



STATE OF ARIZONA
BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGIST EXAMINERS
1740 WEST ADAMS STREET, SUITE 3403
PHOENIX, AZ 85007
PH: 602.542.8162 FX: 602.542.8279
WEBSITE: www.psychboard.az.gov

DOUGLAS A. DUCEY
Governor

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

Committee on Behavior Analysts

REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

August 26, 2021 - 9:30 a.m.
Held via Zoom

1.	CALL TO ORDER Dr. Stenhoff, Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:33 a.m.
2.	ROLL CALL <u>Committee Members Present</u> Donald Stenhoff, Ph.D., BCBA-D Bryan Davey, Ph.D., BCBA-D Diana Davis-Wilson, DBH, BCBA – <i>joined the meeting at 9:48 a.m.</i> Tisha Denton, M.Ed., BCBA Paige Raetz, Ph.D., BCBA-D <u>Staff Present</u> Heidi Herbst Paakkonen, Executive Director Jennifer Michaelsen, Deputy Director Zakiya Mallas, Licensing Specialist Kathy Fowkes, Licensing Specialist <u>Attorney General's Office</u> Jeanne Galvin, Assistant Attorney General A quorum of the Committee was confirmed.
3.	REMARKS/ANNOUNCEMENTS <ul style="list-style-type: none">● General Committee Remarks, Announcements and Updates Dr. Stenhoff acknowledged the efforts of the Committee and staff in preparing for another meeting with an extensive agenda. He also thanked the guests and stakeholders for making the time to attend this meeting for purposes of informing the decision-making process.
4.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES <ul style="list-style-type: none">● July 30, 2021 Regular Session Minutes● July 30, 2021 Executive Session Minutes

	<p>MOTION: Dr. Raetz moved to approve both sets of minutes as drafted. Ms. Denton seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 4-0.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING COMPLAINTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD</p> <p>A. Complaint No. 21-24, Alfredo Robles</p> <p>Dr. Stenhoff provided advisory statements concerning the complaints review process. As the lead member of the complaint. Dr. Davey summarized the complaint filed by KC, a former supervisee of Mr. Robles at the Center for Autism & Related Disorders (CARD). KC alleged that she experienced unjust treatment by him and that he did not submit her verification documentation to the Board in support of her application for licensure in a timely manner. Board staff determined that just prior to receiving the complaint, Mr. Robles had submitted the documentation, however KC stands by her allegations that Mr. Robles provided unjust treatment, relative to her peers, to her while she was at CARD.</p> <p>Mr. Robles’ response indicated that he was disheartened by KC’s allegations and regrets that he is unable to change her perspective. He stated that he provided supervision and support to her at the same level as that supplied to other supervisees with whom he has worked.</p> <p>KC was present and made a statement to the Committee, indicating that she received different treatment from him as compared to her peers, and she had to jump through extra hoops with him. She stated that she had to make multiple attempts to contact Mr. Robles, but her peers reported experiencing none of the issues that she did. KC explained that the delay was the culmination of the concerns she had, and this prompted her to file the complaint.</p> <p>The Committee asked whether KC spoke to anyone in human resources at CARD. She affirmed that she did and that she followed the advice provided, but she did not feel that accomplished anything and that she continued to be stifled with respect to having opportunities to learn and improve her applied skill development. She clarified that she indicated she would be willing to return to CARD, but in a different location than where she was previously.</p> <p>Mr. Robles was present and advised the Committee that he carefully prepared his response to address all of KC’s concerns, and offered to answer questions and clarify his statements.</p> <p>The Committee asked Mr. Robles to walk through the technology challenges he encountered while attempting to submit KC’s supervision documentation to the Board. He explained that CARD’s security protocols were such that he had to identify a work-around to the submission link; he also noted that once he understood what documentation was acceptable, he promptly issued it and confirmed that it was received. He also explained how learning and development opportunities are allocated to supervisees at CARD.</p> <p>The Committee deliberated the complaint and the discussion reflected the fact that there is a lack of evidence that KC was unfairly treated or incurred any harm by Mr. Robles.</p> <p>MOTION: Dr. Davey moved to forward the complaint to the Board with a recommendation to dismiss. Ms. Denton seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.</p> <p>Dr. Stenhoff thanked the parties for participating in the review. Ms. Michaelsen advised that she will communicate to the parties the next steps of the process, including the placement of the recommendation on a future Board meeting agenda.</p>

