1

3

In the Matter of:

In the State of Arizona.

CRYSTAL R HARRIS, Applicant for

Licensure as a Licensed Associate Counselor,

4

5

6 7

8

10

11

12

14

13

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Complaint No. 2014-0024

ORDER OF DENIAL OF LICENSURE

Respondent.

Crystal R Harris ("Respondent") applied for licensure as a Licensed Associate Counselor in the State of Arizona on October 22, 2012. On November 7, 2013, the Board of Behavioral Health Examiners ("Board") determined that Respondent was not eligible for licensure and denied the application because of unprofessional conduct. On July 25, 2014, the Board met to conduct the formal hearing on the appeal filed by Respondent in the above referenced matter. The matter was prosecuted by Assistant Attorney General Elizabeth A Campbell. Assistant Attorney General Diana Day of the Solicitor General's Office was present to provide independent advice to the Board. Respondent was present.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. In 11/00, Respondent was issued her Standard Secondary Education 7-12 teaching certificate by the Arizona Board of Education ("AzBE").
- 2. In 08/02, AzBE received a report from the Washington Elementary School District that indicated the following:
 - a. Respondent picked up a student.
 - b. When the student refused to stand, she dropped him from the waist level onto the concrete at least two times.
 - c. Respondent made two students walk barefoot on blacktop cement during a fire drill

while it was approximately 100 degrees.

- 3. In 10/06, AzBE received a secondary report regarding Respondent from the Dysart School District ("Dysart") that indicated the following:
 - a. Respondent slapped a student in the face with his own hands.
 - b. She disclosed confidential information to the grandmother of a student without the permission of the student's mother.
 - c. She sat a student down with sufficient force to cause the student to his head on the door, making him cry.
- 4. In 02/09, Respondent applied for a School Psychologist Certificate.
- 5. In 02/10, Respondent applied for a Cross Categorical Special Education teaching certificate.
- 6. In 08/10, after investigating the 08/02 and 10/06 allegations, AzBE:
 - a. Denied Respondent's 02/09 application for a School Psychologist certificate.
 - b. Refused to renew Respondent's Standard Cross Categorical Special Education K-12 teaching certificate.
- 7. Further findings by AzBE indicated the following:
 - a. A 03/03 Dysart employment application indicated that Respondent resigned from the Washington Elementary School District at the request of the district.
 - b. In 11/06, there was a serious breach of confidentiality while at Dysart.
 - c. In 01/07, Dysart placed her on a performance improvement plan due to unsatisfactory performance.
 - d. In 04/07, further performance allegations included a lack of honesty and responsibility.

- 8. As a result of AzBE's denial of Respondent's pending certification applications and denial of her renewal application, she can no longer provide any services in Arizona as a certified teacher and is prohibited from practicing as a certified school psychologist.
- 9. From 02/11 0811, Respondent was employed at an agency ("Agency 1").
- 10. Agency 1 personnel records indicate the following:
 - a. Respondent failed to follow Agency 1's Mandated Minimum Review Cycles for her cases on more than one occasion.
 - b. Two file audits revealed missing forms and incomplete documentation.
 - c. She inappropriately communicated with a minor client's mother instead of the client's father, who had sole custody.
 - d. When confronted, she displayed unprofessional conduct as a State employee by raising her voice.
 - e. She displayed non-effective communication and non-active listening skills in emails and phone conversations with clients.
 - f. On 08/16/11, she was involuntarily terminated from Agency 1.
- 11. From 10/11 01/13, Respondent was employed at another agency ("Agency 2") as a case manager.
- 12. Agency 2 personnel records indicate the following:
 - a. A 01/08/13 summary of Respondent's documentation over a 6 month period found multiple discrepancies in length of service and billing codes, as well as what appeared to be cloned notes.
 - b. On 01/11/13, she sent an unsecured email containing confidential client information to the wrong client.

25

1

- c. On 01/16/13, she created a progress note that indicated the following:
 - Length of service time was documented from 9:35 a.m. to 11:08 a.m.
 - "[S]taffing at [facility] [Client] and [Mother] toured facility and discussed job
 development, socialization activities, and computer training [facility] staff
 informed [Client] that currently agency is full and will put [Client] on waiting list
 for services".
- d. Agency 2 became concerned about the legitimacy of this note based on the following:
 - Mother called staff at 9:58 a.m. to report that Respondent did not show up for the scheduled staffing.
 - Staff overheard her apologizing to Mother on the phone for not attending the staffing.
- e. On 01/23/13, Agency 2 management met with her to discuss the "serious allegations" against her and to provide her with an opportunity to respond to these allegations.
- f. She was resistant to the allegations and stated:
 - She did not believe her conduct constituted a HIPAA breach.
 - She was not trained properly regarding required documentation.
- g. Following its review of this matter, Agency 2 determined that her creation of the 01/16/13 note was inappropriate and terminated her employment.
- h. During 08/13 telephonic investigative interviews, a supervisor and the Site Manager from Agency 2 indicated the following:
 - She created fraudulent notes.
 - Issues found during a review of her documentation were unusual and extraordinary.

