



STATE OF ARIZONA
BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGIST EXAMINERS
1740 WEST ADAMS STREET, SUITE 2430
PHOENIX, AZ 85007
602.542.8162
psychboard.az.gov

KATIE HOBBS
Governor

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

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

April 4, 2025

Board Members

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

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 8:33 a.m.

2. ROLL CALL

The following Board members participated in the virtual meeting: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Stewart, Dr. Davey (departed the meeting at 1:30 p.m.), Dr. Flint, Dr. Sideman, and Dr. Stenhoff.

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, Zakiya Mallas, Licensing Specialist; and Krishna Poe, Projects 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 informed the Board that the third and final day of a hearing involving Jamie Jones, a behavior analyst, was held in late March. It is anticipated that the Board will receive and consider the recommended decision in this matter at their June meeting.

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

Mr. Dynar prompted the members for recusals and abstentions. Dr. Sideman announced he would abstain from the consideration and vote of items 6.C.1.a and 6.C.1.b due to educational relationships with the applicants.

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- March 7, 2025 Regular Session Minutes
- March 7, 2025 Executive 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) Heidi Lancaster, Psy.D.
 - b) Amanda Emmerson
 - c) Chrysalis Capielo Rosario, Ph.D.
- 2. Requesting Approval to Sit for EPPP & Licensure (A.R.S. §§ 32-2071, 2071.01 & 2072)**
 - a) Amy Gencarelli, Ph.D.
 - b) Shaunta Hemingway, Ph.D.
 - c) Allison Fairchild, Ph.D.
 - d) Rosalba Mada, Ph.D.
 - e) Kelzie Beebe, Ph.D.
 - f) Ashley Salwei, Psy.D.
 - g) Kerry Guest, Ph.D.
- 3. Requesting Approval of Supervised Experience for Licensure (A.R.S. §§ 32-2071, 2071.01 & 2072)**
 - a) *None in this category*
- 4. Requesting Approval for Licensure by Waiver (A.R.S. §§ 32-2071, 2071.01 & 2072)**
 - a) Kimberly Saelee, Psy.D.
 - b) Courtney Kwan, Ph.D.
- 5. Requesting Approval for Supervised Temporary License w/ EPPP (A.R.S. § 32-2073)**
 - a) *None in this category*
- 6. Requesting Approval for Licensure by Credential (A.R.S. § 32-2071.01)**
 - a) Jennifer Waltman, Psy.D.
 - b) Lisa Riggs, Psy.D.
 - c) Heidi Sauder, Ph.D.
 - d) Valerie Gifford, Ph.D.
 - e) Tara Victor, Ph.D.

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

- a) Amber Marcucci, Psy.D.
- b) Ursula Myers, Ph.D.
- c) Bluma Ekshtut, Psy.D.
- d) Christina Brown, Ph.D.

8. Requesting approval for Telehealth Registry (A.R.S. § 36-3606)

- a) Robert Lusson, Psy.D.

D. DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING BEHAVIOR ANALYST APPLICATIONS

- 1. Matthew Hughes, M.A.
- 2. Alexandria Ririe, M.A.
- 3. Brandy Mamo, M.A.
- 4. Jessica Simpson, M.S.W.
- 5. Paula Maganong, M.A.
- 6. Larsen Angus, M.S.
- 7. Bonnie Fortier, M.A.
- 8. Emily Gunderson, M.A.
- 9. Kelsey Kuniej, M.S.W.
- 10. Abby Palmer, M.A.
- 11. Simon Aspinall, M.A.
- 12. Jazmine West, M.A.
- 13. Elise Evans, M.S.
- 14. Robyn Prestin, M.S.
- 15. Olivia Myers, M.A.
- 16. Nicole Sorenson, M.A.
- 17. Sara Scott, M.A.
- 18. Chelsey Scally, M.A.
- 19. Esmeralda Galvan, M.A.
- 20. Jeana Simmons, M.A.
- 21. Alicia Olivas, M.A.
- 22. Talia DeBrigida, M.S.
- 23. Chloe Meyers, M.A.

E. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RETAKE REQUEST SUBMITTED BY VANESSA SMITH, PH.D. SUPERVISED TEMPORARY LICENSE NO. PSY-T-000066

F. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REQUEST TO RELINQUISH TELEHEALTH REGISTRY AUTHORIZATION:

- 1. Susan Palmer-Ansorg, Ph.D.; PSY-TR-0012
- 2. Natalie Ramirez; BEH-TR-0008

G. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING TELEHEALTH REGISTRY ANNUAL REPORT AND UPDATE:

- 1. Megan Hollister; BEH-TR-0001
- 2. Jo Shaw, Ph.D., PSY-TR-0002
- 3. Shannon Hackett, Ph.D., PSY-TR-0013

H. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REACTIVATION REQUEST SUBMITTED BY JOHN WYMA, PH.D.

