



STATE OF ARIZONA
BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGIST EXAMINERS
1740 WEST ADAMS STREET, SUITE 2430
PHOENIX, AZ 85007
PH: 602.542.8162 FX: 602.926.8095
WEBSITE: www.psychboard.az.gov

KATIE HOBBS
Governor

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

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

November 8, 2024

Board Members

Aditya Dynar, Esq.– Chair
Diana Medina, Ph.D.– Vice Chair
Bryan Davey, Ph.D., BCBA-D
Linda Caterino, Ph.D., ABPP
Melissa Flint, Psy.D.
Donald Stenhoff, Ph.D., BCBA-D
Larry Sideman, Ph.D., ABPP
Joseph Stewart, Ed.D. – Secretary

Board Staff

Heidi Herbst Paakkonen, M.P.A., Executive Director
Jennifer Michaelson, M.P.A., Deputy Director
Krishna Poe, Program Projects Specialist
Kathy Fowkes, Psychologist Licensing Specialist
Zakiya Mallas, Behavior Analyst Licensing Specialist

Board Attorney

Jeanne Galvin, Assistant Attorney General

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Dynar called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m.

2. ROLL CALL

The following Board members participated in the virtual meeting: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Stewart (*departed the meeting at 2:28 p.m.*), Dr. Caterino, Dr. Flint, Dr. Sideman, and Dr. Stenhoff (*absent from 10:45 a.m. to 10:53 a.m.*).

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; Kathy Fowkes, Licensing Specialist, and Zakiya Mallas, Licensing Specialist.

3. REMARKS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

- **Board [Survey](#)**

Mr. Dynar encouraged meeting attendees to provide feedback by contacting Board staff and completing a Board Meeting Assessment Survey.

- **Board Member and Staff Appreciation**

Mr. Dynar 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**

Mr. Dynar announced that the meeting will not exceed four hours and therefore no continuing education credit will be awarded for attendance.

4. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

No members of the public requested to speak.

5. COUNSEL UPDATE

Ms. Galvin did not have an update to provide to the Board.

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

Dr. Medina announced she is recused from item 6.C.1.d. Dr. Stenhoff announced he is recused from item 6.A.

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- September 6, 2024 Regular Session Minutes
- September 6, 2024 Executive Session Minutes
- October 4, 2024 Regular Session Minutes

B. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

C. DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING PSYCHOLOGIST APPLICATIONS

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

- a) Brandon Lipin, Psy.D.
- b) Joshua Smith, Psy.D.
- c) Monica Acevedo-Molina, Ph.D.
- d) Lindsay Polk, Psy.D.

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

- a) Dominique Doss, Ph.D.
- b) Kendra Jacques, Ph.D.
- c) Leslie Belt, Ph.D.
- d) Mishael Ozed-Williams, Ph.D.
- e) Brandon McCormick, Ph.D.

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

- a) Yolanda Estrada, Psy.D.
- b) Petra Duran, Ph.D.

4. Requesting Approval for Licensure by Credential (A.R.S. § 32-2071.01)

- a) Shannon Curry, Psy.D., NRHSP
- b) Ashley Whitaker, Ph.D., ABPP
- c) Morgan Pepiton, Psy.D., CPQ
- d) Denise Gretchen-Doorly, Ph.D., NHSP
- e) Sue Schonberg, Ph.D., ABPP
- f) Jennifer Fisher, Ph.D., ABPP
- g) Pamela Goss-Power, Psy.D., NRHSP

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

- a) Bethany Friedman, Psy.D.
- b) Ajasha Long, Ph.D.

- c) Elizabeth Norris-Walczak, Ph.D.
- d) Annabel Fields, Psy.D.
- e) Amina Simmons, Ph.D.
- f) Elizabeth Stanton, Psy.D.
- g) Steve Kudler, Psy.D.

5. Requesting Approval for Telehealth Registry (A.R.S. § 36-3606)

- a) Mary-Jo Bautista-Bohall, Psy.D.
- b) Jessica Brooks, Ph.D.

D. DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING BEHAVIOR ANALYST APPLICATIONS

- 1. Emma Helvig, M.S.
- 2. Kelsey Goodner, M.A.
- 3. Maria Eleonora Venneri, M.S.
- 4. Raeosha Huffman, M.A.
- 5. Margaret Connors, M.Ed.
- 6. Flor Rizo, M.A.
- 7. Richelle Vincent, M.A.
- 8. Stephanie Horgan, M.Ed.
- 9. Ashley Dahl, M.S.
- 10. Christopher Ceurvels, M.A.
- 11. Sylvia Karjala, M.A.
- 12. Elizabeth Puckerin, M.S.
- 13. Yennifer Robles Aguirre, M.A.
- 14. Anjali Pillai, M.A.
- 15. Cami Williams, M.Ed.
- 16. Brigitte Coronado, M.A.
- 17. Kaela Grant, M.A.
- 18. Scott Fitch, M.S.
- 19. Andrew Wegman, M.A.
- 20. Daniel Bullara, Ph.D.

E. DISCUSSION/DECISION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING BEHAVIOR ANALYST TELEHEALTH REGISTRY ANNUAL UPDATES

- 1. Chloe Fahrberger, M.S.

MOTION: Dr. Stewart moved for the Board to approve the items listed under the Consent Agenda (with the recusals as noted).

SECOND: Dr. Medina.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Sideman, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Flint, Dr. Sideman, and Dr. Stenhoff.

VOTE: 7-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recused.

MOTION PASSED.

TIMED ITEM - 8:45 A.M.

7. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REACTIVATION REQUEST SUBMITTED BY KL

Mr. Dynar stated the Board may vote to meet in Executive Session on any item on the agenda, pursuant to A.R.S. § 38- 431.03(A)(2), to review confidential records including the receipt and discussion of information or

testimony that is confidential by state or federal law, and/or A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3), to receive confidential legal advice from the Board’s attorney.

MOTION: Mr. Dynar moved for the Board to meet in Executive Session for the purpose of discussing confidential health related information, and also to receive legal advice.

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Sideman, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Flint, Dr. Sideman, and Dr. Stenhoff.

VOTE: 7-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recused.

MOTION PASSED.

The Board met in Executive Session from 8:51 a.m. to 10:34 a.m.

Upon resuming the meeting in public session, the Board deliberated this matter.

MOTION: Dr. Medina moved for the Board to move forward with this matter as discussed in Executive Session.

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Sideman, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Flint, Dr. Sideman, and Dr. Stenhoff.

VOTE: 7-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recused.

MOTION PASSED.

TIMED ITEM - 10:30 A.M.

8. INFORMAL INTERVIEW – SUSAN SCHWARTZ, PH.D. – COMPLAINT NO. 24-30

DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATING TO ALLEGATIONS OF UNPROFESSIONAL CONDUCT, PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, POSSIBLE DISCIPLINE AND/OR OFFER OF A CONSENT AGREEMENT OR REFERRAL TO A FORMAL HEARING

Mr. Dynar provided an overview of the informal interview process. Dr. Schwartz and her attorney, Robert Beardsley, were present and introduced themselves for the record. Board members introduced themselves, stating their respective roles on the Board. Dr. Dynar recited the case allegations for 24-30. Dr. Schwartz was sworn in for the proceeding.

Dr. Medina provided a summary of the investigation, noting that KG participated in therapy from 2016 through 2019. The complaint alleges that KG confronted Dr. Schwartz about content about her personal history she discovered in a book she authored, recording the conversation in the process, and obtained an admission of guilt from Dr. Schwartz. KG also alleged Dr. Schwartz improperly billed her for the services provided. In her response to the complaint, Dr. Schwartz denies that KG was overbilled, and claimed she did not use KG’s story and facts from her life in the book. Dr. Medina commented that the investigation has found Dr. Schwartz did not maintain a chart and a complete set of treatment records for KG. She reminded the Board that the outcome of the Board’s initial review of the complaint resulted in the case being remanded to an informal interview with seven potential violations identified.

KG was present and was sworn in to the proceeding. She reiterated her complaint allegations. Mr. Dynar acknowledged KG’s attorney, Elliot Alford, was also present. Mr. Beardsley indicated his client did not have questions for KG.

The Board members posed questions to Dr. Schwartz concerning the corrective action she has elected to pursue on her own since learning of the complaint. Dr. Schwartz described the activities in which she has engaged. Under

questioning, she admitted she has maintained inadequate records for many of her clients, and she has none for KG. The Board observed that Dr. Schwartz has supplied inconsistent answers to the Board, as well as on her most licensure renewal application relative to her documentation and record-keeping compliance. Dr. Schwartz made statements defending how she develops the stories published in her books. Dr. Schwartz affirmed patient forms are available on her website, and cited the components of patient charts she is now maintaining. She denied accepting insurance for service payment, but subsequently acknowledged she is enrolled in some networks and is balance-billing with some clients. Board members observed statements made by Dr. Schwartz today are inconsistent with those she has made previously.

