



Committee on Behavior Analysts
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES
December 1, 2023 – 9:30 a.m.
Held via Zoom

1. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Denton, Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:34 a.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Committee Members Present

Tisha Denton, M.Ed., BCBA

Kristen Byra, Ph.D., BCBA-D

Bryan Davey, Ph.D., BCBA-D – *departed the meeting at 2:30 p.m.*

Paige Raetz, Ph.D., BCBA-D

Donald Stenhoff, Ph.D., BCBA-D – *departed the meeting at 2:30 p.m.*

Staff Present

Heidi Herbst Paakkonen, Executive Director

Jennifer Michaelsen, Deputy Director

Zakiya Mallas, 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**

Ms. Denton thanked the members of the public for attending the meeting, including applicants for licensure as this meeting serves as a valuable opportunity to learn about behavior analyst regulatory issues in Arizona. She acknowledged the efforts of staff to assemble a substantial amount of materials for this meeting, especially at a time when applications and complaints are increasing. She also thanked Ms. Galvin for providing the Committee with legal advice and support. Additionally, she commended the Committee members for their diligence in preparing for this meeting and thanked them for their dedicated service.

● **Introduction to New Committee Member - Kristen Byra, BCBA-D**

Dr. Byra shared a brief introduction, noting that she has lived in Arizona for 8 years, received her Masters and Doctorate at Eastern Michigan University, and has been certified by the BACB for 16 years. She described her professional experience to include both clinical and non-clinical work, and she summarized some of her research accomplishments. Committee members welcomed her to the group and thanked her for her willingness to serve to protect the public.

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

Ms. Denton announced that the Board of Psychologist Examiners is approved by the Behavior Analyst Certification Board (BACB) as an ACE continuing education provider. 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 30, 2023 Regular Session Minutes**
- **August 30, 2023 Executive Session Minutes**

MOTION: Dr. Stenhoff moved to approve both sets of the August 30, 2023 minutes as drafted. Dr. Raetz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 3-0. Ms. Denton and Dr. Byra recused from the vote.

- **October 27, 2023 Regular Session Minutes**
- **October 27, 2023 Executive Session Minutes**

MOTION: Dr. Stenhoff moved to approve both sets of the October 27, 2023 minutes as drafted. Dr. Davey seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 3-0. Dr. Raetz and Dr. Byra recused from the vote.

5. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD TO OPEN A COMPLAINT AGAINST ELIZABETH GRESSARD, M.ED., FOR UNLICENSED PRACTICE

Dr. Davey reminded the Committee that Ms. Gressard did not renew her license by the July 31, 2023 date and she continued to provide behavior analytic services in Arizona for approximately 9 weeks until the lapse was discovered. He noted that Ms. Gressard's supervisors provided some written statement explaining what actions were taken in response to this discovery, but that these letters did not fully inform the Committee relative to whether an investigation should be opened concerning unlicensed practice. He noted that additional written statements have since been submitted for the Committee to review and discuss.

Dr. Davey asked Ms. Gressard whether she agreed with the information in the statements; she replied in the affirmative. The Committee asked Ms. Gressard to describe and to quantify the frequency of supervision and oversight she received during the 9 weeks she was unlicensed. Miriam Young, LBA; Matt LaCoursier, LBA; Jennifer Koger, LBA; and Alycia Link, LBA introduced themselves to the Committee and described how they collaborated with and served in various oversight capacities for the services Ms. Gressard provided. The explanations provided reflected that the frequency with which these individuals met with Ms. Gressard did not provide the clarity necessary to the Committee to find that Ms. Gressard could be considered as supervised during the period of time she was not licensed.

The Committee deliberation reflected that missed deadlines for licensure renewal are creating adverse impacts to not only the professionals involved, but primarily to the clients they serve. In response to a question, Ms. Galvin affirmed that in the past the Committee has recommended the Board open a complaint for the same conduct, and she indicated that some of those cases resulted in the issuance of a Letter of Concern.

MOTION: Dr. Davey moved to meet in Executive Session for the purpose of receiving legal advice. Dr. Stenhoff seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.

The Committee met in Executive Session from 10:06 a.m. to 10:17 a.m.

