



### Board Members

**Clifford A. Johannsen, Ph.D.,  
Chair**

Psychologist, Lake Oswego

**Peter Grover, Ph.D.,  
Vice-Chair**

Psychologist, Portland

**Patricia Bjorkquist, Ph.D.**

Psychologist, Salem

**Celeste Jones, Psy.D.**

Psychologist, Portland

**Linda Nishi-Strattner, Ph.D.**

Psychologist, Tigard

**Dave Ziegler, Ph.D.**

Psychologist, Jasper

**Jon Weiner**

Public Member, Salem

**Janice Schermer**

Public Member, Portland

**Bryan Hagen**

Public Member, Bend

### Staff

**Charles Hill**

Executive Director

**LaRee Felton**

Policy Advisor / Licensing Manager

**Allison McGonagle**

Compliance Specialist

**Dan Vile**

Investigator

**Connie Farrier**

Licensing Program Specialist

**Sharon Ounapuu**

Program Assistant

## A Word from the Executive Director

The summer is slipping away as we scramble to complete our summer newsletter for 2019. The 80<sup>th</sup> Oregon Legislative Assembly adjourned on June 30<sup>th</sup>, and here at the office we are catching our breath before charging off into the new biennium. It was a pleasure this time around to present MHRA's 2019-21 biennium budget (House Bill 5012) before the Joint Ways and Means Subcommittee on Education. The budget bill passed without a hitch. The licensing base for both the BOP and the BLPCT continues to grow, thus, the compliance cases also grow. The \$3.9 MHRA budget request supports the addition of one Investigator position, which is needed to keep up with the workload. I want to say that both co-speakers of the Subcommittee (Senator Lew Frederick and Representative Susan McLain) were very complimentary of the BOP and the BLPCT professions. Indeed, the entire subcommittee received us with favorable compliments about our Boards and Licensees. I was honored to hear such favorable feedback.

Both chambers took an active interest in mental health issues this session and our Policy Advisor and Licensing Manager, LaRee Felton, took on the task of keeping us all abreast of the legislation and subsequent amendments that affected our Boards. Ms. Felton also had the task of drafting the Fiscal Impact Statements (FIS) for each Bill, often on very short notice. It's not uncommon for the Legislative Fiscal Office (LFO) to notify us of the need for a 24-hour or less turn-around time for a FIS. Legislators use FIS to help formulate their decision, and I can testify to the fact that the LFO greatly appreciated Ms. Felton's accurate and timely FIS responses. This newsletter contains a list of some of the House and Senate Bills that we tracked and you may wish to read Ms. Felton's summary.

This newsletter also contains a guest article from one of our Board members, Patricia Bjorkquist, Ph.D. Dr. Bjorkquist's article is insightful as she describes "How Exactly Does the Board Operate"? Every Board meeting is interesting and I always come away impressed on how thoroughly cases are discussed and debated. While Board members may not always reach consensus on a particular case, they are respectful of each other's views and they treat each other, and staff with the utmost respect. At the end of the day, I always come away knowing that the proper balance has been achieved between protecting the public and the licensee.

For those of you who are administrators of certain Oregon institutions of higher learning, or are psychologists or counselors at these institutions, you will be interested to read about HB 2030 which was signed into law by the Governor on June 17, 2019. Ms. Felton gives a nice summary of HB 2030 in this newsletter.

Finally, I penned an article of "Budgeting and Licensing Fees". A question that I am often asked has to do with licensing fees, and if fees are going to increase? That question is never easy to answer. What I can say is that we here at the MHRA endeavor to keep fees as stable as possible. However, so much is out of our direct control on the expenditure side of the ledger. In my article, I have attempted to give the reader a glimpse into the budgeting process which helps to determine how we set the fees.

In closing, I want to take an opportunity to welcome our newest BOP Board member, Dr. Brian Hagen, DNP. Dr. Hagen travels from Bend, Oregon to attend our Board meetings and is our newest public member of the BOP.

-Charles Hill, Executive Director, Mental Health Regulatory Agency

*"Plans are nothing, but planning is everything" – Dwight D. Eisenhower Ψ*

### In this Issue

A Word from the E.D. ....	1
Budgeting & Fees .....	2-3
How Exactly Does the Board Operate? .....	4
Supervisor Registry .....	4
Legislative Report .....	5
Enforcement .....	6
Qualified Person .....	6
New Board Member & Staff .....	7
Obituaries .....	7
Upcoming Events .....	7

