2

3

4

5

6 7

•

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

2425

BEFORE THE ARIZONA BOARD

OF BEHAVIORAL HEALTH EXAMINERS

In the Matter of:

Maia L. Pellegrini, LCSW-19430, Licensed Clinical Social Worker, In the State of Arizona.

RESPONDENT

CASE NO. 2023-0044

CONSENT AGREEMENT FOR VOLUNTARY SURRENDER

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), Maia L. Pellegrini ("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.

4

8

7

11 12

10

13

- 15
- 16 17
- 18
- 19 20
- 21
- 22
- 24
- 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 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

13 14

1516

17

18 19

20

2122

23

2425

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.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT

- Respondent is the holder of License No. LCSW-19430 for the practice of Social Work in the state of Arizona.
- 2. From 06/17/22 to roughly 07/31/22, Respondent provided telehealth services to Complainant.
- 3. Complainant's sister ("Sister") reached out to Respondent asking if Respondent could provide services to Complainant.
- Respondent and Sister were in fact neighbors in California a number of years ago
 and have been longtime acquaintances over the years.
- 5. Respondent represents she never knew Complainant prior to initiating services with him.
- Furthermore, when Respondent was working on obtaining her coaching certification, she was required to practice coaching and Sister was one that she provided coaching services.
- Respondent failed to document the prior relationship with Respondent's sister in Complainant's clinical record and that it would not cause a conflict of interest in treating Complainant.
- 8. Respondent represented she felt it was appropriate to treat Complainant since she did not personally have a relationship with Complainant.

- 9. Respondent now agrees this prior relationship with Sister then subsequently treating Complainant is a conflict of interest.
- 10. Despite Respondent representing she provided ethical and professional services to Complainant, she acknowledged there were times where Complainant disclosed drinking alcohol.
- 11. Furthermore, there are numerous text messages and documentation within the notes that Respondent in fact knew Complainant had been drinking alcohol.
- 12. Respondent provided services knowing Complainant had been drinking and represents that her effort was to get him into a higher level of treatment.
- 13. Respondent documented numerous times throughout the progress notes that Complainant needed residential treatment that he was alternately agreeing to and refusing and was in a crisis for several weeks of sessions.
- 14. Even though Respondent repeatedly documented that Complainant was in a crisis, she continued providing telehealth services when it appeared Complainant was in need of a much higher level of care.
- 15. During an investigative interview, Respondent represented she has never done a service like this before for any other clients but knew Complainant was in a crisis and was facilitating the process to get him into a higher level of treatment so she continued to engage with him to facilitate his getting such treatment.
- 16. Respondent represented she continued providing services to Complainant without signed informed consents or ROIs because he was in such a crisis.
- 17. On 06/22/22, Sister texted Respondent that Complainant reported to Sister that if he had a shotgun he would end it all.
- 18. Additionally, on 07/04/22, Complainant reported to Respondent that he had thoughts of harming himself.

- 19. In light of this statement by Complainant, Respondent called the police to conduct a wellness check but the police told Respondent they could not do anything since Complainant told police he would not harm himself and refused to open the door.
- 20. Complainant's sister and treatment facility were also involved in the situation and Respondent did not document a suicide risk assessment or safety plan at this time.
- 21. Respondent helped coordinate admission of Complainant into a residential treatment facility, and Complainant did enter the facility in July, 2022.
- 22. At the onset of services with Complainant, Respondent failed to obtain a dated signature on any informed consent documents to treat Complainant.
- 23. Respondent represents she emailed informed consent documents to Complainant and Complainant's clinical records included a Notice of Privacy Practices and Informed Consent for Psychotherapy, a Telehealth Treatment Consent, and Consent for Counseling which were all unsigned and undated.
- 24. The Notice of Privacy Practices and Informed Consent for Psychotherapy document was missing the following minimum Board requirements:
 - a. Purpose of treatment.
 - To participate in treatment decisions and in the development and periodic review and revision of the client's treatment plan.
 - c. To refuse any recommended treatment or to withdraw consent to treatment and to be advised of the consequences of refusal or withdrawal.
 - d. There is not a dated and signed informed consent for treatment from a client before providing treatment to the client.
 - There is not a dated signature from an authorized representative of the behavioral health entity.

