



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 August 5, 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

Vice-Chair Davey called the Board's meeting to order at 8:31 a.m.

2. ROLL CALL

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

ALSO PRESENT

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

3. REMARKS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

- **Board Survey**

Vice-Chair Davey encouraged meeting attendees to provide feedback by contacting Board staff and completing a Board Meeting Assessment Survey.

- **Board Member and Staff Appreciation**

Vice-Chair Davey 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**

Vice-Chair Davey 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 recused from Consent Agenda item 6. J. Due to lack of a quorum, Consent Agenda item 6. J. was not heard.

Dr. Mellott recused from Consent Agenda item 6. C. Due to lack of a quorum, Consent agenda item 6. C. was not heard.

Dr. Meier requested that Consent Agenda items 6. G. and 6. H. be removed from the Consent Agenda for independent discussion.

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

SECOND: Dr. Caterino.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **July 8, 2022 Regular Session Minutes**
- **July 8, 2022 Executive Session Minutes**
- **July 14, 2022 Regular Session Minutes**
- **July 14, 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) Denisha Ligett, Psy.D. (*REAPP*) Part 1 & Part 2

2) Jessica Moore, Psy.D. (*REAPP*) Part 1 & Part 2

Requesting Approval to Sit for EPPP & Licensure

1) Karlie A Krause, Psy.D. Part 2 (Passed Part 1)

2) Alex Pearl, Psy.D. Part 1 & Part 2

Requesting Approval of Supervised Experience for Licensure

- 1) None

Requesting Approval for Licensure by Waiver

- 1) Michael Woodward, Ph.D. Part 1 Only

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

- 1) Karlie A. Krause, Psy.D. Part 2 (Passed Part 1)
- 2) Jaime Stephenson, Psy.D. Part 1 & Part 2

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

- 1) Karen Kay, Psy.D. n/a
- 2) Shannon Alexander, PhD. n/a

Requesting Approval for Licensure by Universal Recognition

- 1) Wanda J. Crews, Ph.D. n/a

D. DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING BEHAVIOR ANALYST APPLICATIONS

- 1) Nicole Martinez, M.Ed.
- 2) Lauren Drake, M.Ed.
- 3) Hadjara Ousseyni Hassane, M.Ed.
- 4) Carley Robison, M.S.
- 5) Adriana Torres-Bonilla, M.S.
- 6) Jenna Falleri, MAS.
- 7) Ana Silvia Moreno, M.A.
- 8) Stephen Cook, M.S.
- 9) Ashley Naghash, M.A.
- 10) Logan Ripley, M.A.
- 11) Douglas Hatfield, M.S.
- 12) Kara Loomis, M.A.
- 13) Claire Sterling, M.S.
- 14) Leslie Bennett, M.A.
- 15) Treichae Holmes, M.S.
- 16) Aundrea Abernathy, M.A.
- 17) Suhani Patel, M.S.
- 18) Emily Murray, M.Ed.
- 19) Amanda Fernandez, M.A.
- 20) Andrea Hatfield, M.S.
- 21) Kristie Le, M.A.
- 22) Norma Padilla, M.Ed.

E. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REQUEST FOR TESTING ACCOMMODATIONS FROM DENISHA LIGGETT, PSY.D.

- F. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REQUEST TO RETAKE THE EPPP FROM HEIDI M. RAMIREZ, PSY.D., TEMPORARY LICENSE HOLDER NUMBER PSY-T-000044**
- G. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING POSTDOCTORAL TRAINING PLAN MODIFICATION FROM TIMOTHY FRANKLIN, PSY.D., TEMPORARY LICENSE HOLDER NUMBER PSY-T-000023**

Dr. Meier requested that this item be removed from the Consent Agenda for separate discussion and action.

Dr. Meier summarized stating that the Board received Dr. Franklin's application for exam and licensure in October 2018. Dr. Franklin's application was approved and he sat for the EPPP in 2019. Dr. Franklin submitted a reapplication in August 2019. His application expired in September 2020 as he did not sit for the EPPP within the required time-frame. In November 2019 Dr. Franklin applied for a temporary license and to sit for the EPPP. Dr. Franklin was approved for temporary licensure. Dr. Franklin's postdoctoral supervisor, Dr. Bohanske passed away during that time. Dr. Meier noted that Dr. Franklin did not submit a new postdoctoral training plan within the required time-frame nor did he notify the Board of a change in supervisor with the required time-frame.

Dr. Franklin was present and provided an explanation indicating that he is employed at a private practice and he has been under supervision. Dr. Franklin stated that he had major health issues and had family emergencies which is why he did not submit another exam and licensure application.

