douglass, Psy.D. | n/a |
|---------------------------|-----|

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

- |                              |     |
|------------------------------|-----|
| 1) Jacquelyn Flood, Psy.D.   | n/a |
| 2) Joellen Stevens, Ph.D.    | n/a |
| 3) Heather Walker, Ph.D.     | n/a |
| 4) Tanya Oppenheimer, Psy.D. | n/a |

**D. DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING BEHAVIOR ANALYST APPLICATIONS**

- 1) Jessica Costa, M.S.
- 2) Brittany Jacobsen, M.A.
- 3) Elizabeth Arevalo, M.A.
- 4) Natalie Roper, M.A.
- 5) Kathleen Nemecheck, M.S.
- 6) Madison Sires, M.A.
- 7) Kathryn Difino, M.A.
- 8) Allison Lowy, Ph.D.
- 9) Kelli Hughes, M.Ed.
- 10) Jenny Pagan, M.S.
- 11) Christina Panteloglou, M.S.
- 12) Phillip Peters, M.A.
- 13) Shelby Gillaird, M.Ed.
- 14) Jason Lantier, M.A.
- 15) Belen Montserrat BuenRostro, M.S.
- 16) Kelly Floyd, M.Ed.
- 17) Dawn Wadsworth, M.S.
- 18) Wesley Johnson, M.Ed.
- 19) Kiley Sheehan, M.S.
- 20) Mogos Gabre, M.A.
- 21) Suzzie Campfield, M.S.
- 22) Katherine Makris, M.A.
- 23) Yamilitza Sanchez, M.S.
- 24) Esther DeWitt, M.Ed.
- 25) Lauren Johnson, M.A.

**E. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REQUEST TO RETAKE THE EPPP FROM GENARO R. HUERTA, PSY.D., TEMPORARY LICENSE HOLDER PSY-T-000007**

This item was removed from the Consent Agenda for independent discussion.

Dr. Meier expressed concern that this is Dr. Huerta's seventh request to retake the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP). Dr. Meier asked whether there is a limit on how many times an applicant can take the EPPP. Ms. Paakonon explained that there is no limit as to how many times an applicant can take the EPPP. Dr. Mellott stated that the Board does not limit an applicant on how many times they can take the EPPP. Ms. Fowkes stated that the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) allows an applicant to take the EPPP four times in one year. Dr. Meier expressed concern with Dr. Huerta's study plan and requested that Dr. Huerta submit a more thorough study plan. Dr. Mellott suggested that Dr. Huerta submit an analysis of his strengths and weaknesses.

**MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to request that Dr. Huerta submit a comprehensive study plan prior to approving Dr. Huerta to take for the EPPP.**

**SECOND: Dr. Davey.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Davey, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve, and Dr. Stewart. The following Board members voted not in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar and Mr. Wynn.**

**ROLLCALL VOTE: 7-yay, 2-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.**

**MOTION PASSED.**

**TIMED ITEMS – 9:00 a.m.**

**7. INFORMAL INTERVIEW – JERI GENTRY, PSY.D. – COMPLAINT NO. 22-07**

**DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATING TO ALLEGATIONS OF UNPROFESSIONAL CONDUCT, PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, POSSIBLE DISCIPLINE AND/OR OFFER A CONSENT AGREEMENT OR REFERRAL TO A FORMAL HEARING. THIS ITEM MAY BE CONSOLIDATED WITH ITEM NOS. 8 & 9 BELOW**

Dr. Davis-Wilson opened the proceeding with an overview of the informal interview purpose and the potential outcomes. The Board members exchanged introductions with Dr. Gentry and her attorney, Bretton Barber.

The allegations of unprofessional conduct and potential violations were identified as:

- A.R.S. § 32-2061(16)(c), making or using statements of a character tending to deceive or mislead;
- A.R.S. § 32-2061(16)(j), making a fraudulent or untrue statement to the board or its investigators, staff or consultants;
- A.R.S. § 32-2061(16)(m), using fraud, misrepresentation or deception to obtain or attempt to obtain a psychology license or to pass or attempt to pass a psychology licensing examination or in assisting another person to do so;
- A.R.S. § 32-2061(16)(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
- Association Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct. A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(dd), violating an ethical standard adopted by the Board as it pertains to section 3.05 (Multiple Relationships).

