



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
September 30, 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
Bryan Davey, Ph.D., BCBA-D
Diana Davis-Wilson, DBH, BCBA
Tisha Denton, M.Ed., BCBA
Paige Raetz, Ph.D., BCBA-D

Staff Present

Heidi Herbst Paakkonen, Executive Director
Jennifer Michaelson, 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 welcomed applicants, students, and members of the public for their attendance. He thanked the staff and Committee members for assembling a substantial agenda with a new record number of applications.

● **Continuing Education Credit for Maintenance of BACB Certification**

Dr. Stenhoff announced that the Board of Psychologist Examiners is approved by the Behavior Analyst Certification Board (BACB) as an ACE continuing education provider. Attending a meeting of the Board's Committee on Behavior Analysts is eligible for continuing education credit for maintenance of BACB

certification. To claim credit, attendees are to make note of the code words provided hourly throughout the meeting. A code word reporting form is posted on the Board's Meetings page.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **August 26, 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 4-0.

5. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING LICENSE REINSTATEMENT REQUESTS AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD:

A. Michal Reed, M.Ed.

Dr. Davis-Wilson recused from this agenda item. Dr. Raetz summarized this matter, noting that Ms. Reed had allowed her behavior analyst license to lapse April 30, 2022. Once she discovered her error, she applied for reinstatement of her license and in the process self-reported that she has practiced for several months in Arizona without a license. Dr. Raetz indicated that the Board has received a complaint against Ms. Reed which alleges, in part, Ms. Reed practiced for a period of time in Arizona while unlicensed.

MOTION: Dr. Raetz moved to meet in Executive Session to receive legal advice. Dr. Davey seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 4-0.

The Committee met in Executive Session from 9:36 a.m. to 9:49 a.m.

Upon resuming the meeting in public session, the Committee discussed the reinstatement request.

MOTION: Dr. Raetz moved to recommend the Board reinstate Ms. Reed's license, and to address the allegations when the complaint is presented to the Committee. Ms. Denton seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 4-0.

Ms. Reed was present for the review of this matter. She did not make a statement.

B. Nadia Todd, M.Ed.

Ms. Denton summarized this matter, noting that Ms. Todd had allowed her behavior analyst license to lapse August 31, 2022. She applied for reinstatement of her license on September 16, 2022, and in the process indicated that she practiced as a behavior analyst in Arizona for 9 days while unlicensed. Ms. Denton acknowledged that this will likely need to be addressed by the Committee and the Board.

MOTION: Ms. Denton moved to recommend the Board reinstate Ms. Todd's license.

Dr. Raetz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 4-0.

The discussion reflected that the statutes and rules do not prescribe a grace period for unlicensed practice.

MOTION: Ms. Denton moved to direct staff to add this matter to a future meeting agenda. Dr. Raetz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 4-0.

The Committee noted that Ms. Todd was present for the review of this matter, and commended her for being forthcoming about her license lapse. She informed the Committee that she has performed her due

diligence with respect to notifying in writing the RBTs she has been supervising of the period of time she was unlicensed so they are aware they cannot claim those hours when applying for licensure in the future.

6. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING SELF-REPORT SUBMITTED BY JOEL MATIELLA, BCBA, AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD

Ms. Michaelsen advised the Committee that Mr. Matiella was issued his behavior analyst license by the Board in 2020. On July 25, 2022, Mr. Matiella submitted a self-report to the Board indicating that he had been charged with driving under the influence (DUI) in Colorado following an arrest on July 20, 2022. She noted he reported the criminal charge to the Board within the timeframe required by A.R.S. §32-3208, and that Mr. Matiella supplied all documentation that was requested by staff to include a statement regarding the matter and the police and court records.

Ms. Michaelsen explained that the police report indicated that an officer with the Durango Police Department responded to a call regarding bottomed-out vehicle over an embankment with the front end tilted down and the back wheels in the air blocking a sidewalk. Mr. Matiella was outside of the vehicle in the company of another officer and was observed swaying front to back while standing. Mr. Matiella admitted to the officer having consumed alcohol nearly 6 hours prior to this event. He stated to the officer that he did not understand why his vehicle would not move and appeared to not understand that his car was lodged on the embankment. In doing so, the officer detected a slur in his speech and detected an odor of an alcoholic beverage. Mr. Matiella refused to perform voluntary roadside maneuvers and was placed into custody. He also refused to provide a chemical sample. He was subsequently transported to La Plata County Jail. During booking, Mr. Matiella submitted a breath sample to a preliminary breath test, which yielded a Breath Alcohol Content measurement of 0.142%.