## BUDGETING AND LICENSING FEES

For the 2019-2021 biennium, the Mental Health Regulatory Agency (MHRA) which is the umbrella agency for the Board of Psychology (BOP) and the Board of Licensed Professional Counselors and Therapists (BLPCT) was able to hold licensing fees stable without increasing licensing fees. Now that the legislative session and the budgeting process is over for the 2019-2021 biennium, it's time to start turning our focus to the 2021-2023 budgeting cycle and planning process. Most of us have been through some kind of budgeting process in our lives, whether its work or business related, or simply managing our own checking account. In its simplest terms, budgeting means planning to have enough revenue to cover your expenses during a given period of time. Usually, when dealing with our home budget, we know that our expenses are predictable for the most part; water, sewer, electricity, natural gas, insurance, mortgage/rent, food, car payment and fuel, etc., and we just have to make sure that we earn enough income to cover the bills, plus save some for retirement and take a vacation now and then. If we can't cover the bills, then the equation is really very simple, we need to earn more income, or cut back on spending. Budgeting is simple, yes? Well, in theory, budgeting is simple. With the MHRA, the budget basics are the same, but, there are many more variables and unknowns. The MHRA is a state agency, dealing with a two-year budget cycle, and of course, our budget is legislatively approved, which means we must go through the legislative process. I'd like to take a moment to look into the world of a licensing agency's budgeting process and some of the analysis in deciding whether or not to raise licensing fees.

To begin with, the revenue side of the ledger of the MHRA is made up almost exclusively of the monies that we collect from licensing fees. In order to cover the expenses for a given biennium, the licensing fees must be sufficient to cover all of our costs. Can we hold licensing fees stable again for the 2021-2023 budget cycle like we did for the 2019-2021 cycle? That is really the question as we begin planning. Because we go through the legislative process, our agency will need to have our legislative concepts and proposals in order to present our Agency Request Budget (ARB) to the Legislative Fiscal Office (LFO) and our Chief Fiscal Officer (CFO) by around March/April of 2020. There are actually 3 budgets that are assembled; the MHRA agency request budget (ARB), the Governor's budget through the CFO, and the legislatively approved budget (LAB). During the legislative session, our elected officials must vote to pass our budget which means that usually, some compromise is needed. Be-

cause we are beginning the budget process for the 2021-2023 budget cycle in early 2020, we will not know our actual expenses for the 2019-2021 budget period. Therefore, it's impossible to know how to 100% accurately predict the expenses that we should use to build the 2021-2023 ARB. Since revenue (Licensing Fees) must cover expenses for the 2021-2023 budget cycle, we somehow must make sure that we set licensing fees high enough to cover expenses. Do we need to raise licensing fees for 2021-2023, or can we keep them unchanged? Let me explain more about the MHRA first, before attempting to answer that question.

The MHRA is considered a "small" agency by state standards. As a licensing/compliance agency, we employ just enough staff to administer the licensing and compliance needs of the BOP and BLPCT. The MHRA employs 12 full time staff (12-FTE's, or Full Time Equivalents) to oversee the administration of over 8,000 licensed Psychologists, Psychologist Associates, Licensed Professional Counselors, Licensed Marriage Family Therapists, residents and interns. In a nutshell, the staff at the MHRA provides licensure for new applicants, renews existing licensees, and investigates and reports to the BOP and the BLPCT on complaints received. What about other services such as Human Resource support, IT support, financial support, legal support? Well, the MHRA (as well as a multitude of other small state agencies) contracts for these services, and the fees for these services must be supported by our budget.

### Human Resource Services

The MHRA contracts with the Oregon Department of Administrative Services-Chief Human Resource Office (DAS-CHRO). The DAS-CHRO provides our agency with a variety of HR related services. For the 2017-2019 biennium, the MHRA paid \$64.84 per month per FTE to DAS-CHRO. For the 2019-2021 biennium, the Legislature approved a 49% price increase by DAS-CHRO. For the 2019-2021 biennium, the MHRA will be paying to DAS-CHRO \$98.58 per FTE per month.

### IT Support

The MHRA contracts with the Oregon Department of Administrative Services-Information Technology support center for our IT and desktop computer support. For the 2017-2019 biennium, MHRA paid \$137.55 per month per FTE. For the 2019-2021 biennium, the Legislature approved a 71.6% price increase by DAS-IT. For the 2019-2021 biennium, the MHRA will be paying to DAS-IT \$236.07 per FTE per month.

## BUDGETING AND LICENSING FEES, CONTINUED

### Financial Support

The MHRA contracts with DAS Shared Financial Services (DAS-SFS) for accounting and budgeting services as well as payroll and accounts payable. For the 2017-2019 biennium, the MHRA paid DAS-SFS \$173,899. For the 2019-2021 biennium, we will see about a \$50,000 decrease in fees from DAS-SFS. This represents a 40% savings from the 2017-2019 biennium. This savings is primarily the result of administratively merging the BOP and the BLPCT under the MHRA umbrella in 2017, along with a team effort between our MHRA administrative staff and DAS-SFS to create efficiencies by eliminating redundant financial processes.