Dr. Gentry was sworn in to the proceeding. Dr. Davis-Wilson provided an overview of the complaint filed by human resources personnel at Centurion. The complaint informed the Board that Dr. Gentry's security clearance had been revoked and accordingly she was terminated from her position. The complaint further alleges that the revocation was related to concerns of potential fraternization with a prison inmate who was in

the possession of intimate photographs of Dr. Gentry. She denied knowing how he obtained them. The same inmate stated Dr. Gentry provided him and other inmates with various contraband, but Centurion's investigation did not substantiate this allegation. In her response, Dr. Gentry denies having any knowledge of how the photos came to be in the inmate's possession, and she stated that she resigned from the company due to lack of clarity as to her employment status following her security clearance revocation. The investigation revealed that Dr. Gentry's employment was terminated by Sharper Focus, a previous employer – a fact she failed to disclose on her licensure application. It was noted that Dr. Gentry's response to this allegation was that she is a party to a non-disclosure agreement with the previous employer and therefore was uncertain as to what she could disclose about that event. The investigation revealed that termination was for similar conduct – fraternization with a client (a parolee). Dr. Gentry explained this event as just a chance unplanned and innocent encounter.

Ms. Michaelsen indicated that the Board previously conducted an initial review of this complaint on April 8, 2022 at which time concerns were expressed about Dr. Gentry's failure to disclose the Sharper Focus employment termination on her initial application for licensure and on her employment application with Centurion, and also her failure to disclose the second termination on her application for licensure renewal. She reminded the Board that at the conclusion of the initial review of the complaint, Dr. Gentry agreed to enter into a Consent Agreement restricting her practice to require supervision while the investigation continues.

It was further noted that the Board conducted an initial review of this complaint on April 8, 2022. During this review the Board expressed concerns that Dr. Gentry answered questions on her initial license application, and her license renewal untruthfully. Ms. Michaelsen reminded the Board that following the initial review of the complaint, Dr. Gentry agreed to enter into an interim agreement to practice only under supervision.

The complainant MR and her supervisor, SW, were present and were sworn in to the proceeding. MR stated that August 31, 2021 was the date of Dr. Gentry's termination; Dr. Gentry was escorted from the worksite due to the revocation of her security clearance. MR affirmed that the information supplied by her to the Board is correct. Dr. Gentry and Mr. Barber indicated they had no questions for MR or for SW.

Dr. Gentry was asked to clarify her understanding of what she could, and could not, disclose about her termination from Sharper Focus and how she elected to respond to the employment termination question on her application for licensure. She stated that it was her understanding that the non-disclosure agreement allowed her to only report where she was employed and the employment dates. She explained that she is now aware that she should have reported this on her application for licensure.

Dr. Gentry was asked to explain how the photographs of her came into the possession of the inmates in the facility. She explained that she accidentally brought them into the prison but is unclear how they left her possession and were obtained. She was asked to describe the event while employed at Sharper Image in California where she was observed by a former colleague to be in the company of a client (a parolee) at a bar. She stated that she went there alone, but upon seeing him arrive she allowed him to join her while she drank water and iced tea. When questioned, Dr. Gentry denied the former colleague's report that she left with the parolee and stated that she left alone.

When asked to explain what she had learned from this experience, Dr. Gentry indicated she has learned to consult, and to establish and maintain clear boundaries with clients.

**MOTION: Ms. Shreeve moved to go into Executive Session to receive confidential legal advice.**

**SECOND: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson.**

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

**VOTE: 9-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.**

**MOTION PASSED.**

The Board met in Executive Session from 9:51 a.m. to 10:21 a.m.

Upon resuming the meeting in public session, MR described the entry procedures and screenings that prison personnel must adhere to. She affirmed that no inmates or detention officers have access to the offices of mental health staff; it is only mental health staff members who have keys, and they are required to lock their offices when not there. She affirmed that security clearance revocation results in employment termination. MR and SW described the training that mental health staff must complete to include maintaining appropriate boundaries.

The Board resumed questioning Dr. Gentry. In response to a question, she affirmed she was terminated from Sharper Focus for “overfamiliarity” with a client. She also stated that she was told there might be alternative positions for her with Centurion when her security clearance was revoked, but that did not come into fruition. Dr. Gentry cited the dates of her employment terminations from Sharper Focus and from Centurion; she admitted to not disclosing these events on her licensure renewal application. When asked to explain her representation to the Board of her employment nondisclosure agreement with Sharper Future, she indicated she was uncertain what about what aspects of her employment that she is prohibited to disclose. It was noted that the document she represented as a nondisclosure agreement is not an executed document as it lacks a signature from a Sharper Future representative. Dr. Gentry stated that she did not understand the importance of disclosing on her licensure application the termination by Sharper Focus, and she confessed that she was embarrassed to share those details. The Board noted she has omitted disclosing all of her employment termination history when applying for employment. The Board further noted that the Department of Corrections termination report reflects she was discharged for inappropriate behavior. When asked to explain in her own words her conduct, she reiterated that she was embarrassed to explain her history of terminations, and she admitted to being intentionally evasive in order to obtain future employment.