MOTION: Mr. Dynar moved for the Board to meet in Executive Session for the purpose of receiving legal advice.

SECOND: Dr. Stenhoff.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Sideman, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Flint, Dr. Sideman, and Dr. Stenhoff.

VOTE: 7-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recused.

MOTION PASSED.

The Board met in Executive Session from 11:54 a.m. to 12:26 p.m.

Upon resuming the meeting in public session, the Board deliberated this matter.

In her closing statement, KG asserted that the facts of the book chapter are an exact representation of her life, and she had been harmed by Dr. Schwartz's conduct. KG stated that, contrary to her earlier statement, Dr. Schwartz elected to be credentialed with KG's insurance provider in order to treat KG and in the process source KG's story for her book. Mr. Beardsley made a closing statement on behalf of his client in which he pledged that Dr. Schwartz is prepared to do whatever is necessary to reform her record-keeping practices, and make restitution to clients she improperly balance-billed. Dr. Schwartz denied intentionally using KG's personal story for her book, and explained the course of action she is taking with the publisher to remedy this matter.

The Board's deliberation reflected serious concerns with respect to use of KG's story, and Dr. Schwartz's billing and records maintenance practices. It was noted that Dr. Schwartz has failed to supply to the Board information it has requested. Additionally, the deliberation revealed that the proceeding revealed evidence that supports finding violations in every instance cited in the investigative record. In response to the Board's observation that additional clarity into Dr. Schwartz's practice management is necessary, Ms. Galvin advised the Board that some actions can be ordered today, and the investigation can continue with the potential that additional actions be taken in the future.

MOTION: Dr. Stewart moved for the Board to issue an Interim Order that requires Dr. Schwartz to secure a practice evaluator to assess her compliance with current standards of practice, that Board staff be directed to issue a subpoena to Dr. Schwartz to obtain a sampling of patient files whose care was reimbursed by an insurance provider, and that Dr. Schwartz submit to a fitness for duty evaluation by a psychologist or a psychiatrist;

SECOND: Dr. Medina.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Sideman, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Flint, Dr. Sideman, and Dr. Stenhoff.

VOTE: 7-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recused.

MOTION PASSED.

Ms. Galvin asked the Board if, in lieu of complying with the Interim Order, the Board would accept a voluntary surrender of Dr. Schwartz's license. It was the consensus of the Board that this would be an appropriate resolution to the case.

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

9. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING LICENSE REINSTATEMENT APPLICATION, INCLUDING UNLICENSED PRACTICE DISCLOSURE, SUBMITTED BY JON MCCAINE, PH.D.

Dr. Flint announced she is recused from the consideration of this agenda item. Dr. Caterino disclosed for the record that over 30 years ago she and her family participated in a guided group travel experience which included Dr. McCaine and his family, but they have had no contact since that event. Ms. Paakkonen advised the Board that on October 1 2024, the Board office received Dr. McCaine’s license reinstatement application and payment as his license had expired on March 31, 2024. She also noted that Dr. McCaine subsequently submitted proof of continuing education on October 16, 2024. She called to the Board’s attention that in a written statement to the Board, Dr. McCaine disclosed that he practiced as a psychologist during the time the license was expired, potentially a violation of A.R.S. Section §32-2084.

Dr. McCaine was present for the review of this matter and made a statement to the Board. He explained the circumstances that led to this situation. He clarified that he did not maintain a client caseload during the period of the license lapse, but served in a case consultation role to former colleagues. He affirmed that upon learning in September that his license had expired, he immediately notified the Board and contacted his former colleagues to notify them that he could not continue in that consultative role until his license is reinstated.

MOTION: Dr. Medina moved the Board to approve the application and take no further action.

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Sideman, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Flint, Dr. Sideman, and Dr. Stenhoff.

VOTE: 7-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recused.

MOTION PASSED.

10. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE COMMITTEE ON BEHAVIOR ANALYSTS RECOMMENDATION FOR THE FOLLOWING MATTERS:

A. Complaint No. 24-40, Jennifer Huffman, M.A., and her pending renewal application

Dr. Stenhoff summarized the complaint filed by SS who was working as an RBT at the same agency that employs Ms. Huffman. SS alleged that Ms. Huffman did not effectively oversee her client caseload, that client sessions were often interrupted but billed for the entire time, and she did not properly refer certain clients to other services they required. In her response to the complaint, Ms. Huffman denied the allegations and noted some of the clients referenced in the complaint were not on her caseload. Dr. Stenhoff advised the Board that the vote by the Committee on Behavior Analysts was divided with the majority recommending dismissal, while the minority appeared to support some type of non-disciplinary action.

Ms. Huffman and her attorney, Mandi Karvis, were present. Ms. Karvis made a statement in support of the Committee’s recommendation. She assured the Board that Ms. Huffman has voluntarily committed to completing continuing education to improve her documentation and clinical skills.

MOTION: Dr. Stenhoff moved the Board to dismiss the complaint and to approve Ms. Huffman’s licensure renewal application.

SECOND: Dr. Caterino.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Sideman, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Flint, Dr. Sideman, and Dr. Stenhoff.

VOTE: 7-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recused.

MOTION PASSED.

B. Complaint Nos. 24-44 & 25-01, Courtney Peters, M.A.

Dr. Stenhoff summarized complaints 24-44 and 25-01 filed by FC and AM to include inadequate supervision of, and training to, MA (FC's RBT), substandard documentation, failure to timely provide requested documentation, using a HIPAA non-compliant record keeping system, failure to maintain client confidentiality, fraudulent billing, and delivering inadequate parent training. In her response to the complaint, Ms. Peters' submission contained copious documentation that refuted the allegations.

Ms. Peters and her attorney, Heather Macre, were present. Ms. Macre, requested on behalf of her client that the complaint be dismissed. She stated the complaint was retaliatory on the part of FC for having made false statements to agency personnel.

MOTION: Dr. Stenhoff moved the Board dismiss complaints 24-44 and 25.01.

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Sideman, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Flint, Dr. Sideman, and Dr. Stenhoff.

VOTE: 7-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recused.

11. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING INFORMATION RECEIVED CONCERNING MARTIN GANGLEY (UNLICENSED IN ARIZONA), PREVIOUSLY ISSUED A CEASE AND DESIST ORDER BY THE BOARD ON DECEMBER 21, 2020, TO INCLUDE POTENTIAL CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION REFERRALS AND SEEKING INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Ms. Michaelsen provided an overview of Martin Gangley's (an unlicensed person) disciplinary history with the Board consisting of a Cease and Desist Order issued to him in 2020 addressing findings of his unauthorized practice of psychology in Arizona, and his fraudulent representations he is a psychologist, both of which are violations of A.R.S. §32-2084. She noted Mr. Gangley was also the subject of a prior complaint in 2014 regarding similar concerns, but the Board at that time lacked statutory authority to take any action. Ms. Michaelsen explained Board staff recently received an email from a clinical director of a local behavioral health agency alleging that, in his response to an open position posting by the agency, Mr. Gangley continues to misrepresent himself as a psychologist and may be providing psychological services. Ms. Michaelsen called to the Board's attention his resume content including: "completes clinical assessments to identify developmental, emotional and behavioral needs of children aged 0-5" through observation, interviews and standardized assessments"; "engages in the ethical practice of psychotherapy according to the laws and regulations of the State of Arizona"; "conduct regular appointments with clients who wish to converse with a mental health professional within the community or the client's home"; "continually assess client situations and provide the proper ongoing treatments"; "maintain all required licenses and the appropriate insurance"; "provide high quality, compassionate, and ethical substance abuse therapy to clients in individual and group therapy settings"; "maintain good standing with the appropriate board and insurance entities"; and "provides intake and psychosocial assessments of families and/or their individual members".

Ms. Michaelsen explained staff is seeking direction from the Board with regards to this new information to include a potential finding Mr. Gangley failed to comply with the Cease and Desist Order, and referrals of this matter to other appropriate investigative and enforcement entities.

MOTION: Mr. Dynar moved for the Board to meet in Executive Session for the purpose of receiving legal advice.

SECOND: Dr. Medina.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Flint, Dr. Sideman, and Dr. Stenhoff.

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

MOTION PASSED.

The Board met in Executive Session from 3:18 p.m. to 3:25 p.m.

Upon resuming the meeting in public session, the Board deliberated this matter.