Dr. Meier asked Dr. Franklin when he left Southwest Behavioral Health Services. Dr. Franklin stated that he left Southwest Behavioral Health Services in March 2021. Dr. Meier asked who provided postdoctoral supervision after Dr. Bohanske passed away. Dr. Franklin indicated that there were several other psychologists at Southwest Behavioral Health Services that provided supervision. Dr. Meier asked if Dr. Franklin had a postdoctoral training plan at his new employment. Dr. Franklin said yes. Dr. Meier asked when the postdoctoral training plan became effective at his new employment. Dr. Franklin said that the training plan was in place when he started employment. Dr. Meier asked if Dr. Franklin has postdoctoral supervision logs. Dr. Franklin answered affirmatively. Dr. Franklin recognized that he did not submit his new postdoctoral training plan within the required time-frame. Dr. Caterino asked Dr. Franklin the time-frame of his postdoctoral training plan at Southwest Behavioral Health Services. Dr. Mellott asked Dr. Franklin if he obtained the required hours for his postdoctoral experience. Dr. Mellott noted that Dr. Franklin met his postdoctoral requirements at Southwest Behavioral Health therefore Dr. Franklin may not be required to submit a new postdoctoral training plan. Dr. Meier stated that temporary licensure requires supervision and that a change in supervision should be reported within ten days. Dr. Stewart asked if Dr. Franklin can provide documentation of his supervision. Ms. Fowkes clarified rules regarding supervision for temporary licensure. Ms. Paakkonen asked Ms. Galvin if the agenda allows for the Board's discussion. Ms. Galvin said yes but asked if the Board would like this matter to be reviewed by the Application Review Committee. Ms. Fowkes indicated that temporary license holders are reviewed by the Board. Dr. Mellott noted that non-compliance for reporting a change in supervision has not been heard by the Board.

MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to request additional information regarding supervision documentation beginning when Dr. Franklin left Southwest Behavioral Health Services, to present evidence of when his new training plan became effective and to offer a non-disciplinary letter of concern for not reporting a change of supervision within the required time-frame.

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

Dr. Caterino clarified that the Board does not need supervision documentation from when Dr. Franklin was at Southwest Behavioral Services.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

H. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RETAKE REQUEST FROM TIMOTHY FRANKLIN PSY.D., TEMPORARY LICENSE HOLDER NUMBER PSY-T-000023

MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to table this item until the Board reviews Dr. Franklin’s supervision documentation and postdoctoral training plan.

SECOND: Dr. Mellott.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

I. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RETAKE REQUEST FROM RACHEL JENSEN, PSY.D., TEMPORARY LICENCE HOLDER NUMBER PSY-T-000048

J. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING POSTDOCTORAL TRAINING PLAN MODIFICATION FROM JEFFREY M. SIMMONS, PSY.D., TEMPORARY LICENSE HOLDER NUMBER PSY-T-000049

K. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING LICENSE REACTIVATION REQUEST FROM STEFANI MORRIS, PSY.D.

L. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING LICENSE REINSTATEMENT REQUEST FROM THOMAS VENDETTI, PH.D.

TIMED ITEMS – 9:45 a.m.

7. INFORMAL INTERVIEW – KAREN HAWK, 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.

The Board heard this item at 9:48 a.m. Dr. Davey reviewed the Informal Interview procedures. Dr. Hawk and her attorney, Mandi Karvis, Esq., introduced themselves. Board members introduced themselves. Dr. Davey provided a summary of the allegations including A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(e) gross negligence in the practice of a psychologist; A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(h) 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) making a fraudulent or untrue statement to the board or its investigators, staff or consultants; 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; A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(r) 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)

failing to make available to a client or patient or to 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) 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.

Dr. Davey swore in Dr. Hawk. Dr. Meier provided a summary stating that Dr. Hawk received her license in 2019 and she maintains a private practice (Resilience Counseling and Assessment). The Complainant, R.O., and his ex-wife, Mother, are undergoing a contentious custody case since 2012. A 2020 Court Order provides that R.O. and Mother will have joint legal decision making with the three children residing primarily with Mother. In March 2020 the Daughter received services from a Court appointed therapist. In September of 2020 R.O. withdrew his consent for Daughter to receive services from the Court appointed therapist. In May 2021 Daughter began therapy with Dr. Hawk. Daughter received a total of 9 sessions with Dr. Hawk between May – September 2021. In September 2021 R.O. submitted the Complaint. 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 13, 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 (DCS) on September 3, 2021. 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 believes that because she was not a Court appointed therapist R.O. thought he could control Daughter's therapy sessions. 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 hypothesis.
 - Sharing of confidential information without consent from both parents.
 - Bias of Dr. Hawk against R.O.
 - Email Security.
 - Not sharing treatment plan with R.O. in a timely manner.

