

State of Arizona Board of Behavioral Health Examiners

Information Current as of 3/14/2012.

Name: Alfred Dodini

Address: 1166 E Warner Rd #101-R
Gilbert AZ 85296

Phone: (480) 813-2626

License (s):	License Type	License No	Status	Issued	Expires
	Certified Independent Social Worker	SW-11040I	Closed - Converted	1/1/2004	6/30/2004
	Licensed Associate Marriage and Family Therapist	LAMFT-10257	Revoked	12/1/2007	8/1/2011
	Licensed Clinical Social Worker	LCSW-11040	Revoked	7/1/2004	8/1/2011

Pending Complaints: None

Discipline:

Complaint#: 2009-0043 [View Board Order](#)

Case 2009-0043: In 06/07, Mother initiated therapy for 12-year-old son ("Son A") to address Son A's behavioral issues and help him cope with marital problems occurring between Mother and Son A's Father. Mother provided the professional with Father's history of suicidal threats and rage towards Mother, Son A and their 16-year-old son ("Son B"). At the initial session, Mother told the professional of her plans to divorce Father. Following a 06/21/07 Order of Protection ("OP") against Father, Father initiated treatment with the professional. Father disclosed problems with depression, suicidal ideation, sadness and recent thoughts of hurting or killing himself. At parents' request, the professional served as an intermediary between parents by forwarding emails from one parent to another. The professional never clarified which individuals were clients or his professional obligations to Mother, Father and Son A. During Father's second session, he continued to express suicidal ideation. There was no documented evidence in Father's record that the professional conducted any formal suicide risk assessment. In 07/07, after Mother informed Father of her intent to file for divorce, Father threatened suicide. Father was arrested and 35 guns were impounded. Father admitted to a plan and typing suicide letters. During Father's 3rd session, he reported recent suicidal ideation. The professional failed to document any suicide risk assessment or address Father's suicidal ideation on an ongoing basis. Son A began living with Father. On 08/22/07, Father requested and the professional wrote a

letter to the court on Father's behalf, identifying Father as a client and provided treatment information. There was no documentation of Father signing a written release of information authorization to disclose any information about Father. The professional later spoke with Mother's Friend about Parents and Son A. The professional never obtained a written release of information authorization from Parents to speak with Friend. In 09/07, Mother informed the professional that Father and Son B had a fight and Father hit Son B. The professional did not initially report this incident after speaking with Father. When Mother insisted that he report the incident, the professional reported the incident anonymously to CPS, failed to provide identifying information about Father, failed to document his report to CPS, and failed to submit a written report to CPS within 72 hours, as required. Despite the ongoing conflict within family, the professional continued to see Father and Son A for treatment until 02/08, when Mother requested that he stop counseling with Son A until after the anticipated custody evaluation. In 07/08, the professional spoke with the court-appointed custody evaluators and advised them that Mother might be experiencing aspects of schizophrenia, even though Mother had never been his client, and never participated in a behavioral health assessment with professional and professional had limited contact with Mother. In 10/08, the professional wrote Mother a letter indicating that, if she proceeded to file a Board complaint against him, he would disclose personal damaging information about Mother and Son A to the Board. Even though the professional provided therapy to Father and Son A to address their respective individual issues, he maintained a single clinical record containing treatment information regarding both Son A and Father. The progress notes were intermingled and failed to identify whether he saw Son A and Father together or individually or both. The progress notes were not signed and failed to record the duration of each session. Treatment plans failed to identify a treatment plan review date. Phone calls with family members were not recorded. Emails received or sent to Mother or Father were not maintained. The professional failed to adequately document important aspects of Father's and Son A's treatment. Case 2009-0121: The professional's wife ("Wife") is an Arizona licensed massage therapist. The professional and Wife have both taken training courses for the provision of craniosacral therapy ("CST"). CST involves the use of physical touch to improve the functioning of the central nervous system. It is not a behavioral health treatment modality. In 05/09, the professional met with Parents of a 3-year-old Son to discuss concerns about Son's defiant, aggressive behavior and ongoing sleep problems. Parents contend that the professional recommended CST for Son, gave Parents Wife's business card and said wife could perform CST on Son, and Parents could bill their insurance for the service as a psychotherapy session. The professional indicated that he also recommended a psychiatric evaluation, medication possibilities, and to review other factors that might be contributing to Son's behaviors. Parents' insurance company told the professional that Wife's CST could not be billed because Wife was not a member of the insurance company's panel. CST was never provided to Son. The professional misrepresented to the Board that a psychiatrist endorsed the use of "bodywork modalities", which the psychiatrist denied. Case 2010-0019: Mother and Father were engaged in a high-conflict divorce/custody battle. In 04/09, Mother requested that the professional treat Son A and Son B ("Sons") to help them adjust to Parents' pending divorce. Son A began