B. Complaint No. 21-21, Tami Jursich**C. Complaint No. 21-22, Kaitlin Wittig**

Dr. Stenhoff introduced the agenda item, noting that the cases were filed concurrently by the same complainant, SB, and the complaint allegations are identical. He then stated for the record that he was the complainant's instructor for one semester, and he announced that Dr. Davis-Wilson is recused from the cases. Ms. Denton disclosed that SB completed a practicum experience with the agency at which she is employed and that there some emails exchanged concerning that arrangement, but she is able to review and vote on the complaints objectively.

The complaint alleges that Ms. Jursich and Ms. Wittig failed to provide SB with adequate supervision, and that they acted unethically in the process. The responses from the Ms. Jursich and Ms. Wittig reflected that the threshold of 5% supervised time was met with the exception of one month. Some performance problems were identified in the response that temporarily hindered their ability to provide direct supervision to SB. The complainant left the agency shortly thereafter.

SB was present for the review of the complaint and stated to the Committee that she was not given a supervisor right away. Once supervisors were assigned, she had only minimal contact with them which did not amount to 5% of her time. She also reported that she calculated she would have 158 supervised hours for April of 2021, but she was advised the actual number would be 142 hours. SB explained that she requested additional hours of supervision, but that request was not approved. She also reported that she was given instructions on the hours to record that was contrary to what she understood to be required.

Ms. Jursich was present and explained that SB was hired in February and a contract was promptly executed. She explained that the misunderstanding relative to the total hours is that certain activities, such as training and administrative time, are discounted and deducted as the employee is not functioning as an RBT. She also stated that the RBTs receive compensation for all of the time they are working. Ms. Jursich indicated that she and the other supervisors are very involved and responsive to their supervisees, but once appropriate interventions were modeled, they would fade in order to allow the supervisee to develop their skills; in this instance they observed this wasn't always successful with SB in that she would struggle with applying what she learned in the trainings. Ms. Jursich noted th documentation provided in her response reflects that despite the immense amount of training provide to SB in the fewer than 90 days she was employed with the agency, she was not improving.

Ms. Wittig was also present and concurred with Ms. Jursich's statements. She noted that one of the email communications appears to have been misconstrued by SB and that she regrets SB felt the experience was not successful.

The Committee members deliberated the cases, discussing the fact that the documentation submitted reflects that agency was doing its best to provide sufficient supervision and responsiveness to the RBTs including SB; this included making systems changes when it was in the best interest of the clients to do so. The discussion reflected that while there appears to have been a disconnect where communications were concerned, it was clear that the allegations of inadequate supervision on the part of Mr. Jursich and Ms. Wittig are not supported by the investigative record.

MOTION: Dr. Raetz moved to forward to the Board a recommendation to dismiss complaint 21-21. Dr. Davey seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 4-0.

MOTION: Dr. Raetz moved to forward to the Board a recommendation to dismiss complaint 21-22. Dr. Davey seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 4-0.

