



**Board Members**

Frederick S. Wechsler, Psy.D. ABPP  
Chair  
Janice K. Brundage, Ph.D.,  
Vice-Chair  
Joseph C. Donaldson,  
Secretary  
Bob Bohanske, Ph.D.  
John P. DiBacco, Ph.D.  
Daniel Larson  
Ramona Mellott, Ph.D.

**Staff**

Dr. Cindy Olvey  
Executive Director  
  
Megan Martin  
Deputy Director  
  
Heather Duracinski  
Licensing Coordinator

**State of Arizona  
Board of Psychologist Examiners**

1400 West Washington, Suite 235  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007  
Phone: (602) 542-8162 Fax: (602) 542-8279  
[www.psychboard.az.gov](http://www.psychboard.az.gov)

**REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

**Friday, November 2, 2012, 8:30 a.m.**

Executive Tower  
Grand Canyon Conference Room (Basement)  
1700 W. Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The regular session of the Arizona State Board of Psychologist Examiners was called to order by Chairman Wechsler at 8:30 a.m. on November 2, 2012. One Executive Session was held.

**2. ROLL CALL**

**Board Members Present**

Frederick S. Wechsler, Psy.D., – Chair  
Janice K. Brundage, Ph.D. – Vice - Chair  
Joseph C. Donaldson – Secretary  
Bob Bohanske, Ph.D  
John P. DiBacco, Ph.D.  
Daniel Larson (8:32 a.m.-9:44 a.m.)  
Ramona Mellott, Ph.D.

**Staff Present**

Dr. Cindy Olvey, Executive Director  
Megan Martin, Deputy Director  
Heather Duracinski, Licensing Coordinator

**Attorney General’s Office**

Jeanne Galvin, Esq.

**3. REMARKS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- **CE Documentation** – Chairman Wechsler announced that licensees could receive CE credits in Ethics for attendance at Board meetings. Chairman Wechsler explained how to obtain credit.
- **Board Assessment Forms** –Chairman Wechsler encouraged members of the audience to complete a Board Meeting Assessment Survey and place them in the survey box.
- **Board Member and Staff Appreciation** – Chairman Wechsler thanked Board members and Staff for their dedication and hard work.

**4. CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

*Mr. Larson joined the meeting at 8:32 a.m.*

Chairman Wechsler invited the public to address the Board at this time.

Marilyn Stromsness, Arizona Psychologist Association (AzPA) Liaison to the Board, requested to speak and made a statement to the Board. She stated that AzPA is reconvening their Committee to recommend Board member candidates to the Governor’s Office. Additionally, she stated that AzPA will be holding continuing education for psychologists in December.

Raul Arguello requested to speak and made a statement to the Board. Mr. Arguello stated that Ciara Coultrap was involved in his custody case and that throughout the proceedings she acted professionally and never purported to be a psychologist.

Gerald Chirnomas requested to speak and made a statement to the Board. Mr. Chirnomas explained the definition of trust and stated that Ciara Coultrap misled individuals she was providing services to. He stated that Ms. Coultrap formed biased opinions and alienated family members from each other. He stated that Mr. Coultrap has acted aggressively toward him. Additionally, he stated that Mr. and Ms. Coultrap requested that court documents be sealed and that the Judge denied their request.

Michael Coultrap was present telephonically, requested to speak and made a statement to the Board. Michael Coultrap refuted allegations previously made by public members of the audience. Mr. Coultrap stated that Ciara Coultrap neither represented herself as a psychologist nor has she engaged in the practice of psychology.

Perphilia Tsinnie was present telephonically, requested to speak and made a statement to the Board. Ms. Tsinnie stated that she utilized Ciara and Michael Coultrap's services during her custody case. Ms. Tsinnie affirmed that Ciara Coultrap never represented herself as a psychologist. Ms. Tsinnie stated that Ciara and Michael Coultrap acted professionally during her custody proceeding.

