



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 September 2, 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 8:33 a.m.

2. ROLL CALL

The following Board members participated in the virtual meeting: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Davey, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott (left the meeting at 12:15 p.m.), Ms. Shreeve, Dr. Stewart (joined at 9:36 a.m.) and Mr. Wynn. The following Board member was absent: Mr. Dynar.

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 Website**

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson stated that the Board's website is currently down therefore Board staff is sharing the agenda in the Zoom meeting.

- **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

K.F. requested to speak. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson clarified that K.F. is not the Complainant in the current complaint against Dr. Bigler. K.F. stated that she was a former patient of Dr. Bigler. K.F. stated that she provided the Board a detailed statement of her experience with Dr. Bigler. K.F. commented that she was present at the Board’s Complaint Screening Committee (CSC) and made a statement. K.F. stated that she was disappointed with the CSC’s recommendation to resolve Dr. Bigler’s complaint. K.F. stated that she was harmed by Dr. Bigler.

5. COUNSEL UPDATE

Ms. Galvin indicated she does not have an update for the Board at this time. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson asked Ms. Galvin if she has an update on the Board’s recent decision to move Keever Czaplinski’s matter to a Formal Hearing. Ms. Galvin stated that the summary suspension was issued and the Formal Hearing has been scheduled for September 26, 2022, at the Office of Administrative Hearings.

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

MOTION: Dr. Mellott 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, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve, Dr. Stewart and Mr. Wynn.

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

MOTION PASSED.

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- August 5, 2022 Regular Session Minutes

B. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

C. DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING PSYCHOLOGIST APPLICATIONS

A.	Requesting Approval to Sit for the EPPP	
	1) Peter Hildebrand, Psy.D.	Part 1 & Part 2
B.	Requesting Approval to Sit for EPPP & Licensure	
	1) Andrea Annibale, Psy.D.	Part 1 & Part 2
	2) Beth Richter, Psy.D.	Part 1 & Part 2
	3) Ryan House, Psy.D.	Part 1 & Part 2
	4) Summer Boyd, Psy.D.	Part 1 & Part 2
C.	Requesting Approval of Supervised Experience for Licensure	
	1) Michele Stathatos, Ph.D.	Passed EPPP Parts 1 & 2

D. Requesting Approval of Licensure by Waiver		
1)	Emma Marie Stevens, Psy.D.	Licensed in another jurisdiction
2)	Hydie Henson DiGiovanni, Psy.D.	Part 1 Only per Board's 11/05/2021 Decision
3)	Bret A. Ringdahl, Ph.D.	Passed EPPP Parts 1 & 2
E. Requesting Approval for Supervised Temporary Licensure and to Sit for the EPPP		
	n/a	
F. Requesting Approval for Licensure by Credential (ABPP, CPQ or National Register		
1)	Karlyn M. Pleasants, Psy.D.	
G. Requesting Approval for Licensure by Universal Recognition		
1)	Amy Ford, Psy.D.	
2)	Anthony V. Santoro, Psy.D.	
3)	Blakely Werner, Psy.D.	
4)	Lauren Nicole Meyer, Ph.D.	
5)	Chung Jung Mun, Ph.D.	
6)	Holly Cunningham, Psy.D.	

D. DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING BEHAVIOR ANALYST APPLICATIONS

1)	Erika des Jardins, M.A.
2)	Jeannie Aguilar, Ph.D.
3)	Kristin Robertson, Ph.D.
4)	Diamond Smith, M.S.
5)	Chelsea Blackwell, M.A.
6)	Fumi Horner, Ph.D.
7)	Anthony Hedgepeth, M.A.
8)	Jennica Warner, M.S.
9)	Jennifer Lee, M.Ed.

E. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REQUEST FOR TESTING ACCOMMODATIONS FROM OKSANA SKLYAROV BLANKENSHIP, PSY.D., TEMPORARY LICENSE NO. PSY-T-000040

F. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REQUEST FOR TESTING ACCOMMODATIONS FROM AMANDA MUNOZ, PSY.D.

G. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REQUEST TO RETAKE THE EPPP WITH ACCOMMODATIONS FROM SAMANTHA JACKSON, PSY.D., TEMPORARY LICENSE NO. PSY-T-000038

H. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REQUEST TO RETAKE THE EPPP FROM KARLIE KRAUSE, PSY.D. TEMPORARY LICENSE NO. PSY-T-000058

I. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REQUEST TO RETAKE THE EPPP FROM ADAM WORLEY, PSY.D., TEMPORARY LICENSE NO. PSY-T-000054

J. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING LICENSE REACTIVATION REQUEST FROM LIA ROLEY, PSY.D.

K. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING LICENSE REACTIVATION REQUEST FROM CARL BONACCI, PH.D.

TIMED ITEMS – 8:45 a.m.

7. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING ACCEPTANCE OF A PROPOSED NON-DISCIPLINARY LETTER OF CONCERN FOR LUKE BIGLER, PSY.D., IN COMPLAINT NO. 22-28 (IF NOT ACCEPTED, AN INITIAL REVIEW WILL TAKE PLACE)

Dr. Mellott provided a summary of the Board’s Complaint Screening Committee (CSC) recent review of Complaint No. 22-28. Dr. Mellott commented that one outcome of that review is that the CSC determined Dr. Bigler should have consulted with peers relative to his concerns for the client’s statements toward him. Dr. Mellott stated that the CSC voted to recommend that the Board accept a non-disciplinary Letter of Concern in resolution of Complaint No. 22-28

Dr. Bigler and his attorney, Flynn Carey, Esq., were present. Mr. Flynn requested to speak and stated that there is no evidence to support counter-transference occurred. Mr. Carey stated that Board staff subpoenaed multiple agencies and entities to ensure the CSC had all records necessary to make its determination. Mr. Carey stated that Dr. Bigler completed an additional thirty-six hours of continuing education since the filing of this complaint, and that Dr. Bigler has been participating in a consultation group.

MOTION: Dr. Mellott moved to accept the non-disciplinary Letter of Concern and to vacate the initial review of Complaint No. 22-28.

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

8. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATING TO THE COMMITTEE ON BEHAVIOR ANALYSTS’ RECOMMENDATION REGARDING THE FOLLOWING COMPLAINTS AND/OR INITIAL CASE REVIEW OF THE FOLLOWING COMPLAINTS

a) Complaint No. 22-26

Jessica Marshall, M.A.S.

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson recused from this agenda item.

Dr. Davey provided a summary of the Board’s Committee on Behavior Analysts (CBA) review of this complaint. The Complainant, S.M., claims that a functional behavior assessment (FBA) was not appropriately completed by Ms. Marshall. The Complainant further alleges the FBA was not completed in a professional manner and that Ms. Marshall did not have the client child’s best interests in mind. Dr. Davey stated that the CBA conducted a thorough review of the records in this complaint and determined that there was no violation of statute or rule.

The Complainant was not present. Ms. Marshall and her attorney, Artie Eaves, Esq. were present. Mr. Eaves indicated that he and Ms. Marshall are available for questions.

MOTION: Dr. Davey moved to accept the CBA’s recommendation to dismiss Complaint No. 22-26 as there were no violations of statute or rule.

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

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

a) Complaint No. 22-25

Elisabetta Ambrosia, Psy.D.

Dr. Mellott provided a summary stating that the Board’s Complaint Screening Committee (CSC) reviewed this complaint and voted to forward it to the Board for review. Dr. Ambrosia was a part-time adjunct faculty at Golden Gate University in California. Dr. Ambrosia is licensed in California and Arizona. The Complainant, A.L., was taking a psychology course taught by Dr. Ambrosia in the fall of 2021. A.L. alleges that Dr. Ambrosia was making sexual advances toward him despite their different sexual orientations. A.L. alleges that Dr. Ambrosia divulged personal information about him to others. A.L. submitted a complaint to Golden Gate University which was dismissed. A.L. was under investigation during his internship at Golden Gate University and he was ultimately terminated from his internship. Golden Gate University requested that A.L. be evaluated before he is allowed to re-enroll. Golden Gate University provided guidance to Dr. Ambrosia and Dr. Ambrosia ceased all communication with A.L. Dr. Mellott indicated that Dr. Ambrosia is no longer employed with Golden Gate University as she decided to leave teaching due to time constraints. Dr. Mellott stated that there is evidence from the Department Chair at Golden Gate University that Dr. Ambrosia left Golden Gate University on good terms.