Upon resuming the meeting in public session, the Committee noted that there appear to be no concerns with the supervision and oversight that occurred beginning on October 4, 2023 with the discovery that Ms. Gressard was not licensed. However, there is no documentation that there was similar due diligence from the time of the license lapse to October 4, 2023. A comment was made that opening an investigation would enable further discovery of facts.

MOTION: Dr. Davey moved to open an investigation concerning Ms. Gressard for practicing behavior analysis in Arizona while unlicensed. Dr. Byra seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.

6. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING COMPLAINTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD

A. Complaint No. 24-07, Jamie Jones, M.S.

Ms. Denton provided an overview of the Committee's complaint review process. Dr. Stenhoff summarized the allegations, noting that Ms. Jones was the subject of a previous complaint, submitted anonymously, that was reviewed by the Committee and dismissed by the Board (consistent with the Committee's recommendation) earlier in 2023. Following that event, complainant KH, an RBT, reported to the Board that Ms. Jones contacted her through social media platforms, inquiring whether KH was the anonymous complainant as Ms. Jones observed KH's name on the list of attendees for the Committee's public meeting during which that complaint was reviewed. KH initially responded to a series of questions posed by Ms. Jones, but became uncomfortable with the follow-up questions from Ms. Jones and elected to share this exchange with Board staff for purposes of opening a complaint. In her response to the complaint, Ms. Jones represented that she was respectful in pursuing her concerns, was simply curious about KH's possible involvement in matters that concern her, and asserted she acted ethically with her contact to KH.

KH was present for the review of the complaint; she indicated she did not have a statement to make at this time. She was asked to explain how she perceived the communications, and she described the guidance that she sought and received from her supervisors.

Ms. Jones was present for the review of the complaint and she made a statement indicating how her curiosity and observations led her to contact KH. She stated that she is not harassing anyone as she seeks answers to questions and concerns that impact her personally. She acknowledged that she sees how her intentions were misunderstood and she is willing to grow and learn from this experience, but she does not believe she acted unethically.

The Committee members posed a series of questions to Ms. Jones for purposes of understanding why she pursued this matter, and how she elected to follow the process she did. She was also asked to provide justification for her approach with KH, an RBT, as well as the ultimate goal of her actions. The Committee noted that it is the role of the Board and not that of any person to ascertain whether or not an individual under the Board's authority acted ethically. Ms. Jones stated that she received advice from an ethics consultant who guided her to seek the answers to her questions. She denied that her motivation was to seek any retaliation. The Committee asked Ms. Jones whether her communications align with the guidance supplied by the BACB Code of Ethical Conduct. Ms. Jones acknowledged this is a gray area, and that there could be more than one approach; additionally, she can see how her communications were misunderstood. However, she stated she does not understand how her requests warrant the scrutiny that she is under, and why it is that KH did not respond back to her to articulate any consternation. In response to a question, Ms. Jones affirmed she was aware that KH is an RBT prior to having contacted her. She explained that her curiosity concerned how it was that a person she does not know could have been the source of her original complaint; it was this curiosity that compelled her to contact KH.

MOTION: Dr. Stenhoff moved to meet in Executive Session for the purpose of receiving legal advice. Dr. Byra seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.

The Committee met in Executive Session from 11:02 a.m. to 11:23 a.m. Following a break, the Committee resumed the public session meeting at 11:35 a.m.

The deliberations reflected concerns with Ms. Jones' extensive and intensive efforts to extract information from KH, exacerbated by the fact that KH is an RBT and therefore there is an imbalance of power. It was noted that any person is allowed to attend a public meeting of the Committee and not be expected to have to justify their attendance. The Committee members reviewed the sections of the Ethical Code that may be germane to this matter. Concerns of abuse of power were discussed, and it was noted that it is inappropriate for any person to evaluate and judge the ethical conduct of another person. The Committee questioned Ms. Jones' motives for the conduct, noting that it demonstrates it extends beyond mere curiosity.

MOTION: Ms. Denton moved to meet in Executive Session for the purpose of receiving legal advice. Dr. Stenhoff seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.

The Committee met in Executive Session from 11:47 a.m. to 11:51 a.m.

Upon resuming the meeting in public session, the Committee paused the deliberation on this case and proceeded to the review of the next complaint.