Karen Johnson was present telephonically, requested to speak and made a statement. Ms. Johnson stated that she is Ciara Coultrap's mother. Ms. Johnson elaborated on Ms. Coultrap's education. Ms. Johnson refuted allegations made in the complaint pending against Ms. Coultrap. Ms. Galvin asked Ms. Johnson if she reviewed the complaint. Ms. Johnson stated that she has not seen the complaint but that the Complainant in the case made her aware of the allegations.

Sophia Nicodemus was present telephonically, requested to speak and made a statement. Ms. Nicodemus stated that she utilized Ciara Coultrap's services in her custody proceeding. She stated that Ms. Coultrap was professional and never portrayed herself as being a psychologist.

Rev. Dr. Barbara Hulsing was present telephonically, requested to speak and made a statement. She stated that Ciara Coultrap provided services in a case involving her grandchildren and stated that Ms. Coultrap never represented herself as a psychologist. Additionally, she stated that Ms. Coultrap was always supervised by Dr. Cherry and that any testing that was conducted was performed by Dr. Cherry.

Mark and Kandice Hulsing were present telephonically, requested to speak and made a statement. Ms. Hulsing stated that Ciara Coultrap was involved in her custody proceeding. Ms. Hulsing stated that Ms. Coultrap never purported to be a psychologist and that Dr. Cherry was always supervising Ms. Coultrap.

## **5. COUNSEL REPORT**

Ms. Galvin provided an update to the Board regarding the status of the appeal filed by Jean Hodgson, Ed.D. pertaining to the Board's decision to revoke her license. Dr. Hodgson filed the appeal on October 6, 2011. Ms. Galvin stated that Dr. Hodgson was late in filing her appeal. Subsequently, the State filed a Motion to Dismiss due to the lack of timeliness. On January 5, 2012, the Judge denied the motion to dismiss stating that the Board did not serve her properly even though Dr. Hodgson had requested in writing that the Board not send correspondence via Certified Mail. Dr. Hodgson has filed her Opening Brief with the Superior Court and has requested oral argument. Ms. Galvin stated she submitted a Response to Dr. Hodgson's Opening Brief. Ms. Galvin stated that Dr. Hodgson has filed a motion to compel and a response was submitted to Dr. Hodgson's motion. Ms. Galvin stated that she is awaiting a response from the Judge.

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

Dr. Bohanske made a motion, seconded by Dr. Brundage, to approve the items on the consent agenda. The motion carried 6-0-1, with Mr. Larson abstaining from the August 17, 2012, Regular and Executive Session Minutes

**(a) APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- Executive Session Minutes – August 17, 2012
- Regular Session Minutes – August 17, 2012

**(b) DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING PSYCHOLOGY APPLICATIONS**

**i. REQUESTING APPROVAL FOR EXAM**

Rachel Mark, Psy.D.  
Amra Stafford, Psy.D.

**ii. REQUESTING APPROVAL FOR EXAM AND LICENSURE (UPON A PASSING SCORE)**

Koren Ganas, Psy.D.  
Brandy Gardner, Psy.D.  
Jennifer Thompson, Psy.D.  
Nathan Velez, Ph.D.

**iii. REQUESTING APPROVAL OF LICENSURE BY WAIVER**

Meghan LeBlanc, Psy.D.

**(c) DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING APPLICATIONS FOR LICENSURE OF BEHAVIOR ANALYSTS BY EXPERIENCE**

Saba Biggar, MA, BCBA

**(d) INVESTIGATIONS REPORT**

**(e) LICENSING REPORT**

**(f) DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPROVAL OF 2013-2015 RENEWAL APPLICATIONS FOR PSYCHOLOGISTS AND BEHAVIOR ANALYSTS**

**7. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING INITIAL CASE REVIEWS OF THE FOLLOWING INVESTIGATIONS**

RFI 12-20, John C. Stapert, Ph.D.

Mr. Larson provided a summary to the Board. Mr. Larson stated that this complaint was forwarded to the full Board by the Complaint Screening Committee for possible violation of practicing outside the scope of Dr. Stapert's expertise by providing an opinion on medications in a hospital setting.