24

- 25. The Telehealth Treatment Consent failed to include the following minimum requirements:
 - a. Emergency procedures when the Respondent is unavailable.
 - Manner of identifying the client when using electronic communication that does not involve video.
 - 26. The Consent for Counseling failed to include the following minimum requirements:
 - a. Purpose of treatment.
 - To participate in treatment decisions and in the development and periodic review and revision of the client's treatment plan.
 - c. To refuse any recommended treatment or to withdraw consent to treatment and to be advised of the consequences of refusal or withdrawal.
 - d. While there is a line for the signature and date, and there is not a dated and signed informed consent for treatment from a client before providing treatment to the client.
 - e. While there is a line for the signature and date and, there is not a dated signature from an authorized representative of the behavioral health entity.
- 27. While not required in the consent document (see R4-6-1101 (2h)), Respondent's informed consent documents indicated that 60-minute sessions range from \$125-\$175.
- 28. Initially when Respondent provided Board staff Complainant's clinical records, there was no treatment plan included in the clinical records.
- 29. Respondent also provided Complainant's progress notes when she provided her written response to the complaint and the progress notes failed to include the following minimum Board requirements:
 - At least 9 session notes do not contain the time spent providing the behavioral health service.

- If counseling services were provided, whether the counseling was individual,
 couples, family, or group.
- c. The dated signature of Respondent.
- 30. The progress notes also fail to include the following minimum telehealth requirements:
 - a. The mode of session or a section to indicate the mode of session.
 - b. Verification of the client's physical location during the session.
- 31. Within the clinical records Respondent provided with her written response to the complaint there were no signed and dated releases of information for Respondent to speak with anyone regarding Complainant's care.
- 32. Respondent in fact spoke to two different treatment facilities, a towing company, and Sister numerous times without an adequate written release of information authorizing Respondent to do so.
- 33. Despite Respondent maintaining billing records, the following concerns were observed within Respondent's billing records for services:
 - a. On 06/17/22, Respondent billed Complainant \$125 for a 53-minute phone session.
 - b. On 06/19/22, Respondent billed Complainant \$187.50 for a 65-minute session.
 - c. On 06/22/22, Respondent billed Complainant \$250 for a 95-minute session then \$62.50 for an 8-minute session.
 - d. On 06/23/22, Respondent billed Complainant \$125 for a text session from 10:40 – 11:30 after billing Complainant \$187.50 for an 84-minute session.
 - Respondent billed \$62.50 for 13 separate phone sessions each under 15 minutes.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- f. Respondent also billed roughly 17 phone calls that she identified as care coordination calls with other which were under 15 minutes long and billed \$62.50 for each of the 17 calls.
- g. Respondent also billed for texting which included one day where she billed \$62.50 for 3 texts and another day where she billed \$62.50 for 101 texts.
- h. On 07/02/22, Respondent billed Complainant \$125 for 10 text messages that she identified as coordination of services with treatment facilities.
- Additionally, there were some notes where the duration of the sessions did not align with the duration listed within the billing records.
- j. On 07/12/22, Respondent billed Complainant \$62.50 for an 11-minute phone session, \$62.50 for an 18-minute phone session, \$62.50 for a 27-minute phone session, and \$125 for another 57-minute phone session.
- k. On 07/15/22, Respondent billed Complainant \$125 for a 38-minute phone session, \$62.50 for a 24-minute phone session, \$125 for a 55-minute phone session, and \$62.50 for another 10-minute phone session.
- 34. According to the billing records, Respondent would bill for several conversations with Complainant and/or Sister yet there would only be one progress note for those conversations.
- 35. On 06/22/22, Complainant, unprompted, texted Respondent a screenshot of his bank account balance.
- 36. Respondent acknowledged she was aware of Complainant's financial situation and the businesses he had owned, but notes that this did not play a role in her fees.
- 37. Respondent had a fee schedule that charged for increments of time and if a session went over a set time, then the client would be charged for the next increment.
- 38. Respondent would bill for phone calls that were less than 30 minutes at a rate she charged for 30-minute sessions.

- 39. Respondent represents Complainant was in a crisis and knew Complainant had been drinking yet continued to collect fees from Complainant.
- 40. Respondent has attempted to refund the fees to Respondent, who refuses those efforts.
- 41. During an investigative interview, Respondent represented the following regarding her documentation and billing practices:
 - a. Respondent emailed Complainant the informed consents for his signature and discussed and requested it be signed numerous times but she continued treating him without signed consents since Complainant provided verbal consent.
 - Respondent typically does not allow verbal consent for treatment but Respondent felt like Complainant was in crisis.
 - c. Respondent does not typically provide telehealth substance use services.
 - d. Respondent felt she had the treatment goals in her progress notes and just did not develop a separate treatment plan.
 - e. Respondent typically has separate treatment plans for her other clients.
 - f. Respondent would not develop separate notes for each interaction within the same day since Complainant would call for a session at any given moment.
 - g. Respondent is not sure when she became aware that her progress notes did not meet Board requirements but believes it was sometime after the complaint was filed.
 - h. Respondent obtained a verbal release of information from Complainant and felt that was sufficient to speak with others regarding Complainant.
 - Respondent typically does not accept verbal release of information authorizations from clients.