- 13. During Respondent's investigative interview, she represented the following:
 - a. She arrived late for the 01/16/13 staffing scheduled with Mother and Client.
 - b. By the time she arrived, Mother had already left, but she was able to meet with Client.
 - c. She accurately documented the time she spent providing services to Client at the facility.
- 14. It is impossible to reconcile Respondent's statement that she accurately documented a staffing that occurred on 01/16/13 with the following:
 - a. Her 01/16/13 progress note indicates that she met with both Client and Mother.
 - b. According to Respondent, she arrived at the staffing late and Mother had already left the facility by the time she arrived.
 - c. Following its review of this matter, Agency 2 determined that her conduct was inappropriate and terminated her employment.
- 15. From 03/13 07/13, Respondent was employed at a third agency ("Agency 3").
- 16. An unsigned 06/21/13 Agency 3 Performance Evaluation rated her as Unsatisfactory or Needs Improvement in all categories and indicated the following:
 - a. On several occasions, she had yelled at and hung up on staff.
 - b. She has issues following directions.
 - c. She has refused to take required trainings.
 - d. She has been asked not to schedule herself directly with providers.
 - e. She must schedule shifts through Agency 3 in order to avoid overtime.
 - f. In response, she indicated that she was going to work if she was needed, disregarding Agency 3's directives.

- 17. According to a supervisor from Agency 3:
 - a. The 06/21/13 Performance Evaluation was reviewed with Respondent.
 - b. The issues were also discussed verbally with her several times before they were documented on 06/21/13.
 - c. She does not seem to accept feedback and, instead, will comment that she does her job well.
- 18. On the 03/20/13 employment application Respondent submitted to Agency 3, she misrepresented the basis for her leaving Agency 2 as "changes in policy".
- 19. On her 05/23/13 employment application with another agency ("Agency 4"), she indicated the following:
 - a. "I was asked to leave [Agency 2] for not completing paperwork with sufficient detail."
- 20. Respondent's representations to Agency 3 and Agency 4 regarding the basis for her separation from Agency 2 are not consistent with information provided by Agency 2 indicating that she was involuntarily terminated for a HIPAA breach and the creation of inconsistent and fraudulent documentation.
- 21. Under these circumstances, it appears she deliberately misrepresented the basis for her separation from Agency 2 on the employment applications she submitted to Agency 3 and Agency 4.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Respondent is not eligible for licensure pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-3275(6), as it relates to a violation of A.R.S. § 32-3251(12)(l), any conduct, practice or condition that impairs the ability of the licensee to safely and competently practice.

- 2. Respondent is not eligible for licensure pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-3275(6), as it relates to a violation of A.R.S. § 32-3251(12)(b), use of fraud or deceit in connection with rendering services as a licensee.
- 3. Respondent is not eligible for licensure pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-3275(6), as it relates to a violation of A.R.S. § 32-3251(12)(d), any false, fraudulent or deceptive statement connected with the practice of behavioral health.
- 4. Respondent is not eligible for licensure pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-3275(6), as it relates to a violation of A.R.S. § 32-3251(12)(11), being the subject of the revocation, suspension, surrender or any other disciplinary sanction of a professional license, certificate or registration or other adverse action related to a professional license, certificate or registration in another jurisdiction or country, including the failure to report the adverse action to the board. The action taken may include refusing, denying, revoking or suspending a license or certificate, the surrendering of a license or certificate, otherwise limiting, restricting or monitoring a license or placing a licensee on probation.

<u>ORDER</u>

Based on the evidence and testimony presented, and having heard the arguments of the parties, the Board hereby DENIES Respondent's appeal and affirms its previous decision to deny licensure.

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 date of

1	mailing. If a motion for rehearing is not filed, the Board's Order becomes effective thirty-f	ive
2	(35) days after it is mailed to Respondent.	
3	Respondent is further notified that the filing of a motion for rehearing is required	. to
4	preserve any rights of appeal to the Superior Court.	
5	Dated this 6th day of August, 201	4
6	20.7%	
7	Tobi Zavala, Executive Director	
8	Arizona Board of Behavioral Health Examiners	
9	ODICINIAL and the ferroscing filed	
10	The day of lugues of the foregoing filed, 2014, with:	
11	The Board of Behavioral Health Examiners	
12	3443 North Central Avenue, Suite 1700 Phoenix, AZ 85012	
13	COPY of the foregoing sent certified mail	
14	This 5th day of Quality, 2014, to:	
15	Crystal Harris	
16	Address of Record Respondent	
17	COPY of the foregoing sent by mail this tlay of the foregoing sent by mail this 2014 to:	
18	Elizabeth A Campbell	
19	Assistant Attorney General 1275 W. Washington, CIV/LES	
20	Phoenix, Arizona 85007	
21	Diana Day	
22	Assistant Attorney General, Solicitor General's Office 1275 W. Washington	
23	Phoenix, Arizona 85007	
24		
25	Board Staff	