refusing visits with Father. Son A's therapy was to specifically address Son A's anger towards Father. Mother told the professional that a motion was pending before the court to have a therapist appointed and "whether or not Father was going to have access to any information". At the time the professional began seeing Sons, he did not review any court documentation pertaining to Sons' custody status or therapy-related issues. Treatment plans developed for Sons did not contain a treatment plan review date. The professional did not sign progress notes and failed to record the duration of sessions. The professional failed to document information he received from Sons' grandparents. The professional elected not to report to CPS information received from Mother about discipline involving a "2x4" because Mother indicated that she reported the incident to CPS. The professional failed to document that he gave Son B a Bow Drill Set and failed to document the therapeutic basis for this gesture. On 04/23/09, Father requested a copy of Sons' treatment records. The professional failed to provide the records to Father. On 05/03/09, the court appointed the professional as Son A's therapist and ordered that the counseling reports be submitted only to the court. The court order did not address Son B's therapy. On 05/07/09, Father called the professional indicating that he would pick up the records. The professional returned Father's call to say he would not release Sons' records. The professional never made an effort to involve Father in Son A's treatment or to obtain input into the problems between Father and Son A. The professional acknowledged that he developed negative feelings about Father. In a 08/09 letter to the court, the professional made a number of representations based on information provided by Son A that were not documented in the clinical record. The professional included a number of inflammatory statements regarding Father and recommended that Son A should not be required to participate in visits with Father. Board Action 08/01/11 Consent Agreement and Order: The professional's license shall be surrendered. The surrender shall be considered a revocation of his license.

Complaint#: 2009-0121 [View Board Order](#)

Case 2009-0043: In 06/07, Mother initiated therapy for 12-year-old son ("Son A") to address Son A's behavioral issues and help him cope with marital problems occurring between Mother and Son A's Father. Mother provided the professional with Father's history of suicidal threats and rage towards Mother, Son A and their 16-year-old son ("Son B"). At the initial session, Mother told the professional of her plans to divorce Father. Following a 06/21/07 Order of Protection ("OP") against Father, Father initiated treatment with the professional. Father disclosed problems with depression, suicidal ideation, sadness and recent thoughts of hurting or killing himself. At parents' request, the professional served as an intermediary between parents by forwarding emails from one parent to another. The professional never clarified which individuals were clients or his professional obligations to Mother, Father and Son A. During Father's second session, he continued to express suicidal ideation. There was no documented evidence in Father's record that the professional conducted any formal suicide risk assessment. In 07/07, after Mother informed Father of her intent to file for divorce, Father threatened suicide. Father was arrested and 35 guns were impounded. Father admitted to a plan and typing suicide letters. During Father's 3rd session, he reported recent suicidal ideation. The professional failed to document any suicide risk assessment or address Father's suicidal ideation on an ongoing basis. Son A began living with

Father. On 08/22/07, Father requested and the professional wrote a letter to the court on Father's behalf, identifying Father as a client and provided treatment information. There was no documentation of Father signing a written release of information authorization to disclose any information about Father. The professional later spoke with Mother's Friend about Parents and Son A. The professional never obtained a written release of information authorization from Parents to speak with Friend. In 09/07, Mother informed the professional that Father and Son B had a fight and Father hit Son B. The professional did not initially report this incident after speaking with Father. When Mother insisted that he report the incident, the professional reported the incident anonymously to CPS, failed to provide identifying information about Father, failed to document his report to CPS, and failed to submit a written report to CPS within 72 hours, as required. Despite the ongoing conflict within family, the professional continued to see Father and Son A for treatment until 02/08, when Mother requested that he stop counseling with Son A until after the anticipated custody evaluation. In 07/08, the professional spoke with the court-appointed custody evaluators and advised them that Mother might be experiencing aspects of schizophrenia, even though Mother had never been his client, and never participated in a behavioral health assessment with professional and professional had limited contact with Mother. In 10/08, the professional wrote Mother a letter indicating that, if she proceeded to file a Board complaint against him, he would disclose personal damaging information about Mother and Son A to the Board. Even though the professional provided therapy to Father and Son A to address their respective individual issues, he maintained a single clinical record containing treatment information regarding both Son A and Father. The progress notes were intermingled and failed to identify whether he saw Son A and Father together or individually or both. The progress notes were not signed and failed to record the duration of each session. Treatment plans failed to identify a treatment plan review date. Phone calls with family members were not recorded. Emails received or sent to Mother or Father were not maintained. The professional failed to adequately document important aspects of Father's and Son A's treatment. Case 2009-0121: The professional's wife ("Wife") is an Arizona licensed massage therapist. The professional and Wife have both taken training courses for the provision of craniosacral therapy ("CST"). CST involves the use of physical touch to improve the functioning of the central nervous system. It is not a behavioral health treatment modality. In 05/09, the professional met with Parents of a 3-year-old Son to discuss concerns about Son's defiant, aggressive behavior and ongoing sleep problems. Parents contend that the professional recommended CST for Son, gave Parents Wife's business card and said wife could perform CST on Son, and Parents could bill their insurance for the service as a psychotherapy session. The professional indicated that he also recommended a psychiatric evaluation, medication possibilities, and to review other factors that might be contributing to Son's behaviors. Parents' insurance company told the professional that Wife's CST could not be billed because Wife was not a member of the insurance company's panel. CST was never provided to Son. The professional misrepresented to the Board that a psychiatrist endorsed the use of "bodywork modalities", which the psychiatrist denied. Case 2010-0019: Mother and Father were engaged in a high-conflict divorce/custody battle. In 04/09, Mother requested that the professional treat Son A and Son B

