

**REGULAR SESSION MEETING MINUTES**  
**July 25, 2006**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Helene Fearon, P.T., President  
Joni Kalis, P.T., Vice President  
Mark Cornwall, P.T., Ph.D., Secretary  
Merlin Gossman, Member  
Randy Robbins, Member

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Heidi Herbst Paakkonen, Executive Director  
Peggy Hiller, P.T., Program Compliance Specialist (Investigator)  
Carol Lopez, Licensing Administrator  
Melissa Cornelius, Assistant Attorney General

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Fearon called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

**1. Review and Approval of Draft Minutes:**

**June 27, 2006 Regular Session Meeting**

Ms. Fearon introduced the agenda item, and the Board reviewed the draft minutes. Ms Fearon moved the minutes be approved as drafted. Ms. Kalis seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**June 27, 2006 Executive Session Meeting**

Ms. Fearon introduced the agenda item, and the Board reviewed the draft minutes. Ms Fearon moved the minutes be approved as drafted. Mr. Robbins seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**COMPLAINTS AND INVESTIGATIONS**

**Note: the agenda was recorded as follows**

**3. Initial Review of Complaint:**

**#05-23; Ray Holtzapfel, P.T.**

Ms. Fearon introduced the agenda item and Ms. Hiller summarized the complaint filed against Mr. Holtzapfel by Ms. Yvonne Harrison, P.T. Ms. Harrison reviewed Mr. Holtzapfel's physical therapy documentation on behalf of a former patient, J.S., at First Choice Physical Therapy, in

conjunction with a civil lawsuit filed against Mr. Holtzapfel. Ms. Harrison alleged that Mr. Holtzapfel's documentation for J.S. was difficult to read and was incomplete, that the duration of services may have been excessive and that J.S. sustained physical injury during the course of treatment. If true, these allegations may be a violation of:

- **A.R.S. § 32-2044 (1)** "Violating this chapter, board rules or a written board order."
- **A.R.S. § 32-2044(4)** "Engaging in the performance of substandard care by a physical therapist due to a deliberate or negligent act or failure to act regardless of whether actual injury to the patient is established."
- **A.R.S. § 32-2044(12)** "Failing to adhere to the recognized standards of ethics of the physical therapy profession."
  - ***Code of Ethics Principle 3*** "Physical therapists accept responsibility for the exercise of sound judgment."
    - ***Guide for Profession Conduct 3.1*** Acceptance of Responsibility **E.** "When a patient is referred from another practitioner, the physical therapist shall communicate the findings of the examination...to the referring practitioner..."
  - ***Code of Ethics Principle 1*** "Physical therapists respect the rights and dignity of all individuals."
    - ***Guide for Professional Conduct 1.4*** Informed Consent "Physical therapists shall obtain patient informed consent before treatment, to include disclosure of: (i) the nature of the proposed intervention, (ii) material risks of harm or complications, (iii) reasonable alternatives to the proposed interventions, and (iv) goals of treatment."
- **A.R.S. § 32-2044(20)** "Failing to maintain adequate patient records. For the purposes of this subsection, "adequate patient records" means legible records that comply with board rules and that contain at a minimum an evaluation of objective findings, a diagnosis, the plan of care, the treatment record, a discharge summary and sufficient information to identify the patient."
- **A.A.C. R4-24-301. A.** "A physical therapist shall provide the referring practitioner, if any, with information from the patient assessment, diagnosis, and plan of care. A physical therapist shall provide this information, verbally or in writing, after a patient is initially evaluated."
- **A.A.C. R4-24-301. C.** "A physical therapist shall obtain a patient's informed consent before treatment. The consent shall be in writing or documented in the patient chart."
- **A.R.S. § 32-2044(22)** "Providing treatment intervention unwarranted by the condition of the patient or treatment beyond the point of reasonable benefit."