	<p>Dr. Stenhoff thanked the parties for participating in the review. Ms. Michaelsen advised that she will communicate to the parties the next steps of the process, including the placement of the recommendation on a future Board meeting agenda.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD PERTAINING TO APPROVAL OF BEHAVIOR ANALYST APPLICANTS</p>	
	<p>A. Behavior Analyst Applications for Licensure</p>	
	<p>1) Brittany Messina, M.Ed. (SAIR**)</p>	
	<p>Dr. Davis-Wilson and Ms. Denton recused from the discussion and vote of the application. The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application noting that Ms. Messina was previously requested to supply documentation of 156 additional hours to address that deficiency; additionally the Committee determined it was necessary to discuss with Ms. Messina the criminal history she disclosed on her application. It was noted that Ms. Messina failed to disclose a 2017 event which required an explanation and additional records. More recently, separation from two employment positions was not disclosed by Ms. Messina which also requires an explanation.</p> <p>Ms. Messina was present for the review of her application and agreed to provide some explanations. With respect to her previous two DUIs and in particular the 2017 incident, she explained that she was close to the birth of her child and believed at that time she had been thorough in her reporting. She noted that the second DUI was a felony charge due to the earlier one, suggestion to her that the records were cumulative and all-inclusive. When asked how she could demonstrate how she can demonstrate she possesses the good moral character that is necessary to hold a behavior analyst license, she responded that in 2017 and 2018 she experienced a series of personal struggles which compelled her to move away to Flagstaff where she stayed sober and completed substance abuse counseling. Ms. Messina stated her life is considerably different now as a wife and a mother, and she is aware she will always be required to report these events when she applies for employment positions.</p> <p>The Committee then questioned the applicant relative to the two employment separations that she did not originally disclose on her application, but that the Committee subsequently learned about recently. With respect to her separation from United Behavioral Services, Ms. Messina explained that she was advised by her supervisor and the clinical director that the agency did not have a BCBA position available to her and this was the cause of the separation. She also noted a potential dual relationship situation while employed there that she appropriately addressed. The Committee also noted that the agency’s personnel file reflects that Ms. Messina is eligible for rehire.</p> <p>MOTION: Dr. Davey moved to meet in Executive Session in order to obtain legal advice. Dr. Stenhoff seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 3-0</p> <p>The Committee met in Executive Session from 10:40 a.m. to 10:43 a.m.</p> <p>Upon resuming the meeting in public session the Committee then asked Ms. Messina to speak to her separation from Hope Group. She explained that she was notified by the human resources department that she was no longer permitted to drive to appointments due to insurance issues relate to her DUIs. She further explained that she subsequently was notified that she could no longer be employed by the agency, and that it was her assumption her driving record was the issue. Ms. Messina indicated she understood the agency’s position, and that she was soon relating to Flagstaff anyway. The Committee noted that the records obtained by the employer reflects the termination of Ms. Messina’s employment given she was not eligible to operate a motor vehicle. She explained that she did not question the contents of her termination letter because she was only driving herself and was not transporting any clients at that time; she was also unclear that she was prohibited to drive from the office to a client’s home. Ms. Messina stated that she was never</p>	

directly told the reason for her termination, but she believes it was related to the fact the company’s insurance would not cover her while driving.

The Committee cautioned Ms. Messina that it is essential she answer questions accurately and completely when presented on an application, and that she be thorough in supplying the necessary documentation to support those answers. She was further advised that it is her professional responsibility to seek guidance when she has questions about what is being asked of her, and be clear about what future employers expect from her.

MOTION: Dr. Davey moved to forward the application of Brittany Messina to the Board with a recommendation for approval. Dr. Raetz seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Messina assured the Committee that she will be more careful when completing applications in the future.

VOTE: The motion was approved 3-0.

2)	Nicole Steele, M.S. (SAIR*)
-----------	------------------------------------

The Committee noted that the applicant was present, as well as her former supervisors Misty Oppenheim-Leaf and Kelsey Isom. The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application, and in the process noted that based on the documentation supplied, some of the hours of supervision supplied to Ms. Steele by Ms. Isom over about two months appear to have been provided prior to the date Ms. Isom was licensed in the Missouri. It was noted that the Committee’s concerns are specific to the inability to quantify the number of hours that may not be qualifying for purposes of Ms. Steele meeting Arizona’s qualifications for licensure.