B. Complaint No. 24-08, Jamie Jones, M.S.

Dr. Stenhoff summarized the complaint, stating that in August of 2023, Ms. Jones emailed Complainant JB, a licensed behavior analyst regarding an "ethical concern". In her email, Ms. Jones attached two documents: a non-disclosure agreement she prepared for JB to sign, and a document that contained various questions and demands for information regarding JB's personal and professional relationships with multiple individuals in the behavior analytic community. Additionally, Ms. Jones indicated she wished to meet with JB with a mediator present. Ms. Jones also demanded JB disclose whether she knew the identity of the anonymous complainant for complaint no. 23-31, making statements inferring that JB knew the complainant's identity and that she had insights into the Board's investigations. The document included a list of potential documentation that Ms. Jones postulated that JB may submit to remediate her unarticulated ethical conduct concerns to include the confidential employment files of various individuals. Dr. Stenhoff reported that Ms. Jones' demands compelled the attorney of the Arizona Association for Behavior Analysts (AzABA), as well as the attorney for JB's employer, to issue Cease and Desist letters to Ms. Jones. He also indicated that other behavior analysts received the same correspondence from Ms. Jones. In her response to the complaint, Ms. Jones stated that she believed her conduct was ethical, and she expressed concerns of dual relationships and conflicts of interest among the members of AzABA. She stated that her actions and communications were guided by the advice of an ethics expert with whom she consulted.

JB was present and made a statement to the Committee in which she described the receipt of the correspondence from Ms. Jones and how she perceived the content to be ambiguous, unreasonable, retaliatory, harassing, and consisting of threatening demands. She noted that she had to involve her company's legal counsel and human resources personnel who characterized the communication as outlandish. JB stated that it appears Ms. Jones believes AzABA is behind her dismissed complaint, and that this is unfounded.

Ms. Jones explained that her inquiry to JB and AzABA came from a place of compassionate curiosity. She explained that she was shocked to receive the notice of complaint and that she found the Cease and Desist letters to be unnecessary. She acknowledged that while she did not believe her intentions were nefarious, she can see they were misconstrued. Ms. Jones stated that JB should have contacted her directly in response to the communications to express her concerns, she is confused about the accuracy of guidance she received from the ethics consultant, and she is disheartened that her intentions were misunderstood. She requested the Committee dismiss the complaint.

The Committee questioned Ms. Jones as to why she did not reach out to JB with a less confrontational approach. She admitted that she understands why her conduct was perceived as concerning, but she equally believes that

her intentions and her actions were ethical. She was cautioned by the Committee that the ethical consultation she indicates that she sought was through a non-regulatory organization and therefore it does not appear to have been appropriate. Ms. Jones explained that she was trying to address her ethical concerns through appropriate channels, and she now feels as though she is being told she isn't allowed to have her concerns. She stated that she believes she was simply asking for an opening to discuss her concerns. Ms. Jones refuted that she was demanding information; rather, she was suggesting documentation be supplied for purposes of allaying her concerns.

The Committee questioned Ms. Jones as to why she took the actions she did as opposed to filing a complaint with the Board. Ms. Jones stated that her past experience established that her thinking does not align with those of the AzABA leaders, many of whom have played a role in her ABA journey. Ms. Jones was asked why she specifically suggested to the recipients of her communications that they resign from their roles, given her "compassionate curiosity". Ms. Jones stated that she perceived there to be conflicts of interest and dual relationships. The Committee observed that the actions appear to reflect Ms. Jones' own personal judgment. The Committee asked Ms. Jones to comment as to what she would do if someone demanded from her that she supply her company's personnel files; she responded that she would collaborate where possible and decline as necessary. The Committee noted this response is inconsistent with what she communicated to JB. Additionally, the Committee advised Ms. Jones that some of the statements she is making are inconsistent with those that are in the investigative record. It was also noted that Ms. Jones' actions amount to conducting her own investigation as opposed to approaching colleagues with concerns. The Committee asked Ms. Jones to explain the timing with which she took these actions. When asked what she might do differently, Ms. Jones stated she would have taken a more collaborative approach and scaled back on the volume of material she cited.

