BEFORE THE ARIZONA BOARD OF BEHAVIORAL HEALTH EXAMINERS

2 | In the Matter of:

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Deana M. Perry, LMSW-17830, Licensed Master Social Worker, Applicant for licensure as a Licensed Clinical Social Worker In the State of Arizona.

CASE NO. 2023-0005

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER OF REVOCATION AND ORDER OF DENIAL OF LICENSURE

RESPONDENT

On May 10, 2024, the Arizona Board of Behavioral Health Examiners ("Board") held a formal hearing in the above matter for the purpose of determining whether good cause exists for the Board to discipline Deana M. Perry ("Respondent's") License No. LMSW-17839, pursuant to A.R.S. § § 32-3251 et. seq. and A.A.C. R4-6-101 et. seq., and to consider the appeal filed by Respondent in the matter of her application for licensure as a Licensed Clinical Social Worker. Assistant Attorney General Mona Baskin appeared on behalf of the State. Assistant Attorney General Carrie Smith was present to provide independent legal advice to the Board. Respondent was not present. Board staff verified that the Complaint and Notice of Hearing in this matter had been mailed to Respondent's address of record with the Board.

AAG Baskin introduced 14 exhibits¹ and the testimony of one witness - Tobi Zavala, the Board's Executive Director. After having considered all the testimony and evidence presented, the Board issues the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order for License Revocation.

|| --

23 || .

24

25

| 1 Exhibits 2 - 9 and 11 were accepted under seal as confidential documents.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- Respondent is the holder of License No. LMSW-17830, for the practice of social work in Arizona, which was issued by the Board on or about May 1, 2019.
- 2. On or about January 23, 2020, Respondent was approved for supervised private practice for her agency ("Agency") under the supervision of a clinical supervisor ("Clinical Supervisor"), whom she met in May 2019 while they both worked at a home health agency.
- 3. In February of 2022, Respondent applied to the Board for an LCSW license. On the Board application, Respondent disclosed Clinical Supervisor as the supervisor who verified her supervised work experience and that the verification forms were submitted directly by Clinical Supervisor by email. Approximately 100 clinical supervision session notes were submitted in support of her application. Respondent signed a certifying statement that under penalty of perjury all information contained in her application, including all supporting documents were true and correct to the best of her knowledge and belief, and will full knowledge that any false statements or misrepresentations made in the application may be grounds for refusal, subsequent revocation or suspension of her license(s), or other disciplinary action.
- 4. On or about April 23, 2022, Board staff sent Respondent a deficiency notice identifying insufficient documentation relating to verification of supervised work experience and clinical supervision on her LCSW application. Board staff identified multiple areas of deficient documentation and asked Respondent to provide the documentation no later than June 22, 2022. Board staff requested that Respondent have Clinical Supervisor submit the following documentation:
 - Clinical Supervisor to complete new forms to include the hours acquired after 01/23/20.
 - Clinical Supervisor to submit copies of the contemporaneous documentation she relied on to verify the 3,200 hours of direct client contact hours

(psychotherapy and psychoeducation) and the contemporaneous clinical supervision session notes for the entire time from 01/23/20-01/30/22.

- Clinical Supervisor to complete new verification of clinical supervision and include the correct total hours based on inconsistencies in the submitted documentation.
- 5. On June 20, 2022, the Board received two documents in support of Respondent's application. The first document entitled, Social Work Verification of Clinical Supervision Form, states that the form must be completed by the Clinical Supervisor and must be submitted to the Board directly from the Clinical Supervisor. The form contains clinical supervision hours for 02/01/2020 to 02/01/2022, which reflects a total of 171 hours of clinical supervision. The Supervisor Attestation form bears the docusigned signature of Clinical Supervisor, dated 06/20/2022 12:52 PDT, attesting that the information in the verification and all supporting was true and correct. The form was submitted to the Board from Clinical Supervisor's email address.
- 6. The second document received by the Board on June 20, 2022, is entitled, Social Work Verification of Supervised Work Experience Form. The form indicates it must be completed by the Clinical Supervisor and must be submitted to the Board directly from the Clinical Supervisor. The form contains supervised work experience hours for 02/01/2020 to 02/01/2022, which reflects a total of 3,200 hours of supervised work experience in the practice of social work. The Supervisor Attestation form bears the docusigned signature of Clinical Supervisor, dated June 20, 2022 16:44 PDT, attesting that the information in the verification and all supporting was true and correct. The form was submitted to the Board from Clinical Supervisor's email address.
- 7. On or about June 20, 2022, Board Staff received a response from Clinical Supervisor's email address, which Board Staff believed had been authored by Clinical