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 expressed concern that Dr. Hawk improperly shared confidential information to a third party. Dr. DiCarlo stated that Dr. Hawk could have requested that the subpoena to testify in Court be quashed.

The Board reviewed this matter at its May 6, 2022, meeting and voted to forward the matter to an Informal Interview. Subsequent to the May 6, 2022, meeting Dr. Hawk submitted additional information stating that she does not have access to phone conversations during the time of Daughter's treatment as she has switched phone service providers. Dr. Hawk attested that she made the DCS report on September 3, 2022, and acknowledged that she should have made the report sooner.

Ms. Karvis stated that Dr. Hawk has reflected on the Board's concerns. Ms. Karvis stated that Dr. DiCarlo did point out that Dr. Hawk showed many strengths in providing services to Daughter. Ms. Karvis stated that Dr. Hawk is working on retaining a practice consultant. Ms. Karvis stated that Dr. Hawk has revised her practice to only accept certain types of custody cases for whom she will provide services. Ms. Karvis confirmed that Dr. Hawk never denied R.O.'s participation in sessions. Dr. Hawk did not encourage Daughter to jump out of a car or window. Ms. Karvis confirmed that R.O. did not submit a written request for Daughter's treatment plan until September 2021. Ms. Karvis indicated that there was implied consent for Dr. Hawk to testify in Court as R.O. was made aware of the subpoena for Dr. Hawk's testimony. Ms. Karvis stated that Dr. Hawk

has implemented requiring written consent from all parties prior to providing testimony. Ms. Karvis reiterated that Dr. Hawk acknowledges that she should have made the DCS report sooner. Dr. Hawk stated that her intent was to improve family dynamics. Dr. Hawk attested that R.O. was not easy to work with. Dr. Hawk said that she requested multiple times to meet with all parties however, R.O. objected to having a session that involved all parties. Dr. Hawk stated that R.O. pressured her to adopt the same treatment goals that were utilized by a prior therapist even though she believed the treatment goals did not meet Daughter's needs. Dr. Hawk stated that she made R.O. aware of treatment goals but he did not request a treatment plan until September 2021. Dr. Hawk reviewed the timeline of opening her practice and accepting insurance. Dr. Hawk highlighted changes she has made in her practice as follows:

- She will not provide therapy to high conflict clients.
- She will accept providing services as a Court appointed Parenting Coordinator or Therapeutic Interventionist.
- She only communicates via encrypted email.
- She utilizes Zoom and Microsoft Teams which are both HIPAA compliant.
- She will contact attorneys regarding subpoenas and offer to submit a treatment summary rather than testifying.
- She no longer will rely on implied consent.
- She will provide a copy of signed treatment plans to clients.
- She will report to DCS within twenty four hours of the incident.
- She will only see clients three days a week and utilize other work days for administrative duties.
- She will utilize continuing education offered by the Association for Family and Conciliation Courts.
- She is working on retaining a forensic psychologist for consultation purposes.

The Complainant R.O., was present. Dr. Davey swore in R.O. R.O. requested that the Board look at the facts in the Complaint. Dr. Meier asked R.O. when he received a copy of the treatment plan. R.O. stated that he received the treatment plan the day after he revoked his consent. Dr. Meier confirmed that R.O. did not sign the treatment plan. Dr. Stewart asked R.O. whether Daughter is currently in treatment. R.O. attested that Daughter is in therapy with her previous therapist. R.O. explained that Daughter discontinued services with previous therapist due to insurance reasons. R.O. stated that he and his Daughter are doing well. Dr. Caterino asked R.O. how much time he spent in session with Dr. Hawk and Daughter. R.O. stated that he participated in the first session and one other session. R.O. confirmed that he explained to Dr. Hawk that Mother was using Dr. Hawk to build a case against him. Dr. Caterino confirmed that Dr. Hawk is not licensed in California. R.O. confirmed that Dr. Hawk did not include Stepmother in any sessions.

Ms. Karvis and Dr. Hawk had no questions for R.O.