Dr. Stapert and his legal counsel, Michael Wolver, were present. Mr. Wolver requested to speak and made a statement to the Board and answered Board members' questions. Dr. Stapert answered Board members' questions. Board members asked Dr. Stapert to summarize his qualifications and expertise in medications. Dr. Stapert responded.

Board members deliberated. Board members determined that Dr. Stapert only provided information on medications. Board members determined that Dr. Stapert is practicing within his scope of expertise in that Dr. Stapert provides information and does not recommend specific medications nor does he prescribe medications.

After deliberation, Dr. Bohanske made a motion, seconded by Dr. Brundage to dismiss RFI 12-20 as there was no violation of statute or rule. The motion carried 7-0 on a roll call vote.

*Mr. Larson left the meeting at 9:44 a.m.*

**8. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING SUE MOLER, PSY.D. APPLICATION FOR LICENSURE AS A PSYCHOLOGIST**

Dr. Mellott provided a summary to the Board stating that the Application Review Committee forwarded Dr. Moler's application to the full Board to review Dr. Moler's internship. Dr. Moler's supervisor indicated that although Dr. Moler completed a 2,000 hour APA approved internship, she underwent a remediation plan for a portion of those hours which was successfully completed.

Dr. Moler was present telephonically and answered Board members questions. Board members asked Dr. Moler if the institution accepted her internship as successfully completed. Dr. Moler affirmed that the institution considered her internship successfully completed. Board members asked Dr. Moler if she received a certificate of completion and if the institution can verify completion of her internship. Dr. Moler stated that she received a certificate of completion and that the institution can verify completion of her internship. Board members asked Dr. Moler if she has a copy of the internship logs. Dr. Moler responded stating that she does not have copies but can obtain them from the institution.

After deliberation, Dr. Bohanske made a motion, seconded by Dr. Brundage, to accept Dr. Moler's internship as successfully completed and meeting the statutory requirements. The Motion carried 6-0.

**9. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING ANNUAL MEETING AND ELECTION OF OFFICERS.**

Board members who were interested in the Board Chair position expressed their interest. Dr. DiBacco made a motion, seconded by Dr. Mellott, to nominate Dr. Brundage to serve as Chair of the Board for 2013. The motion carried 5-1 on a roll call vote with Mr. Donaldson voting no. Dr. Wechsler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Donaldson, to nominate Dr. Bohanske to serve as Vice-Chair of the Board for 2013. The motion carried 5-0-1 on a roll call vote with Dr. Bohanske abstaining. Dr. Mellott made a motion, seconded by Dr. Brundage, to nominate Dr. DiBacco to serve as Secretary for the Board for 2013. The motion carried 6-0 on a roll call vote.

**10. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING COST FOR PRACTICE MONITOR OR SUPERVISOR**

In follow up to a previous Board request, Dr. Olvey provided information regarding the cost for a Practice Monitor or Supervisor. She indicated that fees ranged from \$150 to \$250 per hour. Some Practice Monitors/Supervisors charged an hourly rate for meeting with the licensee, report writing, and appearing before the Board while others included the cost of report writing and appearing before the Board in the hourly meeting rate. Board members expressed the importance of Practice Monitors/Supervisors and spoke of the responsibility that is imposed upon them.

**11. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING LEGISLATION FOR 2013 LEGISLATIVE SESSION**

Dr. Olvey provided a summary to the Board stating that every year state agencies are contacted by the Governor's Office inquiring whether the Board intends to run legislation. It was the consensus of the Board to table this item until other items on the Board's agenda are addressed as some items may affect the Board's decision regarding running legislation.