A.L. was present, requested to speak, made a statement and answered Board members’ questions. A.L. alleges that Dr. Ambrosia did not leave Golden Gate University on good terms. A.L. claims that he settled with Golden Gate University and that Golden Gate University refused to include Dr. Ambrosia in the settlement. A.L. stated that he did not submit a complaint to Golden Gate University against Dr. Ambrosia. A.L. stated that he could not return to Golden Gate University because of the trauma that Dr. Ambrosia caused. He indicated that he was recently able to resume his studies at a prestigious university. A.L. alleges that Dr. Ambrosia made racist remarks. Ms. Shreeve asked A.L. if Dr. Ambrosia was his treating psychologist to which he indicated she was not. Dr. Caterino asked A.L. about the numerous phone calls that occurred late at night. A.L. stated that if he did not answer Dr. Ambrosia he felt he would have to suffer the repercussions. Dr. Caterino asked A.L. if he felt he had to text and call Dr. Ambrosia. A.L. alleges that Dr. Ambrosia brainwashed him. Dr. Caterino confirmed with A.L. that he had to change schools. Dr. Caterino asked A.L. if this situation impacted him financially; he confirmed it did. Dr. Meier asked A.L. how many classes he took that Dr. Ambrosia instructed. A.L. stated he took three classes with Dr. Ambrosia. Dr. Meier asked when he became uncomfortable with Dr. Ambrosia’s interactions. A.L. stated that he became concerned in the spring of 2021. Dr. Meier asked when he last interacted with Dr. Ambrosia. A.L. stated that there was no more contact after the day he was suspended from Golden Gate University. Ms. Shreeve asked A.L. when he brought the matter to Golden Gate University. A.L. reiterated that he did not submit a complaint to Golden Gate University.

Dr. Ambrosia and her attorney, Artie Eaves, Esq., were present, requested to speak, made a statement and answered Board members’ questions. Mr. Eaves stated that the issues revolve around classes that were difficult for students, one of which was multiculturalism. Mr. Eaves opined that A.L. was very confrontational in class. Mr. Eaves opined that A.L.’s behavior is what led to his suspension from Golden Gate University. Mr. Eaves stated that multiple students in the multicultural class were upset with A.L. Mr. Eaves stated that

A.L. made multiple complaints to the Dean of the school regarding civil rights and various other subjects. Mr. Eaves stated that if A.L. could complain to the Dean of the school on multiple subjects, A.L. could have brought his concerns regarding Dr. Ambrosia to the Dean. Mr. Eaves confirmed that Dr. Ambrosia was never warned or disciplined regarding her handling of A.L. Mr. Eaves stated that A.L. did not submit complaints against Dr. Ambrosia until after he was suspended. Dr. Ambrosia stated that she entered into academia in 2020 and that she was not prepared for situations that occurred during the pandemic. She stated that resources were sparse at Golden Gate University due to the pandemic. She confirmed the multicultural class was difficult for students. She stated that A.L. was a challenging student as he had strong opinions about multiculturalism. She stated that her intentions in guiding A.L. were to succeed in the class. She denied making accusatory or racial remarks to any student. Dr. Ambrosia confirmed that she sought supervision while teaching at Golden Gate University. Dr. Mellott asked Dr. Ambrosia to describe the time-frame in which she and A.L. began texting and talking on the phone, and Dr. Ambrosia complied. Dr. Mellott asked Dr. Ambrosia if she communicated with other students in the same way she communicated with A.L. Dr. Ambrosia confirmed that she communicated similarly with other students. Dr. Ambrosia stated that she strove to treat all students the same. Dr. Mellott asked Dr. Ambrosia to explain why she sought supervision from two of the Department Chairs. Dr. Ambrosia said that she sought supervision for all aspects of handling A.L. as well as other issues. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Ambrosia if her texting relationship with A.L. was different with other students. Dr. Ambrosia stated that her and A.L. texted more than other students and explained her motivations. Mr. Eaves stated that A.L.'s issues were extensive which required more attention. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Ambrosia if she maintained a professional boundary with A.L. Dr. Ambrosia opined that she maintained professional boundaries. Dr. Meier asked Dr. Ambrosia if the content of the text messages were appropriate. Dr. Ambrosia stated that she was trying to accommodate A.L.'s cultural situation. Dr. Ambrosia confirmed that she learned a lot about how to handle students while under supervision. Dr. Caterino asked Dr. Ambrosia if she called other students late at night. Dr. Ambrosia confirmed that some of her classes ended late so she called, or accepted calls, late at night. Dr. Caterino asked Dr. Ambrosia how many students she had in each class; Dr. Ambrosia complied. Dr. Caterino asked her to speak to divulging confidential information during supervision. Dr. Ambrosia and Mr. Eaves affirmed that students were made aware that she was under supervision and that confidential information may be divulged.

