1. CALL TO ORDER

The regular session of the Arizona State Board of Psychologist Examiners was called to order by Chairman Bohanske at 8:34 a.m. on August 1, 2014. One Executive Session was held.

2. ROLL CALL

**Board Members Present**
- Bob Bohanske, Ph.D., Chair
- John P. DiBacco, Ph.D., Vice-Chair
- Paul Beljan, Psy.D., ABPdN, ABN
- Janice K. Brundage, Ph.D.
- Ramona Mellott, Ph.D.
- Rob Robichaud
- Tamara Shreeve, MPA
- Frederick S. Wechsler, Ph.D., Psy.D., ABPP

**Staff Present**
- Dr. Cindy Olvey, Executive Director
- Lynanne Chapman, Deputy Director
- Heather Duracinski, Licensing Coordinator
- Jeanne Galvin, Esq.

**Board Members Absent**
- Joseph C. Donaldson

3. REMARKS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

**CE Documentation** – Dr. Bohanske announced that licensees could receive CE credits in Ethics for attendance at Board meetings and explained how to obtain credit.

**Board Assessment Forms** – Dr. Bohanske encouraged members of the audience to complete a Board Meeting Assessment Survey and place them in the survey box.

**Remarks, Board Member and Staff Appreciation** – Dr. Bohanske thanked Board members and Staff for their dedication and hard work. Dr. Bohanske presented Notice of Appointment certificates to Dr. Brundage, Ms. Shreeve, and Dr. Wechsler.
4. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Dr. Bohanske invited the public to address the Board at this time.

Mathilda Canter, Ph.D. requested to speak and introduced herself as the Arizona Psychological Association (AzPA) Liaison to the Board. Dr. Canter reported that Dr. Jeff Thomas will be addressing the Board during the afternoon portion of the Board meeting regarding scope of practice and prescriptive authority for psychologists in Arizona.

5. COUNSEL REPORT

Ms. Galvin reported that an Evidentiary Hearing for the appeal filed by Anthony Luick, Ph.D., was heard on May 21, 2014, in Pima County Superior Court. Ms. Galvin stated that a briefing schedule has been set and that she will file the Board’s Answering Brief as required. Ms. Galvin stated that she will keep the Board apprised as the appeal moves through the process.

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

Mr. Robichaud made a motion, seconded by Dr. Brundage, to approve the following items on the Consent Agenda. Dr. Mellott abstained from the June 6, 2014 & July 11, 2014, Regular Session Minutes. The motion carried 8-0.

(a) APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   - June 6, 2014, Regular Session Minutes (Dr. Mellott abstained)
   - July 11, 2014, Regular Session Minutes (Dr. Mellott abstained)

(b) DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING PSYCHOLOGY APPLICATIONS

   i. REQUESTING APPROVAL FOR EXAM AND LICENSURE
      - Andrea Montoya, Ph.D.
      - Ashley Shenberger, Psy.D.
      - Jacob Boney, Psy.D.
      - Nicole Robello, Psy.D.
      - Ron Glazier, Ph.D.
      - Tiffany Meites, Ph.D.
      - Tyler Barratt, Ph.D.

   ii. REQUESTING APPROVAL FOR LICENSURE BY WAIVER
      - Lauren Canniff, Psy.D.
      - Tara Noecker, Ph.D.

   iii. REQUESTING APPROVAL FOR LICENSURE BY CREDENTIAL
      - Brenda Vidal, Psy.D.
      - Lesley Donnelly, Ed.D.

(c) DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING BEHAVIOR ANALYST APPLICATIONS

   - Brittani Harris, M.Ed.
   - Christina Carlson, M.Ed.
   - Pamela Lozada, M.Ed.
   - Sarah Duarte, M.Ed.

(d) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

(e) INVESTIGATIONS REPORT
(f) LICENSING REPORT

(g) DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REQUEST TO WITHDRAW APPLICATION FROM VALERIE GOLD-NEIL, ED.D.

7) DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATING TO CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED FROM MICHAEL J. COHN, ED.D. REQUESTING A CONTINUANCE FOR AGENDA ITEM PERTAINING TO SIGNED CONSENT AGREEMENT FOR SURRENDER OF PSYCHOLOGIST LICENSE

Dr. Cohn was present telephonically and withdrew his request for a continuance; therefore the Board did not hear this agenda item.

8) DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATING TO CASE NO. 13-10 INVOLVING MICHAEL J. COHN, ED.D. AND THE BOARD'S ACCEPTANCE OF HIS SIGNED CONSENT AGREEMENT FOR SURRENDER OF PSYCHOLOGIST LICENSE, POSSIBLE INFORMATION FROM DR. COHN, AND POSSIBLE RECONSIDERATION OF THE VOLUNTARY SURRENDER

Ms. Chapman provided a summary to the Board stating that at the July 11, 2014, Board meeting the Board voted to accept Dr. Cohn’s voluntary surrender of his license. Subsequent to the Board meeting, the Board office received correspondence from Dr. Cohn indicating that he was unable to participate in the July 11, 2014, meeting and requested that the Board hear the matter of voluntary surrender of his license at a future meeting at which he can be present.

Dr. Cohn was present telephonically, requested to speak, made a statement and answered Board members’ questions. Dr. Cohn provided a summary of events that have taken place prior to and during his incarceration. Dr. Cohn stated that he is not opposed to voluntary surrender of his license. Board members asked Dr. Cohn if he is requesting ADA accommodations. Dr. Cohn said he is not requesting ADA accommodations. Board members asked if Dr. Cohn is competent to enter into the Consent Agreement for voluntary surrender of his license. Dr. Cohn confirmed that he is competent to enter into the Consent Agreement for voluntary surrender of his license.

No action was taken on this agenda item as the Consent Agreement for voluntary surrender was previously accepted by the Board and Dr. Cohn.

9) DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED FROM SUSAN PROEBSTING, PH.D. REQUESTING RELEASE FROM HER NON-DISCIPLINARY CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ms. Duracinski provided a summary stating that the Board office received correspondence from Dr. Proebsting requesting early release from her Non-Disciplinary Consent Agreement. Ms. Duracinski stated that Dr. Proebsting is requesting release from the Consent Agreement with completion of 19 of the 20 required supervision hours. Dr. Proebsting has completed all other terms of the Consent Agreement.

Dr. Proebsting was present telephonically, requested to speak and made a statement. Board members deliberated. Some Board members expressed concern about releasing Dr. Proebsting from the Non-Disciplinary Consent Agreement without completing all of the 20 supervised hours. Dr. Proebsting clarified that her short-term employment ended and she would need to find a setting in which she could work under supervision for the final one hour. Some Board members indicated that the 20 hours of supervision contained in the Non-Disciplinary Consent Agreement is not a statutory requirement and that Dr. Proebsting fulfilled the spirit of the Non-Disciplinary Consent Agreement. After deliberation, Dr. Mellott made a motion, seconded by Dr. Brundage, to release Dr. Proebsting from the Non-Disciplinary Consent Agreement and to find her in full compliance of the terms of the Non-Disciplinary Consent Agreement. The motion carried 6-2 on a roll call vote with Drs. Beljan and Wechsler voting no.
10) DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATING TO APPLICATIONS FOR LICENSURE INCLUDING POSSIBLE DENIAL OF THE SAME

a.) Jamie Kobsar, Ph.D.

Dr. Wechsler provided a summary to the Board stating that the Application Review Committee (Committee) reviewed Dr. Kobsar’s application and requested additional information pertaining to Dr. Kobsar’s preinternship experience and residency. Dr. Wechsler stated that the Committee determined that Dr. Kobsar was not an employee during his preinternship experience and that Dr. Kobsar met the residency requirement pursuant to A.R.S. §32-2071(K). Dr. Wechsler stated that the Committee forwarded Dr. Kobsar’s application to the full Board for further review of his supervision during his preinternship experience. Specifically, a licensed psychologist did not always provide 75% of Dr. Kobsar’s individual face-to-face supervision on a weekly basis but did provide 75% of the individual face-to-face supervision overall throughout the entire preinternship experience. Dr. Wechsler stated that during the weeks in which Dr. Kobsar received 50% individual face-to-face supervision by a licensed psychologist the additional 50% of the individual face-to-face supervision was by a licensed mental health provider.