Supervisor. The email contained the following response, "Please find the additional documentation requested on 5/23/22 [sic] regarding licensure for supervisee DeAna Perry." The email contained a professional signature block for Clinical Supervisor with her contact information.

- 8. The June 20, 2022, email also contained the following two attachments: Clinical Hours Documentation Spreadsheet and Signed Scanned Supervision Session Notes. Board staff reviewed the submitted documentation and detected irregularities including discrepancies between the dates the sessions occurred and the dates of the clinical supervision notes.
- 9. The Board Executive Director ("ED") attempted to reach Clinical Supervisor multiple times to seek further clarification regarding the documentation provided to the Board. On June 29, 2022, the ED sent an email to Clinical Supervisor advising her that both of her phone numbers did not appear to be hers and asked her to call the ED. The ED did not receive a response from Clinical Supervisor. Instead, Respondent responded by telephone to the ED's email indicating that Clinical Supervisor forwarded the email to her. Respondent attempted to answer the ED's questions on behalf of Clinical Supervisor. The ED advised Respondent that she needed to speak with Clinical Supervisor in order to move forward with Respondent's application.
- Respondent later contacted the ED by telephone and advised her that Clinical Supervisor was deceased.
 - 11. The ED confirmed that Clinical Supervisor had passed away on 06/13/22.
- 12. Neither the ED nor Board staff ever spoke with Clinical Supervisor to confirm the validity of any of the documentation submitted to the Board relating to her clinical supervision of Respondent/Applicant.
- 13. Following the opening of a Board complaint, Respondent stated to Board Staff and in her written response to the Board that she created an email address at the request of

Clinical Supervisor that would grant Respondent access to the email. Respondent stated that she had created this email address because Clinical Supervisor had limitations with technology. The email address Respondent created contained the name of Clinical Supervisor and the name of Respondent's private practice. Respondent used the email address created in Clinical Supervisor's name to submit Board documentation.

- 14. The Board investigation revealed that Respondent sent emails to the Board purportedly from Clinical Supervisor, and signed and submitted forms to support her application on behalf of Clinical Supervisor both before and after she had passed away on June 13, 2022, in an attempt to obtain licensure.
- 15. Respondent represented the following in her written response and during her investigative interview:
 - a. On 01/31/22, after meeting and reviewing the approved supervision verification forms and supporting documentation, the initial verification of clinical supervision and verification of supervised work experience were submitted by Respondent to the Board on behalf of Clinical Supervisor.
 - b. On 05/23/22, Respondent and Clinical Supervisor met, in person, to review the application deficiencies noted by Board staff. Based on information maintained in a notebook, Clinical Supervisor subsequently physically signed the requested supporting documentation. The notes were signed and dated to appear as if they were signed contemporaneously on the date of the actual date the supervision had occurred. Respondent told Board staff that at the time she did not see her actions as improper but now understood how it is a misrepresentation.
- 16. Contemporaneous documentation of the clinical supervision sessions was not maintained, but rather the notes were created and signed once Board staff requested further information.

17. Respondent and Clinical Supervisor conducted clinical supervision sessions involving client cases at various restaurant establishments. A majority of the clinical supervision session notes document the length of time between 90 to 120 minutes. Text message communication between Respondent and Clinical Supervisor confirmed that they conducted clinical supervision in public settings.