**12. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING TELPRACTICE COMMITTEE UPDATE AND THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION'S DRAFT GUIDELINES FOR THE PRACTICE OF TELEPSYCHOLOGY RELEASED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

Dr. Bohanske provided a summary to the Board stating that the Association for State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) draft guidelines for telepsychology are open for comment. Dr. Bohanske said the guidelines are very general. Dr. Bohanske stated that the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) will be drafting guidelines for regulatory boards. Dr. Bohanske elaborated that ASPPB is proposing a Certificate of Professional Qualification in telepsychology and that the draft guidelines will likely recommend that a psychologist's licensing jurisdiction maintain jurisdiction regardless of the state in which the psychologist practices. Dr. Bohanske informed the Board that there is an overarching statute (A.R.S. §36-3601) that pertains

to healthcare professionals, including psychologists, regarding telemedicine. Dr. Bohanske asked the Board to consider increasing the amount of supervision that can be done via electronic means in the future. Dr. Bohanske stated that the Telepractice Committee will continue to address issues that arise and make recommendations to the Board.

Board members deliberated and stated that there are many overarching statutes that pertain to healthcare professionals that are not in the psychology statutes. Board members expressed concern that many psychologists may not be aware of all the statutes that pertain to healthcare professionals. Board members expressed concern that SKYPE is not HIPAA compliant but many psychologists utilize SKYPE in their practice.

### **13. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RULES FOR PSYCHOLOGISTS**

Dr. Olvey provided a summary to the Board stating that this item arises out of correspondence submitted by Dr. Andy Hogg, who represented a committee of the Arizona Psychology Training Consortium. Dr. Hogg encouraged the Board to delete the “substantial financial interest” clause in the rules (A.A.C. R4-26-209 General Supervision), which has served as a deterrent to recruiting internship and residency supervisors. Dr. Hogg recommended the Board replace this language with a rule that provides supervisors clear guidance including concepts contained in the Board’s Substantive Policy Statement on this topic.

Board members deliberated. Board members expressed concern that it does not want to burden individuals by making it more difficult to obtain a supervisor, but also expressed concern that supervisees not be exploited. Board members conceptually agreed with the recommendations offered by the Consortium and directed that draft rules should reflect these recommendations. In addition, Board members stated that they would like draft rules to address the written training plan for practicum students as well as continuing education requirements for licensees.

### **14. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING PROPOSAL BY ATTORNEY GENERAL’S OFFICE THAT THE BOARD ESTABLISH AN INTERAGENCY SERVICE AGREEMENT**

Dr. Olvey provided a summary to the Board. Dr. Olvey stated that currently the Board does not pay for legal services and that the Board office was contacted by the Attorney General’s (AG) Office with a proposal to establish an Interagency Service Agreement (ISA) that would include payment for legal services. Dr. Olvey clarified that the AG’s Office receives funding from the Legislature; however, payment for legal services would assist in filling attorney positions. Some Boards and Commissions have established an ISA and pay for legal services, while others do not. Dr. Olvey stated that the Board does not have the revenue to pay for legal services for the current fiscal year. Dr. Olvey elaborated that the Board approved an increase in fees for renewal applications and licenses beginning in the Spring of 2013. Dr. Olvey noted that the Board office has been working at three-quarter staffing and has been unable to implement projects, such as accepting credit cards for payment, designing and implementing online applications, and revising the renewal process due to lack of funds. Board members expressed that legal services provided by the Board’s Assistant Attorney General are excellent and inquired whether there would be a negative impact on legal services, if payment is not made. It was the consensus of the Board to gather more information and extend an invitation to Mr. John Tellier, Licensing and Enforcement Section Chief, to attend a future Board meeting to discuss the proposal.

### **15. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CLARIFICATION OF USE OF REAPPLICATION FORM**

Ms. Duracinski provided a summary to the Board. Ms. Duracinski explained that neither the rules nor statutes are clear as to when an applicant may reapply versus when an applicant has to apply anew. Ms. Duracinski

elaborated that the only time a reapplication is currently utilized is when an applicant has failed the EPPP and wishes to reapply. In addition, there are circumstances when an application has been administratively closed and the applicant wishes to again apply for licensure or a licensee has allowed the license to expire. In these instances, applicants have been required to apply anew.

Board members deliberated and determined that if the Board office still has a file that has not yet been destroyed pursuant to the State Records Retention Schedule, the Board office can utilize some documents from the previous file, such as official transcripts and verification of supervised experience. It was the consensus of the Board to draft a Substantive Policy Statement for review and approval at a future Board meeting clarifying this issue.