Dr. Kobsar was present, requested to speak, made a statement and answered Board members’ questions. Board members deliberated and discussed the historical interpretation of contemporaneous supervision. Board members determined that there were no weeks in which Dr. Kobsar received 100% individual face-to-face supervision by a licensed mental health provider. Board members directed Board staff to work with Dr. Kobsar regarding his preinternship hours in order to identify the number of hours of supervised experience that would count toward licensure if the Board allows the 75% of supervision per week versus for the overall experience. Findings will be presented to the Board at a future meeting for review.

b.) John Hope, Ph.D.

Dr. Wechsler provided a summary stating that the Board previously tabled this application to request that Dr. Hope attend the meeting in which his application is reviewed. Dr. Wechsler stated that the Board’s concerns included, but were not limited to, the following:

- University is not regionally accredited
- Most of his course work was at the masters level
- Internship and postdoctoral experience is reported to have occurred simultaneously
- Did not complete a residency
- Transcript does not reflect whether his doctoral program was in clinical or counseling psychology
- May have misrepresented on his application that his doctoral program was accredited by the American Psychological Association

Dr. Hope was not present. Board members deliberated and it was the consensus of the Board to table this item to request Dr. Hope’s presence at a future meeting in which his application will be reviewed. The Board directed Board staff to send Dr. Hope’s notice by regular and certified mail.

11) DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING INITIAL CASE REVIEWS OF THE FOLLOWING INVESTIGATIONS

(a) RFI 13-25 Kimberly Wright, Ph.D.
Dr. Beljan and Wechsler recused from this case. Dr. Brundage provided a summary to the Board stating that the Complaint Screening Committee forwarded this case to the full Board for further review of a possible violation of A.R.S. §32-2061(15)(dd) as it pertains to the American Psychological Association Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct Standard 3.05, Multiple Relationships. Dr. Brundage stated that the Complainant in this case alleges that Dr. Wright entered into a dual and/or dating relationship with a patient, T.A., within two years after cessation of treatment.

The Complainant was not present. Dr. Wright and her legal counsel, Larry Cohen, were present, requested to speak, made statements and answered Board members’ questions. Mr. Cohen stated that Dr. Wright did not have a therapeutic relationship with T.A. therefore a multiple relationship did not occur. Mr. Cohen stated that Dr. Wright has taken continuing education and has started consulting with a peer. Board members asked Dr. Wright to elaborate on her initial intake of T.A. and a timeline of events. Dr. Wright responded.

Board members deliberated and expressed concern that Dr. Wright started the intake process with T.A., then subsequently appears to have entered into a forensic collaborative business relationship with T.A. Additionally, Dr. Wright indicated that there was boundary crossing but she maintains that there was no boundary violation in this case. After deliberation, Dr. DiBacco made a motion, seconded by Dr. Mellott, to move this case to an Informal Interview for possible violations of A.R.S. §32-2061(15)(o) for possibly providing services that are unnecessary or unsafe or otherwise engaging in activities as a psychologist that are unprofessional by current standards of practice; and A.R.S. §32-2061(15)(dd) for possibly violating an ethical standard adopted by the Board as it pertains to the American Psychological Association Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct Standard 3.05, Multiple Relationships. The motion carried 6-0-2 with Drs. Beljan and Wechsler recused.

(b) RFI 14-07 G. Joseph Bluth, Ph.D.

Drs. Beljan and DiBacco recused from this case. Dr. Wechsler provided a summary to the Board stating that the Complainants’ in this case allege that Dr. Bluth’s psychosexual evaluation of their son, M.A., was below the current standard of practice and that Dr. Bluth did not release M.A.’s records in a timely manner.

Complainants’, B.A. and P.A., were present, requested to speak, made statements and answered Board members’ questions. The Complainants’ stated that Dr. Bluth did not speak to M.A. at all during M.A.’s two appointments but rather had someone else check on M.A. during his testing. Additionally, the Complainants’ stated that Dr. Bluth left M.A.’s “half-taken” test in the hallway on a clipboard and that Dr. Bluth would not release M.A.’s testing to their attorney. The Complainants’ stated that this case is pending before the Court.

Dr. Bluth and his legal counsel, Larry Cohen, were present, requested to speak, made a statement and answered Board members’ questions. Mr. Cohen indicated that Dr. Bluth is aware that he did not handle this case appropriately. Mr. Cohen stated that Dr. Bluth has taken corrective action in his practice to ensure this does not happen again.