The Committee deliberated the case and in doing so identified instances where Ms. Jones' communications were not reflective of a collaborative engagement. The Committee noted where her conduct was contrary to the Ethical Code of Conduct, and that the impetus for Ms. Jones' conduct and communications appear to be retaliatory in nature. It was the consensus of the Committee to recommend the two complaints be adjudicated together. It was also noted that corrective action in the form of education is warranted; continuing education is not sufficient but coaching may be more effective.

MOTION: Ms. Denton moved to meet in Executive Session for the purpose of receiving legal advice. Dr. Raetz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.

The Committee met in Executive Session from 12:27 p.m. to 12:36 p.m. followed by a short break.

Upon resuming the meeting in public session, the Committee continued its deliberation.

MOTION: Dr. Stenhoff moved to recommend that with respect to complaints 24-07 and 24-08 the Board find Ms. Jones in violation of A.R.S. §32-2091(12)(o), engaging in activities as a behavior analyst that are unprofessional by current standards of practice as well as (dd), violating an ethical standard adopted by the Board at sections 1.02, 1.09, 1.10, and 1.13 of the BACB Code of Ethical Conduct. The motion included a recommendation that corrective action under probation be ordered to include executive coaching, completing 4 hours of continuing education in professional ethics, and completing 4 hours in multiple/exploitative relationships. Ms. Denton seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: The Committee discussed the purpose and necessity of probation to enforce the corrective action.

VOTE: The motion was approved 4-1.

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

A. Behavior Analyst Applications for Licensure

1. Katherine Seckinger, 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.

2. Grace Li, M.Ed.

The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that there are several instances of deficiencies with respect to her supervised experience. The Committee directed staff to issue a FAIR requesting the applicant provide clarification as to when her supervision occurred at Center for Autism & Related Disorders; provide clarification as to when supervisor Denise Rhine completed her BACB supervision training; submit verification of an additional 259 hours (approximately) of supervised experience that meet Arizona's requirements in A.A.C. R4-26-404.2 given that two supervisors are not licensed in Arizona and the hours acquired with them are therefore disqualified.

3. Madeleine Toland, 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.

4. Clarissa Jackson, M.S.*

The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that there are several instances of deficiencies with respect to her supervised experience. The Committee directed staff to issue a FAIR requesting the applicant clarify the roles of Kevin Kachadourian, Anne O'Brien, Anika O'Connor and Jennifer Martin by providing the names of each supervisor, the dates of supervision and the number of hours of supervision they each provided, and submit her monthly supervision verification logs.

5. Amy Ayala, M.A.

The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that there are several instances of deficiencies with respect to her supervised experience. The Committee directed staff to issue a FAIR requesting the applicant provide the names, dates and hours of supervision for all supervisors.

6. Lucia Margaret, 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.

7. Gabrielle Gutierrez, 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.

8. Amanda Ariza, 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. Jack Kelly, 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.

10. Dayren Hensen, M.S.

The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that there are several instances of deficiencies with respect to her supervised experience. The Committee directed staff to issue a FAIR requesting the applicant clarify his position, nature of work, and duties as a Supervising Clinician as he is not licensed as a behavior analyst in Arizona.

11. Jessica Crespo, M.Ed.

MOTION: Dr. Davey moved to meet in Executive Session for the purpose of receiving legal advice. Dr. Raetz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.

The Committee met in Executive Session from 2:19 p.m. to 2:25 p.m.

After resuming the meeting in public session, 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. Cathryn Swoger, M.Ed., 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 there are errors with her graduate date and the entry of her Graduate Advisor. Once the corrections are received, the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.

13. William Martin, M.Ed.

This application was forwarded to the Board for substantive review due to a lack of quorum of Committee members.

14. Emily Galindo, M.A.

The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.

15. Atanacio Gonzalez, M.S.

This application was forwarded to the Board for substantive review due to a lack of quorum of Committee members.

16. Aimee Luttinen, 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.

17. Luana Guardado, M.A.

The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that there are several instances of deficiencies with respect to her application. The Committee directed staff to issue a FAIR requesting the applicant provide clarification of her graduation date, provide clarification with regards to the seven individuals listed on the Final Experience Verification Form, and provide the dates of supervision and number of hours of each supervisor

18. Austin Yllander, 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. Tashai Mayberry, 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.