MOTION: Dr. Caterino moved for the Board to direct staff to refer this matter to the Arizona Attorney General’s Office of Criminal Investigation and to the Gilbert Police Department, and to direct the Board’s attorney to seek injunctive relief against Mr. Gangley.

SECOND: Dr. Medina.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Flint, Dr. Sideman, and Dr. Stenhoff.

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

MOTION PASSED.

12. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPLICATION FOR LICENSURE BY WAIVER SUBMITTED BY NICOLLE NAPIER-IONASCU, PSY.D.

Dr. Flint provided a summary of the application file, noting the application was forwarded to the Board given it reflects a disclosure of disciplinary action in 2019 to her California psychologist license. She reported that the Application Review Committee (ARC) review did not otherwise identify any deficiencies with this application as the file is administratively and substantively complete.

Dr. Napier-Ionascu was present for the application review and explained the events and circumstances involving a former intern that led to the California investigation and action, and how she elected to settle the case on the advice of her attorney. Dr. Flint noted the file represents Dr. Napier-Ionascu complied with all the terms of the settlement.

MOTION: Dr. Flint moved the Board to approve the application.

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Sideman, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Flint, Dr. Sideman, and Dr. Stenhoff.

VOTE: 7-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recused.

13. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPLICATION TO SIT FOR EPPP AND LICENSURE UPON A PASSING SCORE WITH STUDY PLAN SUBMITTED BY MICAELA REECE-WILLIAMS, PSY.D.

Dr. Flint provided a summary of the application file, noting the applicant has made four unsuccessful attempts to pass the EPPP. She noted that the Application Review Committee (ARC) review did not otherwise identify any deficiencies with this application as the file is administratively and substantively complete. Dr. Flint explained that the ARC recommended the Board review this application given the concerns around the effectiveness of Dr. Reece-Williams’ study plan.

The applicant was present for the review and described her current efforts to prepare for her next EPPP attempt. The Board provided input into her preparation strategy.

MOTION: Dr. Stewart moved for the Board to approve the application inclusive of the study plan.

SECOND: Dr. Sideman.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Stewart, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Flint, Dr. Sideman, and Dr. Stenhoff.

VOTE: 7-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recused.

14. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION CONCERNING DRAFT PROPOSED REVISIONS TO A.A.C. R4-26-406

This item was not addressed and will be scheduled for review on a future meeting agenda.

15. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING PRELIMINARY ASPPB 2024 ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING REPORT

Ms. Paakkonen summarized the discussions that preceded the ASPPB Business Meeting during which the membership heard presentations concerning the amendments to Article IV of the bylaws of the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) proposed by the Texas State Board of Examiners of Psychologists. She reported the amendments failed, and supplied the potential reasons for this outcome. Dr. Stewart acknowledged the pivot by the ASPPB Board to work toward a “reimagined EPPP” was a significant turn of events. Ms. Paakkonen commented that there will be opportunities for volunteering to assist in the shift toward the reimagined EPPP, and that she hopes Arizonans will be involved.

16. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING DRAFT PROPOSED SUBSTANTIVE POLICY STATEMENT CLARIFYING A.R.S. §32-2072 SPECIFIC TO EXAMINATION CANDIDATE APPROVAL FOR PART 1 OF THE EPPP

Ms. Paakkonen presented the draft substantive policy statement, and recommended the Board consider whether it should be adopted given the new direction of the EPPP. The Board discussion reflected that even a brief period of time of allowing approved applicants to take the current knowledge-based EPPP provides valuable assistance to some candidates. The Board discussion reflected an interest in exploring a better solution through statutory revision, while supporting applicant examination candidates to the extent possible. The members directed Ms. Paakkonen to make some edits to the draft.

MOTION: Mr. Dynar moved for the Board to approve the draft substantive policy statement with two edits: state that the program director’s designee may sign the education requirements completed affirmation letter, and clarify that all other licensure requirements be met before the Board determines a license shall be granted. The motion also stipulated the effective date of the substantive policy statement is its filing date.

SECOND: Dr. Flint.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Flint, Dr. Sideman, and Dr. Stenhoff.

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

17. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION CONCERNING SUPERVISED PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE VERIFICATION FORMS TRAINEE COMPENSATION QUESTION ADDITION, CONSISTENT WITH A.A.C. R4-26-209(C)

Ms. Paakkonen advised the Board the purpose of this agenda item is to consider suggested edits to the Board’s psychologist supervised professional experience (SPE) verification forms to ascertain training program compliance with A.A.C. R4-26-209(C) which requires that payment to trainees be stipend and not productivity based. She explained a modification to the forms will better facilitate the Board verifying this information when conducting substantive reviews of applications.