("Sons") to help them adjust to Parents' pending divorce. Son A began refusing visits with Father. Son A's therapy was to specifically address Son A's anger towards Father. Mother told the professional that a motion was pending before the court to have a therapist appointed and "whether or not Father was going to have access to any information". At the time the professional began seeing Sons, he did not review any court documentation pertaining to Sons' custody status or therapy-related issues. Treatment plans developed for Sons did not contain a treatment plan review date. The professional did not sign progress notes and failed to record the duration of sessions. The professional failed to document information he received from Sons' grandparents. The professional elected not to report to CPS information received from Mother about discipline involving a "2x4" because Mother indicated that she reported the incident to CPS. The professional failed to document that he gave Son B a Bow Drill Set and failed to document the therapeutic basis for this gesture. On 04/23/09, Father requested a copy of Sons' treatment records. The professional failed to provide the records to Father. On 05/03/09, the court appointed the professional as Son A's therapist and ordered that the counseling reports be submitted only to the court. The court order did not address Son B's therapy. On 05/07/09, Father called the professional indicating that he would pick up the records. The professional returned Father's call to say he would not release Sons' records. The professional never made an effort to involve Father in Son A's treatment or to obtain input into the problems between Father and Son A. The professional acknowledged that he developed negative feelings about Father. In a 08/09 letter to the court, the professional made a number of representations based on information provided by Son A that were not documented in the clinical record. The professional included a number of inflammatory statements regarding Father and recommended that Son A should not be required to participate in visits with Father. Board Action 08/01/11 Consent Agreement and Order: The professional's license shall be surrendered. The surrender shall be considered a revocation of his license.

Complaint#: 2010-0019 [View Board Order](#)

Case 2009-0043: In 06/07, Mother initiated therapy for 12-year-old son ("Son A") to address Son A's behavioral issues and help him cope with marital problems occurring between Mother and Son A's Father. Mother provided the professional with Father's history of suicidal threats and rage towards Mother, Son A and their 16-year-old son ("Son B"). At the initial session, Mother told the professional of her plans to divorce Father. Following a 06/21/07 Order of Protection ("OP") against Father, Father initiated treatment with the professional. Father disclosed problems with depression, suicidal ideation, sadness and recent thoughts of hurting or killing himself. At parents' request, the professional served as an intermediary between parents by forwarding emails from one parent to another. The professional never clarified which individuals were clients or his professional obligations to Mother, Father and Son A. During Father's second session, he continued to express suicidal ideation. There was no documented evidence in Father's record that the professional conducted any formal suicide risk assessment. In 07/07, after Mother informed Father of her intent to file for divorce, Father threatened suicide. Father was arrested and 35 guns were impounded. Father admitted to a plan and typing suicide letters. During Father's 3rd session, he reported recent suicidal ideation. The professional failed to document any suicide risk assessment or address

