#### 2

### 3

# 4

### 5 6

## 7

#### 8

### 9

### 10

### 11

12

## 13 14

# 15

### 16

17

## 18 19

20

21

2223

24

25

BEFORE THE ARIZONA BOARD

OF BEHAVIORAL HEALTH EXAMINERS

#### In the Matter of:

Deanna D. Vance, LPC-10224, Licensed Professional Counselor, In the State of Arizona.

#### RESPONDENT

CASE NO. 2023-0166
CONSENT AGREEMENT

In the interest of a prompt and speedy settlement of the above captioned matter, consistent with the public interest, statutory requirements and responsibilities of the Arizona State Board of Behavioral Health Examiners ("Board"), and pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 32-3281(F) and 41-1092.07(F)(5), Deanna D. Vance ("Respondent") and the Board enter into this Consent Agreement, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order ("Consent Agreement") as a final disposition of this matter.

#### **RECITALS**

Respondent understands and agrees that:

- Any record prepared in this matter, all investigative materials prepared or received by the Board concerning the allegations, and all related materials and exhibits may be retained in the Board's file pertaining to this matter.
- 2. Respondent has the right to a formal administrative hearing at which Respondent can present evidence and cross examine the State's witnesses. Respondent hereby irrevocably waives their right to such formal hearing concerning these allegations and irrevocably waives their right to any rehearing or judicial review relating to the allegations contained in this Consent Agreement.
- Respondent has the right to consult with an attorney prior to entering into this Consent Agreement.

- 25 |

- 4. Respondent acknowledges and agrees that upon signing this Consent Agreement and returning it to the Board's Executive Director, Respondent may not revoke their acceptance of this Consent Agreement or make any modifications to it. Any modification of this original document is ineffective and void unless mutually approved by the parties in writing.
- 5. The findings contained in the Findings of Fact portion of this Consent Agreement are conclusive evidence of the facts stated herein between only Respondent and the Board for the final disposition of this matter and may be used for purposes of determining sanctions in any future disciplinary matter.
- 6. This Consent Agreement is subject to the Board's approval, and will be effective only when the Board accepts it. In the event the Board in its discretion does not approve this Consent Agreement, this Consent Agreement is withdrawn and shall be of no evidentiary value, nor shall it be relied upon or introduced in any disciplinary action by any party hereto, except that Respondent agrees that should the Board reject this Consent Agreement and this case proceeds to hearing, Respondent shall assert no claim that the Board was prejudiced by its review and discussion of this document or of any records relating thereto.
- 7. Respondent acknowledges and agrees that the acceptance of this Consent Agreement is solely to settle this Board matter and does not preclude the Board from instituting other proceedings as may be appropriate now or in the future. Furthermore, and notwithstanding any language in this Consent Agreement, this Consent Agreement does not preclude in any way any other state agency or officer or political subdivision of this state from instituting proceedings, investigating claims, or taking legal action as may be appropriate now or in the future relating to this matter or other matters concerning Respondent, including but not limited to violations of Arizona's Consumer Fraud Act. Respondent acknowledges that, other than with respect to the Board, this Consent Agreement makes no representations, implied or

otherwise, about the views or intended actions of any other state agency or officer or political subdivision of the state relating to this matter or other matters concerning Respondent.

- 8. Respondent understands that once the Board approves and signs this Consent Agreement, it is a public record that may be publicly disseminated as a formal action of the Board, and that it shall be reported as required by law to the National Practitioner Data Bank.
- 9. Respondent further understands that any violation of this Consent Agreement constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-3251(16)(n) and may result in disciplinary action pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-3281.
- 10. The Board therefore retains jurisdiction over Respondent and may initiate disciplinary action against Respondent if it determines that they have failed to comply with the terms of this Consent Agreement or of the practice act.

The Board issues the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order:

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

- Respondent is the holder of License No. LPC-10224 for the practice of counseling in the State of Arizona.
  - 2. From 12/17 05/22, Respondent provided behavioral health services to Client.
- 3 At the onset of services, Respondent had Complainant and the mother ("Mother") sign an informed consent for Client but the informed consent does not include anything regarding Respondent offering to provide court testimony as part of her services.
- 4. Respondent represents she was subpoenaed to appear in court, but had no intention to provide court testimony.
  - 5. Respondent in fact testified in court multiple times regarding Client's treatment.
- Despite Respondent testifying in court and billing Mother for her testimony,
   Respondent failed to document anywhere in the clinical record that she testified or the content of her testimony.

- 7. A 09/27/22 court transcript included the following in part based on her involvement:
  - a. Respondent acknowledged testifying in court before regarding Client.
  - b. Client was afraid of having to see Complainant outside of where Mother lives.
  - c. Respondent felt Complainant was not receptive during therapy sessions regarding Client and felt he was angry and blaming.
  - d. Client was doing better since not seeing Complainant.
  - e. Respondent stated that Client did not feel safe with Complainant and does not want to see him or be with him.
  - f. Respondent did not believe it was in Client's best interest to be forced to spend time with Complainant.
  - g. Respondent's perception of Complainant is based off of who he was in 2019, and Client's perceptions of Complainant.
  - h. Complainant's overall presentation was one of real anger.
  - i. Respondent did not see parental alienation as a factor.
  - j. Respondent feels it is best if Client is given the opportunity to decide when she is ready to rekindle a relationship with Complainant.
- 8. Respondent wrote a 03/15/19 letter upon the Judge's request regarding Client's response to contact with Complainant which included the following:
  - a. Client continued to be clear about not wanting to see Complainant.
  - b. Complainant was receptive and cooperative, but remained very angry and frustrated.
  - c. Perhaps this is one of the reasons that Client feels afraid.