In his response to the complaint submitted by his attorney, Mr. Cody Hall, Mr. Holtzapfel's noted that Ms. Harrison did not have a complete copy of J.S.'s physical therapy records when she reviewed the treatment documentation. He acknowledged that the civil suit alleges he failed to provide J.S. with proper therapy and he breached his duty of care resulting in the injuries sustained in Ms. Smith's fall during therapy. This matter has yet to be resolved in civil court although a settlement is pending. Ms. Hiller advised the Board that Mr. Hall submitted the proposed settlement to the Board office two days prior to this meeting, and she had prepared copies for the Board but that the document was too voluminous to review at this time. Mr. Holtzapfel was treating J.S. for ataxia and concurrently for chronic left shoulder and right hip pain from March 12, 2003 until the incident of her injury on May 12, 2003. Prior to this incident

J.S. had performed diagonal “plyometric” exercises with six pounds of weight attached to her waist through a cable to a pulley stack. “While she was walking towards the weight machine in a zigzag pattern, the patient lost her footing and fell forward. It appeared to Mr. Holtzapfel as if the sole of the patient’s left shoe caught on the carpet. The patient fell towards the weight tower along the wall, and she injured her left shoulder.” Mr. Holtzapfel was present in the gym area when the injury occurred. Mr. Holtzapfel’s response also asserts that his treatment documentation is legible and not difficult to read; the treatment records contain a document titled “Patient Responsibility Form that reflects consent and authorization for treatment; he kept both referring physicians informed of Ms. Smith’s progress; objective measures are included in the treatment records; J.S.’s prior medical history was known to him through her previous treatment; the treatment records contain assessments; and J.S.’s fall during therapy was not the result of medical malpractice. Following discussion, Dr. Cornwall moved to dismiss the possible violations under the jurisdiction of A.R.S. §32-2044(12), failing to adhere to the recognized standards of ethics and of A.R.S. §32-2044(1) specific to A.A.C. R4-24-301, failing to obtain informed consent for treatment, as there was no evidence in the investigative record to suggest that Mr. Holtzapfel had violated these sections. Ms. Fearon seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote. The Board discussed whether questions were raised by the investigative report relative to the remaining allegations to warrant inviting Mr. Holtzapfel for an informal hearing. The Board questioned the licensee’s inaccurate use of the term “plyometrics” to describe the exercises that he had J.S. perform. Ms. Hiller advised the Board that during an informal discussion with Mr. Holtzapfel that took place while she was in his clinic retrieving records for the investigation, the licensee stated that he severely regretted his erroneous use of the term “plyometrics”, and that more accurately he should have stated that he was using “resisted gait activities”. The Board noted the proposed case settlement stipulates that Mr. Holtzapfel admits no wrong-doing with respect to the care provided to J.S. and to the incident where she fell and injured her shoulder. The Board discussed the fact that the treatment notes indicate that J.S. was progressing with her goals, and questioned whether it was necessary to invite Mr. Holtzapfel for an informal hearing in order to confirm this fact and to discuss with him that he failed to document a discharge summary for J.S.’s treatment for chronic pain. Dr. Cornwall moved to dismiss the complaint allegations under A.R.S. §32-2044(4), providing substandard care. Ms. Kalis seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote. Following additional discussion, Dr. Cornwall moved to dismiss the complaint allegations under A.R.S. §32-2044(22), providing treatment intervention unwarranted by the condition of the patient or treatment beyond the point of reasonable benefit. Mr. Gossman seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote. The Board then discussed the fact that the evaluation Mr. Holtzapfel prepared could have been more complete with respect to recording J.S.’s prior medical condition. Dr. Cornwall moved to dismiss the remaining complaints allegations and to issue an Advisory Letter that will address the failure on the part of Mr. Holtzapfel to document the discharge summary and to develop more thorough documentation of J.S.’s medical history and his clinical rationale for establishing the treatment plan for J.S. Ms. Kalis seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

## **2. Review and Possible Action on Complaint**

### **#05-20; Richard Sedillo, P.T.**

#### **a. Consideration of Request for Continuation of Informal Hearing**

#### **b. Consideration of Request to Continue Investigation**

Ms. Fearon introduced the agenda item and Ms. Herbst Paakkonen reminded the Board that complaint #05-20 concerns Richard Sedillo, P.T. a former employee of Stephen Glacy, M.D. at the Arizona Pain Clinic. Dr. Glacy filed this complaint alleging that during the time of his employment, Mr. Sedillo failed to maintain adequate patient records for hundreds of patient referred by Dr. Glacy to Mr. Sedillo from January 2003 through May 2005. According to the complainant, an audit conducted by Arizona Pain Clinic personnel identified 504 missing patient notes including 34 missing initial evaluations, 237 missing daily progress notes, and 233 missing discharge summaries. If true, these allegations may be a violation of:

- **A.R.S. § 32-2044 (1)** “Violating this chapter, board rules or a written board order.”
- **A.R.S. § 32-2044 (20)** “Failing to maintain adequate patient records. For the purposes of this subsection, “adequate patient records” means legible records that comply with board rules and that contain at a minimum an evaluation of objective findings, a diagnosis, the plan of care, the treatment record, a discharge summary and sufficient information to identify the patient.”
- **A.R.S. § 32-2044(12)** “Failing to adhere to the recognized standards of ethics of the physical therapy profession.”

