



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

DOUGLAS A. DUCEY
Governor

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

Committee on Behavior Analysts
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES
July 29, 2022 - 9:30 a.m.
Held via Zoom

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

Committee Members Present

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

Committee Members Absent

Bryan Davey, Ph.D., BCBA-D

Staff Present

Heidi Herbst Paakkonen, Executive Director
Jennifer Michaelsen, Deputy Director
Zakiya Mallas, Licensing Specialist
Kathy Fowkes, Licensing Specialist

Attorney General's Office

Jeanne Galvin, Assistant Attorney General

A quorum of the Committee was confirmed.

3. REMARKS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

Dr. Stenhoff thanked Board staff for their work to assemble the meeting materials, and expressed his gratitude to the Committee members for their time and dedication toward preparing for the meeting. Lastly he

acknowledged the applicants for attending, noting that in many cases their participation provides helpful clarity to the Committee.

- **Continuing Education Credit for Committee Meeting Attendance**

Dr. Stenhoff announced that the Board of Psychologist Examiners is now approved by the BACB as an ACE continuing education provider and that attending a Committee meeting is eligible for continuing education credit for maintenance of BACB certification. He noted that to claim this credit, attendees should make note of the code words provided hourly throughout the meeting, and may report the code words to Board staff for purposes of earning continuing education credit using the form available on the Meetings page of the website.

Dr. Stenhoff posed the question whether members of the CBA earn continuing education credit for participating in Committee meetings. Dr. Raetz, the ACE Coordinator, responded that she would research this and report on her findings later in the meeting. Dr. Raetz affirmed that ethics-specific credit is awarded for Committee meeting attendance.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **April 29, 2022 Regular Session Minutes**

MOTION: Dr. Davis-Wilson moved to approve the minutes as drafted. Ms. Denton seconded the motion
VOTE: The motion was approved 4-0.

- **April 29, 2022 Regular Executive Session Minutes**

MOTION: Dr. Davis-Wilson moved to approve the minutes as drafted. Ms. Denton seconded the motion
VOTE: The motion was approved 4-0.

- **May 27, 2022 Regular Session Minutes**

MOTION: Ms. Denton moved to approve the minutes as drafted. Dr. Davis-Wilson seconded the motion
VOTE: The motion was approved 3-0.

- **May 27, 2022 Executive Session Minutes**

MOTION: Ms. Denton moved to approve the minutes as drafted. Dr. Stenhoff seconded the motion
VOTE: The motion was approved 3-0.

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 5. | DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD PERTAINING TO APPROVAL OF BEHAVIOR ANALYST APPLICANTS | |
| | The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval. | |
| | A. Behavior Analyst Applications for Licensure | |
| | 1) | Nicole Martinez, M.Ed. (*) |
| | The applicant was present for the review of her application. The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval. | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | 2) Jenna Battaglia, M.S. (*) | |
| <p>The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the documentation continues to reflect that she is 750 hours deficient of the required supervised experience hours. It was the consensus of the Committee that a FAIR letter be issued to her, and concurrently a recommendation be forwarded to the Board that the applicant be allowed to withdraw her application; should she elect to reapply in the future, the fee can be transferred to that application.</p> | | |
| | 3) Hadjara Ousseyni Hassane, M.Ed. | |
| <p>The applicant was present for the review of her application. The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.</p> | | |
| | 4) Carley Robison, M.S. | |
| <p>Dr. Stenhoff stated for the record that he is a former instructor of the applicant but is able to review the application objectively. He also noted that Dr. Davis-Wilson is recused from this item. The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. It was noted for a period of time during the pandemic, some of the observations with a client were not face to face (permitted by the BACB's temporary waiver) The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.</p> | | |
| | 5) Adriana Torres-Bonilla, M.S. | |
| <p>The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.</p> | | |
| | 6) Jenna Falleri, M.A. | |
| <p>The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.</p> | | |
| | 7) Ana Silvia Moreno, M.A. | |
| <p>The applicant was present for the review of her application. The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.</p> | | |
| | 8) Stephen Cook, M.S. | |
| <p>Dr. Stenhoff and Dr. Davis-Wilson stated for the record that they are former instructors of the applicant but are able to review the application objectively. The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.</p> | | |
| | 9) Norma Padilla, M.Ed. | |
| <p>The applicant was present for the review of her application. The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee noted that there is a date error reported on the Multiple Supervisors form that will require a correction. The Committee determined the application can be</p> | | |