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

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

THE FOLLOWING AGENDA ITEMS ARE UNTIMED AND MAY BE DISCUSSED AND DECIDED UPON AT VARIOUS TIMES THROUGHOUT THE MEETING AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIR

7. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING UPDATE TO THE BOARD FROM THE ARIZONA PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION (AzPA)

Jennifer Mandigo, Psy.D., liaison between the Arizona Psychological Association (AzPA) and the Board, was welcomed to share and discuss AzPA's efforts to address key issues relevant to psychologists in Arizona. She noted that AzPA aims to maintain a strong relationship with the Board through provision of regular updates. Dr. Mandigo shared that AzPA has been compiling a list of recurring concerns raised in Board disciplinary actions and complaints concerning psychologists. She reminded the Board this includes an initiative to develop practice standards and guidelines for issuing Emotional Support Animal (ESA) letters and addressing psychologist well-being. She reported that AzPA is recognizing the increasing stress and mental health challenges faced by psychologists, particularly since the pandemic, and accordingly is forming a group to design training and support systems. There was discussion around the potential for collaboration between AzPA's well-being initiatives and the Board's existing RAMP (Rehabilitation Assistance Program for Mental Health Professionals) program. Board members expressed their appreciation for Dr. Mandigo's work and AzPA's efforts to address these important issues through the collaborative relationship between the Board and AzPA, with a focus on improving professional practices and supporting the well-being of psychologists in Arizona.

8. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REQUEST FOR NOMINATION OF RAMONA MELLOTT, PH.D., AS A CANDIDATE FOR THE PRESIDENT-ELECT POSITION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF STATE AND PROVINCIAL PSYCHOLOGY BOARDS

Ms. Paakkonen informed the Board that the purpose of this agenda item is to consider submitting a nomination of Dr. Ramona Mellott for the President-elect position on the board of the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB). Dr. Mellott, a former Arizona Board member currently serving on the ASPPB Board of Directors, was present and requested that the Arizona Board formally nominate her to run as a candidate for the ASPPB President-elect position. She explained ASPPB requires a jurisdiction to submit a nomination for officer elections.

Dr. Mellott expressed her gratitude to the Board for their support of her pursuit of ASPPB leadership roles and acknowledging the work of the Board members. She also mentioned her past and present connections with several Board members. Board members expressed overwhelming support for Dr. Mellott's nomination, praising her experience, contributions to the field of psychology, and leadership qualities. Several members highlighted her work on the EPPP (Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology) and her advocacy for early entry for postdoctoral program participants.

MOTION: Mr. Dynar moved for the Board to formally nominate Dr. Mellott to be slated as a candidate for the ASPPB President-elect position on its Board of Directors.

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

9. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING NICOLE MIRKIN'S INTERIM CONSENT AGREEMENT AND ORDER FOR VOLUNTARY SUSPENSION OF LICENSE FOR CASE NO. 25-14

Mr. Dynar announced the agenda item and proposed the following motion.

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

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Stewart, Dr. Davey, 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 9:09 a.m.

Upon resuming the meeting in public session, the Board acknowledged having very recently received new information related to this case that requires investigation and obtaining a response from the licensee. Dr. Mirkin and her attorney, Andrew Turk, were allowed an opportunity to make a brief statement during which Mr. Turk acknowledged his client has been dealing with issues stemming from a violent relationship which she coped with inappropriately and which led to serious consequences, including the loss of her primary income source and public disclosure of personal details. On behalf of his client Mr. Turk requested Dr. Mirkin's license be reinstated on a probationary basis, citing her progress in treatment and improved well-being and compliance with the Board's directives. With respect to her license suspension, Mr. Turk explained Dr. Mirkin had recently requested evaluation referrals from the Department of Child Safety (DCS) in anticipation of potential reinstatement of her license, but later returned them. Mr. Turk emphasized that Dr. Mirkin did not perform any work on these cases and did not violate the terms of her suspension.

Board discussion reflected concern about Dr. Mirkin's alleged actions with respect to requesting assignment related information while still under suspension, even if no services were ultimately performed. Mr. Turk summarized the timeline of events and reiterated that Dr. Mirkin did not violate the terms of her suspension. The Board acknowledged Mr. Turk's statements, but reiterated that the information regarding the DCS referrals was related to a separate matter and could not be considered in the context of the current request for reinstatement.