20. Carlos Sanchez, 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.

21. Ashley Begaye, 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.

22. Gabrielle King, 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 there is an error with her graduate date. Once the correction is received, the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.

23. Deanna Wilcox, 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 an error with the number of supervised experience hours recorded. Once the correction is received, the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.

24. Emily Fitzgerald, 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.

25. Christopher Albers, M.A.

This application was forwarded to the Board for substantive review due to a lack of quorum of Committee members.

26. Orchideh Christensen, 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.

27. Grace Henbest, 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 an error with the entry of her Graduate Advisor. Once the correction is received, the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.

28. Brendan Ferris, 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 he is required to clarify his current employment position. Once the correction is received, the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.

29. Karina Lee, 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 there are errors with her graduation date and the entry of her Graduate Advisor. Once the corrections are received, the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.

30. Amanda Sobus, M.Ed.

This application was forwarded to the Board for substantive review due to a lack of quorum of Committee members.

31. Alexandra Hernandez, 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 there are errors with her graduation date, the end date of her employment, and the entry of her Graduate Advisor. Once the corrections are received, the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.

32. Natasha Sandhu, M.S., 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.

33. Ashley Stuart, 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 there is an error with the number of supervised experience hours recorded. Once the correction is received, the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.

34. Mario Euceda-Cruz, M.A.

This application was forwarded to the Board for substantive review due to a lack of quorum of Committee members.

35. Andreina Ledesma, 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.

36. Kevin Ybarra, 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 there are errors with the entry of his Graduate Advisor. Once the correction is received, the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.

37. Ashley Holland, M.A.

This application was forwarded to the Board for substantive review due to a lack of quorum of Committee members.

38. Kara Clinkscales, 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.

39. Molly Rieper, M.A.

This application was forwarded to the Board for substantive review due to a lack of quorum of Committee members.

40. Sean Rockwell, 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 there are errors with the total hours of supervised experience recorded, and the entry of his Graduate Advisor. Once the corrections are received, the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.

41. Lorraine Kamper, 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.

MOTION: Dr. Raetz moved to forward the correct and complete applications to the Board with a recommendation for approval, to forward all applications for which clerical error corrections are received to the Board with a recommendation for approval, and to issue FAIR letters as reflected in the substantive review of the applications. Ms. Denton seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 3-0.

B. Behavior Analyst Applications for Licensure by Universal Recognition

1. Sian Price, 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.

MOTION: Ms. Denton moved to forward the application to the Board with a recommendation for approval. Dr. Raetz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 3-0.

- *First Formal Additional Information Request
- ** Second Formal Additional Information Request

8. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD REGARDING LICENSE REINSTATEMENT REQUEST SUBMITTED BY SKYARR SHURN, M.S.

Dr. Raetz summarized the content of the application file, noting it was complete (including the continuing education requirements) and that it complies with the Board's statutes and rules.

MOTION: Dr. Raetz moved to forward the reinstatement application to the Board with a recommendation for approval. Dr. Byra seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 3-0.

9. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING ELECTION OF 2024 COMMITTEE CHAIR

This item was tabled and will be included on the Committee's January 5, 2023 meeting agenda.

10. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RECENT UPDATES FROM THE BEHAVIOR ANALYST CERTIFICATION BOARD (BACB) TO INCLUDE FINALIZING ATTENDANCE AT THE REGULATOR TRAINING EVENT TO BE HELD MARCH 7, 2024 IN NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA

Ms. Paakkonen reminded the Committee that the deadline to register attendees for this meeting is approaching and that she will clarify with respect to who is attending. Ms. Denton indicated that she will attend the meeting as she also intends to participate in the conference that follows it. Ms. Paakkonen indicated she will complete the registration for the Arizona participants ahead of the deadline.

11. NEW AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

The Committee directed staff to invite the two California-based former supervisors for applicant Grace Li to a future meeting to address questions and to clarify the services they provided.

The Committee also requested an agenda item to discuss the frequency of errors made by applicants entering the names of their Masters degree advisor(s) in the Doctoral Degree Program section.

12. ADJOURN

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

VOTE: The motion was approved 3-0.

The meeting adjourned at 3:16 p.m.