| | |
|------------|--|
| | forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval once the correction is received from the applicant. |
| 10) | Logan Ripley, M.A. |
| | The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval. |
| 11) | Douglas Hatfield, M.S. |
| | The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval. |
| 12) | Kara Loomis, M.A. |
| | The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval. |
| 13) | Claire Sterling, M.S. |
| | Dr. Stenhoff and Dr. Davis-Wilson stated for the record that they are former instructors of the applicant but are able to review the application objectively. The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval. |
| 14) | Leslie Bennett, M.A. |
| | The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval. |
| 15) | Treichae Holmes, M.S. |
| | The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval. |
| 16) | Aundrea Abernathy, M.A. |
| | The applicant was present for the review of her application. The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval. |
| 17) | Suhani Patel, M.S. |
| | The applicant was present for the review of her application. The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval. |
| 18) | Kristie Le, M.A. |
| | Dr. Raetz indicated she is recused from the review of this application. The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were |

| | |
|--|--|
| | complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules, however her Multiple Supervisors form appears to have some date errors. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval once the correction is received from the applicant. |
| 19 | Amanda Fernandez, M.A. |
| | The applicant was present for the review of her application. The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval. |
| 20 | Emily Murray, M.Ed. |
| | The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval. |
| 21 | Fumi Horner, Ph.D. |
| | The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules, however an error on page 17 was noted for which Board staff has sought a correction. The Committee also noted that a set of recorded dates reflects that supervision was provided prior to that person obtaining certification and licensure. It was the consensus of the Committee that a FAIR letter be issued to her to obtain additional and clarifying information. |
| 22 | Ashley Naghash, M.S. |
| | The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval. |
| 23 | Lauren Drake, M.Ed. |
| | Dr. Stenhoff indicated that he is recused from the review of this application. The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval. |
| 24 | Andrea Hatfield, M.S. |
| | The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval. |
| B. Behavior Analyst Applications for Licensure by Universal Recognition | |
| 1) | Kaitlyn Arnold, M.S. |
| | The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the applicant appears to not qualify for licensure by Universal Recognition as she is not a resident of Arizona and does not intend to become one. It was the consensus of the Committee that a recommendation be forwarded to the Board that the applicant be allowed to withdraw her application and explore other pathways to licensure; should she refrain to withdraw, the Committee recommends to the Board that the application be denied. |
| 2) | Jana Goldberg, M.A. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the applicant appears to not qualify for licensure by Universal Recognition as she does not hold a behavior analyst license in any U.S. jurisdiction. Additionally, it was noted that she left question 12 blank. It was the consensus of the Committee that a recommendation be forwarded to the Board that the applicant be allowed to withdraw her application and explore other pathways to licensure; should she refrain to withdraw, the Committee recommends to the Board that the application be denied.</p> <p>MOTION: Ms. Denton moved to forward the following applications to the Board with a recommendation for approval: Nicole Martinez, M.Ed.; Hadjara Ousseyni Hassane, M.Ed.; Carley Robison, M.S.; Adriana Torres-Bonilla, M.S.; Jenna Falleri, M.A.; Ana Silvia Moreno, M.A.; Stephen Cook, M.S.; Logan Ripley, M.A.; Douglas Hatfield, M.S.; Kara Loomis, M.A.; Claire Sterling, M.S.; Leslie Bennett, M.A.; Treichae Holmes, M.S.; Aundrea Abernathy, M.A.; Suhani Patel, M.S.; Amanda Fernandez, M.A.; Emily Murray, M.Ed.; Ashley Naghash, M.S.; Lauren Drake, M.Ed.; and Andrea Hatfield, M.S. The motion included the provision that the applications of Norma Padilla, M.Ed. and Kristie Le, M.A. will also be forwarded with a recommendation for approval once the noted corrections are received, and that FAIR letters will be issued to Jenna Battaglia, M.S. and Fumi Horner, Ph.D. as reflected by the discussion. Finally, the Committee recommends the Board deny the applications of Kaitlyn Arnold, M.S. and Jana Goldberg, M.A. unless they elect to withdraw. Dr. Stenhoff seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 4-0.</p> |
| | <p><i>*First Formal Additional Information Request</i> <i>** Second Formal Additional Information Request</i></p> |

6. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD PERTAINING TO APPROVAL OF BEHAVIOR ANALYST APPLICANT JAMIE SCOURFIELD, M.S. ()**

Dr. Davis-Wilson summarized the application file noting that Ms. Scourfield has been certified as a BCBA for quite some time, and her supervised training consisted of 1,000 documented hours. The Committee sought clarification of the hours that were completed post-certification, and initially received a statement from Dr. Kelly reflecting that the hours were considered supervised experience, and then subsequently Dr. Kelly submitted a statement indicating that experience was actually employment (and not necessarily hours meeting the BACB standards for supervision). Dr. Davis-Wilson stated that accordingly the Committee determined during its previous meeting that Dr. Kelly’s hours are non-qualifying for purposes of Ms. Scourfield’s application. Additionally, the other 500 hours reported must meet the current standards of the Board as outlined in the administrative rule.

Ms. Scourfield was present for the discussion of her application and stated that she has signed a contract with Hope Bridge in Arizona in order to begin acquiring qualifying supervised hours.

MOTION: Dr. Davis-Wilson moved to issue a FAIR letter to Ms. Scourfield and to communicate to the applicant the time frames and potential extensions that are available to her while she completes this application deficiency. The motion was seconded by Dr. Raetz.

VOTE: The motion was approved 4-0.

7. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING SUPERVISION DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED BY AMANDA KELLY FOR THE APPLICATION OF JAMIE SCOURFIELD

Ms. Paakkonen reminded the Committee that during the review of Ms. Scourfield’s application, some questions and concerns were raised relative to inconsistent information supplied by Ms. Kelly in the initial and follow-up documents that she submitted in support of Ms. Scourfield’s application.

Ms. Kelly was present for the discussion of this matter. In response to a question, she agreed to complete the forms requested by Ms. Scourfield as she knew she was seeking licensure in Arizona. She stated to the Committee that she initially supplied the documentation to support Ms. Scourfield's application. When asked to explain the discrepancy in how she initially answered the supervision questions relative to the description of the employment relationship that she subsequently submitted, Ms. Kelly stated that the latter statement is more accurate. She further explained they worked together for 10 years and accordingly she made a mistake.

The Committee deliberated this matter, noting that an applicant, when realizing she would not meet the requirements for licensure in Arizona due to a lack of qualifying hours of supervision, reached out to her former supervisor and requested that she sign her supervision forms. The Committee had since learned that the hours represented by Ms. Kelly as supervision are admittedly not. It was further noted how easily the applicant and Ms. Kelly signed forms stating that services that did not happen were provided. Additionally, the discussion recalled that the applicant provided misleading information when asked about supplying supervision logs in that she indicated she no longer had them, when in fact they did not actually exist.

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

VOTE: The motion was approved 4-0.

The Committee met in Executive Session from 11:28 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.

Upon resuming the meeting in public session, the deliberation reflected the responsibility that the Committee has to forward concerns to the Board, along with recommendations for the Board to consider and either accept or reject.

MOTION: Dr. Raetz moved to forward this matter to the Board with a recommendation that the Board submit the information to the BACB. The information supplied to the Board will reflect that Amanda Kelly appears to have made false statements when completing a supervised experience verification form for Jamie Scourfield. Ms. Denton seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 4-0.

It was the consensus of the Committee to rescind the direction to Board staff to issue the subpoena.

Ms. Kelly thanked the Committee and apologized for her error. She indicated that because she has never worked in a state that requires licensure, she was unaware of certain requirements and processes.

8. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING POTENTIAL UNLICENSED SUPERVISION PROVIDED BY LAUREN ALLEGRA

Ms. Paakkonen reminded the Committee that during the December 2021 meeting, review of an application found that Ms. Allegra provided 95 hours of remote supervision to an applicant who was in Arizona for the duration of those hours. She noted that Ms. Allegra has never been licensed in Arizona. At the Committee's direction she invited Ms. Allegra to attend this meeting for purposes of answering the Committee's questions. Ms. Paakkonen called to the Committee's attention Ms. Allegra's written explanation concerning this matter.

Ms. Allegra was present for the review of this item and agreed to answer questions. She stated to the Committee that in October of 2020, while with her former employer and due to staffing issues created by COVID, she was directed to supply remote supervision to a BCBA for less than one month. Ms. Allegra stated that there was no intention to misrepresent herself, deceive anyone, or to violate the law.

The Committee members acknowledged that while Ms. Allegra's period of practice in Arizona was within the 20-day exemption allowed by statute, any BCBA should do their due-diligence to research state laws before providing any services there.

MOTION: Dr. Stenhoff moved to take no action with respect to this matter. Ms. Denton seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 4-0.

9. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RECENT UPDATES FROM THE BEHAVIOR ANALYST CERTIFICATION BOARD (BACB)

Ms. Paakkonen summarized an update from the BACB which reports three new states – Illinois, Georgia, and Wyoming, and a practice act modification in New York. She also noted the communique reports on some instances of litigation in which the BACB is engaged.

10. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING NOTICE OF FINAL RULEMAKING FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE RULES THAT REGULATE THE PRACTICE OF BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS IN ARIZONA (A.A.C. TITLE 4, CHAPTER 26, ARTICLE 4)

Ms. Paakkonen reported that the Board voted to make one modification to both the psychology continuing education rule (A.A.C. R4-26-207), and to the behavior analyst continuing education rule (A.A.C. R4-26-409) based on a written comment received from a psychologist. The commenter suggested the examples of diversity education topics be expanded, and the Board concurred and elected to make that non-substantive change. Ms. Paakkonen advised the Committee that she anticipates the rule packages will be reviewed on September 7, 2022; if approved, the new rules will be in effect about 60 days later.

The Committee discussed the fact that some courses may meet both the ethics and the diversity topics required by the rule.

11. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPLICATION TO BACB AUTHORIZED CONTINUING EDUCATION (ACE) PROGRAM

Ms. Paakkonen advised the Committee that this meeting is serving as a test-run for purposes of collecting attendance of licensed behavior analysts to award continuing education credit. She explained that the staff is essentially replicating the process used for Board meeting attendance by licensed psychologists, modified slightly to confirm to the BACB's ACE Provider requirements. Ms. Paakkonen noted that assuming the Committee and ACE Coordinator, Dr. Raetz, are pleased with today's process, she is prepared to send an email to all Arizona licensed behavior analysts informing them of this new opportunity to earn ethics content continuing education credit toward maintenance of BACB certification.

Dr. Raetz informed the Committee that her review of the ACE Handbook indicates that Committee members appear to be eligible to earn credit under the presenting or teaching category.

12. NEW AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

Ms. Paakkonen reminded the Committee that she will be bringing a summary of the review of the licensure application against the administrative rules to the next agenda. Additionally, Ms. Galvin has been asked to provide advice on whether the Board has the authority to require documentation that effectively captures data provided by the various supervisors who provided that service (and in what capacity). She is also asked to opine on A.R.S. §32-2091.03 as it relates to the requirement that the language states that the number of hours required for supervised experience must be at least 1,500 hours of supervised work experience. This may have implications to the BACB's new requirements for 2,000 hours of supervised work experience.

13. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Ms. Denton moved to adjourn the meeting. Dr. Raetz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 4-0.

The meeting concluded at 11:38 a.m.

Donald Stenhoff, Ph.D., BCBA-D
Chair, Committee on Behavior Analysts