- j. Respondent has not billed clients for texting before.
- k. Respondent represented she would bill in half hour increments for time spent within a half hour, and felt she could do this in her practice.
- Respondent acknowledged her informed consents do not specify how she would bill for texting or coordination of care services.
- 42. Respondent's informed consent does not require an indication that she would be charging for texting or that she would automatically round up to the next half hour only that Complainant has the right to be informed of all fees (see R4-6-1011 (2h)).
- 43. Due to these documentation concerns, Board staff randomly subpoenaed 3 client files from Respondent's caseload to determine whether documentation deficiencies were a common theme.
- 44. All 3 clinical records included deficiencies regarding the Notice of Privacy Practices and Informed Consent for Psychotherapy, the Telehealth Treatment Consent, and the Informed Consent for Counseling.
- 45. In addition, all progress notes were signed by Respondent on 02/18/23, following Board staff's investigative interview, all treatment plans failed to include a review date for the treatment plan, and the treatment plans were signed and dated in 02/23, following Board staff's investigative interview.
- 46. Board staff only requested random clinical records for 3 clients and Respondent provided updated and changed clinical records for Complainant when she provided the 3 random clinical records for other clients.
- 47. Board staff had concerns regarding the updated and changed records for Complainant, such as a new treatment plan, inclusion of text notes from text messages in an informed consent, and new ROIs noting verbal consent.

- 48. Even after being notified of the deficiencies within her informed consent documents, Respondent provided an updated informed consent which still failed to include the following minimum Board requirements:
 - a. Despite indicating that the treatment goals and treatment plan will be discussed with the client, it does not indicate the periodic review and revision of the client's treatment plan
 - A section for the dated signature from an authorized representative of the behavioral health entity.
- 49. Board staff followed up with various questions and Respondent responded as follows:
 - a. Respondent lacked familiarity with the records system she was using.
 - Respondent knew she was missing treatments plans for two of the random clinical records requested and created them in 02/23.
 - Respondent created and dated Complainant's treatment plan for 06/17/22 after the investigative interview.
 - d. Respondent signed and backdated ROIs in Complainant's file.
 - e. Respondent thought Board staff was asking for corrected and modified documents so she made revisions to the chart and recreated progress notes for Complainant following the interview with Board staff, believing that she had been tasked with making the changes to address the Board's concerns with deficiencies.
- 50. On 09/19/22, Complainant emailed and sent a letter to Respondent requesting his signed informed consents and billing records.

24 ||

21

22

23

25 || -

- 51. Respondent did not provide Complainant these requested records and represented she did not because she was uncertain if it was Complainant requesting the records and she did not feel it was in Complainant's best interest to have the records without her walking him through some of information in the records.
- 52. Respondent also did not document in the clinical record the rationale for not providing Complainant his records when requested.
- 53. Respondent changed original clinical records for a few clients including f the progress notes, informed consent, and ROIs for Complainant, and created a treatment plan for Complainant and backdated it to a 06/22 date after Board staff concluded their investigative interview with Respondent.
- 54. Respondent has acknowledged that she made errors in her processes, and that she has learned a great deal through this process that was not part of her training.
- 55. Respondent has twice attempted to return the fees from Complainant but Complainant has refused the offer and has made threats to Respondent, such that she is not comfortable with efforts at further contact.

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)(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:

1.06 (a) Conflicts of Interest

Social workers should be alert to and avoid conflicts of interest that interfere with the exercise of professional discretion and impartial judgment. Social workers should inform clients when a real or potential conflict of interest arises and take reasonable steps to resolve the issue in a manner that makes the clients' interests primary and protects clients' interests to the greatest extent possible. In some cases, protecting clients' interests may require termination of the professional relationship with proper referral of the client.

- 3. The conduct and circumstances described in the Findings of Fact constitute a violation of A.R.S. § 32-3251(16)(r), providing behavioral health services that are clinically unjustified or unsafe or otherwise engaging in activities as a licensee that are unprofessional by current standards of practice.
- 4. 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.
- 5. 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. R4-6-1104. Financial and Billing Records

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

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

6. The conduct and circumstances described in the Findings of Fact constitute a violation of A.R.S. § 32-3251(16)(kk), failing to make client records in the licensee's possession promptly available to the client, a minor client's parent, the client's legal guardian or the client's authorized representative on receipt of proper authorization to do so from the client, a minor client's parent, the client's legal guardian or the client's authorized representative.