After deliberation, Dr. Wechsler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Robichaud, to move this case to Informal Interview for possible violations of A.R.S. §32-2061(15)(o) for possibly providing services that are unnecessary or unsafe or otherwise engaging in activities as a psychologist that are unprofessional by current standards of practice; A.R.S. §32-2061(15)(p) for possibly falsely or fraudulently claiming to have performed a professional service, charging for a service or representing a service as the licensee's own when the licensee has not rendered the service or assumed supervisory responsibility for the service; A.R.S. §32-2061(15)(q) for possibly representing activities or services as being performed under the licensee's supervision if the psychologist has not assumed responsibility for them and has not exercised control, oversight and review; and for violation of Arizona Administrative Code R4-26-106, client records. The motion carried 6-0-2 with Drs. Beljan and DiBacco recused. Additionally, the Board requested that the therapist and case manager in this case be present at the Informal Interview.
(c) RFI 14-08 Julio Ramirez, Ph.D.

Dr. Beljan recused from this case. Dr. Mellott provided a summary to the Board stating that Dr. Ramirez conducts immigration evaluations and that the Complainant, C.H., alleges that Dr. Ramirez did not provide a timely report which affected C.H.’s husband’s immigration status.

The Complainant, C.H. and her husband, J.K., were present. J.K. requested to speak, made a statement and answered Board members’ questions. J.K. stated that he made numerous attempts to contact Dr. Ramirez regarding the status of the evaluation. J.K. stated that Dr. Ramirez was provided the deadline by which the evaluation had to be submitted.

Dr. Ramirez and his legal counsel, Larry Cohen, were present, requested to speak, made statements and answered Board members’ questions. Mr. Cohen stated that Dr. Ramirez failed to submit the evaluation in a timely manner and that there was a letter in the file that indicated the deadline for the evaluation. Board members asked Dr. Ramirez about informed consent and whether J.K. signed a consent allowing his wife to be present during the evaluation, Dr. Ramirez said the consent was verbal. Board members confirmed with Dr. Ramirez that the evaluation was sent by email and that the email was not encrypted. Dr. Ramirez confirmed.

After deliberation, Dr. Mellott made a motion, seconded by Dr. Wechsler, to move this case to an Informal Interview for possible violations of A.R.S. §32-2061(15)(o) for possibly providing services that are unnecessary or unsafe or otherwise engaging in activities as a psychologist that are unprofessional by current standards of practice; and A.R.S. §32-2061(15)(r) for possibly failing to obtain a client's or patient's informed and written consent to release personal or otherwise confidential information to another party unless the release is otherwise authorized by law. The motion carried 7-0-1 with Dr. Beljan recused.

(d) RFI 14-06 Steven Fox, Ph.D.

Dr. DiBacco provided a summary to the Board stating that the Complainant alleges that Dr. Fox performed an inadequate psychosexual evaluation of her son and that Dr. Fox is not qualified to perform a psychosexual evaluation.

The Complainant was present, requested to speak, made a statement and answered Board members’ questions. Complainant stated that Licensee agreed to perform a psychosexual evaluation on her son, which was needed to help determine the appropriate placement for her son, but the evaluation he conducted was inadequate, it could not be utilized.

Dr. Fox and his legal counsel, Terence Cushing, were present, requested to speak, made statements and answered Board members’ questions. Mr. Cushing stated that Licensee likely is not qualified to perform a psychosexual evaluation and did not perform a psychosexual evaluation, but rather performed a psychological evaluation with sexual emphasis. Mr. Cushing stated that Licensee regrets changing the name of the evaluation at Complainant’s request, and that the report was stamped with his signature before it was final and before he had an opportunity to review it with Complainant. Licensee stated that his intentions were to help Complainant.