Father's suicidal ideation on an ongoing basis. Son A began living with Father. On 08/22/07, Father requested and the professional wrote a letter to the court on Father's behalf, identifying Father as a client and provided treatment information. There was no documentation of Father signing a written release of information authorization to disclose any information about Father. The professional later spoke with Mother's Friend about Parents and Son A. The professional never obtained a written release of information authorization from Parents to speak with Friend. In 09/07, Mother informed the professional that Father and Son B had a fight and Father hit Son B. The professional did not initially report this incident after speaking with Father. When Mother insisted that he report the incident, the professional reported the incident anonymously to CPS, failed to provide identifying information about Father, failed to document his report to CPS, and failed to submit a written report to CPS within 72 hours, as required. Despite the ongoing conflict within family, the professional continued to see Father and Son A for treatment until 02/08, when Mother requested that he stop counseling with Son A until after the anticipated custody evaluation. In 07/08, the professional spoke with the court-appointed custody evaluators and advised them that Mother might be experiencing aspects of schizophrenia, even though Mother had never been his client, and never participated in a behavioral health assessment with professional and professional had limited contact with Mother. In 10/08, the professional wrote Mother a letter indicating that, if she proceeded to file a Board complaint against him, he would disclose personal damaging information about Mother and Son A to the Board. Even though the professional provided therapy to Father and Son A to address their respective individual issues, he maintained a single clinical record containing treatment information regarding both Son A and Father. The progress notes were intermingled and failed to identify whether he saw Son A and Father together or individually or both. The progress notes were not signed and failed to record the duration of each session. Treatment plans failed to identify a treatment plan review date. Phone calls with family members were not recorded. Emails received or sent to Mother or Father were not maintained. The professional failed to adequately document important aspects of Father's and Son A's treatment. Case 2009-0121: The professional's wife ("Wife") is an Arizona licensed massage therapist. The professional and Wife have both taken training courses for the provision of craniosacral therapy ("CST"). CST involves the use of physical touch to improve the functioning of the central nervous system. It is not a behavioral health treatment modality. In 05/09, the professional met with Parents of a 3-year-old Son to discuss concerns about Son's defiant, aggressive behavior and ongoing sleep problems. Parents contend that the professional recommended CST for Son, gave Parents Wife's business card and said wife could perform CST on Son, and Parents could bill their insurance for the service as a psychotherapy session. The professional indicated that he also recommended a psychiatric evaluation, medication possibilities, and to review other factors that might be contributing to Son's behaviors. Parents' insurance company told the professional that Wife's CST could not be billed because Wife was not a member of the insurance company's panel. CST was never provided to Son. The professional misrepresented to the Board that a psychiatrist endorsed the use of "bodywork modalities", which the psychiatrist denied. Case 2010-0019: Mother and Father were engaged in a high-conflict divorce/custody battle. In

04/09, Mother requested that the professional treat Son A and Son B ("Sons") to help them adjust to Parents' pending divorce. Son A began refusing visits with Father. Son A's therapy was to specifically address Son A's anger towards Father. Mother told the professional that a motion was pending before the court to have a therapist appointed and "whether or not Father was going to have access to any information". At the time the professional began seeing Sons, he did not review any court documentation pertaining to Sons' custody status or therapy-related issues. Treatment plans developed for Sons did not contain a treatment plan review date. The professional did not sign progress notes and failed to record the duration of sessions. The professional failed to document information he received from Sons' grandparents. The professional elected not to report to CPS information received from Mother about discipline involving a "2x4" because Mother indicated that she reported the incident to CPS. The professional failed to document that he gave Son B a Bow Drill Set and failed to document the therapeutic basis for this gesture. On 04/23/09, Father requested a copy of Sons' treatment records. The professional failed to provide the records to Father. On 05/03/09, the court appointed the professional as Son A's therapist and ordered that the counseling reports be submitted only to the court. The court order did not address Son B's therapy. On 05/07/09, Father called the professional indicating that he would pick up the records. The professional returned Father's call to say he would not release Sons' records. The professional never made an effort to involve Father in Son A's treatment or to obtain input into the problems between Father and Son A. The professional acknowledged that he developed negative feelings about Father. In a 08/09 letter to the court, the professional made a number of representations based on information provided by Son A that were not documented in the clinical record. The professional included a number of inflammatory statements regarding Father and recommended that Son A should not be required to participate in visits with Father. Board Action 08/01/11 Consent Agreement and Order: The professional's license shall be surrendered. The surrender shall be considered a revocation of his license.

Click on the Name for detailed information on licensees, addresses, phone numbers, and discipline. Dismissed complaints and nondisciplinary actions and orders do not appear on the Board's web site. Information on dismissed complaints and nondisciplinary actions and orders can be obtained by calling the Board office at 602 542-1882 or submitting a [Public Records Request](#).

Written verifications are available by sending a request to the Board office include a \$20.00 fee for each verification. The verification includes a certified letter that indicates a person's licensure number, issuance date, expiration date, license status and past and pending complaint and discipline information.