MOTION: Dr. Stewart moved for the Board to table this matter in light of the new information received until adequate investigation can be conducted.

SECOND: Dr. Sideman.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Stewart, Dr. Davey, 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 APPLICANT JODI TICHI'S EXAMINATION RETAKE REQUEST WITH ACCOMMODATIONS AND REVIEW OF HER SELF REPORT FOR CRIMINAL CHARGES

Dr. Medina summarized the matter noting that Dr. Tichi has applied to retake the EPPP exam, having failed three times previously. She also noted that Dr. Tichi self-reported an altercation with a family member leading to misdemeanor criminal charges including domestic violence, disorderly conduct, and hit-and-run. Dr. Tichi was present and addressed the Board, explaining that she had not utilized accommodations during her previous examination attempts, despite having had them in graduate school, and believed this significantly impacted her performance. She also described changes to her study methods, including using different study materials and working with a coach. She expressed remorse for her actions that culminated in the criminal charges and reported being in therapy to address the underlying issue. She cited personal stressors as contributing factors but

acknowledged they did not excuse her behavior. Dr. Tichi noted her court date is approaching, and there is a possibility of a diversion program.

MOTION: Dr. Medina moved for the Board to approve Dr. Tichi to retake the examination with the accommodations previously approved.

SECOND: Mr. Dynar.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

The Board acknowledged Dr. Tichi's proactive self-reporting and directed that she continue keeping staff informed of developments in her case.

MOTION: Dr. Medina moved for the Board to table any action on the self-report until there is an outcome with respect to the criminal proceedings.

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

11. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATING TO INITIAL CASE REVIEW OF COMPLAINT NO. 25-17 AGAINST BETHANY YOUNG, PH.D.

Mr. Dynar provided a summary of the Dr. Bethany Young related to her involvement in issuing Emotional Support Animal (ESA) recommendation letters. He noted the complaint was filed by an individual who raises awareness about issues related to ESA letters and it focused on Dr. Young's former contract with American Service Pets, a website operated by Greater Guide, Inc. This website facilitates ESA letter issuance based on answers to a brief online questionnaire. Mr. Dynar explained Dr. Young contracted with Greater Guide, Inc., and issued ESA letters through their website. He stated that the Complaint Screening Committee review revealed she had completed approximately 2,000 ESA evaluations in a two-year period, and estimated that about 50% of applicants did not qualify for the letters. Mr. Dynar advised that the CSC recommended the Board issue a non-disciplinary Letter of Concern, citing statutes related to engaging in activities not congruent with professional education, training, and experience, and potential violations of ethical standards, specifically concerning professional judgments, assessments, and interpreting assessment results.

Dr. Young was present with her attorney, Randall Nice, and acknowledged the concerns and stated that she would not work with similar companies in the future. She indicated she is committed to seeking relevant training, mentorship, and supervision before resuming conducting ESA evaluations. She also emphasized her intention to conduct more thorough evaluations in the future, including clinical interviews and screening.

Board discussion reflected concerns about the high volume of ESA support letters issued by Dr. Young. The members discussed the lack of clear guidance on conducting ESA evaluations and the potential for exploitation of psychologists by companies offering these services. The Board acknowledged Dr. Young's good intentions in trying to increase access to services, but stressed the importance of ethical and thorough evaluations. The Board also addressed the need for regulatory action against companies like Greater Guide, Inc.

MOTION: Dr. Stewart moved for the Board to issue to Dr. Young a non-disciplinary Letter of Concern, citing the applicable Arizona statutes and sections of the APA ethical code.

SECOND: Dr. Sideman.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

12. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON BEHAVIOR ANALYSTS TO REFER TO THE BEHAVIOR ANALYST CERTIFICATION BOARD INFORMATION CONCERNING THE FOLLOWING BCBAs:

a. Shravya Sanagala

Dr. Davey advised the Board that he recommends tabling this item to allow staff opportunity to gather additional information and, once obtained, for the Committee on Behavior Analysts (Committee) to reconsider this matter.