After deliberation, Mr. Robichaud made a motion, seconded by Dr. Wechsler, to move this case to an Informal Interview for possible violations of A.R.S. §32-2061(15)(o) for possibly providing services that are unnecessary or unsafe or otherwise engaging in activities as a psychologist that are unprofessional by current standards of practice; A.R.S. §32-2061(15)(g) for possibly engaging or offering to engage as a psychologist in activities not congruent with the psychologist's professional education, training and experience; A.R.S. §32-2061(15)(h) for possibly failing or refusing to maintain and retain adequate business, financial or professional records pertaining to the psychological services provided to a client or patient; and A.R.S. §32-2061(15)(dd) for possibly violating an ethical code adopted by the Board as it pertains to the American Psychological Association Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of
12) DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATING TO THE AGENCY BUDGET TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE GOVERNOR AND LEGISLATURE FOR FY 2016

Dr. Olvey provided a summary to the Board. Dr. Olvey stated that additional funds will be needed for FY 2016 for increased operational costs such as Board IT costs, telephone increases, as well as required Board member training. Dr. Olvey asked that the Board approve the items identified and allow her to work with the Board Chairman as other areas are identified for inclusion in the request for additional funds for FY 2016. Dr. Wechsler made a motion, seconded by Ms. Shreeve, to approve the budget request for 2016. The motion carried 8-0.

13) DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING INITIAL CASE REVIEWS OF THE FOLLOWING INVESTIGATIONS (cont.)

(e) RFI 14-05 Aileen Lee, Ph.D.

Ms. Shreeve provided a summary to the Board stating that this case was reviewed by the Complaint Screening Committee (Committee) and the Committee requested that Dr. Lee provide the report in question and that it be reviewed at a subsequent Committee meeting. Ms. Shreeve stated that after review of the report in question, the Committee voted to forward this case to the full Board due to Dr. Lee’s possible use of outdated tests.

The Complainant was not present. Dr. Lee and her legal counsel, Artie Eaves, were present, requested to speak, made statements and answered Board members’ questions. Dr. Lee provided an explanation as to why she chose certain tests such as the WAIS III and Wechsler Memory Scale III instead of utilizing the most current versions of the tests. Board members asked Dr. Lee about the appropriateness of using certain tests to which Dr. Lee responded.

At 1:37 p.m. Dr. Wechsler made a motion, seconded by Dr. Mellott, to go into Executive Session to review confidential medical records. The motion carried 8-0. Open session reconvened at 1:57 p.m.

After deliberation, Dr. Mellott made a motion, seconded by Mr. Robichaud, to dismiss this case as there is no violation of statute or rule. The motion carried 5-3 on a roll call vote with Drs. Beljan, DiBacco and Wechsler voting no.

14) DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATING TO RULES INCLUDING:

(a) Recommended rule changes received from a licensee,
(b) Development and possible approval of draft rules for psychology, and
(c) Possible approval of agency Five Year Review of Rules

Dr. Mellott provided a summary to the Board and outlined the changes the Rules Committee is recommending including but not limited to:

- Definition of applied psychology
- Clarification of “on-staff” as used in A.R.S. §32-2071(F)
- Continuing education

Dr. Mellott stated that it is recommended that the Board post the draft rules on the Board’s website for public comment. Dr. Mellott stated that Dr. Olvey’s report of the Five-Year Review of Rules is included in the Board’s materials. In addition, Board members discussed the recommended change in rule as proposed by a licensee of the Board. It was the consensus of the Board not to include the recommended changes as discussed by the Board’s Rules Committee.
Dr. Mellott made a motion, seconded by Dr. Wechsler, to post the draft rules on the Board’s website for 30 days for public comment. The motion carried 8-0.

Dr. DiBacco made a motion, seconded by Dr. Wechsler, to approve the Five-Year Review of Rules. The motion carried 8-0.

15) DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION PERTAINING TO RENEWAL OF CONTRACT FOR LEGISLATIVE SERVICES PROVIDED BY STUART GOODMAN FOR 2015 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Dr. Olvey provided a summary to the Board and asked whether the Board would like to renew its contract with Mr. Stuart Goodman for the 2015 legislative session. Dr. Wechsler made a motion, seconded by Dr. Brundage, to renew the contract with Mr. Goodman. The motion carried 8-0. The Board directed Dr. Olvey to send Mr. Goodman a letter of appreciation on behalf of the Board.

16) DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING COMMENORATING 50 YEARS (1965-2015) SINCE ENACTMENT OF ENABLING LEGISLATION REGULATING PSYCHOLOGY AS A PROFESSION

Dr. Bohanske provided a summary stating that the Board will hold its meeting in Tucson on February 27, 2015, and its meeting in Flagstaff on August 14, 2015. Dr. Bohanske stated that a comprehensive history of Board milestones and list of previous Board members has been compiled. Dr. Bohanske stated that the commemorative certificates are being researched and that the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards will hold its annual meeting in Arizona in 2015.

17) DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATING TO BOARD MEMBER TRAINING AS REQUIRED BY HB 2087

Dr. Olvey provided a summary stating that all Board members are now required to have 12 hours of continuing education. Dr. Olvey stated that the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards will provide New Board Member Training at the November 2014 meeting. Dr. Olvey stated that the Federation of Regulatory Boards (FARB) will be providing an eight hour training seminar in January of 2015. Dr. Olvey asked Board members if they would be interested in attending the FARB training. All Board members expressed interest if funds are available.

18) DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING WHETHER EXPERIENCE GAINED DURING COURSEWORK IN ASSESSMENT OR SUPERVISION OR OTHER COURSES MAY BE APPLIED TO PREINTERNSHIP HOURS AND WHETHER EXPERIENCE FROM A MASTERS DEGREE MAY BE APPLIED TO PREINTERNSHIP EXPERIENCE AND IF SO, POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENT OF A SUBSTANTIVE POLICY STATEMENT RELATING TO THE SAME

Dr. Wechsler provided a summary to the Board stating that coursework in teaching basic assessment and supervision skills are being seen on applications as practicum experiences. Dr. Wechsler asked the Board whether courses such as these should be counted as a practicum experience. Additionally, Dr. Wechsler asked the Board to consider whether experience gained during a terminal master’s degree should apply to practicum experience.

Board members deliberated on the differences between clinical and counseling programs and discussed master’s degree courses that are accepted into doctoral programs. Board members expressed concern with accepting an internship from a master’s program. Board members discussed accepting master practicum experiences as long as they are accepted as part of the doctoral program. Some Board members expressed concern with accepting coursework in teaching basic assessment and supervision skills as part of the practicum experience.
19) DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATING TO IMPLEMENTATION OF HB 2260 PERTAINING TO REGULATORY BILL OF RIGHTS

Dr. Olvey provided a summary stating that HB 2260 passed during the 2014 Legislative Session. This bill requires that certain agencies post the Small Business Bill of Rights on the agencies website. Dr. Olvey stated that the Board has posted the Small Business Bill of Rights on its website.

20) DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATING TO POSSIBLE ADDITION OF AN IN-PERSON BOARD MEETING PRIOR TO THE END OF THE CALENDAR YEAR

Dr. Bohanske provided a summary to the Board stating that the Board has a lot of work to be completed before the end of the year and is proposing holding an additional in-person Board meeting in 2014. It was the consensus of the Board to hold an in-person Board meeting on October 3, 2014, in lieu of the Board’s telephonic meeting.

21) DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATING TO UPDATE FROM THE ARIZONA PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION REGARDING EXPANDING SCOPE OF PRACTICE FOR PSYCHOLOGISTS TO INCLUDE PRESCRIPTIVE AUTHORITY

The Chair of the Arizona Psychological Association’s (AzPA) Task Force on RxP, Jeff Thomas, Ph.D., was present and provided an update to the Board pertaining to efforts to gain prescriptive authority for psychologists. Dr. Thomas stated that AzPA is ready to submit the sunrise application for prescriptive authority. Dr. Thomas stated that once the sunrise application has been submitted then AzPA will focus on the four focus group meetings with stakeholders. Dr. Thomas elaborated on the first focus group pertaining to educational requirements for a psychologist who wishes to obtain prescriptive authority. Educational requirements being proposed include but are not limited to:

- Must be licensed as a psychologist to be accepted into a 2 year master’s program on pharmacology
- Complete a two year residency
- Pass a national examination
- Obtain restricted license to prescribe under supervision for two years

22) NEW AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

There were no new items for future meetings.

23) ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Board, a motion was made by Dr. Wechsler, seconded by Mr. Robichaud, to adjourn the meeting at 4:27 p.m. on August 1, 2014. The motion carried 8-0.

Respectfully submitted,