

Oregon Board of Psychologist Examiners

Special Public Board Meeting Minutes

Morrow Equipment Company Board Room

May 30, 2013

3218 Pringle Road SE

Salem, OR 97302

Members Present: Shane Haydon, Ph.D., Chair
Fran Ferder, Ph.D., Vice Chair
Kent Anderson, Public Member
James Hendry, Public Member
Sandra Jenkins, Ph.D.
Daniel Munoz, Ph.D.
Anne-Marie Smith, Ph.D.

Legal Counsel: Warren Foote, AAG

Staff: Becky Eklund, Interim Executive Director
Karen Berry, Investigator
LaRee Felton, Program Analyst
Ashlie Rios, Office Specialist

Guests: Donna Sperry, M.A.

INTRODUCTIONS/ROLL CALL

Dr. Haydon called the Board of Psychologist Examiners public session meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. on Thursday, May 30, 2013, at the Board's office at 3218 Pringle Road SE, Salem, Oregon 97302. The primary purpose of the meeting was to discuss the proposal made by Sarah Miller during the May 17, 2013 Board meeting.

ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATION OF BOARDS

Ms. Miller's proposal was to combine the staff of the Board of Psychologist Examiners with the staff of the Board of Licensed Professional Counselors and Therapists with one director and a management assistant to oversee both boards. Ms. Eklund provided information to Board members that included identifying the similarities and differences between the two boards. The goal would be to merge the administrative functions and the services of outside support including legal services, financial services, human resources, and information technology. Both Boards focus on consumer protection, licensing, and complaints. The separation between the two boards would continue to be budgets, boards, and licensing requirements.

Implementing the proposal would be a developmental process, and it would take time to identify efficiencies and potential cost savings. Staff would continue with their current responsibilities.

The executive director would work with the Governor's office, the legislature, developing the budget, boards and their committees, and supervisors.

The new management assistant person would analyze processes, state reporting, identify coordination issues and potential resolution, OARs, and problem solving.

A decision whether to enter into this arrangement is significant and has pros and cons. The project could identify work efficiencies and sharing of best processes and this solution could possibly help avoid being a part of a super board. We know that the Governor and some members of the legislature are interested in combining small boards during the next two years. The challenges of the pilot would include the chaos that goes along with significant change.

Mr. Foote added that the executive director would be responsible for two Boards; that would be a huge time constraint. The management assistant would not be a managerial position and would not take the place of the executive director if he or she was gone. Eklund explained the positions for the Board indicating that current executive director positions would be reclassified; one would get raised and the other would be lowered.

Mr. Hendry asked why this option is coming up and what the Governor's office stand is. Dr. Ferder explained that it's an option to avoid being placed in a super board that continues to be brought up in legislation. During the May 17 meeting, Sarah Miller said that Governor's office wants to consolidate Boards because there are too many small boards. The original suggestion was that we merge with the Oregon Health Licensing Agency. The Governor's office is providing an opportunity to be proactive and allow us to take control and merge with either the Social Workers board or the LPC board because we are more in common with them and we already have their executive director working with us and learning our duties and rules. A merger will not go away, and they will continue to try and merge small boards. Dr. Haydon believes that if the Board chooses not to accept this experiment, then we will be stuck in a super board or wherever they put us.

Dr. Lori Queen spoke for OPA. She has spoken with a few OPA Board Members and members, and they are opposed to anything that "smells" of a super board. They are in support for merging the administrative support. They support a system and not the person in the role. OPA does not like the idea that a super board may take control later. Dr. Haydon and Dr. Ferder said that during the OPA Town Hall they got comments that OPA members would not mind merging with the Social Workers board or LPC board. The understanding was that OPA members already have more exposure to the concept of the mergers because they started talking about these concepts at least a year ago due to proposed legislation to combine boards. The public recognizes that this has been on the agenda for some time, and OPA is always looking for a way out of a super board.