In April of 2006, Ms. Hiller, Ms. Donna Borden, P.T., contract investigator, conducted two on-site reviews of the charts for patients treated by Mr. Sedillo, as well as for those patients treated by other therapists on staff at the Arizona Pain Clinic. This audit, consisting of 30 patient charts reflecting 68 alleged missing treatment notes, found that all of the physical therapists at the Arizona Pain Clinic had missing records identified by Dr. Glacy’s audit for patient treatments documented in 2004. Twenty of the missing records were for Mr. Sedillo’s treatment visits while 22 missing records were for treatments provided by the other therapists on staff. Several of the treatment notes alleged to be missing were actually misfiled, misdated or found upon audit of the patient chart. Additionally, 6 of the alleged missing records appeared to be for dates when the patients did not receive physical therapy services, and several treatment notes were found to be missing that were not identified on Dr. Glacy’s audit. The Board reviewed this complaint during its regular session meeting of April 25, 2006 and voted to remand the complaint to an informal hearing. Mr. Jerry Gaffaney, attorney for Mr. Sedillo, contacted Ms. Herbst Paakkonen in early July to discuss a possible settlement to the case, indicating that while Mr. Sedillo believes that certain circumstances beyond his control resulted in several patient records being incomplete, Mr. Sedillo is prepared to accept a certain level of responsibility for the condition of the records given that A.R.S. §32-2044(20) establishes that a physical therapist is responsible for maintaining patient records. Mr. Gaffaney proposed a continuation for the hearing in order to allow the Board time to conduct a random audit of Mr. Sedillo’s current patient records to determine whether he is currently in compliance with A.R.S. §32-2044(20). During this settlement conference Mr. Sedillo agreed that he would, at a minimum, sign a Consent Agreement that would issue a Decree of Censure for a violation of §32-2044(20) as a final disposition of the case. He also agreed that should a review of his records reveal deficiencies, he would sign a Consent Agreement imposing a term of probation and remediation terms as determined by the Board. Additionally, Dr. Glacy, submitted a packet of materials to the Board office on July 11, 2006 which consists of affidavits signed by current employees at the Arizona Pain Clinic concerning Mr. Sedillo’s alleged failure to maintain patient records, a summary of

the costs Dr. Glacy estimates that he has incurred for his staff to conduct the on-going internal audit of his clinic's patient records, and notes from staff meetings during which the maintenance of patient records was allegedly discussed with Mr. Sedillo. Finally, the Board was provided copies of nine patient records from among those audited by Ms. Hiller and Ms. Borden. Ms. Hiller prepared a summary of her findings comparing the original audit findings with her current findings. In several instances, records that were not present in April are now present. Mr. Gaffaney addressed the Board on behalf of Mr. Sedillo acknowledging that there is controversy concerning the condition of the records. He indicated that Mr. Sedillo is willing to accept responsibility for the condition of the records rather than require that the Board conduct a contentious hearing. Mr. Gaffaney explained that Mr. Sedillo requests a continuance of the informal hearing for purposes of assuring the Board that Mr. Sedillo's record-keeping is in compliance with the law at this time and that he is not a danger to public. He is also willing to accept a Decree of Censure with a violation of A.R.S. §32-2044(20). The Board discussed offering a Consent Agreement to Mr. Sedillo containing a Decree of Censure and proposing a term of probation that would include one on-site review of records; Mr. Sedillo's probation would be terminated early if he demonstrates that he is in compliance with A.R.S. §32-2044(20). The Board proposed that the probation term could be of short duration – perhaps 6 months – and if the initial review is clean, he could petition for early termination. The Board noted that there is evidence in the record that demonstrates Mr. Sedillo was resistant to requests made by other staff members of the Arizona Pain Clinic to complete his chart notations. Mr. Gaffaney stated that his client would want to see the consent agreement before committing verbally to its terms, and advised the Board that Mr. Sedillo will dispute some of the facts that have been presented to the Board. Dr. Glacy was granted permission to address the Board. He stated that Mr. Sedillo has filed a lawsuit against him. He also asked what mechanism the Board will use to compel Mr. Sedillo to complete the missing notes, and asked whether the Board will order Mr. Sedillo to make restitution for costs that Dr. Glacy has incurred relative to the internal audit of the physical therapy records. The Board advised Dr. Glacy that it lacks that authority. Ms. Fearon moved the Board offer Mr. Sedillo a Consent Agreement containing findings of fact drafted by Board staff in conjunction with Board counsel reflecting the facts of the investigative record, containing conclusions of law citing violations of A.R.S. §32-2044(1), violating Board statutes and rules and of §32-2044(20), failing to maintain adequate patient records, and containing a probation term of 6 months during which time the Board will conduct one on-site review of 6 patient records to include 3 active and 3 discharged patients with the majority of the records to have Medicare as their payer. Ms. Kalis seconded the motion. The Board also discussed requiring Mr. Sedillo to complete a documentation course, but ultimately determined it was not necessary at this time and that he can pursue education in this area independently. The roll call vote was unanimous.