Dr. Caterino asked Dr. Hawk how much time she spent with Mother and Stepfather. Dr. Hawk said she did not have sessions with Mother or Stepfather. Dr. Hawk confirmed that she did not have any joint sessions with Daughter and Mother. Dr. Hawk attested that if Mother had concerns she would address the concerns in an email in which R.O. was copied on. Dr. Caterino asked how payment was received for her Court testimony. Dr. Hawk stated that Mother paid for the Court testimony. Dr. Caterino asked Dr. Hawk whether she entertained alternative hypothesis. Dr. Hawk attested that she did consider alternative hypothesis but was unable to observe it in session. Dr. Stewart asked Dr. Hawk whether her report to DCS involved allegations of abuse from R.O. and Stepmother. Dr. Hawk clarified that she reported to DCS that her patient reported that she feels emotionally abused by R.O. and Stepmother and gave examples that Daughter provided. Dr. Stewart asked if Dr. Hawk made a recommendation to the Court regarding custody. Dr. Hawk stated that she did not make a custody recommendation. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Hawk to clarify her progress notes in that she met privately with Mother on June 4th. Dr. Hawk stated that she had a zoom meeting with R.O. on June 4th not with the Mother. Dr. Meier stated that R.O. attested that his first session was in August, not June. Dr. Hawk attested that she never met with Mother alone in session. Dr. Hawk stated that she had a crisis session with R.O. and Mother after Daughter jumped out of a moving vehicle. Dr. Hawk apologized and stated that she did have separate zoom sessions with R.O., Mother and Daughter as part of the intake but no private sessions

with Mother or R.O. were held after the initial intake. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Hawk why she did not specify with R.O. whether he was seeking a treatment plan rather than treatment goals. Dr. Hawk stated that R.O. was a part of the treatment plan at intake but R.O. continued to insist that previous treatment goals be included as part of Daughter's therapy. Dr. Hawk stated that the previous treatment goals were not relevant to Daughter's current treatment goals. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Hawk when she drafted the treatment plan. Dr. Hawk stated that treatment goals were discussed with R.O. and Mother throughout therapy. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Hawk about R.O.'s June 29 request for a treatment plan. Dr. Hawk stated that she replied to R.O. stating that Daughter is old enough to decide her treatment goals. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Hawk what training she has in providing therapy to minors. Dr. Hawk stated that all of her training is in child and family therapy. Dr. Meier asked when she gave the treatment plan to R.O. Dr. Hawk stated that she sent R.O. the treatment plan three days after he submitted the written request. Dr. Davey asked whether parents are required to sign treatment plans. Dr. Hawk indicated that she recently implemented the policy that parents have to sign the treatment plan. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Hawk why there is no documentation regarding the safety plan she developed with Daughter. Dr. Hawk indicated that she developed a safety plan with Daughter after the incident of Daughter jumping out of the car. Dr. Meier stated that Mother testified in Court prior to the incident that Daughter and Dr. Hawk had developed a safety plan. Dr. Hawk stated that there was no formal safety plan prior to the incident. Dr. Hawk attested that after the incident she developed a formal safety plan and emailed the safety plan to R.O. and Mother. Dr. Meier asked why there is no documentation regarding Dr. Hawk making a report to DCS. Dr. Hawk acknowledged that it was her oversight for not including her report to DCS in her progress notes. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Hawk whether she was bias toward R.O. Dr. Hawk stated that there may have been some bias as R.O. was difficult to work with therefore all of her information came directly from Daughter. Dr. Stewart asked Dr. Hawk how she avoids bias in high conflict cases. Dr. Hawk indicated that as a Parenting Coordinator or Therapeutic Interventionist she has more control in sessions. Dr. Hawk indicated that she will no longer provide therapeutic services to high conflict cases. Dr. Stewart asked if she has ever consulted with a forensic psychologist. Dr. Hawk confirmed that she consulted approximately one year ago with a forensic psychologist and is actively looking to retain another forensic psychologist for consultation. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Hawk about her June 30 email stating that she no longer wants to include R.O. in sessions. Dr. Hawk stated that Daughter indicated that she did not want R.O. included in sessions due to an incident at church camp but Daughter later changed her mind. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Hawk what her primary goals were in sessions. Dr. Hawk indicated that her primary goal was to improve Daughter's relationship with R.O. and Stepmother.

Dr. Davey reviewed the allegations. Dr. Meier expressed concern about Informed Consent regarding Dr. Hawk's testimony. Dr. Meier asked for clarification on A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(j). Ms. Michaelsen answered. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Hawk if she had Informed Consent to testify in Court. Dr. Hawk stated that she believed there was implied consent for her Court testimony. Ms. Karvis explained implied consent from a legal standpoint. Dr. Hawk stated that after she was served the subpoena R.O. requested a private session. In the session R.O. acknowledged that Dr. Hawk would be testifying in Court.