## **16. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING ANNUAL MEETING OF ASSOCIATION OF STATE AND PROVINCIAL PSYCHOLOGY BOARDS**

Dr. Brundage provided a summary to the Board. Dr. Brundage announced that Dr. Olvey was presented the Ming Fisher Award at the 2012 Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) Annual Meeting. Dr. Bohanske stated that ASPPB is the proprietor of the EPPP and that Puerto Rico will have the exclusive rights to the Spanish version of the EPPP. At this time, it is unknown if other jurisdictions will have access to the Spanish version of the EPPP. Dr. Bohanske stated that ASPPB is initiating its universal application and suggested that the Board contemplate utilizing the universal application.

## **17. INFORMAL INTERVIEW – David A. Biegen, Ed.D., RFI 11-34**

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

Chairman Wechsler reviewed Informal Interview procedures. Dr. Biegen and his legal counsel, Larry Cohen, were present. Chairman Wechsler swore in Dr. Biegen. Mr. Cohen requested to speak, made a statement and answered Board member's questions. Mr. Cohen affirmed that Dr. Biegen is no longer practicing psychology and has no intent to resume practicing. Mr. Cohen addressed the issue relating to Dr. Biegen's previous Board Order pertaining to chaperones. Mr. Cohen stated that Dr. Biegen's previous investigative file was located in the Board office wherein extensive documentation was found that Dr. Biegen was in compliance with the Order. Mr. Cohen addressed the current allegations stating that the complaint arises out of a Court proceeding wherein Dr. Biegen testified as a witness for his client. Mr. Cohen confirmed that Dr. Biegen's records were available to the Court at the time of the proceeding.

Dr. DiBacco provided an overview of the case. Dr. Biegen answered Board members' questions regarding his court testimony. Board members expressed concern that Dr. Biegen's records are not clear due to poor penmanship. Board members stated that Dr. Biegen did not provide misleading testimony in Court pertaining to dates and did not avow to the accuracy of his records in Court.

The Complainant, M.M. and her legal counsel, Greg Eagleburger, were present. Chairman Wechsler swore in the Complainant. The Complainant made a statement and answered Board members' questions. Mr. Eagleburger answered Board members' questions. The Complainant discussed her concerns with Dr. Biegen's patient records and stated she believed the records were falsified and that Dr. Biegen did not see this patient in treatment. Mr. Cohen stated that both Dr. Biegen and his patient testified under oath in Court that services were provided by Dr. Biegen to the patient. Mr. Cohen stated that Mr. Eagleburger filed a motion with the Court not to allow the jury to have Dr. Biegen's patient records.

The Board deliberated. Board members voiced concern that Dr. Biegen's patient records are inaccurate and illegible. Board members expressed concern that Dr. Biegen's notes are disorganized. Additionally, Board members expressed concern that there are no billing records.

Following deliberation, Dr. Wechsler made a motion, seconded by Dr. Mellott, to issue Dr. Biegen a Decree of Censure and to include Findings of Fact, for violations of A.R.S. §32-2061(13)(h) failing or refusing to maintain and retain adequate business, financial or professional records pertaining to the psychological services provided to a client by listing wrong dates in the patient file, the notes are disorganized, there is no evidence to conclude whether the notes are contemporaneous and there are no billing records. Dr. Beigen expressed that he will cancel his license after receiving the Decree of Censure. The motion carried 6-0 on a roll call vote.

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

RFI 12-17, David M. Rubin, Ph.D.

Dr. Brundage recused from this agenda item.

Mr. Donaldson provided a summary to the Board. The Complainant, R.H., alleges that Dr. Rubin treated his child without his consent. The Complainant alleges that because of Dr. Rubin's actions his parental time was temporarily suspended. The Complainant alleges that although he has joint legal custody, Dr. Rubin refused to release records to him.