Ms. Isom addressed the Committee and confirmed that the State of Missouri does not require a BCBA to be licensed in order to provide supervision. The Committee explained that licensure is a requirement to provide supervision in Arizona. Ms. Isom affirmed that she did supply supervision to Ms. Steele for appropriately two months from June to August of 2020 prior to when she was granted her Missouri license.

Ms. Oppenheim-Leaf also stated that her team shared in the supervision responsibilities for Ms. Steele, complying with Missouri law in the process.

MOTION: Dr. Davis-Wilson moved to meet in Executive Session in order to obtain legal advice. Dr. Stenhoff seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.

The Committee met in Executive Session from 11:10 a.m. to 11:22 a.m.

Upon resuming the meeting in public session the Committee asked the former supervisors whether they are aware of the BACB requirement that all supervisors must be listed on a contract. Ms. Oppenheim-Leaf responded that she had sought this clarity from the BACB in the past and has not been able to obtain confirmation that this is a requirement. She noted this would be a hardship for some organization to capture this information. The Committee asked whether Ms. Oppenheim-Leaf would be willing to execute with Ms. Steele an addendum to her contract that lists the additional supervisors. A suggestion was made to also research Missouri law in terms of whether the two months of supervision supplied to Ms. Steele by Ms. Isom are non-qualifying for purposes of Ms. Steele supplying evidence of 1,500 of supervised experience. Ms. Oppenheim-Leaf affirmed that she would prepare a statement listing the additional supervisors as an addendum to the contract.

MOTION: Dr. Stenhoff moved to direct staff and legal counsel to research Missouri law for purposes of quantifying Ms. Steele’s qualifying hours, and to bring the application back to a future agenda with that information along with the contract addendum prepared by Ms. Oppenheim-Leaf. Ms. Denton seconded the motion.

	VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.	
	The Committee encouraged Ms. Steele to forward any questions or concerns on the part of her future employer to Board staff. The Committee also directed staff to contact the BACB for clarification on the requirement to list each supervisor and their respective roles, and also clarification as to whether signatures are required from all supervisors.	
	3)	Amy Angell, 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.	
	4)	Beatriz Adriana Aiton, M.S.
	The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.	
	5)	Ashley Brock, M.Sp.Ed.
	The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.	
	6)	Beth Carling, M.Ed.
	Ms. Denton and Dr. Davis-Wilson announced that they are recused from the discussion and vote of this application. The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.	
	7)	Gabriella Donatelli Casale, 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.	
	8)	Brittany Cook, M.Ed.
	Ms. Denton disclosed that she is employed by the same agency, but they don't work together so she is objective. Dr. Davis-Wilson announced that she is recused from the discussion and vote of this application as she previously served as her supervisor. 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)	Amy Dalmendray, 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.	
	10)	Marianna Esposito, M.A.

	The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.	
	11)	Christopher James Harness, 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.	
	12)	Catherine Huggins, 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.	
	13)	Shayla Johns, 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 noted that the applicant will need to correct what appears to be a typographical error on the date she indicated that supervision initiated. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval once the correction is received.	
	14)	Samantha Klebanow, M.Ed.
	Dr. Davis-Wilson disclosed that she and the applicant worked at the same agency a number of years ago but she is able to vote on the application objectively. Ms. Denton disclosed that she and the applicant also worked for the same organization but not concurrently; therefore she is also able to vote on the application objectively. 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 the applicant will need to fill in the missing license numbers on her application. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval once the correction is received.	
	15)	Tristan Lyle, M.S.
	Dr. Davis-Wilson disclosed that the applicant is a former student but she is able to vote on the application objectively. Dr. Stenhoff announced that he is recused from the discussion and vote on the application as he served as the applicant's supervisor. 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.	
	16)	Louis Alexander Marull, M.A.
	<p>The Committee noted that having received information concerning a criminal charge only this morning, the application will need to be tabled to allow staff to notify the applicant of what information he is to supply relative to that matter. Board staff noted that this is the fourth closely related charge reported by Mr. Marull. The applicant was present for the review of his application and provided a brief summary of his previous criminal matters. He indicated he would attend the future review and discussion of his application.</p> <p>MOTION: Dr. Davey moved to table action on the application until such time that board staff notifies Mr. Marull of the information he is required to submit, associated with the DUI he reported to staff this morning. Ms. Denton seconded the motion.</p>	

	VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.	
	The Committee directed Ms. Paakkonen to have a conversation with Mr. Marull concerning the possible options that may be made available to him by the Board relative to his application.	
	17)	Andrea Nicholson Brennan, Ph.D.
	The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. Upon review, the Committee noted that the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.	
	18)	Sara Richards, 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)	Ashlee Rogers, M.Ed.
	Ms. Denton stated that she recalled having possibly interviewed the applicant for employment, but she is able to review the application objectively. 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)	Pamela Scott, 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)	Jennifer Anne Swicegood, 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)	Chaynee Tabet, M.S.
	Dr. Davis-Wilson and Dr. Stenhoff disclosed that they have been involved in the applicant's education program, but they are both able to review and vote on the application objectively. The Committee proceeded with a substantive review of the application. It was noted that the applicant disclosed a minor in possession charge from several years ago; the file reflects she has met all court-ordered requirements and has not incurred similar charges since that event; otherwise the materials submitted were complete and fulfilled the requirements of statutes and rules. The Committee determined the application can be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation for approval.	
	23)	Rachel Vissichelli, 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: Dr. Davey moved to forward the following applications to the Board with a recommendation for approval with the recusals and corrections noted in the discussion: Brittany Messina, M.Ed.; Amy Angell, M.Ed.; Beatriz Adriana Aiton, M.S.; Ashley Brock, M.Sp.Ed.; Beth Carling, M.Ed.; Gabriella	

	<p>Donatelli Casale, M.A.; Brittany Cook, M.Ed.; Amy Dalmendray, M.A.; Marianna Esposito, M.A.; Christopher James Harness, M.A.; Catherine Huggins, M.S.; Shayla Johns, M.A.; Samantha Klebanow, M.Ed.; Tristan Lyle, M.S.; Andrea Nicholson Brennan, Ph.D.; Sara Richards, M.A.; Ashlee Rogers, M.Ed.; Pamela Scott, M.A.; Jennifer Anne Swicegood, M.A.; Chaynee Tabet, M.S.; and Rachel Vissichelli, M.A. Dr. Raetz seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.</p>
	<p>B. Behavior Analyst Applications for Licensure by Universal Recognition</p>
	<p>1) Alycia Leal, M.Ed.</p>
	<p>Ms. Denton stated that she recalled having interviewed the applicant for possible employment, but she is able to review the application objectively. 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.</p> <p>MOTION: Dr. Davey moved to forward the application of Ms. Leal to the Board with a recommendation for approval. Ms. Denton seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0.</p>
	<p><i>*First Additional Information Request</i></p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RECENT UPDATES FROM, AND PRESENTATION BY, THE BEHAVIOR ANALYST CERTIFICATION BOARD (BACB)</p> <p>Ms. Paakkonen summarized an email from the BACB reporting that the United States Department of Justice secured a guilty plea on one count of health care fraud and one count of using false identification by a person who falsified BACB-issued credentials to commit such crimes. Additionally Misty Bloom, Esq., Director of Regulatory Affairs for the BACB, followed up to questions posed to her by the Committee on July 30, 2021 concerning whether behavior analyst regulators might be afforded some degree of investigative immunity by the BACB should a complaint be filed for alleged ethical misconduct while acting in a regulatory capacity. Ms. Bloom reported that the BACB has updated its policies such that it will prohibit filing of a complaint against a behavior analyst regulator for actions taken in the regulator’s official capacity and where the actions are within the state requirements for immunity.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE OUT-OF-STATE TELEHEALTH PRACTICE REGISTRY ESTABLISHED AT A.R.S. §36-3606</p> <p>Ms. Paakkonen shared with the Committee the webpage that is being built to serve as the starting point for applications to the Registry, and also for members of the public to verify the status of a registrant. She indicated that the developer tasked with building the site is currently working on connecting it to the State of Arizona’s digital payment system. She noted that the administrative rules that prescribe the application fee and the processing time frames will be in effect on September 1, 2021 with the Registry intake system to be launched by the end of September. In the meantime, the agency continues to accept applications for temporary emergency licensure (although the behavior analyst numbers continue to be relatively low as compared to those for psychologists).</p>