The Board deliberated. Dr. Mellott opined that the text messages seemed to be friendly rather than focused on academics. Dr. Mellott stated that becoming friends with students is not prohibited and does happen in universities and also opined that in doing so appropriate boundaries should always be set. Dr. Mellott stated that A.L. was having other issues with the University and confirmed that confidentiality does not always apply in a university setting. Dr. Mellott opined that dual relationships in a university setting is a gray area. Dr. Meier stated that Dr. Ambrosia was not teaching under her psychology license and further stated that he does not believe there was a violation of statute or rule. Ms. Shreeve echoed Dr. Meier.

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, Dr. Meier, Dr. Mellott, Ms. Shreeve, Dr. Stewart and Mr. Wynn.

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

MOTION PASSED.

The Board met in Executive Session at 10:17 a.m. and resumed open session at 10:21 a.m.

Dr. Meier explained that the American Psychological Association Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (Code of Ethics) addresses teaching. Dr. Meier opined that there is no violation of the Code of Ethics. Dr. Mellott cautioned professionals utilizing text messages and phone calls rather than email. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson suggested that ideally professors utilize the feature to schedule a time during which an email is sent. Board members discussed policies and procedures in academic settings. At Dr. Caterino request Ms. Galvin outlined the Board's options for resolution of the complaint.

MOTION: Dr. Mellott moved to dismiss Complaint No. 22-25 as there were no violations of statute or rule.

SECOND: Mr. Wynn.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

The Board recessed at 10:51 a.m. and returned to open session at 10:57 a.m.

b) Complaint No. 22-30

Neal Olshan, Ph.D.

Ms. Michaelsen stated that earlier during this meeting Dr. Olshan departed and emailed her asking for a continuance of Complaint No. 22-30, claiming he required time to retain an attorney. In doing so, Dr. Olshan asserted that he was not given sufficient time to obtain an attorney. Ms. Michaelsen stated that Board records indicate that Dr. Olshan was given sufficient notice. Ms. Michaelsen stated that she observed Dr. Olshan joined today's meeting at 8:30 a.m. and departed at 9:40 a.m. Ms. Michaelsen described Board procedures with respect to providing notice to Respondents of their due process rights. Ms. Michaelsen stated that Dr. Olshan was sent notice of today's meeting more than thirty days in advance.

MOTION: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson moved to go into Executive Session to receive confidential legal advice.

SECOND: Ms. Shreeve.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

The Board met in Executive Session at 11:13 a.m. and resumed open session at 11:26 a.m.

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson stated that she is concerned with the timeliness of Dr. Olshan's request as he was given ample opportunity to obtain an attorney and was provided more than adequate notice of today's meeting.

MOTION: Chairwoman Davis-Wilson moved to deny Dr. Olshan's request for a continuance.

SECOND: Dr. Meier.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson provided a summary of the complaint submitted by the wife of Father, D.J., on his behalf. The complaint alleges that Dr. Olshan treated D.J.'s son without his consent, did not interview D.J. as part of the custody evaluation, and made a custody recommendation without interviewing all relevant parties. Accordingly, Mother of son (Mother) filed with the court a motion to modify terms of the custody arrangement after receiving Dr. Olshan's report. Mother initiated services with Dr. Olshan in October 2021; Son had six sessions with Dr. Olshan. In February 2022, Dr. Olshan submitted his report to the Court in which he stated that Mother should have $\frac{3}{4}$ time custody and D.J. should have supervised visitation. Dr. Olshan responded to the complaint allegations in a timely manner. Dr. Olshan stated that he has concerns that D.J.'s current wife submitted the complaint. Dr. Olshan indicated that he has concerns regarding his safety as

D.J. was recently terminated from his employment with the police department. Dr. Olshan stated that D.J. did not appeal any of the charges against him during his termination from the police department. Dr. Olshan stated that the complaint is not a true picture of D.J.'s relationship with son. Dr. Olshan attested that he was assured by multiple parties that D.J. was informed of his treatment of son. Dr. Olshan stated that he never denied interviewing D.J. Dr. Olshan attempted to contact D.J. with no response. Dr. Olshan denied conducting a psychological evaluation of son.