Dr. Gentry was asked to explain how the photos of herself could have plausibly left her possession. She responded that she cannot explain how they came into the hands of inmates.

SW clarified to the Board that during her interview Dr. Gentry was asked to speak to any boundary issues that have been problematic in her past, but she denied having any.

The Board concluded the questioning and deliberated the case. The findings that emerged from that discussion found that Dr. Gentry failed to disclose two employment terminations, and she has misrepresented those facts to both the Board and to multiple employers. Board members noted that making false statements constitutes grounds for denying her licensure renewal application. It was further noted by the Board that in both instances, the terminations involved violating boundaries. The Board deliberation reflected concerns about the apparent pattern of behavior exhibited by Dr. Gentry, questioned whether this can effectively be monitored to protect the public, and deliberated whether this type of behavior can be rehabilitated.

**MOTION: Dr. Davey moved to go into Executive Session to receive confidential legal advice.**  
**SECOND: Dr. Meier.**

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

**ROLLCALL VOTE: 9-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.**  
**MOTION PASSED.**

The Board met in Executive Session from 11:14 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

Upon resuming the meeting in public session, the Board reviewed the grounds for unprofessional conduct and against the findings of fact.

**MOTION: Dr. Davis-Wilson moved to find Dr. Gentry in violation of A.R.S. § 32-2061(16)(c), making or using statements of a character tending to deceive or mislead; A.R.S. § 32-2061(16)(j), making a fraudulent or untrue statement to the board or its investigators, staff or consultants; A.R.S. § 32-2061(16)(m), using fraud, misrepresentation or deception to obtain or attempt to obtain a psychology license or to pass or attempt to pass**

a psychology licensing examination or in assisting another person to do so; A.R.S. § 32-2061(16)(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 Association Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct. A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(dd), violating an ethical standard adopted by the Board as it pertains to section 3.05 (Multiple Relationships).

**SECOND: Dr. Meier**

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

**ROLLCALL VOTE: 9-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.**

**MOTION PASSED.**

Given the violations found, the Board elected to proceed to address the related agenda items 8 and 9.

**8. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING JERI GENTRY'S INTERIM CONSENT AGREEMENT AND ORDER FOR CLINICAL SUPERVISION IN COMPLAINT NO. 22-07**

It was the consensus of the Board that the Interim Consent Agreement remain in effect until such a time that the renewal denial is in effect.

**9. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING JERI GENTRY'S PENDING RENEWAL APPLICATION**

**MOTION: Dr. Caterino moved to deny Dr. Gentry's renewal application and that the Interim Consent Agreement remain in effect until such a time that Dr. Gentry's renewal denial is in effect.**

**SECOND: Dr. Meier.**

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

**VOTE: 9-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.**

**MOTION PASSED.**

**Ms. Galvin asked the Board if it would accept a voluntary surrender of Dr. Gentry's license in lieu of a renewal denial. It was the consensus of the Board to accept a voluntary surrender of Dr. Gentry's license. In the event Dr. Gentry does not voluntarily surrender her license the renewal application will be denied.**

The Board recessed at 11:40 a.m. and returned to open session at 11:56 a.m.

**TIMED ITEMS – 10:30 a.m.**

**10. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE REGARDING PAIGE HUFF'S REQUEST TO TERMINATE PROBATION IN CASE NO. 20-52**

Ms. Michaelsen provided a summary stating that in 2019 Ms. Huff submitted her application for behavior analyst licensure. During the application process the Board received a complaint alleging Ms. Huff was practicing behavior analysis without a license. After review of the Complaint, the Board approved Ms. Huff's application with a Consent Agreement. The Consent Agreement entailed probation, practice monitoring and continuing education. Ms. Michaelsen stated that the Board received information indicating that Ms. Huff has completed the terms of the Consent Agreement.