MOTION: Mr. Davey moved for the Board to table any action on this matter in order for communications issued by the former supervisee of Ms. Sanagala to be submitted and re-presented to the Committee

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

b. Taylor Heinsohn

Dr. Stenhoff summarized this matter noting that the Committee reviewed Shauna Paul's licensure application on January 31, 2025 and observed Ms. Paul had requested her former supervisor, Taylor Heinson, submit verification of her supervised experience in support of that application, but Ms. Heinson failed to respond to that request. He explained Ms. Heinson was licensed and supervised Ms. Paul in Hawaii, but is not licensed in Arizona. Dr. Stenhoff noted that in accordance with Board rule, the Committee accepted the required documentation from the applicant in order to allow Ms. Paul's application to proceed with a licensure recommendation to the Board. Dr. Stenhoff stated that in cases where a supervisor fails or refuses to submit supervision verification and is outside the Board's jurisdiction, the precedent is to refer the matter to the Behavior Analyst Certification Board (BACB) for investigation into potential violations of the Ethics Code.

MOTION: Dr. Stenhoff moved for the Board to refer the matter to the BACB, as recommended by the Committee.

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

13. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING FY2025 EXECUTIVE BUDGET RECOMMENDATION & PROPOSED LEGISLATION INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO: HB2027, HB2061, HB2173, HB2276, HB2351, HB2441, HB2451, HB2632, HB2707, SB1037, SB1125, SB1235, SB1243, SB1372, SB1447, SB1527 AND SB1587

Ms. Paakkonen provided an oral summary of the impact of select bills that are on the current legislative session tracking list, and supplied an analysis of how the bills will impact the Board and the licensees it regulates. She noted that HB2027 will not be heard in the Arizona State Senate, meaning the bill is effectively dead. She indicated HB2173 was signed by Governor Katie Hobbs which will require edits to be made to at least one of the questions posed on both initial and licensure renewal applications specific to mental health diagnosis and treatment.

The Board held a focused discussion on SB1235 which has undergone several amendments, with the most recent one reverting to the status quo with respect to the composition of the Board. Ms. Paakkonen explained the remaining provisions of the bill include creation of a new council comprised of rotating board Executive Directors to hear appeals from licensees who believe board disciplinary actions were "market restrictive." Additionally, there are requirements for boards to collect and submit an extensive list of data and documents to facilitate the

creation of overarching health professions regulatory statutes. Finally, she noted, the bill proposes provisions aimed at streamlining the process for boards to acquire new board members.

The Board discussed whether to take an official position on the bill, given that additional amendments could drastically alter the bill, rendering any current position obsolete.

MOTION: Dr. Davey moved for the Board to register a neutral position on SB1235, and to rescind that position if it is further amended.

SECOND: Dr. Medina.

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

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

14. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REPORT-OUT FROM THE APRIL 3, 2025 ASPPB INTEGRATED EPPP VIRTUAL TOWN HALL MEETING

Dr. Medina provided a summary of the discussion regarding the town hall meeting hosted by the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) on the state of development of the integrated Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP). She reminded the Board that ASPPB is moving towards a single, integrated EPPP exam that assesses both knowledge and skills, rather than the previously planned two-part test. The town hall meeting presented an overview of the structure of the new exam which will consist of three levels: content domains, assessment of competencies, and knowledge and skills within a competence. Dr. Medina noted the discussion emphasized the EPPP's role in ensuring that individuals entering the profession have the necessary foundational knowledge, especially given the existence of unaccredited psychology programs. She commented that information on the length and cost of the new exam is still under development, but it is expected to be longer than the current exam and the fee may change from that charged currently given that the costs associated with developing and administering an examination is a complex and expensive process. Dr. Medina noted ASPPB confirmed that practice examinations and other resources will continue to be available for candidates preparing for the reimagined exam.

The Board discussed the implications of exam requirements for license mobility and portability across jurisdictions. The discussion briefly touched on the broader issue of licensing individuals at the master's level and its potential impact on the practice of psychology. It was the consensus of the Board to continue to maintain awareness of and to engage with this effort.

15. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING ASPPB POTENTIAL REGULATORY IMPLICATIONS OF LICENSING MASTERS TRAINED INDIVIDUALS TASK FORCE (PRI-LM) REPORT

Ms. Paakkonen introduced to the Board the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards' (ASPPB) model for licensing master's-level individuals in psychology. She explained this consists of a model set of statutes and rules/regulations for jurisdictions to consider when addressing the licensing of individuals with master's degrees in psychology. She further noted the model addresses program eligibility, supervised experience requirements, and the appropriate examination (potentially a master's-level specific EPPP).