Ms. Karvis reiterated that Dr. Hawk has acknowledged that she was not experienced in forensic psychology when she first began working on this case. She reiterated that Dr. Hawk has made many changes to her practice since this Complaint.

R.O. stated that Dr. Hawk was biased and was manipulated. R.O. expressed concern that this will happen again. R.O. stated that documentation shows discrepancies in dates.

The Board deliberated. Dr. Meier opined that there are violations including, A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(e) for bias against R.O., lack of contemplating alternative hypothesis, testifying in Court regarding emotional abuse caused by R.O. and Stepmother and refusal to include parents in the treatment plan; A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(h) for lack of the treatment plan being signed by parents, errors in documentation, lack of consent to release information and lack of progress notes; A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(o) for clear alienation of R.O. and unprofessional treatment; A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(r) for not obtaining informed consent to testify in Court or to release confidential information and not using secure email correspondence; A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(cc) for not releasing the treatment plan to R.O. when he first requested treatment goals in emails to Dr. Hawk; A.R.S.

(dd) 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. Dr. Davey echoed Dr. Meier. Dr. Mellott opined that there are violations and that Dr. Hawk may benefit from a Practice Monitor. Dr. Caterino asked whether the Board is obligated to contact DCS as Dr. Hawk did not report the incident in a timely manner. Ms. Galvin stated that the Board is not obligated to contact DCS regarding Dr. Hawk's failure to report in a timely manner as the Board is addressing the issue. Dr. Stewart agreed that Dr. Hawk was practicing out of the scope of her expertise and did not seek consultation.

Dr. Davey reviewed the Board's options in adjudicating this Complaint.

MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to find the following violations A.R.S. §32-2061(16)(e)(h)(o)(r)(cc) and (dd) 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. Dr. Hawk shall retain a Board approved practice monitor for twelve months. The practice monitor shall have experience in forensic psychology, adolescent and family psychology, record management, treatment planning and collaboration, Informed Consent, bias, confidentiality and high conflict cases. Dr. Hawk shall complete 24 hours of continuing education in forensic psychology. The continuing education is in addition to the required hours for license renewal. Dr. Hawk shall meet with the practice monitor at least twice monthly. The practice monitor shall submit a report to the Board on a quarterly basis.

SECOND: Dr. Caterino.

ROLL CALL VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Dr. Caterino, Dr. Davey, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve, and Dr. Stewart.

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

MOTION PASSED.

The Board recessed at 11:45 a.m. and returned to open session at 12:02 p.m.

TIMED ITEMS – 11:00 a.m.

8. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION PERTAINING TO AUSTIN MCCALL, PSY.D., AND POSSIBLE NON-COMPLIANCE WITH THE CONSENT AGREEMENT AND ORDER FOR COMPLAINT NO. 20-47

Ms. Michaelsen provided a summary stating that the Board held a special meeting on July 14, 2022, regarding Dr. McCall's possible non-compliance with a Board Order (Order). The Order indicates that if Dr. McCall has a positive test for illegal substances, alcohol or a substance without a valid prescription it could result in the revocation of Dr. McCall's license. At the July 14, 2022, meeting, the Board voted to table the matter until the most recent hair test results were received. Additionally, Dr. McCall agreed to cease practicing psychology until the hair test results were received by the Board with a negative test. Ms. Michaelsen stated that the hair test was negative as well as other substance tests since the July 14, 2022, meeting. Ms. Michaelsen stated that Dr. McCall's previous Fitness for Duty evaluator is no longer providing Fitness for Duty evaluations. Dr. McCall is required to undergo another Fitness for Duty evaluation. Dr. McCall is requesting that Eric Lott, M.D., be approved to conduct the Fitness for Duty evaluation. Ms. Michaelsen stated that the Board is reviewing Dr. McCall's positive test result in June 2022 in regards to the Order.

Dr. McCall and her attorney, Tammy Thibodeau, were present. Ms. Thibodeau stated that Dr. Faria does not have a recommendation at this time as she is awaiting the results of the Fitness for Duty evaluation. Dr. Meier asked Dr. McCall about Dr. Faria's last report as Dr. Faria indicated that the monitoring relationship has been

deteriorating. Dr. McCall stated that it is difficult to maintain a clinical and a monitoring relationship. Dr. McCall stated that Dr. Faria would prefer to maintain only a clinical relationship.

Ms. Galvin asked the Board whether it would like to take action on the positive test result in June 2022. Dr. Davey indicated that the Board will receive multiple test results before Dr. McCall is released from the Order. Dr. Caterino asked whether the Board has to take action on the Fitness for Duty evaluator. Ms. Galvin indicated that the Fitness for Duty evaluator does not have to be Board approved.