#### **4. Review and Possible Action on Disclosure on Licensure or Certification Renewal Application:**

##### **Melinda Cannamela, P.T.**

Ms. Fearon introduced the agenda item and Ms. Herbst Paakkonen reported that Ms. Cannamela had filed her licensure renewal application and answered “yes” to the question “Since your last renewal, have you been convicted of a felony, misdemeanor involving moral turpitude, or entered into diversion in lieu of prosecution in any jurisdiction of the United States or foreign country?” Additionally Ms. Cannamela submitted a written statement and a summary of court records for the Scottsdale City Court noting that on July 23, 2004 she pled guilty to a charge of Driving Under the

Influence (DUI) of alcohol. Ms. Cannamela also submitted a copy of the Arizona Traffic Ticket and Complaint, and records indicating that she has complied with the court-ordered terms of her sentence. Ms. Cannamela addressed the Board and stated that this event was an isolated incident and assured the Board that she is a safe and competent physical therapist. The Board questioned why Ms. Cannamela did not report this charge with her last licensure renewal application. Board staff advised that Ms. Cannamela had filed her 2004-2006 application prior to having been charged with this misdemeanor. Ms. Fearon moved to renew the license of Ms. Cannamela. Ms. Kalis seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**Julie Fernando, P.T.**

Ms. Fearon introduced the agenda item and Ms. Herbst Paakkonen reported that Ms. Fernando had filed her licensure renewal application and had answered “yes” to the question “Do you have any impairment to your cognitive, communicative or physical ability to engage in the practice of physical therapy with skill and safety?” Ms. Fernando attached a written statement noting that she continues to be stricken with Fibromyalgia Syndrome, and she provided an updated with respect to her current physical challenges. Ms. Fernando also submitted a note from her physician in which he advises that while she is on her way to “full recovery”, she is not yet able to return to the practice of physical therapy. Ms. Fernando submitted essentially the same information in July 2004 when she filed her licensure renewal application. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen advised the Board that Ms. Fernando is willing to sign a Consent Agreement that prohibits her from practicing unless she submits written clearance from her physician that she is capable of returning to the practice with skill and safety, identical to the agreement she signed two years ago. The Board discussed the fact that Ms. Fernando may engage in physical therapy education activities under her license, and the Board discussed the likelihood that Ms. Fernando will be required to demonstrate competency when she returns to the actual practice of physical therapy. Ms. Kalis moved to renew the license of Ms. Fernando. Ms. Fearon seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**Julie Funk, P.T.**

Ms. Fearon introduced the agenda item and Ms. Herbst Paakkonen reported that Ms. Funk had filed her licensure renewal application and answered “yes” to the question “Since your last renewal, have you been found guilty of or do you have a complaint, allegation or charge currently pending for any action by a professional licensing board in any jurisdiction of the United States or foreign country?” Ms. Funk subsequently submitted a written statement noting that she was disciplined by the Nevada Board of Physical Therapy in March of 2006, and she signed a Consent Decree finding that she failed to notify that Board of a change of professional and residential address – a violation of Nevada law. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen reported that she had confirmed with the Nevada Board that Ms. Funk has paid the administrative fine to that Board and her license was restored to good standing. Ms. Fearon moved to renew the license of Ms. Funk. Ms. Kalis seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**Susan Priestman, P.T.**