Dr. Rubin and his legal counsel, Larry Cohen, were present, requested to speak, made statements to the Board and answered Board members' questions. Mr. Cohen stated that Dr. Rubin has recognized that at the first consultation he should have inquired if there was a custody issue and whether Court Orders were in place. Mr. Cohen asserted that Dr. Rubin chose to release the patient records to the Court to let the Court determine if the records should be released to the Complainant. Mr. Cohen stated that Dr. Rubin was asked to provide his opinion as to whether the child was in danger while in the Complainant's care. Mr. Cohen stated that Dr. Rubin opined that parenting time should cease pending further investigation. Dr. Rubin stated that he realizes that before giving an opinion to the Court, he should have interviewed the Complainant. Dr. Rubin stated that he felt compelled to protect the child and believed that he was acting in the best interest of the child. Dr. Rubin confirmed that he overstepped his boundaries in this matter by making a recommendation to the Court.

The Complainant was present telephonically, requested to speak and made a statement. The Complainant stated that Dr. Rubin did not contact him regarding treatment of his child and never obtained his consent for treatment of his child. The Complainant stated that because of Dr. Rubin's actions, his child has suffered severe emotional damage.

Board members asked Dr. Rubin what steps he has taken in response to this complaint. Dr. Rubin stated that he is diligent in obtaining Informed Consent by all parties involved before providing services to a child and is clear in informing individuals that he will not become involved in custody matters. Dr. Rubin divulged that he does provide forensic services, but is diligent in keeping his private practice separate from his forensic practice.

Board members deliberated. Board members expressed concern that Dr. Rubin failed to obtain Informed Consent from all parties involved before providing services and that Dr. Rubin provided an affidavit to the Court regarding suspending parenting time for one parent without meeting or evaluating the parent.

After deliberation, Dr. DiBacco made a motion, seconded by Dr. Wechsler to offer Dr. Rubin a Letter of Concern for failing to obtain Informed Consent and for providing an affidavit to the Court regarding suspending parenting time without meeting or evaluating that parent. The Board recommended that Dr. Rubin revise his Informed Consent form for therapy patients to include a statement that he will not testify in Court. The Board suggested that participating in a monthly peer supervision group would be beneficial to Dr. Rubin. Additionally, the Board is recommending that Dr. Rubin read the book by Stanley L. Brodsky, *Testifying in Court: Guidelines and Maxims for the Expert Witness*. An examination for continuing education credit relating to the book is available, and the Board recommended that Dr. Rubin take the exam and submit the results to the Board. The motion carried 5-0 on a roll call vote.

**19. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATING TO A REQUEST FOR A CONTINUANCE FILED BY J. VINCENT GONZALEZ, ESQ. ON BEHALF OF MS. CIARA COULTRAP**

Ms. Coultrap and her legal counsel, Vincent Gonzalez, were present. Mr. Gonzalez stated that he would like to withdraw his request for a continuance. It was the consensus of the Board to accept Mr. Gonzalez's request to withdraw his request for a continuance.

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

RFI T-12-07, Ciara Coultrap

Dr. Bohankse provided a summary to the Board. Dr. Bohanske stated that the Complainant, F. J., alleges that Ms. Coultrap has represented herself as a psychologist. Dr. Bohanske provided a summary of Ms. Coultrap's vitae and educational background. Dr. Bohanske cited incidents where Ms. Coultrap uses Psy.D. and Ph.D. interchangeably. Additionally, Dr. Bohanske elaborated that many of Ms. Coultrap's degrees were acquired by paying an organization for the degree without having to complete coursework.

Ms. Coultrap and her legal counsel, Vincent Gonzalez, were present, requested to speak, made statements and answered Board members' questions. Mr. Gonzalez stated that Ms. Coultrap was acting under the supervision of Dr. Cherry, at the recommendation of Dr. Cherry, Ms. Coultrap began using Ph.D. when signing her name, Ms. Coultrap never provided psychological services and affirmed that the Court was fully aware that Ms. Coultrap is not licensed as a psychologist. Mr. Gonzalez stated that Ms. Coultrap paid Dr. Cherry for his supervision. Mr. Gonzalez stated that there is no evidence that Ms. Coultrap ever represented herself as a psychologist. Ms. Coultrap stated that she is a certified dentist. Ms. Coultrap elaborated on her education and training. Ms. Coultrap stated that she has obtained her schooling and subsequent degrees online due to the fact that she has five children. Ms. Coultrap stated that she never provided psychological services nor did she represent herself as a psychologist. Ms. Coultrap asserted that her role was a behavioral health technician and that she would observe Dr. Cherry. Ms. Coultrap stated that she would write reports under the direction of Dr. Cherry.