7. The conduct and circumstances described in the Findings of Fact constitute a violation of A.R.S. § 32-3251(16)(x), exploiting a client, former client or supervisee. For the purposes of this subdivision, "exploiting" means taking advantage of a professional relationship with a client, former client or supervisee for the benefit or profit of the licensee.

ORDER

Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusion of Law, the parties agree to the provision and penalties imposed as follows:

- Respondent's license, LCSW-19430, shall be surrendered to the Board, effective from the date of entry as signed below.
 - 2. The surrender shall be considered a revocation of Respondent's license.

Practice Termination Plan

- 3. Within 14 days of the effective date of the Consent Agreement, Respondent shall submit a written plan for terminating their private practice for pre-approval by the Board Chair or designee. At a minimum, the proposed termination plan must include each of the following:
 - a. A written protocol for the secure storage, transfer and access of the clinical records of Respondent's clients and former clients.
 - b. The procedure by which Respondent shall notify each client and former client in a timely manner regarding the future location of the clinical records of Respondent's clients and former clients and how those records can be accessed after the termination of Respondent's practice.

2	for Respondent's current clients.
3	d. A list of Respondent's current clients and the timeframe for terminating services
4	to each client. The timeframe for terminating services shall not exceed 30 days.
5	PROFESSIONAL ACCEPTS, SIGNS AND DATES THIS CONSENT AGREEMENT
6	Maia Pellegrini (Jun 20, 2023 14:53 PDT) Jun 20, 2023
7	laia L. Pellegrini Date Date
8	BOARD ACCEPTS, SIGNS AND DATES THIS CONSENT AGREEMENT
9	
10	By: Mi Zanda Jun 21, 2023
11	TOBI ZAVALA, Executive Director Date Arizona Board of Behavioral Health Examiners
12	
13	original of the foregoing filed Jun 21, 2023 with:
14	Arizona Board of Behavioral Health Examiners 1740 West Adams Street, Suite 3600 Phoenix, AZ 85007
15	
16	EXECUTED COPY of the foregoing sent electronically Jun 21, 2023 to:
17	Mona Baskin Assistant Attorney General 2005 North Central Avenue Phoenix, AZ 85004
18	
19	
20	Maia L. Pellegrini Address of Record Respondent
21	
22	Robin E. Burgess Sanders & Parks 3030 North Third Street, Suite 1300 Phoenix AZ 85012 Attorney for Respondent
23	
24	
-	

c. A written protocol for developing an appropriate referral for continuation of care

Pellegrini Consent Agreement

Final Audit Report 2023-06-21

Created: 2023-06-20

By: Jarret Carver (jarett.carver@azbbhe.us)

Status: Signed

Transaction ID: CBJCHBCAABAAFsYR7v7r_A554Vm-1DueVS-Er9wjk5gK

"Pellegrini Consent Agreement" History

- Document created by Jarret Carver (jarett.carver@azbbhe.us) 2023-06-20 6:36:46 PM GMT- IP address: 136.226.64.125
- Document emailed to maiapellegrini@yahoo.com for signature 2023-06-20 6:37:39 PM GMT
- Document emailed to robin.burgess@sandersparks.com for delivery 2023-06-20 6:37:40 PM GMT
- Email viewed by maiapellegrini@yahoo.com 2023-06-20 7:18:04 PM GMT- IP address: 69.147.86.248
- Signer maiapellegrini@yahoo.com entered name at signing as Maia Pellegrini 2023-06-20 9:53:17 PM GMT- IP address: 67.234.218.18
- Document e-signed by Maia Pellegrini (maiapellegrini@yahoo.com)

 Signature Date: 2023-06-20 9:53:19 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 67.234.218.18
- Email viewed by robin.burgess@sandersparks.com 2023-06-20 9:55:51 PM GMT- IP address: 4.36.124.56
- Signer robin.burgess@sandersparks.com entered name at signing as Robin Burgess 2023-06-20 9:57:07 PM GMT- IP address: 4.36.124.56
- Document receipt acknowledged by Robin Burgess (robin.burgess@sandersparks.com)

 Receipt Acknowledgement Date: 2023-06-20 9:57:09 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 4.36.124.56
- Document emailed to Tobi Zavala (tobi.zavala@azbbhe.us) for approval 2023-06-20 9:57:10 PM GMT
- Email viewed by Tobi Zavala (tobi.zavala@azbbhe.us) 2023-06-20 11:44:28 PM GMT- IP address: 66.249.84.40



Document approved by Tobi Zavala (tobi.zavala@azbbhe.us)

Approval Date: 2023-06-21 - 3:20:05 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 136.226.64.120

Agreement completed.
 2023-06-21 - 3:20:05 PM GMT