Ms. Huff was present, requested to speak and made a statement. Ms. Huff's Practice Monitor, Jamie Jones, was present, requested to speak and made a statement. Ms. Jones noted that Ms. Huff engaged in practice monitoring and completed the terms of the Consent Agreement. Dr. Davey asked Ms. Jones to explain the timeline in which issues were addressed. Ms. Jones answered and explained the timeline and issues/goals that were addressed. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson thanked Ms. Jones for her time and effort in the behavior analyst community.

**MOTION: Dr. Davey moved to release Ms. Huff from the Consent Agreement.**

**SECOND: Dr. Stewart.**

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

**VOTE: 9-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.**

**MOTION PASSED.**

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

### **a) Complaint No. 22-13**

**Linda Russek, Ph.D.**

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson provided a summary stating that in January 2022 the Board received this complaint from AY which alleges that Dr. Russek engaged in multiple relationships. Specifically, it is alleged that Dr. Russek engaged in multiple conversations with AY regarding Dr. Russek's sexual relationship with her husband. The Complainant alleges that bitcoins were discussed in which Dr. Russek asked the Complainant if her husband could help set up her bitcoin. Additionally, AY reported having dinner with Dr. Russek during which bitcoin investment was discussed. AY alleges that after the professional relationship had ceased she called Dr. Russek because she needed professional support. AY indicated that Dr. Russek dismissed her concerns. Dr. Russek responded timely to the complaint and in the process provided information regarding her professional background. Dr. Russek acknowledged that she and AY became friends during the professional relationship. Dr. Russek claims that she ended therapy with AY but remained in contact in a professional capacity. Dr. Russek stated that she did not engage in a business relationship with AY's husband. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson reviewed the Complaint Screening Committee's (CSC) concerns and recommendation to the Board to further the investigation. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson stated that after the CSC meeting Dr. Russek submitted correspondence indicating that she understands and agrees with the CSC's concerns. Subsequently, Dr. Russek obtained additional continuing education and retained a Practice Monitor.

Dr. Russek and her attorney, Anne McClellan, Esq., were present and requested to speak. Ms. McClellan noted that Dr. Russek has been practicing psychology for forty years and this is the first complaint against her. Additionally, she noted that Dr. Russek recognized that there were boundary issues and subsequently she took remedial action. Ms. McClellan attests that this was a one-time incident from which Dr. Russek has learned to maintain appropriate boundaries. Ms. McClellan noted that Dr. Russek denies discussing her sexual relationship with her husband. Ms. McClellan stated that Dr. Larry Sideman has agreed to act as a Practice Monitor to Dr. Russek, and they have been meeting regularly. Ms. McClellan outlined Dr. Russek's remedial action, including, but not limited to, engaging in a peer group, implementing physical changes to office, decreasing her client base, joining a state association, practicing self-care, and returning to a risk management practice. Ms. McClellan indicated that Dr. Sideman submitted his recommendations to the Board. Additionally, Dr. Sideman has agreed to continue to act as a Practice Monitor to Dr. Russek for the next six months.

The Complainant, AY, was not present.



Dr. Sideman was present, requested to speak and made a statement. Dr. Sideman attested that Dr. Russek has acknowledged the CSC's concerns and has taken this Complaint seriously. Dr. Russek has taken remedial action but would benefit from continued Practice Monitoring. Dr. Stewart thanked Dr. Sideman for his work in this matter. Dr. Meier asked for clarification as to why the comment was made that Dr. Russek is not a threat to the public. Dr. Sideman answered stating that he and Dr. Russek have consulted on how to address clients and how to document all conversations.

The Board deliberated the case. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson indicated she appreciated Dr. Russek acknowledging the boundary crossing and acknowledged Dr. Russek's efforts to avoid boundary crossing in the future. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson indicated that there was a statutory violation in this Complaint. Dr. Meier affirmed there was a violation and that offering a Consent Agreement to resolve this would be appropriate and efficient. Dr. Caterino echoed Dr. Meier. Ms. Shreeve asked Ms. Galvin to clarify the Board's options.

Dr. Mellott declared that she will be recusing from this matter as she works directly with Dr. Sideman.