On September 5, 2022, Ms. Michaelsen noted, Mr. Matiella reported to Board staff the terms of his plea deal resulting in a deferred judgment with the La Plata County Court. The Sentence Order, dated August 30, 2022, reflects that Mr. Matiella pleaded guilty to DUI and is granted a deferred judgment based on completion of the following terms:

- 15 months unsupervised probation.
- Payment of a \$750 court fee; documentation submitted reflects this was paid on August 30, 2022
- Attendance at a Victim Impact Panel; documentation submitted reflects this was completed on September 1, 2022
- 48 hours of community service, which Mr. Matiella supplied documentation to staff yesterday which reflects that he has enrolled through the City of Tempe and intends to start this weekend.
- Submit to a substance abuse evaluation and adhere to its treatment recommendations; which Mr. Matiella reports is scheduled for October 24th.
- A driving restriction in the State of Colorado for 12 months.

With respect to a previous criminal history, Mr. Matiella disclosed on his licensure application regarding a 2001 conviction for possession of marijuana and a 2017 conviction for disorderly conduct. Ms. Michaelsen concluded the summary noting that possible options regarding this matter are outlined for the Committee in its memorandum.

Mr. Matiella was present for the review of this matter. He expressed remorse for his choice and for the choices he made that led to the DUI, and stated that he is focused on making better decisions going forward. He stated that it is his hope to continue providing behavior analytic services in Arizona.

MOTION: Dr. Davey moved to forward this matter with a recommendation to take no action, but to direct the licensee to keep the Board informed of the completion of, and compliance with, the sentencing terms of his DUI. Dr. Raetz seconded the motion

VOTE: The motion was approved 4-0.

7. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING COMPLAINTS AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD

A. Complaint No. 22-38, Emily Orn, M.A.

Dr. Raetz recused from this agenda item. Dr. Stenhoff summarized the Committee's complaint review process

Dr. Davey summarized the allegations as submitted by LS, a former employee at SARC who worked as a behavior specialist reporting to Mrs. Orn. LS states in the complaint that in May of 2022 she was placed on a work performance plan and subsequently terminated, however she asserts it was Ms. Orn, and not she, who exhibited unprofessional behavior and failed to maintain appropriate boundaries. It was further alleged by LS that Ms. Orn failed to create a safe environment for LS to learn, created a hostile work environment, issued unprofessional communications, and has created a situation making it impossible for her to secure employment due to the lapse of her RBT certification. LS further alleged that other agency employees shared her concerns.

In her response, Ms. Orn refuted the allegations. She stated that at all times she treated LS professionally, and that LS was placed on the work performance plan as she was unresponsive to other feedback supplied.

Ms. Orn was present for the review of her complaint, accompanied by her attorney Claudia Stedman. Ms. Orn affirmed that she was the supervisor of LS, during which time she expressed concerns about LS's use of personal communications using agency modalities and on agency's time. Accordingly, LS was placed on a work improvement plan in order to modify the behaviors; despite her efforts to coach her to meet the objectives, LS became increasingly uncooperative and unprofessional. Mr. Orn stated she is confident her conduct adheres to the BACB Code of Ethics. Ultimately, she stated, LS was terminated for failure to comply with the work improvement plan, and the reason for this is clearly documented; this was not a unilateral decision.

The Committee deliberated the case, and the discussion reflected that there is no evidence in the investigative record to find that Mrs. Orn has violated the statutes or the ethical code. However, it was noted that supervisors should exercise care and caution with respect to communications in order to avoid giving the wrong impressions, and to establish appropriate relationship boundaries. This can become a slippery slope.

MOTION: Davey moved to recommend to the Board dismissal of the complaint. Dr. Davis-Wilson seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 4-0.

8. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD PERTAINING TO APPROVAL OF BEHAVIOR ANALYST APPLICANTS

A. Behavior Analyst Applications for Licensure

1) Jane Tammik, 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.

2) Emma Maas, 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 but she will need to correct a typographical error on a date

entry. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.

3) Jessica McGowan, 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, except for the fact that the applicant indicated that a supervisor is related to her, and she also indicated that COVID accommodations were implemented. The Committee determined that clarity and additional information will need to be obtained for this application through a FAIR request.

4) Danielle Hooke, 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.