Ms. Fearon introduced the agenda item and Ms. Herbst Paakkonen reported that Ms. Priestman had filed her licensure renewal application and answered “yes” to the question “Since your last renewal, have you been found guilty of or do you have a complaint, allegation or charge currently pending for any action by a professional licensing board in any jurisdiction of the United States or foreign country?” Ms. Priestman also submitted a written statement noting that she was disciplined by the Nevada Board of Physical Therapy in November of 2005; she subsequently faxed a copy of a signed Consent Decree finding that she failed to notify that Board of a change of professional and residential address – a violation of Nevada law. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen reported that she had

confirmed with the Nevada Board that Ms. Priestman has paid the administrative fine to that Board and her license was restored to good standing. Ms. Fearon moved to renew the license of Ms. Priestman. Mr. Robbins seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**Shauna Smith, P.T.**

Ms. Fearon introduced the agenda item and Ms. Herbst Paakkonen reported that Ms. Smith had filed her licensure renewal application and answered “yes” to the question “Since your last licensure renewal, have you been the subject of any criminal investigation by a federal, state or local agency or had criminal charges filed against you?” She attached a written statement noting that she has been charged with driving under the influence of alcohol on December 16, 2005. Additionally, she submitted court records concerning this matter. She has pled “not guilty” to the charges, and the case awaits a hearing unless a settlement is reached prior to trial. Ms. Smith submitted additional materials noting that she has entered a plea of “not guilty” to the charges, and the case awaits trial in October. Ms. Smith addressed the Board and stated that in spite of the incident she is still a competent physical therapist, and that she is not a danger to her patients. Ms. Fearon moved to renew Ms. Smith’s license with a directive to Ms. Smith to provide copies of the final judgment of the case to the Board office within 30 days. Ms. Kalis seconded the motion. The Board Directed staff to place on a future Board agenda a review and possible action concerning the resolution of Ms. Smith’s criminal case.

**5. Review and Possible Action on Disclosure on Licensure Renewal Application and Request for Waiver of Continuing Competence Requirement:**

**Robert Hilz, P.T.**

Ms. Fearon introduced the agenda item and Ms. Herbst Paakkonen summarized the request submitted by Mr. Hilz. The licensee had filed his licensure renewal application indicating “yes” to the question “do you have any impairment to your cognitive, communicative, or physical ability to engage in the practice of physical therapy with skill and safety? Since he filed his licensure renewal application for the 2004-2006 licensure period, Mr. Hilz’s condition relative to his A.L.S has not changed significantly. Mr. Hilz filed the request for renewal of his license because it is a source of personal importance for him. He also requests that the Board grant him a waiver of his continuing competence requirements as the disease prevents him from completing this requirement. Mr. Hilz also submitted a statement from his physician affirming that he is unable to practice physical therapy. Mr. Hilz indicated that he is willing to sign a Consent Agreement that prohibits him from practicing physical therapy unless he provides evidence to the Board of having obtained written clearance from his physician. Dr. Cornwall moved to offer Mr. Hilz a Consent Agreement renewing his license and granting him the waiver of his continuing competence requirement, and that prohibits him from practicing physical therapy unless he submits written evidence from his physician stating that he may return to practice. Ms. Kalis seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**SUBSTANTIVE REVIEWS OF APPLICATIONS FOR LICENSURE & CERTIFICATION**

**6. Substantive Review and Possible Action on the Following Applications for Physical Therapist Licensure:**

<b>Janene K. Alcantar</b>	<b>Mary P. Aloe</b>	<b>Sarah J. Barendt</b>
<b>Jessica L. Baronas</b>	<b>Monica S. Becker</b>	<b>Eric D. Biglang-Awa</b>
<b>Sharon L. Caulder</b>	<b>Lynne A. Coffin</b>	<b>Taylor L. Custer</b>
<b>Carysa M. Dugan</b>	<b>Garrett C. Early</b>	<b>Jamie R. Hartzell</b>
<b>Paige L. Heller</b>	<b>Blas Herrera</b>	<b>Katherine E. Kolshak</b>