**MOTION: Ms. Shreeve moved to forward Complaint No. 22-13 to an Informal Interview but directed Board staff to negotiate a Consent Agreement with Dr. Russek and her attorney. The Consent Agreement shall include statutory violations.**

**SECOND: Dr. Caterino.**

**VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Davey, Dr. Meier, Ms. Shreeve, Dr. Stewart and Mr. Dynar. The following Board member did not vote in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar. The following Board member recused from voting on this matter: Dr. Mellott.**

**VOTE: 7-yay, 1-nay, 0-abstain, 1-recuse.**

**MOTION PASSED.**

## **12. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING INFORMATION RECEIVED CONCERNING KIA WATKINS, PSY.D.**

Ms. Paakkonen provided a summary stating that a healthcare professional in the state of Ohio contacted the Board on June 16, 2022. The healthcare professional reported concerns regarding Dr. Watkins. Local responders were contacted and those responders did confirm that Dr. Watkins recently began receiving care for the reported concerns. Board staff interviewed Dr. Watkins and her attorney on June 30, 2022, and a letter was submitted by Dr. Watkins' employer. Ms. Paakkonen stated that a complaint has not yet been opened and that the information is before the Board for review and possible action. Dr. Meier asked Ms. Paakkonen and Ms. Galvin if there is a time-frame in which a psychologist is required to report impairment.

**MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to go into Executive Session to receive confidential legal advice and to review confidential health records.**

**SECOND: Dr. Davey.**

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

**ROLL CALL VOTE: 9-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.**

**MOTION PASSED.**

The Board met in Executive Session from 12:46 p.m. to 1:22 p.m.

**MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to take no action.**

**SECOND: Mr. Dynar.**

**VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson, Dr. Davey, Mr. Dynar, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve, Dr. Stewart and Mr. Wynn. The following Board member abstained from voting on this matter: Dr. Caterino.**

**VOTE: 8-yay, 0-nay, 1-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**

**13. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING DRAFT PROPOSED SUBSTANTIVE POLICY STATEMENT 01-22 SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS AND INDEPENDENT EDUCATIONAL EVALUATIONS**

Ms. Paakkonen provided a summary stating that, at the Board's May 5, 2022 meeting, it directed Board staff to draft a Substantive Policy Statement (SPS) regarding the recent legislation modifying the language that provides the licensure exemption for school psychologists. Ms. Paakkonen indicated that the recent legislation will not become effective until September 24, 2022, and in the meantime the draft SPS is before the Board for review. Dr. Caterino opined that the draft Substantive Policy Statement reflects the Board's discussion. Dr. Mellott asked that a sub-header be added to the SPS for clarification. Ms. Paakkonen stated that she will look into adding a sub-header. Ms. Paakkonen asked the Board if it would like her to send the draft SPS to stakeholders prior to submission to the Governor's Office. Board members directed Ms. Paakkonen to send the SPS to stakeholders prior to submission to the Governor's Office.

**MOTION: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson moved to approve the SPS with the potential to add a sub-header.**

**SECOND: Dr. Caterino.**

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

**VOTE: 9-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.**

**MOTION PASSED**

**14. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING COMMENTS SUBMITTED TO PROPOSED REVISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE RULES THAT REGULATE THE PRACTICE OF PSYCHOLOGY AND BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS IN ARIZONA (A.A.C. TITLE 4, CHAPTER 26, ARTICLES 1-4)**

Ms. Paakkonen provided a summary stating that the Board has promulgated rule packages for both the psychology and for the behavior analyst sections of the Arizona Administrative Code. During the public comment period the Board office received one written comment on the psychology rule package regarding R4-26-207. The Commenter requested that the Board add additional examples to the diversity topics as it pertains to continuing education in order to be more specific and inclusive. Ms. Paakkonen indicated that the behavior analyst rule package did not receive any public comment. Dr. Mellott agrees with the Commenter's language changes. Dr. Mellott also asked whether the jurisprudence tool will be changed every two years. Ms. Paakkonen answered stating that the tool will be reviewed at least annually and if there are changes to the statutes and rules, Board staff will update the content. Mr. Dynar expressed concern with the time-frame if the Board does not move the rule package to the Governor's Regulatory Review Council (GRRC). Mr. Dynar suggested moving the rule package to GRRC except for the continuing education section. Ms. Shreeve opined that if there are changes made to the psychology rule package the same changes should be made to the behavior analyst rule package. Ms. Galvin opined that adding the suggested language may not be a substantive change therefore the Board can add the suggested language and submit the psychology and behavior analyst rule packages to GRRC. Dr. Caterino asked about time-frames in the event GRRC

determines that the language change is substantive. Ms. Paakkonen answered and suggested possibly issuing a substantive policy statement in lieu of adding the language to rule.

**MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to add the Commenter’s language and confirm with GRRC staff that the change is not a substantive change. If the language change is substantive then the rule packages will be remanded back to the Board.**

**SECOND: Dr. Mellott.**

During the discussion of the motion Mr. Dynar stated that he is opposed to requiring diversity continuing education for psychologists and behavior analysts. Dr. Mellott stated that students are required to undergo diversity training throughout their education. Dr. Caterino and Dr. Meier agreed with Dr. Mellott in that diversity training has been a large part of psychology. Dr. Davey stated that diversity training is not a political stance by the Board. Dr. Stewart stated that he does not believe the language should be added as it makes the rule more restrictive.

**ROLL CALL VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Davey, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve and Mr. Wynn. The following Board member voted not in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar and Dr. Stewart.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE: 7-yay, 2-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.**

**MOTION PASSED.**

#### **15. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPLICATION FOR EXAM AND LICENSURE FROM JENNIFER WEIGERT, PSY.D. AND POSSIBLE DENIAL OF THE SAME**

Dr. Meier provided a summary stating that the Application Review Committee (ARC) reviewed Dr. Weigert’s application and noted that she submitted documentation describing two part-time internships. The ARC noted the first part-time internship lacked a training plan, did not meet the 1,500 hour requirement and did not meet the 25% client contact requirement. The second internship did not meet the supervision requirement and did not meet the 1,500 hour requirement. Additionally, the internship was not completed within 24 consecutive months. Dr. Meier indicated that Dr. Weigert submitted additional internship hours just prior to the Board meeting. Dr. Meier suggested that the Board move Dr. Weigert’s application to the ARC for substantive review of the additional internship hours once she supplies appropriate documentation.

**MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to move Dr. Weigert’s application to the ARC for substantive review and request that Dr. Weigert’s supervisor submit the additional internship hours on the Board’s internship verification form for the 2014-2016 internship hours, submit the internship training plan, and that the supervisor submit documentation of the supervision hours (supervision logs).**

**SECOND: Dr. Caterino.**

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

**VOTE: 9-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.**

**MOTION PASSED.**

#### **16. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPLICATION FOR EXAM AND LICENSURE AND APPLICATION FOR SUPERVISED TEMPORARY LICENSE WITH EPPP APPROVAL FROM JOSE BEZERRA, PH.D., PSY.D. AND POSSIBLE DENIAL OF THE SAME**

Dr. Meier provided a summary of Dr. Bezerra’s application. Dr. Meier stated that the ARC reviewed Dr. Bezerra’s application and expressed concern that there was not a second supervisor that was licensed in Arizona during Dr. Bezerra’s internship as required by the statute. Dr. Meier explained that Board statute does not allow an applicant to redo an internship after graduation. Additionally, Dr. Bezerra does not meet the

coursework requirement in assessment content. Dr. Caterino noted that Dr. Bezerra requested that the Board allow him to withdraw his application for licensure.

**MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to allow Dr. Bezerra to withdraw his application for licensure.**

**SECOND: Dr. Caterino.**

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

**VOTE: 9-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 1-recuse.**

**MOTION PASSED.**

#### **17. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPLICATION FOR BEHAVIOR ANALYST LICENSURE FROM WHITNEY WAGNER, M.A.**

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson recused from reviewing this item.

Dr. Davey summarized Ms. Wagner's application. Dr. Davey opined that Ms. Wagner's application meets the requirements of statute and rule.

**MOTION: Dr. Davey moved to approve Ms. Wagner's application for licensure as a behavior analyst.**

**SECOND: Dr. Meier.**

**VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Dr. Caterino, Dr. Davey, Mr. Dynar, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve, Dr. Stewart and Mr. Wynn. The following Board member recused from voting on this item: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson.**

**VOTE: 8-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 1-recuse.**

**MOTION PASSED.**

#### **18. NEW AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

Ms. Paakkonen indicated that she is arranging for Dr. Matt Turner with the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards to attend the August Board meeting to speak on the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology Part 2 and to answer Board members' questions.

Dr. Davey requested that question number 21 on the psychologist application be reviewed by the Board at a future meeting. Dr. Meier asked that Board staff research how often applicants answer "yes" to question number 21.

Dr. Meier requested that Board member vacancies and reappointments be placed on a future meeting.

Dr. Mellott requested that an item regarding resuming in-person Board meetings be placed on a future meeting.

#### **19. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION: Dr. Stewart moved to adjourn the meeting.**

**SECOND: Dr. Meier.**

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

**VOTE: 9-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recuse.**

**MOTION PASSED.**

The meeting adjourned at 1:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

*Linda C. Caterino Ph.D., ABPP*

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