- 18. Text message communications between Respondent and Clinical Supervisor displayed a friendship between them. Respondent told Board staff that her professional relationship with Clinical Supervisor developed into a friendship. Respondent stated that she did not find anything wrong with having a friendship with Clinical Supervisor.
- 19. On February 17, 2023, the Board reviewed Respondent/Applicant's application and denied the application finding a violation of A.R.S. § 32-3275(A)(5), committing an act or engaging in any conduct that would constitute grounds for disciplinary action against a licensee. The Board specifically found violations of: A.R.S. § 32-3251(16)(I), engaging in any conduct, practice or condition that impairs the ability of the licensee to safely and competently practice the licensee's profession; A.R.S. § 32-3251(16)(c)(i), making any oral or written misrepresentation of a fact to secure or attempt to secure the issuance or renewal of a license; and A.R.S. § 32-3251(16)(k), engaging in any conduct or practice that is contrary to recognized standards of ethics in the behavioral health profession or that constitutes a danger to the health, welfare or safety of a client, as it relates to the NASW Code of Ethics: 3.01 Supervision and Consultation.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Respondent is not eligible for licensure pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-3275(A)(5) as it relates to A.R.S. § 32-3251(16)(I), engaging in any conduct, practice or condition that impairs the ability of the licensee to safely and competently practice the licensee's profession; and

A.R.S. § 32-3251(16)(c)(i), making any oral or written misrepresentation of a fact to secure or attempt to secure the issuance or renewal of a license.

- 2. The Board has jurisdiction over Respondent pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-3251 *et seq.* and the rules promulgated by the Board relating to Respondent's professional practice as a licensed behavioral health professional.
- 3. The conduct and circumstances described in the Findings of Fact constitute a violation of A.R.S. § 32-3251(16)(I), engaging in any conduct, practice or condition that impairs the ability of the licensee to safely and competently practice the licensee's profession; A.R.S. § 32-3251(16)(c)(i), making any oral or written misrepresentation of a fact to secure or attempt to secure the issuance or renewal of a license.

ORDER

Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusion of Law, the Board issues the following order:

- Respondent's license, LMSW-17830, is hereby REVOKED, effective immediately.
- Respondent's appeal is DENIED and the previous decision to deny licensure is affirmed.

RIGHT TO PETITION FOR REHEARING OR REVIEW

Respondent is hereby notified of the right to petition for a rehearing or review by filing a petition with the Board's Executive Director within thirty (30) days after service of this Order. A.R.S. § 41-1092.09. The petition must set forth legally sufficient reasons for granting a rehearing. A.A.C. R4-6-1002. Service of this Order is effective five (5) days after the date of mailing. If a motion for rehearing is not filed, the Board's Order becomes effective thirty-five (35) days after it is mailed to Respondent.

1	Dated this 28" day of May, 2024
2	Mi Zarola
3	By: TOBI ZAVALA, Executive Director
4	Arizona Board of Behavioral Health Examiners ORIGINAL of the foregoing filed
5	This <u>28th</u> day of <u>May</u> , 2024 with:
6 7	Arizona Board of Behavioral Health Examiners 1740 West Adams Street, Suite 3600 Phoenix, AZ 85007
8 9	COPY of the foregoing mailed via Interagency Mail This <u>28th</u> day of <u>May</u> , 2024, to:
10	Mona Baskin Assistant Attorney General
11	2005 North Central Avenue Phoenix, AZ 85004
12	Carrie Smith
13	Assistant Attorney General 2005 North Central Avenue
14	Phoenix, AZ 85004 Attorney for the Board of Behavioral Health Examiners
15	CORV of the foregoing mailed via regular and
16 17	COPY of the foregoing mailed via regular and Certified mail no. This <u>28th</u> day of <u>May</u> , 2024, to:
18	Deana M. Perry
19	Address of Record Respondent
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	