Dr. Smith would like to have a sunset if the pilot project doesn't work well or has more problems than foreseen. Ms. Eklund thinks that they will be able to add this in the interagency agreement to see if this pilot is working and whether or not it should continue. Because this is an experiment, we would have resources and help to monitor the process. The new management support position already exists and would be a set appointment so the new person would not lose their job if this pilot project did not work. If the fact that this position is a limited position that will only be active for a few years, then the pool of candidates would be lowered. A time limit and preservation of the Board's the current position should

revert to its current classification if the project doesn't work so the Board could recruit for our own executive director.

If the Board is not proactive, then the inevitable super board will be pending. Mr. Foote expressed worry about the new executive director who will have too much demand from both Boards and that he/she will have to attend both board meetings, committee meetings. The physical location of the executive director may be a concern also.

Mr. Hendry wondered if the current model isn't broken, then why fix it. Hendry also wondered if psychologists aren't going to want their own executive director working on their own since it has been working for so long. Ms. Eklund noted that the Governor's office isn't happy with the small Boards that have a history of problems.

Dr. Munoz thinks that this is an opportunity that the Board should not blindly dismiss. He thinks that with the psychological background of Board members, we should prove that we are team players. He doesn't think that the chaos associated with a pilot is an issue to worry about because we have been in a state of chaos for a year now. He thinks that staying with the way things are is not the direction the Governor's office wants and that we will be viewed as a problem children.

Ms. Eklund is open to whatever the Board decides, and she believes that if everyone is not behind the pilot, then she doesn't see it working.

Mr. Anderson's primary concern is in the management assistant position. He remembers the time when there was a full-time position and found that quite helpful. He worries that with this merger there won't be any "go to" person. He expressed his position that when there was an education administrative rule change that we didn't do much research into and we are still 1.5 years into fixing the associated problems. If don't do the research or critically review this decision, then he believes we will seriously regret it. Good decisions are not made when you are forced and pushed into a decision immediately.

Dr. Ferder was told that interim directors Michelle Gaines and Randy Everitt did not feel that the executive director was not a full-time position and that the efficiencies were not up to speed. The lone executive director for this board did not have enough to do. Mr. Anderson disagreed and said that there are some things that the interim directors did not do that a permanent position would normally do. For example the newsletter for the Board that hasn't been completed since November 2011.

Ms. Felton expressed concern that with changes in staff responsibilities, personnel desk audits may result in the classifications being lowered. A lot of the concerns now are out of our control. Some of these issues can be solved in the interagency agreement.

Dr. Munoz believes that the purpose of today's meeting is to vote whether or not we are even willing to move forward with the idea and not be worried about the specifics. A yes vote will be to continue with the ongoing process and decide if we are willing to move forward with consolidation and then work out the details of an interagency agreement. A no vote is not to proceed further and we shut it down and then work on recruiting for an executive director we have that is vacant. Anne-Marie noted that a decision should be based on the policy and not on a person.

Dr. Munoz moved and Dr. Ferder seconded to accept the proposal to move forward with consolidation.

Dr. Ferder-Yes; Mr. Anderson-No; Mr. Hendry-No; Dr. Munoz-Yes; Dr. Smith-Yes; Dr. Jenkins-Yes; Dr. Haydon-Yes. The motion passed.

PUBLIC FORUM

The public forum is an opportunity for the public to address the Board. The Chair will determine the length of time each person would be allocated on the meeting agenda. The Chair will also determine the length of time each individual will be given to speak, based on the number of individuals that wish to speak.

Guest Donna Sperry asked to speak to the Board. She is a psychologist associate applicant contacted by the Board indicating that she was licensed without having taken her EPPP and that she needs to give up her license in Oregon. She would like to become licensed through the senior psychologist application process in Oregon. Ms. Felton indicated that the licensure by endorsement procedure does not apply to psychologist associate applicants, and the statutes do not allow the Board to create such a rule.

ADJOURN

Dr. Haydon called the Board of Psychologist Examiners Public Session meeting to a close at 4:56 p.m. on Friday, May 17, 2013, at the Board's office at 3218 Pringle Road SE, Salem, Oregon 97302.