The Board proposed and debated some modifications to the suggested edits.

MOTION: Dr. Medina moved for the Board to insert into the supervised experience verification forms the question “was this psychologist trainee compensated based on productivity or revenue generated by them during the training period?”

SECOND: Dr. Caterino.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Flint, Dr. Sideman, and Dr. Stenhoff.

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

18. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE BOARD HAS JURISDICTION REGARDING INFORMATION RECEIVED CONCERNING PAUL MEYER, PSY.D., WHETHER TO OPEN A COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION AGAINST THE LICENSEE, AND WHETHER TO REFER THE MATTER TO ANOTHER PSYCHOLOGIST LICENSURE BOARD

Ms. Paakkonen reminded the Board that in 2023, the Board adjudicated complaint 23-13 which alleged Dr. Meyer was preparing and issuing Emotional Support Animal ("ESA") letters that were not a reflection of individualized ongoing client treatment plans, but instead amounted to a one-time transactional service for the clients. She noted that the final disposition of complaint 23-13 consists of issuance of a Letter of Concern memorializing the Board's concerns that the evaluations Dr. Meyer conducted to arrive at recommendations for ESAs for student clients reflected that he engaged in activities that were not congruent with a psychologist's training, knowledge and experience. The Letter of Concern further articulates that, as a psychologist, Dr. Meyer is expected to maintain the established standard of care for a psychologist, and not merely follow an employer's direction that failed to comply with acceptable psychology practice. That Letter of Concern also includes the following advisory: "Should you resume conducting ESAs, the Board recommends you obtain and apply psychology-related education and training. Additionally, the Board requests you issue written notification to the office should you intend to resume the practice of evaluating for ESAs. The Board will review your request to conduct ESA evaluations at a scheduled meeting during which you will be required to attend and answer questions."

Ms. Paakkonen explained that more recently staff was contacted by an individual expressing concerns that Dr. Meyer is issuing boiler plate ESA recommendation letters with a diagnosis, including one for a person in Michigan although he is not licensed in that jurisdiction. She called to the Board's attention Dr. Meyer's attempt to reflect that he is using only his Florida license in the process. Ms. Paakkonen stated that the Board is asked to determine whether it maintains jurisdiction over the actions and conduct of Dr. Meyer with respect to the information received; additionally, the Board may consider making a referral to the Michigan Board of Psychology or perhaps other jurisdictions and entities.

In response to questions, Ms. Galvin affirmed that the Board has jurisdiction over this matter given the evidence the actions were initiated from Dr. Meyer's Mesa, Arizona office. The Board deliberation reflected that not only did Dr. Meyer contradict statements he made previously to the Board that he has ceased conducting ESA evaluations, it appears he is attempting to represent this work as occurring outside of this Board's purview and authority.

MOTION: Dr. Sideman moved for the Board to open a complaint against Paul Meyer, Psy.D. and to refer the information received to the Michigan and Florida psychology boards.

SECOND: Dr. Medina.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Flint, Dr. Sideman, and Dr. Stenhoff.

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

19. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE APPLICATION FOR LICENSURE BY WAIVER AND REQUEST TO WITHDRAW THE SAME SUBMITTED BY TABITHA CAMPBELL, PSY.D.

Ms. Fowkes explained to the Board that Dr. Campbell submitted an application for licensure by waiver which is in the substantive review time frame and for which the ARC has issued two FAIR requests for additional information concerning her training experience. Ms. Fowkes noted that although Dr. Campbell responded to the FAIRs, she indicated that her circumstances have changed such that she no longer wishes to seek an Arizona license, and she requests her application be withdrawn.

MOTION: Dr. Stenhoff moved for the Board to approve Dr. Campbell’s request to withdraw the application.

SECOND: Mr. Dynar.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Stewart, Dr. Caterino, Dr. Flint, Dr. Sideman, and Dr. Stenhoff.

VOTE: 7-yay, 0-nay, 0-abstain, 0-recused.

20. NEW AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

Ms. Paakkonen affirmed that an item will be on the Board’s December meeting agenda to elect the 2025 officers.

21. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Dynar announced the adjournment of the meeting at 3:43 p.m.