<b>Anne M. Lehmann</b>	<b>Janis J. Kim</b>	<b>Tara R. Martin</b>
<b>Vancil B. McNulty</b>	<b>Wolfgang J. Oswald</b>	<b>Saundra M. Patterson</b>
<b>Bethany L. Phillips</b>	<b>Kristen N. Purdum</b>	<b>Alessandra L. SantaBarbara</b>
<b>Stephanie G. Schild</b>	<b>Rhonda L. Scnabl</b>	<b>Brian A. Schwallier</b>
<b>Eric L. Shifley</b>	<b>Margaret M. Siegel</b>	<b>April R. Sneathen</b>
<b>Tracy L. South</b>	<b>Ryan K. Tobin</b>	<b>Katherine C. Toney</b>
<b>Sarah J. Vesley</b>	<b>Kate M. Warren</b>	<b>Joseph A. Malecha</b>
<b>Todd W. Holland</b>	<b>Laura A. Halbrook</b>	

Ms. Fearon introduced the agenda item and the Board stated the application file for Ms. Caulder requires additional discussion. Dr. Cornwall disclosed he had a prior professor-student relationship with the following students: J. Alcantar, J. Baronas, L. Coffin, T. Custer, G. Early, J. Hartzell, T. Martin, B. Phillips, B. Schwallier, A. Sneathen, T. South, S. Vesley and J. Malecha; the relationship no longer exists so Dr. Cornwall stated that he can objectively vote to grant or deny licensure. Ms. Fearon was assured by Board staff that the remaining files were administratively complete. Ms. Kalis moved to grant licensure to the all the applicants with the exception of Ms. Caulder. Mr. Gossman seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote. Ms. Calder's file was discussed; the Board questioned whether an interview with her was beneficial for purposes of obtaining additional information concerning her moral character as she has been found guilty on 5 counts of fraud in U.S. District Court. The Board questioned staff concerning her current address; the address of record is in New Jersey. Board members noted that her application materials indicate that she has not practiced since 1989 which was in a limited practice environment. Additionally, Ms. Caulder submitted no evidence of continuing education in the field. The Board was advised by Ms. Cornelius that if the application is denied and if Ms. Caulder appeals, the burden is hers to show an Administrative Law Judge or the Board that she is competent to hold a PT license. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen also noted that denial of initial licensure is reportable to the HIP-DB – the national disciplinary data-bank. Ms. Kalis moved to deny licensure to Ms. Caulder based on the felony conviction, and due to the fact that the applicant has not practiced since 1989. Mr. Robbins seconded the motion. The motion carried a unanimous vote.

**7. Substantive Review and Possible Action on the Following Applications for Physical Therapist Assistant Certification:**

<b>Mark G. Anderson</b>	<b>Leslie A. Bugbee</b>	<b>Mary E. Kiefer</b>
<b>James E. Kilgore</b>	<b>Phillip L. Leavell</b>	<b>Jessica A. McKee</b>
<b>Lori A. Miles</b>		

Ms. Fearon introduced the agenda item and Board staff confirmed the applications were administratively complete. Ms. Kalis moved to grant certification to all the listed applicants and Mr. Robbins seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**8. Substantive Review of and Possible Action on the Following Applications for Physical Therapist Licensure (Foreign Educated, Graduates of Program Not Accredited by CAPTE):**

**a. Review for Determination of Substantially Equivalent Education and Possible Action on Approval to Take National Physical Therapist Examination**

Ms. Fearon introduced the agenda item and stated the Board will take each applicant separately:

**Thelma Caisip**



Ms. Caisip's file was reviewed by the Board. The Board discussed her credential evaluation report, noting that she has met the minimum requirements for both general and professional semester credit hour. Ms. Kalis moved to find Ms. Caisip's education to be substantively equivalent to that of a graduate a U.S. accredited program and to allow her to take the National Physical Therapy Examination (NPTE). Dr. Cornwall seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**Sunil S. George**

Mr. George's file was reviewed by the Board. The Board discussed his credential evaluation report, noting that he has not met the minimum requirements for general semester credit hours. Ms. Kalis moved to find Mr. George's education not substantively equivalent to that of a graduate a U.S. accredited program and to deny his request to take the NPTE. Mr. Gossman seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**Leah Anne Marzan**

Ms. Marzan's file was reviewed by the Board. The Board discussed her credential evaluation report, noting that she has met the minimum requirements for both general and professional semester credit hours. Ms. Kalis moved to find Ms. Marzan's education to be substantively equivalent to that of a graduate a U.S. accredited program and to allow her to take the NPTE and upon passing be required to complete a supervised clinical practice period. Mr. Robbins seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**Ionel Cornea**