The Complainant, D.J., was present, requested to speak, made a statement and answered Board members' questions. D.J. stated that the first time he knew Dr. Olshan was treating son was when he received Dr. Olshan's report. D.J. stated that since son was one month old he and Mother had 50/50 custody. Recently Mother relocated and began having care of son more frequently. D.J. confirmed that the three Department of Child Safety reports concerning him that were filed by Mother and Counselor were unsubstantiated. D.J. affirmed that Dr. Olshan never contacted him. D.J. stated that he has not seen his son since Dr. Olshan submitted his report. D.J. explained the circumstances of his termination from the police department. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson asked D.J. to clarify the custody arrangement prior to the Court Order. D.J. stated that he had sole custody for a while then it was shared 50/50. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson asked if son had to change schools when the Court ordered the new custody arrangement. D.J. confirmed that son had to change schools. Dr. Meier asked D.J. if he had joint medical decision making during the time that Dr. Olshan was treating son. D.J. confirmed that he had joint medical decision making until the most recent Court Order. Board members asked D.J. if he had any interactions with Dr. Olshan. D.J. attested that he has never had any interactions with Dr. Olshan. Ms. Michaelsen clarified the timeline for Board members.

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson expressed concerns that Dr. Olshan provided a custody evaluation to the Court without D.J.'s consent. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson further expressed concern that Dr. Olshan utilized a news article pertaining to D.J. to arrive at certain conclusions in his report. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson reiterated that Dr. Olshan did not interview D.J. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson stated that there are certain standards to follow when conducting services for the Court. Board members' expressed concern that Dr. Olshan indicated that he did not conduct a psychological evaluation but that his report indicates otherwise.

MOTION: Dr. Mellott moved to forward Complaint No. 22-30 to an Informal Interview, to subpoena Dr. Olshan's presence and to subpoena relevant phone records. The motion includes not granting a continuance of the Informal Interview unless there is an emergency situation. Potential violations include A.R.S. §§32-2061(16)(c)(e)(g)(h)(j)(o)(v)(aa) and (dd) as it pertains to the American Psychological Association Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct: 2.04, 3.10, 9.03, 10.01.

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

Board members discussed potential violations.

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

VOTE: 8-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

10. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT QUESTIONS ON APPLICATIONS SPECIFIC TO IMPAIRMENT

Ms. Paakkonen provided a summary stating that in recent weeks some Board members have raised questions regarding addiction and impairment on the initial and renewal applications. She indicated this matter is on the agenda to allow the Board to gain some clarity relative to what to expect from licensees and

applicants as they answer these questions. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson opined that the questions are intended to protect the public but also cautioned that there could be unintended consequences in terms of privacy rights being violated. Dr. Meier indicated that the questions should be answered by individuals and the Board should take each unique situation into consideration. Dr. Davey questioned whether the impairment question may be irrelevant. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson explained that the Board should be aware if an individual's impairment will potentially affect their practice as a psychologist or behavior analyst. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson explained that an individual will not necessarily be disciplined or reprimanded by the Board if the individual has a medical condition or is in treatment. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson opined that an individual who is in treatment for a certain condition could potentially answer "no" to the impairment question if the condition is not affecting their practice as a psychologist or a behavior analyst. Ms. Galvin clarified that most licensing agencies have similar questions on their applications. Ms. Galvin stated that a court case issued an opinion finding that licensing agencies must focus on the conduct of an individual and that it is improper for a licensing agency to focus on a specific diagnosis and/or the treatment of an individual. Licensing agencies should only make a determination based on an individual's conduct. Ms. Galvin confirmed that the questions on the applications have been scrutinized to ensure that they meet federal standards. Ms. Shreeve clarified that the question specifically asks whether an impairment will affect an individual's ability to practice safely. Ms. Galvin opined that the questions are appropriate. Board members discussed situations in which an individual should inform the Board of potential impairment.