The Board discussion recognized the need to approach this issue thoughtfully and strategically while maintaining its responsibility and commitment to protect the public. There was acknowledgement of the controversy surrounding the accreditation of master's-level programs in psychology. The discussion also reflected that while Arizona does not currently authorize master's-level practice and there is growing pressure to do so, however the ASPPB model provides a framework for creating this new type of practice authorization and licensure. It was the consensus of the Board to "take ownership" of this issue and develop a plan for moving forward, recognizing the importance of stakeholder involvement, particularly from psychology associations and academic programs and training programs. There was discussion about the timeline for implementation, suggesting 2027 as a more realistic target than 2026.

MOTION: Dr. Stewart moved the Board to direct Ms. Paakkonen to develop and propose a preliminary implementation timeline and draft a plan to explore moving forward with this potential initiative.

SECOND: Mr. Dynar.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

16. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING PSYCHOLOGIST UNIVERSAL RECOGNITION APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY JOHN BRADFORD, PSY.D., AND POSSIBLE DENIAL OF THE SAME

Dr. Sideman advised the Board that the Application Review Committee (ARC), when reviewing Dr. Bradford's application, noted some deficiencies and discrepancies. He noted Dr. Bradford holds an active license in California since 2005 and previously held licenses in Georgia and Arizona. He stated that Dr. Bradford submitted a bank deposit account balance summary as proof of Arizona residency, however, the account was for a business entity (Psychogenic, LLC) and not a residential account. Dr. Sideman explained Board staff could not find a business with that name in the Arizona Corporation Commission's records, and that a residential property address in Scottsdale provided by Dr. Bradford was found to be owned by someone else, according to the county assessor. Dr. Sideman called to the Board's attention Dr. Bradford's communication to Board staff that he was renting a room in Scottsdale from AB, an Arizona licensed psychologist, while awaiting licensure. However, when contacted by Board staff AB stated that he did not know Dr. Bradford and that Dr. Bradford had not been a tenant.

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

SECOND: Dr. Sideman.

VOTE: The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Dynar, Dr. Medina, Dr. Stewart, Dr. Davey, 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 12:56 p.m. to 1:01 p.m.

Upon resuming the meeting in public session, the Board discussion identified potential violations of Arizona statutes related to making fraudulent or untrue statements; using fraud, misrepresentation, or deception to obtain a license; and violating ethical standards, specifically regarding false or deceptive statements.

MOTION: Dr. Flint moved for the Board to deny Dr. Bradford's application based on the facts set forth in the investigative file and as reflected in the Board's discussion.

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mr. Dynar - yes

Dr. Medina - yes

Dr. Stewart - yes

Dr. Davey - yes

Dr. Flint - yes

Dr. Sideman - yes

Dr. Stenhoff - yes

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

MOTION PASSED.

17. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING FAILURE ON THE PART OF THE FOLLOWING TELEHEALTH AUTHORIZATION HOLDER TO SUBMIT ANNUAL UPDATE AND REPORT PURSUANT TO A.R.S. §36-3606(A)(9)

- a. **Pamela Singer, Psy.D. - PSY-TR-0006**
- b. **Ann-Marie Arabian, Ph.D. - PSY-TR-0008**
- c. **Stephen Smith, Psy.D. - PSY-TR-0009**
- d. **Chaya Kobernick, Psy.D. - PSY-TR-0010**
- e. **Picolya Robinson, Psy.D. - PSY-TR-0011**

Ms. Paakkonen explained that an internal staff audit revealed that five Telehealth Registry psychologists had not submitted their statutorily required annual update and client contact report within one year of their telehealth registration issuance. She noted that in all cases the authorization holders had affirmed in writing they would comply with the requirement, and were reminded of the requirement in their authorization approval letter. She also stated that none of the five psychologists have contacted the Board to explain their failure to submit the update and report.

The Board discussion referenced precedent to guide its decision, noting that a complaint was previously opened against a behavior analyst for failing to submit the update and report. Board members discussed whether to send a reminder, open a complaint, or take no action. The discussion reflected the fact that the responsibility to comply with statutory requirements rests entirely with the authorization holders and that issuing a reminder was not the Board's obligation. Concerns were raised about the potential for unauthorized telehealth practice if the reports are not submitted. The Board also acknowledged the statutory shortcomings and challenges in applying the telehealth regulations.

MOTION: Dr. Stewart moved for the Board to open investigations on each of the 5 psychologists who failed to submit the annual update and report.

SECOND: Mr. Dynar.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

The Board also discussed the need to place on a future meeting a more comprehensive discussion about the telehealth registry and its associated challenges including the Board's procedures and policies, given the regulatory challenges that are emerging.

18. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING PSYCHOLOGIST APPLICATIONS

- a. **Martha Patricia Liimatainen, Psy.D., Reapplication for Exam & Licensure**

Dr. Flint advised the Board that Dr. Liimatainen was found by the Application Review Committee to be administratively and substantively complete, and that she is requesting with her application to retake the EPPP for the seventh time. She noted the ARC review identified concerns due to the number of previous attempts and raised questions about the validity of the existing accommodation letter from the applicant's healthcare provider as it is several years old. ARC also noted that the current study plan was very similar to one submitted previously. Dr. Liimatainen was present for the review of her application and explained that her previous attempts were hindered by personal circumstances including her pregnancy. She stated that she had been working with a coach and implementing test-taking strategies to manage her anxiety which she believes to be a major factor in her difficulty with the exam, and that her scores are improving. She also noted she initially hadn't requested accommodations for this retake, believing she could manage without them. Board members encouraged Dr. Liimatainen to avail herself of the accommodations to which she is entitled as they appeared to have been beneficial in the past.

MOTION: Dr. Flint moved for the Board to approve Dr. Liimatainen's reapplication to retake the EPPP with accommodations contingent on her providing an updated recommendation from her healthcare provider supporting the need for these accommodations. Once received Board staff is authorized to implement the accommodations.

SECOND: Dr. Stewart.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

b. Weare Zwemer, Ph.D., NRHSP, Application for Licensure by Credential

Dr. Flint advised the Board that Dr. Zwemer's application was found by ARC to be administratively and substantively complete, but it was noted that Dr. Zwemer has been the subject of four previous lawsuits related to forensic work, none of which led to any adverse actions. Dr. Flint explained ARC determined it was necessary for the Board to review the application given the number of lawsuits, however, ARC also acknowledged that such suits are not uncommon in forensic work and wanted to ensure no Board members had concerns. Board discussion reflected no concerns about granting licensure by credential to Dr. Zwemer.

MOTION: Dr. Stewart moved the Board to approve Dr. Zwemer 's application for licensure.

SECOND: Dr. Sideman.

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

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

MOTION PASSED.

19. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE COMMITTEE ON BEHAVIOR ANALYSTS RECOMMENDATION TO DENY THE TELEHEALTH REGISTRY APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY RAEGAN GOULD, BCBA

Dr. Stenhoff summarized the matter, noting that during its substantive review of Ms. Gould's application, the Committee found several deficiencies including lack of proof of professional licensure in any US jurisdiction, an Arizona address provided instead of the actual California address where she resides, an email address supplied that did not belong to the applicant, and indications the application was delegated to someone else. Additionally, Dr. Stenhoff commented the file contains a statement from the applicant suggesting her national certification issued by the BACB allows her to practice in any state.

Ms. Gould was present for the review of her application and, contrary to her previous assertion that she alone submitted her application, stated that she collaborated with a representative from Ideal Services (a credentialing company) for assistance with the application, particularly regarding which addresses and contact information to use. She claimed the application content comprised misunderstandings on her part and offered to submit a new application with correct information. She also clarified her statement about her intent to provide supervision into Arizona, stating she was referring to supervision of technicians in client cases, not supervision for purposes of qualifying for BCBA certification.

MOTION: Dr. Stenhoff 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. Stewart, Dr. Davey, 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 10:46 a.m. to 10:05 a.m.

Upon resuming the meeting in public session, Board members raised concerns about the accuracy and completeness of the application content, Ms. Gould's understanding of Arizona's statutes, and the implications of the misrepresentations in the application. The Board deliberated whether to deny Ms. Gould's application or allow her to withdraw it, noting that denial would have consequences for future applications and reporting requirements.

MOTION: Dr. Stewart moved for the Board to deny Ms. Gould's application citing her false representations and inaccuracies, lack of understanding of the statutory requirements and restrictions of the telehealth registry, and failure to meet the requirements of the practice authorization to which she applied.

SECOND: Dr. Davey.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mr. Dynar - yes

Dr. Medina - yes

Dr. Stewart - yes

Dr. Davey - yes

Dr. Flint - yes

Dr. Sideman - yes

Dr. Stenhoff - yes

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

MOTION PASSED.

20. NEW AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

As previously noted, a future meeting agenda will accommodate a discussion of the telehealth registry and its regulatory implications and challenges.

21. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Dynar announced the adjournment of the meeting at 2:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Melissa Flint Psy.D., FT, CTP, CGP

Melissa Flint, Psy.D.,
Secretary