The Complainant, F.J., was present telephonically, requested to speak and made a statement. The Complainant stated that Ms. Coultrap was paid for her services and is concerned for public safety as Ms. Coultrap has misrepresented herself.

Board members deliberated. Board members stated that Ms. Coultrap does not hold any doctoral degrees from an accredited program. Board members expressed concern that there is continual representation and ignorance on the part of Ms. Coultrap to what a doctoral degree represents. Board members expressed concern that Ms. Coultrap has used Ph.D. and Psy.D. credentials interchangeably and that she has used those credentials without having earned a doctoral degree.

At 2:56 p.m., Mr. Donaldson made a motion, seconded by Dr. Brundage, to go into Executive Session to obtain confidential legal advice from the Board's attorney. The motion carried 6-0. Open session reconvened at 3:13 p.m.

After deliberation, Dr. Bohanske made a motion, seconded by Dr. Mellott, to issue Ms. Coultrap a Cease and Desist Order for misrepresentation of psychology degrees that she does not hold and misrepresentation of services that are provided; to submit letters to the presiding judges in all counties, the Arizona State Board of Dental Examiners, the Arizona State Board of Behavioral Health Examiners, the Domestic Relations Committee and the Association of Marriage and Family Therapists, detailing the concerns of the Board, the allegations brought forth and elaborating that Ms. Coultrap is not licensed to practice psychology in Arizona. The motion carried 6-0 on a roll call vote.

**21. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING AN UPDATE ON SCOPE OF PRACTICE FOR PSYCHOLOGISTS**

Dr. Olvey provided a summary to the Board stating the Exploratory Committee on the Scope of Practice for Psychologists will be meeting to review draft legislation that was provided to the Board by the Arizona Psychological Association (AzPA). Dr. Jeff Thomas, Past President of AzPA, was present and provided a



summary to the Board regarding recent and upcoming legislative activities. Dr. Thomas stated that AzPA is conducting stakeholder meetings with various organizations and groups. AzPA has continued to have discussions regarding scope of practice for psychologists on their member list serve. Presentations were made at AzPA's Annual Convention in Tucson regarding scope of practice for psychologists. Dr. Thomas stated that a Sunrise Application regarding scope of practice for psychologists was submitted on August 31, 2012, and that it is currently before the Joint Legislative Audit Committee. Board members thanked Dr. Thomas for the update and asked that it continue to receive updates.

## **22. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING DOCTOR OF BEHAVIORAL HEALTH DEGREE SEEKING LICENSURE**

Dr. Olvey provided a summary to the Board. Dr. Ronald O'Donnell was present and made a presentation to the Board and answered Board members questions. Dr. O'Donnell stated that he is still interested in creating a new license for the graduates of the Doctor of Behavioral Health Program. Dr. O'Donnell confirmed that the program is growing with more students applying for the program. Dr. O'Donnell focused on the scope of practice for the graduates of the program. Dr. O'Donnell elaborated that graduates from the Doctor of Behavioral Health Program typically practice in a hospital setting and serve as a part of the integrated health team. Dr. O'Donnell requested that the Board support the idea of a new license by next spring. Dr. O'Donnell affirmed that funding would be provided for the initial costs of creating a new license. Board members asked Dr. O'Donnell if this type of program is offered in other states. Board members expressed concern that creating a new license is a long process and that there is not currently a national association supporting the program or profession. It was the consensus of the Board that Dr. O'Donnell keep the Board apprised of the progress of the program.