Dr. Mellott left the meeting at 12:15 p.m.

11. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING 2023 MEETINGS CALENDAR AND RESUMING IN-PERSON MEETINGS

Ms. Paakkonen provided a summary noting that the 2023 Board meeting and Committee meeting calendar is before the Board for review. Ms. Paakkonen stated that there may be challenges resuming in-person meetings due to Boardroom construction. Ms. Paakkonen indicated that the budget will support four in-person Board meetings in 2023. Ms. Paakkonen asked for direction as to whether the Board wishes to resume in-person meetings. Ms. Shreeve opined that resuming in-person Board meetings three to four times a year is feasible. Board members agreed to resume quarterly in-person Board meetings. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson requested that Board staff continue to explore the potential of Zoom meetings. Dr. Stewart asked about travel time for Board members who do not live in Maricopa County. Chairwoman Davis-Wilson stated that Board members are not required to appear in-person if travel is not an option. Ms. Paakkonen explained that travel and lodging is reimbursed to Board members who do not live in Maricopa County.

The Board directed staff to plan for in-person meetings in May, August, and November of 2023.

12. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATING TO THE COMMITTEE ON BEHAVIOR ANALYST RECOMMENDATION REGARDING REQUEST TO WITHDRAW INITIAL APPLICATION FOR KAITLYN ARNOLD

Ms. Paakkonen provided a summary stating that Ms. Arnold applied for licensure by Universal Recognition. Ms. Paakkonen explained that the Universal Recognition application requires that an applicant establish residency in Arizona. Ms. Arnold is not a resident of Arizona and she indicated that she has no intention to establish residency in Arizona. Ms. Arnold indicated that she no longer needs to be licensed in Arizona. Ms. Paakkonen stated that the Board's Committee on Behavior Analysts recommended that Ms. Arnold be allowed to withdraw her application rather than denying the application.

MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to allow Ms. Arnold to with her application for licensure as a behavior analyst.

SECOND: Dr. Davey.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

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

Dr. Davey left the meeting at 11:00 a.m. and rejoined at 11:15 a.m.

Dr. Meier recused from reviewing this item.

Dr. Caterino provided a summary stating that Dr. Simmons received his temporary license in September 2021 and noted there were several new supervisors during his supervision. Dr. Simmons submitted his modified training plan in July 2022. Dr. Caterino explained that there is a statute requiring that a temporary license holder submit the modified training plan within ten days of the modification.

Dr. Simmons was present and explained that the wording of the statute regarding notifying the Board of a modification in the supervision is not clear. Additionally, Dr. Simmons explained that his first/primary supervisor was supposed to return within a month. Dr. Simmons stated his primary supervisor did not return so he obtained other licensed psychologists as supervisors. Dr. Simmons further stated that he has had four supervisors since his first supervisor. Part of the delay in submitting the modified training plan was acquiring the signatures of all of his supervisors. Dr. Mellott discussed drafting a Substantive Policy Statement regarding the ten-day noticing requirement.

MOTION: Dr. Mellott moved to accept Dr. Simmons modified training plan.

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

14. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REQUEST TO RETAKE THE EPPP WITH ADDITIONAL MATERIALS FROM GENARO HUERTA, PSY.D., TEMPORARY LICENSE NO. PSY-T-000007

Dr. Meier provided a summary stating that Dr. Huerta has provided a comprehensive study plan at the request of the Board's Application Review Committee. Dr. Huerta is consulting with a licensed psychologist as part of his study plan.

MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to approve Dr. Huerta's study plan and his request to retake the EPPP.

SECOND: Dr. Caterino.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

15. NEW AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

Chairwoman Davis-Wilson stated that Dr. Mellott requested that the Board discuss the ten-day noticing requirement for an individual to report a change in a training plan.

Ms. Paakkonen stated that there will be an item on the October meeting agenda regarding legislation that will become effective at the end of September.

16. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Dr. Meier moved to adjourn the meeting.

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

MOTION PASSED.

The meeting adjourned at 12:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda C. Caterino Ph.D., ABPP

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