MOTION: Dr. Mellott moved to take no action.

SECOND: Ms. Shreeve.

Dr. Meier asked about the inconsistency in the chain of custody paperwork submitted by Dr. Faria. Dr. McCall answered stating that she did not receive paperwork. Dr. Meier expressed his concern with two positive tests results and Dr. Faria's last report. Dr. Meier asked about Dr. McCall calling in sick for a test. Dr. McCall attested that her son had been ill and she was ill. Dr. McCall stated that she did not miss a test but did convey to Dr. Faria that both she and her son have been ill. Ms. Thibadeau reiterated that Dr. Faria is willing to remain in a clinical relationship with Dr. McCall. Ms. Thibadeau explained that Dr. Faria is finding it increasingly difficult to continue to monitor for the Board. Dr. Mellott provided clarification on the timeline of Dr. McCall's substance testing. Dr. Mellott requested that the Board take action on the motion as the Board has previously discussed prior test results. Ms. Galvin clarified that the Board is taking action on the hair test result that was conducted when Dr. McCall was out of state.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

The Board continued to discuss this matter. Ms. Galvin stated that if the Board is concerned with Dr. McCall's behavior and Dr. Faria's last report regarding a deteriorating relationship, then the Board can request that Dr. Faria attend the next Board meeting to discuss the concerns. Dr. Davey asked how the Board would proceed if Dr. Faria ended the monitoring relationship. Ms. Galvin stated that Dr. McCall and her attorney would work with the Board to retain a new monitor. Dr. Mellott clarified that Dr. McCall can petition the Board to be released from probation. The Board will make a determination at that time. Dr. Meier expressed concern that Dr. McCall will be without drug monitoring if Dr. Faria decides to end the monitoring relationship. Dr. Caterino expressed concern that Dr. McCall was not honest with her previous monitor. Ms. Thibadeau indicated that the matter of the previous monitor was addressed by the Board.

9. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING COMPLAINT NO. 22-14 AGAINST MARVIN JIM, PH.D., AND HIS PENDING PSYCHOLOGIST APPLICATION FOR LICENSURE

Ms. Michaelsen provided a summary stating that in 2021 Dr. Jim submitted his application for licensure as a psychologist and was subsequently approved to take the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP). During the application process, the Board office received information from Complainant, K.G., that Dr. Jim physically assaulted her in September 2021. K.G. filed a police report in November 2021. Subsequently, Board staff opened a Complaint regarding the allegations. Dr. Jim responded to the Complaint and denied physically assaulting K.G. In January 2022, Board staff spoke with the detective assigned to the case. The detective indicated that the information was forwarded to the Phoenix City prosecutor's office to determine if criminal charges would be filed against Dr. Jim. The Board reviewed the Complaint in January 2022, and voted to approve Dr. Jim to take the EPPP as the Phoenix City prosecutor's office had not yet reviewed the file. The Board determined it would revisit the Complaint after Dr. Jim sat for the EPPP and when the Phoenix City prosecutor's office made a decision. Subsequently, K.G., contacted the Board office and submitted additional information. In April 2022, the Phoenix City

prosecutor's office issued a letter stating that at this time no charges had been filed against Dr. Jim. Dr. Jim took the EPPP approximately two weeks ago and received a passing score.

K.G. was present, requested to speak, made a statement and answered Board members' questions. K.G. attested that she and Dr. Jim were sexually involved. K.G. discovered that Dr. Jim was having a sexual encounter with another woman. K.G. stated that she is a pharmacy technician and Dr. Jim solicited her for prescription drugs on two separate occasions. In September 2021, Dr. Jim approached K.G. to have a sexual encounter. K.G. declined and shortly after Dr. Jim physically assaulted her. K.G. stated she tried to speak with Dr. Jim about the incident and Dr. Jim was dismissive. K.G. opined that Dr. Jim uses his credentials to protect individuals that should not be protected. Dr. Caterino asked K.G. if there were witnesses to the assault incident. K.G. said there were no witnesses. K.G. confirmed that she contacted Dr. Jim a few weeks ago because there was a landlord situation.