5) Holly Spring Collinsworth, 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.

6) Nicole Balistrieri, 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.

7) Meredith Essey, 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.

8) Brianna Leveston, 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.

9) Mari Lynn Weiss, M.Ed.

Dr. Stenhoff 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.

10) Madison Burke, 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) Molly Barrett, 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.

12) Alexis Myers, 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.

13) Tiana Bonds-Marshall, 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.

14) Alison Gehrman, 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.

15) Brittney Moore, 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 with the exception of a typographical error on page 6 that requires correction. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.

16) Lindsey Osborne, 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.

17) Samantha Shah, M.S.

Dr. Stenhoff and Dr. Davis-Wilson disclosed that the applicant was a former student but they are both able to vote on the application objectively. 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) Kathryn Heyden, 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.

19) Carla Smith, 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.

20) Danielle Arganbright, M.Ed.

Dr. Davis-Wilson recused from the review of this application. 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.

21) Cinda Atwood, M.S. ()**

The applicant was present for the review of her application. The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application, noting that she completed her required hours of supervision in response to a FAIR. 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. Ms. Atwood thanked the Committee for the guidance supplied to her.

22) Rebecca Odum, 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.

23) Samantha Barth, 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.

24) Linly Dai, 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 application received her entire supervision hours under an individual who was not licensed for the duration of the supervised practice period. The Committee noted that the former supervisor appears to have appropriately provided services in Arizona under a licensure exemption in A.R.S. §32-2091.08, however as she is not licensed, she is not eligible to provide qualifying supervision to an applicant for licensure. The Committee determined that a FAIR letter will be issued to the applicant notifying her of this deficiency.

25) Adriana Quintana, 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.

26) Jingyao Martha Xu, 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 with the exception of the fact that there is a typographical error on a date she recorded on the application. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.

27) Molly Wendorf, 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 with the exception of the fact that she will need to correct the values she recorded for her supervision hours. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.

28) Taylar Grossman, 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.

29) Alesha Kimbrell, 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.

30) Adrienne Szabo, 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.

B. Behavior Analyst Applications for Licensure by Universal Recognition

1) Nyah McAuliffe, 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.

MOTION: Dr. Davey moved to recommend to the Board to approve the applications of Jane Tammik, M.A.; Danielle Hooke, M.S.; Holly Spring Collinsworth, M.Ed.; Nicole Balistrieri, M.Ed.; Meredith Essey, M.A.; Brianna Leveston, M.A.; Mari Lynn Weiss, M.Ed.; Madison Burke, M.A.; Molly Barrett, M.A.; Alexis Myers, M.S.; Tiana Bonds-Marshall, M.A.; Alison Gehrman, M.Ed.; Lindsey Osborne, M.Ed.; Samantha Shah, M.S.; Kathryn Heyden, M.A.; Carla Smith, M.A.; Danielle Arganbright, M.Ed.; Cinda Atwood, M.S.; Rebecca Odum, M.Ed.; Samantha Barth, M.A.; Adriana Quintana, M.Ed.; Jingyao Martha Xu, M.S.; Taylar Grossman, M.S.; Alesha Kimbrell, M.S.; Adrienne Szabo, M.S.; and Nyah McAuliffe, M.Ed. The applications of Emma Maas, M.A.; Brittney Moore, M.Ed.; and Molly Wendorf, M.A. will be forwarded to the Board with the same recommendation once the identified errors have been corrected. Applicants Linly Dai, M.A. and Jessica McGowan, M.Ed. will be issued FAIR letters as noted in the discussion. Dr. Raetz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0 with the recusals as captured in the application summaries.

***First Formal Additional Information Request**

**** Second Formal Additional Information Request**

9. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING TELEHEALTH ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TELEHEALTH BEST PRACTICES

Dr. Davey reported that the Committee's work is currently on pause but that the group may be charged with tasks in the 2023 legislative session. The members discussed the fact that there may be reimbursement issues with

behavior analysts who are approved to deliver services under the Telehealth Registry, but are not licensed. The discussion reflected the fact that the Telehealth providers will need to navigate this situation. The Committee members concurred that this may be an issue that the Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System (AHCCCS) will need to address.

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

Ms. Paakkonen summarized the BACB updates, including information describing successful action taken by the organization concerning an individual who has misrepresented BACB credentials and who practiced for a time in Michigan under falsified credentials. The second supplies some commentary concerning investor-owned and operated behavior analytic agencies. Essentially, the communique advises regulators that the BACB's jurisdiction is over applicants and certificants, but does not extend to agencies or schools. The Committee acknowledged that, similarly, the Board is constrained from taking action against persons who are not licensed behavior analysts.

11. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REQUIRING ALL SUPERVISORS TO BE IDENTIFIED BY ROLE, AND TO QUANTIFY SERVICES PROVIDED, ON SUPERVISED EXPERIENCE VERIFICATIONS

Dr. Davis-Wilson commented that the term "supervisor" has involved where the BACB is concerned. By extension, this evolution may have implications for the Arizona Board of Psychologist Examiners when evaluating the training experience of applicants for licensure. The BACB requires designation of a supervisor, and employment supervisor, and in some instances a consulting supervisor. As new supervisory roles are defined by the BACB, the Committee and the Board need to evaluate whether the current statutes and rules effectively cross-walk to the BACB requirements, or whether the language must be updated or perhaps clarified. It was acknowledged that legal advice may need to be sought as the Committee and the Board will at time need to make a determination whether licensure qualifying supervision was completed pursuant to the statutes and rules. Ms. Galvin indicated she would review A.R.S. §32-2091.03(B) which prescribes the educational and training standards for behavior analyst licensure; in doing so, she can provide legal advice as to whether this language would enable the Committee and the Board to issue a FAIR in order to obtain additional clarifying information when reviewing applications reflecting individuals supplying variations of supervision. Ms. Paakkonen also noted that the Board may need to insert definitions of the various supervisor types in the administrative rules. The discussion encompassed the question that if the supervision meets the standards of the BACB, what responsibility, if any, does this place onto the Committee and the Board to verify the type of supervision provided when evaluating qualifications for licensure. Additionally, is the Committee and Board to be held responsible to verify that consulting supervisors and supervisors appropriately comply with the BACB's requirements when a supervisor is providing services in their first year of certification; the BACB is only verifying compliance of a small percentage of instances of this through an after-the-fact audit. It was suggested that perhaps the psychology training verification model would present some possible solutions for behavior analyst licensure. The discussion reflected a reticence on the part of the Committee to absolve from its responsibility to protection of the public, but acknowledged that this issue may present some "red herrings". It was acknowledged that the Committee and the Board may elect to make a policy decision to disqualify supervision supplied to a trainee during the supervisor's initial year of certification by the BACB. The Committee noted that the FAIR authority allows for the collection of additional information if there are any questions or concerns about adherence to the BACB standards. The Committee directed staff to initiate an effort update its forms to effectively collect information relative to supervisors' compliance with the consulting supervisor requirements of the BACB, depending on the outcome of the legal advice Ms. Galvin supplies. Dr. Stenhoff volunteered to assist in the effort to develop the application modifications that may be appropriate.

12. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING USE OF TITLES BY BEHAVIOR ANALYSTS AND TITLE PROTECTION

Ms. Paakkonen advised the Committee that this matter is on the agenda based on a previous matter considered by the Committee. She called to the Committee's attention the statutes A.R.S. §§ 32-2091 Definitions; 32-2091.12

Violations; classification; and 32-2091.08 Exemptions from licensure. The members discussed the language and concurred that it does not effectively inform the public. Additionally, the language fails to advise licensed behavior analysts what specific titles must be used. Ms. Galvin and Ms. Paakkonen suggested that inspiration can be sourced from other professions' language. The members acknowledged that there is no universal widely-accepted term that clearly designates to the public that a person is a licensed behavior analyst. The discussion also reflected the fact that the licensure exemption statute may not be as compressive as is ideal (encompassing practice outside of autism services delivery), and also that the language is likely unclear to some.

The Committee directed staff to schedule a stakeholder meeting with the members of the Arizona Association of Behavior Analysts in early 2023. The Committee also commented that collecting public input and perspectives would also be very informative, as would inviting C-Suite level executives with agencies operating in Arizona. Additionally, the Committee directed staff to task the Board's student intern to research the use of titles and title protection language of the other states regulating behavior analysts.

13. NEW AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

The Committee requested the matter concerning Nadia Todd's period of unlicensed practice be placed on a future meeting agenda. Additionally, Dr. Davis-Wilson will provide an agenda item to staff to discuss the implications the Telehealth Registry might have on reimbursement for services where the Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System is concerned.

14. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Dr. Davis-Wilson moved to adjourn the meeting. Dr. Davey seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0. The meeting concluded at 12:59 p.m.