9.	<p>DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPLICATION EFFICIENCIES WORKGROUP</p> <p>Ms. Paakkonen summarized the most recent meeting of the group, noting that in recent months the average number of days to administratively process application files has decreased from 34 (the entire fiscal year average) to 13 (for June and July). With the addition of Ms. Mallas to the team, this level of performance should continue to improve. As has been noted previously, the launch of the new application system this fall will bring a high degree of transparency to applicants as to the status of their file completion. Other plans include engaging a student intern to create an application flow chart guide.</p> <p>The group has acknowledged that file completeness is most often thwarted by delayed submission of supervision verifications. The group explored the possibility of rescinding much of the language in the administrative rule at A.A.C. R4-26-404.2 Supervised Experience Requirement once the BACB’s revised supervision requirements take effect January 1, 2022. The rationale for this possible revision is that the Committee and the Board may determine that BACB certification verification alone will constitute satisfactory evidence that an applicant has successfully completed the supervision requirements (i.e. 1,500 hours). Ms. Paakkonen advised the Committee that she will contact the BACB for purpose of inquiring whether the organization might agree to allow regulatory agencies and state boards to access their repository of documents to verify supervised experience when a former supervisor fails to supply that information to support a former trainee’s application for licensure.</p> <p>Finally, Ms. Paakkonen acknowledged Dr. Raetz for providing some survey development guidance to her so the group can collect and analyze data supplied by applicants relative to their experience.</p>
10.	<p>DISCUSSION CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON PROMOTING AWARENESS OF THE REHABILITATION AND MONITORING PROGRAM (RAMP)</p> <p>Dr. Davis-Wilson reminded the Committee that the Board recently established this program, and noted that the profession is observing an increase in reports of its members experiencing mental health and substance abuse issues. She advised the members that she will be presenting on RAMP to the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards during the Annual Meeting in October, but encouraged them to share thoughts on how else to promote the program for purposes of both public protection and also rehabilitating members of the profession. Raakel Elzy, Board Member of the Arizona Association for Behavior Analysis (AzABA), expressed support on behalf of the association to have Board staff present information on RAMP to their membership. Ms. Paakkonen suggested the staff issue a RAMP reminder email twice a year which was well received by the Committee. It was also suggested that AzABA encourage members to share the program information with their human resources offices at their agencies.</p>
11.	<p>NEW AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS</p> <p>Dr. Davey shared with the Committee that he was recently appointed to serve on the newly established Telehealth Advisory Committee. He offered to provide a report to the members during future meetings. Ms. Paakkonen affirmed she will place this as a standing item on future agendas.</p> <p>Ms. Paakkonen mentioned that the Committee may be ready to revisit the behavior analyst statutes and administrative rules for purposes of considering whether to make recommendations for revisions to those documents.</p>
12.	<p>ADJOURNMENT</p> <p>MOTION: Dr. Davis-Wilson moved to adjourn the meeting. Dr. Stenhoff seconded the motion.</p> <p>VOTE: The motion was approved 5-0. The meeting concluded at 1:37 p.m.</p>