Dr. Jim and his attorney, Sara Stark, were present and requested to speak. Ms. Stark stated that K.G. presented new allegations that neither she nor Dr. Jim were aware of. Ms. Stark stated that the prosecutor's office did not file charges. Ms. Stark stated that Dr. Jim denies having a sexual or abusive relationship with K.G. Ms. Stark stated that a few weeks ago K.G. contacted Dr. Jim on his cell phone and left a message. Ms. Stark stated that the message should discredit K.G.'s testimony. Dr. Caterino confirmed that the prosecutor's office has approximately one month to press charges. Ms. Michaelsen stated that the prosecutor's office indicated that they will not press charges but the statute of limitation has not expired. Ms. Shreeve asked Ms. Galvin if Dr. Jim would be required to self-report any criminal charges if he were approved for licensure. Ms. Galvin confirmed that Dr. Jim is required to report criminal charges within the required time-frame.

MOTION: Dr. Mellott moved to approve Dr. Jim's application.

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

ROLL CALL VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Dr. Caterino, Dr. Davey, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve and Dr. Stewart.

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

MOTION PASSED.

Dr. Meier stated that the Board needs to take action on the complaint. Dr. Meier acknowledged that the prosecutor's office did not press charges. Dr. Stewart stated that the Board is not a criminal authority and that the allegations of physical assault should be addressed by law enforcement agencies.

MOTION: Dr. Mellott moved to dismiss Complaint No. 22-14 as there were no violations of statute or rule.

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

ROLL CALL VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Dr. Davey, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve and Dr. Stewart. The following Board member abstained from voting on the motion: Dr. Caterino.

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

MOTION PASSED.

The Board recessed at 12:57 p.m. and returned to open session at 1:08 p.m.

10. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE REGARDING SELF-REPORT SUBMITTED BY STEPHANIE REYNOLDS, PSY.D., AND HER PENDING RENEWAL APPLICATION

Ms. Michaelsen provided a summary stating that Dr. Reynolds reported a driving under the influence (DUI) charge in May of 2021. Ms. Michaelsen stated that Dr. Reynolds reported the DUI charge in a timely

manner. Although, the arrest occurred in May 2021, charges were not filed until April 2022. Dr. Reynolds indicated that she was not aware that charges had been filed. Ms. Michaelsen summarized the police report. Ms. Michaelsen stated that Dr. Reynolds blood alcohol level was below the legal limit. Additionally, the blood test results were positive for THC. Dr. Reynolds submitted a response stating that she is fighting the charges due to several different reasons. Ms. Michaelsen stated that the next Court date is September 14, 2022. Ms. Michaelsen stated that Dr. Reynolds renewal application is before the Board for review.

Dr. Reynolds was present, requested to speak, made a statement and answered Board members questions. Dr. Reynolds stated that at this time she is fighting the charges. The Court has not yet adjudicated the charges.

The Board deliberated its options. Dr. Mellott opined that Dr. Reynolds did not report the charges in a timely manner. Dr. Reynolds attested that as soon as she was made aware that she was charged she self-reported to the Board. Dr. Meier confirmed that Dr. Reynolds can continue to practice while the Court adjudicates the matter.

MOTION: Dr. Mellott moved to approve Dr. Reynold’s renewal application and to require that Dr. Reynolds keep the Board apprised of the matter.

SECOND: Dr. Meier.

ROLL CALL VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Dr. Caterino, Dr. Davey, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, 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

11. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING EPPP PART 2 PRESENTATION

Ms. Paakkonen reminded the Board that during its June 3, 2022 meeting, questions were raised relative to whether ASPPB intends to develop EPPP Part 2 preparation materials. She indicated that Matt Turner, Ph.D., Senior Director of Examination Services for ASPPB, was invited to this meeting to share a presentation cover the same material as that which was shared with ASPPB members and stakeholders during Town Hall meetings held in May of this year.

Dr. Turner was welcomed by the Board, and he provided a status report on the EPPP Part 2, noting that the number of takers is still relatively small given that only a few U.S. jurisdictions, and a few Canadian jurisdictions, require this portion of the examination. He reminded the Board that ASPPB has pledged to provide an EPPP Part 2 update to the membership and to stakeholders in 2022, and noted that two Town Hall meetings in late spring were held for this purpose. Dr. Turner indicated that several additional jurisdictions would like to require Part 2 of the EPPP, but in order to do so, they would need for ASPPB to make the decision that the examination consists of both parts. Dr. Turner also explained that ASPPB has not historically developed examination study guides. Rather, third party exam preparation companies have done so with Part 1, but at this time are reticent to invest in developing guides for Part 2 given the market is currently so small.

Dr. Turner provided an overview of ASPPB’s processes to ensure items are written in such a way to circumvent the appearance of any type of bias.

The Board members thanked Dr. Turner for sharing this information. Ms. Paakkonen advised that a copy of the slides that were shared during the recent EPPP Part 2 Town Hall meetings is available in her Executive Director's report.

12. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING TERMINAL DATE FOR ACCEPTING APPLICATIONS FOR TEMPORARY EMERGENCY LICENSE, AND ACTIVATION DATE FOR THE TELEHEALTH REGISTRY

Ms. Paakkonen provided a timeline of the telehealth registration application. In November 2021, the Board voted to continue to accept the temporary emergency license in lieu of offering the telehealth registration application. Ms. Paakkonen stated that the temporary emergency license will be terminated in January 2023. Ms. Paakkonen asked the Board to make a determination on a date to discontinue accepting temporary emergency license applications and to begin accepting telehealth registration applications. Ms. Paakkonen stated that a notice will be put on the Board's website and that Board staff will contact the temporary emergency license holders to inform them of the expiration date.

MOTION: Dr. Mellott moved to put a notice on the Board's website notifying individuals that the Board will discontinue accepting temporary emergency license applications on October 1, 2022, and will begin accepting telehealth registration applications on October 1, 2022.

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

13. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING STATUS OF APPOINTMENT TO FILL PSYCHOLOGIST MEMBER POSITION ON THE BOARD

Ms. Paakkonen provided a summary stating that she requested an update from the Governor's Office and has not received a response. Ms. Paakkonen indicated that she reported to that office an error on their roster, therefore the Governor's Office may have been previously unaware of the vacancy. Ms. Paakkonen stated that she will continue to follow up with the Governor's Office regarding Board member vacancies.

14. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPLICATION FOR EXAM AND LICENSURE FROM JENNIFER WEIGERT, PSY.D., POSSIBLE WITHDRAWAL OF PREVIOUS MOTIONS RELATING TO THE APPLICATION (DENIAL OR VOLUNTARY WITHDRAW), AND POSSIBLE REFERRAL FOR STAFF INVESTIGATION OF THE SAME

Ms. Paakkonen provided a summary stating that Dr. Weigert submitted her application in December 2021. At that time, Dr. Weigert expressed concern that her internship may not meet the internship requirements for Arizona. The Board's Application Review Committee reviewed Dr. Weigert's application at its June 2022, meeting and determined that Dr. Weigert's internship does not meet the requirement of A.R.S. §32-2071(f)(10). The Board reviewed Dr. Weigert's application at its July 8, 2022, meeting in which Dr. Weigert provided additional hours she believed would meet the internship requirement. At the July 8, 2022, meeting, the Board requested additional information regarding a letter from the internship supervisor and documentation (supervision logs) of Dr. Weigert's internship hours. Ms. Paakkonen stated that within the last hour the Board office received a letter from Dr. Weigert's internship supervisor. Ms. Fowkes reviewed the submitted documents with the Board. Ms. Fowkes suggested requesting Dr. Weigert's complete application file from California. Ms. Paakkonen reviewed a discrepancy that was noted in the original documentation compared to the documentation that was recently received.

MOTION: Dr. Mellott moved to forward Dr. Weigert’s application to the Board’s Application Review Committee for substantive review.

SECOND: Dr. Meier.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

15. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING PROPOSED CONSENT AGREEMENT AND ORDER PERTAINING TO COMPLAINT NO. 22-13 FOR LINDA RUSSEK, PH.D., AND POSSIBLE MOTION TO VACATE THE INFORMAL INTERVIEW

Ms. Michaelsen provided a summary stating that the Board reviewed this Complaint at its meeting on June 8, 2022. The Board voted to move the Complaint to an Informal Interview and directed Board staff to negotiate settling the matter with Dr. Russek and her attorney. Ms. Michaelsen stated that a Consent Agreement was negotiation and she outlined the violations in the proposed Consent Agreement. The proposed Consent Agreement requires probation for six months and practice monitoring. Dr. Russek signed the proposed Consent Agreement and it is before the Board for review.

Dr. Russek and her attorney, Dina Aouad, Esq., were present. Ms. Aouad spoke and reviewed the remedial actions that Dr. Russek took during the complaint process. Ms. Aouad indicated that Dr. Russek has signed and accepted the proposed Consent Agreement.

MOTION: Ms. Shreeve moved to accept the proposed Consent Agreement and to vacate the Informal Interview.

SECOND: Dr. Meier.

ROLL CALL VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Dr. Caterino, Dr. Davey, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve and Dr. Stewart.

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

MOTION PASSED.

16. NEW AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

There were no requested items for future meeting agendas.

17. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Dr. Stewart moved to adjourn the meeting.

SECOND: Dr. Meier.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

The meeting adjourned at 1:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda C. Caterino, Ph.D., ABPP

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