- d. Respondent recommends that only phone calls continue, and time is given for Client to a happy, healthy child and to assess how to proceed with healing the relationship with Complainant.
- 9. Respondent in fact extended her boundaries of competence by providing her opinion regarding Complainant's contact with his child, when she was contracted to provide therapy services to Client.
- 10. Respondent further acknowledged not having any sort of training regarding writing letters.
- 11. Respondent inappropriately provided her recommendation via the letter to the Judge.
- 12. In her 09/22 court testimony she indicated her perception of Complainant was based on who he was in 2019, meaning Respondent was opinionating about Complainant based on interactions from three years prior.
- 13. At the onset of services, Respondent had Complainant and Mother sign an informed consent for Client to receive therapy services from Respondent.
- 14. Upon review of the clinical records, Respondent involved Mother in various therapy sessions with Client and Complainant participated individually for a number of sessions.
- 15. Respondent failed to ever have Complainant sign a separate informed consent for his own individual sessions.
- 16. Complainant did sign an informed consent with a reduced rate, but it was the same consent that Mother also signed.
- 17. Nowhere within the clinical records was it indicated that family therapy would be a modality of Client's therapy so it is unclear the reason or rationale for both Complainant's and Mother's involvement in the therapy.

3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

- 18. At the onset of services and throughout the course of treatment, Respondent failed to identify each participant's role in the therapy yet she represents the purpose was to provide individual therapy to Client and provide parenting skills to the parents.
- 19. Despite Respondent providing a number of individual services to Complainant, she maintained his clinical notes within Client's clinical file again making it unclear who the specific client was during the course of treatment.
- 20. Respondent also failed to maintain a treatment plan within Client's clinical records making it unclear what the goals of therapy were, whether the goals were supposed to be family therapy or not.
- 21. Respondent testified in court on behalf of Client when none of her clinical records outline that testifying would be a service she offers, once again making the nature of her clinical role unclear in this case.
- 22. Respondent failed to clearly define her role and relationship with each person involved in Client's and Complainant's therapy.
- 23. A 12/04/17 Informed Consent for Client that Respondent presently used in her practice is missing the following minimum Board requirements:
  - a. The client's right to participate in treatment decisions and in the development and revision of client's treatment plans.
  - b. The clients right to refuse any recommended treatment or to withdraw consent to treatment and to be advised of the consequences of refusal or withdrawal.
  - c. Dated signature from an authorized representative of the behavioral health entity.
- 24. Despite Respondent treating Client for several years, there was not a completed treatment plan within the clinical records.

25 ||

- 25. All of Respondent's progress notes failed to include the following minimum Board requirements:
  - a. If counseling services were provided, whether the counseling session was individual, couples, family or group.
  - b. Dated signature of licensee who provided the behavioral health service.
- 26. Throughout Client's treatment, Respondent completed numerous releases of information which all failed to include the minimum Board requirement regarding a statement indicating authorization and understanding the authorization can be revoked at any time.
- 27. During the Board's investigation, Respondent acknowledged conducting sessions via telehealth with Complainant and other clients, yet failed to implement any sort of telehealth informed consents until Board staff made her aware that telehealth consents are required when providing telehealth services.
- 28. Respondent has been independently licensed with the Board since 2004 and has failed to implement minimum practice standards to her clinical documentation as required by Board rules.
- 29. In 09/20 and 09/22, Respondent submitted her LPC renewal applications with the Board where she attested to completing the Board's Tutorial regarding statutes and regulations, which specifically provides education and training on clinical documentation standards.
- 30. Since being notified of the deficiencies with her clinical documentation, Respondent provided updated forms that all meet minimum Board requirements.

#### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

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.

- 2. The conduct and circumstances described in the Findings of Fact constitute a violation of A.R.S. § 32-3251(16)(m), engaging or offering to engage as a licensee in activities that are not congruent with the licensee's professional education, training or experience.
- 3. The conduct and circumstances described in the Findings of Fact constitute a violation of 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 following section of the ACA Code of Ethics:

#### A.8. Multiple Clients:

When a counselor agrees to provide counseling services to two or more persons who have a relationship, the counselor clarifies at the outside which person or persons are clients and the nature of the relationship the counselor will have with each involved person. If it becomes apparent that the counselor may be called upon to perform potentially conflicting roles, the counselor will clarify, adjust, or withdraw from roles appropriately.

4. The conduct and circumstances described in the Findings of Fact constitute a violation of A.R.S. § 32-3251(16)(p), failing to conform to minimum practice standards as developed by the board, as it relates to the following:

A.A.C R4-6-1101. Consent for Treatment

A.A.C R4-6-1102. Treatment Plan

A.A.C R4-6-1103. Client Record

A.A.C R4-6-1105. Confidentiality

A.A.C R4-6-1106. Telepractice

Mona Baskin Assistant Attorney General 2005 North Central Avenue Phoenix, AZ 85004 Deanna D. Vance Address of Record Respondent