Mr. Cornea's file was first reviewed in January 2006 and found to be deficient in 10 general education semester credit hours. The Board reviewed the transcripts from Mohave Community College recently submitted by Mr. Cornea and approved the 12 semester credit hours. Ms. Kalis moved to find Mr. Cornea's education to be substantively equivalent to that of a graduate a U.S. accredited program and to allow him to take the NPTE and upon passing be required to complete a supervised clinical practice period and submit passing iBT scores. Ms Fearon seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**b. Review for Determination of Substantially Equivalent Education and Determination of Need for Supervised Clinical Practice Period (SCCP)**

Ms. Fearon introduced the agenda item and stated the Board will review each applicant separately:

**Maritess G. Ganz**

Ms. Ganz's file was reviewed by the Board. The Board discussed her credential evaluation report, noting that she has met the minimum requirements for both general and professional semester credit hours, and found her education to be substantively equivalent to that of a graduate a U.S. accredited program. The Board directed staff to request from the applicant a letter of explanation as to why the States of Arkansas and Missouri were excluded from the licensure history of the application and to request that she arrange to have submitted to the Board verification of licensure from both states. Additionally the Board requested receipt of passing scores from the iBT and on the jurisprudence examination before approval of the supervised clinical practice period proposal.

**Hannah Parry**

Ms. Parry's file was reviewed by the Board. The Board discussed her credential evaluation report, noting that she has met the minimum requirements for both general and professional semester credit hour, and found her education to be substantively equivalent to that of a graduate a U.S. accredited program. The Board requested Ms. Parry submit additional documentation for

consideration of completion of the Supervised clinical practice period and passing scores on the jurisprudence examination.

**Cletus D. Junio**

Mr. Junio's file was reviewed by the Board. The Board discussed his credential evaluation report, noting that he has met the minimum requirements for both general and professional semester credit hours, and found his education to be substantively equivalent to that of a graduate of a U.S. accredited program. The Board approved the completed interim evaluation form as evidence of completion of the supervised clinical practice period noting his experience practicing in New Hampshire in a general hospital for several years. Ms. Kalis moved to license Mr. Cletus upon receipt of passing scores for the jurisprudence and iBT exams. Ms. Fearon seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**BOARD BUSINESS AND REPORTS**

**11. Review and Possible Approval on Draft Substantive Policy Statement – Patient Care Management**

Ms. Herbst Paakkonen presented the revised draft Substantive Policy Statement and advised the Board that the document now reflects the changes to A.R.S. §32-2043; Supervision, patient care management. The second page of the draft lists the temporary session law language, and the Board's preliminary interpretations of that language. Ms. Cornelius advised the Board that the draft can reflect the Board's current understanding of the restrictions and requirements. The Board suggested some edits to the document for purposes of correcting minor errors and clarifying certain statements. The Board directed staff to schedule another review of the draft Substantive Policy Statement for the August agenda for purposes of final review and approval.

**9. Executive Director's Report**

- a. Financial Report:** No additional information to report.
- b. Board Staff Activities:** No additional information to report.
- c. FSBPT Initiatives and News:** No additional information to report.
- d. Rules Revision Update:** Ms. Herbst Paakkonen distributed the preliminary recommendations of the Rule Writing Task Force appointed to provide the Board with input relative to the proposed administrative rules that will address general supervision of physical therapist assistants. The Task Force has additional research to conduct and Ms. Herbst Paakkonen anticipates one additional meeting will be necessary for the group to finalize its recommendations to the Board.
- e. Legislative Update:** No additional information to report.

**10. Review and Possible Action on Draft Employee Performance Pay Plan**

Ms. Fearon introduced the agenda item and Ms. Herbst Paakkonen explained the purpose of the Employee Performance Pay Plan with respect to the 2.5% pay increase that all State employees were granted in March of 2006. The Board questioned whether the plan's performance measures can be easily tracked by Ms. Herbst Paakkonen and whether the plan establishes an administrative burden. She assured the Board that she is able to manage the quarterly assessment functions proposed in the plan. Dr. Cornwall moved to approve the plan as drafted. Ms. Fearon seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

Prepared by,

Heidi Herbst Paakkonen  
Executive Director

Approved by,

Mark Cornwall, P.T., Ph.D.  
Secretary