## **23. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CONTRACT BETWEEN ASPPB AND THE BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGIST EXAMINERS FOR DELIVERY OF THE EPPP**

Dr. Olvey provided a summary stating that the Board currently contracts with the Professional Examination Services (PES) for continued administration of the EPPP in Arizona. The current five-year contract is due to expire in March, 2013. The Board office has received a letter from the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB), proprietor of the EPPP, indicating that ASPPB intends to establish agreements directly with State psychology Boards rather than asking PES to contract with Boards. A proposed agreement was also provided by ASPPB. ASPPB will continue to contract with PES to administer the EPPP. The agreement outlines responsibilities of the Board and ASPPB in order to ensure the EPPP is available for Board approved applicants. Dr. Olvey stated that it is likely that ASPPB will cover the cost of accommodations for Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) once the new agreement takes effect. Dr. Olvey confirmed that the cost of the EPPP will increase to \$600 for applicants beginning in March 2013. Dr. Olvey informed the Board that she initiated contact with the State's Procurement Office to inquire whether the agreement would need to follow the process for a contract.

After deliberation, Dr. Bohanske made a motion, seconded by Dr. Brundage, to approve finalization of the contract between ASPPB and the Board. The motion carried 6-0.

## **11. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING LEGISLATION FOR 2013 LEGISLATIVE SESSION (Cont.)**

The Board continued this item. Dr. Olvey provided the Board with examples of statutes the Board may want to update/revise in the future and indicated that the Board does not have the funds for a lobbyist for 2013. The Board discussed the advantages of proposing statutory changes in 2013 versus 2014. It was the consensus of the Board not to propose statutory changes at this time.

**24. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING INTERPRETATION OF A.R.S. §32-2071(F) PERTAINING TO REQUIREMENTS FOR SUPERVISED POSTDOCTORAL EXPERIENCE**

Dr. Olvey provided a summary to the Board. Dr. Olvey stated that Board staff is requesting that the Board clarify how the Board wishes to count the number of hours of direct client contact for postdoctoral experiences that include fewer than 1,500 hours. In addition, the Board was asked to clarify how the Board wishes to address instances in which an applicant accrued 1,500 postdoctoral hours but did not reach the 600 required direct client contact hours and whether the Board would allow the applicant to continue accruing additional postdoctoral hours in order to reach the required 600 direct client contact hours.

Board members deliberated and stated that it was not the intent of the statute to restrict the amount of postdoctoral hours an applicant can obtain. It was the consensus of the Board to prorate the direct client contact hours to 40 percent of the total number of postdoctoral hours for applicants with fewer than 1,500 postdoctoral hours. It was also the consensus of the Board to allow applicants to obtain more than 1,500 postdoctoral hours in order to obtain the required 600 hours of direct client contact; however, no more than 1,500 hours of postdoctoral experience will be allowed to be used toward the 3,000 hours of required experience and the applicant is still required to obtain 1 hour of supervision for every 20 hours worked.

**25. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE BOARD'S ROLE IN THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS AS WELL AS ROLE OF THE BOARD WHEN APPROACHED WITH REQUESTS FROM GROUPS/ORGANIZATIONS**

Dr. DiBacco provided a summary to the Board. Dr. DiBacco expressed an interest in the Board's view and recommendation on how Board members should approach legislation. Additionally, he asked for clarification from the Board regarding how a Board member should approach a situation when asked to speak on a specific area.

Ms. Galvin provided clarification stating that Board members are regularly approached by organizations/groups requesting that the Board member speak on certain issues. Ms. Galvin stated that Board members should always disclose that they are not speaking on behalf on the Board. Ms. Galvin stated that Board members should never speak about issues that are before the Board.

**26. NEW AGENDA ITEMS**

Dr. Mellott requested that the 2013 calendar be reviewed at a future meeting.

**27. ADJOURN**

There being no further business to come before the Board, a motion was made by Dr. Bohanske, seconded by Dr. Brundage, to adjourn the meeting at 5:00 p.m. The motion carried 6-0.

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Joseph C. Donaldson  
Board Secretary**