### Legal Support, Department of Justice

The MHRA contracts with the Oregon DOJ to provide our legal support, and each Board pays its own DOJ expenses. The DOJ provides legal counsel to us for compliance matters, contested case hearings, and provides us with qualified legal opinions upon request. We pay a flat fee every quarter to the DOJ, which is based upon a formula that takes into account prior years activities. For the 2017-2019 biennium, the MHRA paid the DOJ \$404,610. For the 2019-2021 biennium, the Legislature approved a 26.6% increase by DOJ. For the 2019-2021 biennium, the MHRA is contracted to pay \$512,412 to DOJ for legal support.

What makes the budgeting process difficult is that we never know what the service fee charges will actually be when we put the budget together. In other words, when we built the 2019-2021 budget, we did not know that all of the agencies that we contract with for services would raise their rates so significantly. When we build a budget, we take into account the current year's expenses and add a state-approved inflationary factor to estimate the coming biennium's budget. Anything above and beyond the state-approved inflation rate must go through a special process for review and approval. Once the Legislature approves our budget, we must operate within our spending authority. So, what happens when expenses exceeds our spending authority? The answer is that the state budgeting process allows agencies to go before the E-Board (Emergency Board) to seek an increase in spending authority. However, in order to get approval from the Legislature to exceed spending authority, an agency must have adequate cash reserves. This is where the art and science of managing your agency's budget pays off. Do I anticipate having to go before the E-Board to seek a spending limitation increase for the 2019-2021 biennium? The answer is yes. Does the MHRA have ade-

quate cash reserves to cover an increase in spending limitation for the 2019-2021 biennium? Again, the answer is yes.

But, the question at hand, is, will a licensing fee increase be necessary for the 2021-2023 biennium? The short answer is that I am not sure yet. There are some other wild cards out there that have not yet been played. Sometimes, we have cost savings due to staffing shortages. Starting off the 2019-2021 budget cycle, we fortunately are fully staffed with 12 FTE's, so in all likelihood, I do not expect much, if any cost savings due to a staffing shortage. The wildcard that is the most unpredictable and most significant is what will our actual DAS and DOJ charges be for the current biennium? We have no idea what our contested case expenses will be for the current biennium. What we do know is that the agency is able to recover contested case charges from BLPCT-related cases because of ORS 675.745(7), a statute that allows the BLPCT the ability to recover costs when the Board prevails on a contested case hearing. However, the BOP does not have a cost recovery statute in place at the present time, and the BOP is unable to recover DOJ and Office of Administrative Hearing expenses when the Board prevails on a contested case hearing. Given the recent increases in contracted service fees and the growing number of contested case hearings that is consistent with a growing licensee base and our inability to recover contested case costs for BOP, I would say that there is a 50/50 chance that we will need to raise BLPCT fees for 2021-2023, and a greater than 50/50 chance of needing to raise licensing fees for BOP in 2021-2023.

In summary, we will continue to manage our resources wisely to hold the line on licensing fees for the BOP and the BLPCT, however, much is beyond our control in our legislatively controlled environment.

-Charles Hill, Executive Director, Mental Health  
Regulatory Agency

---

<sup>1</sup> During the 2017-2019 Legislative Session, the Board of Psychology introduced House Bill (HB) 2329, which would have allowed the Board to recover DOJ and Office of Administrative Hearing expenses for contested cases in which the BOP prevailed. HB 2329, however, was opposed by the Oregon Psychological Association and the Administrative Law Section of the Oregon State Bar. HB 2329 died in committee and was never voted upon by the House Healthcare Committee.

## HOW EXACTLY DOES THE BOARD OPERATE?

The Oregon Board of Psychology has the dual responsibilities of both examining and licensing all those in Oregon who engage in the practice of psychology along with “safeguarding” the people of the state from the dangers of “unqualified and improper practice”. It is the latter that seems most to engender the level of discomfort with which practitioners too frequently approach their dealings with the Board and, for that reason, the Board wishes to give a more personal glimpse into its workings and hopefully defuse some of the concern and mystique.

When I first began serving as a professional member, I encountered a steep learning curve, both to the legal issues involved in the Board’s work and the multiple arenas encompassed by providing good practice and insuring against harm. Every Board meeting is preceded by delivery of a “packet” of information to be discussed at the coming meeting, often 1500-2000 pages. The bulk of that is typically related to consumer complaints, and those discussions occupy the first half of each full-day Board meeting. I have been consistently impressed by the close reading, deep questioning and extended discussions that are devoted to each case. Both chairs I have worked under rarely intervene to curtail the deliberation. While not yet as diverse in our representation as we wish to be, there are a plethora of perspectives, philosophies and opinions among the public and professional members and we rarely lack a “spirited” discussion. By the time a decision is reached on a case, it has typically been examined and debated from several different perspectives so the resulting decision is thoroughly considered. I personally have not always agreed with the result but have never doubted the integrity of the process.

Afternoons for regular Board meetings, and the additional day of the annual retreat, are devoted to “Public Session” issues, which encompass the policy aspect of the Board’s responsibilities. One of the areas currently being considered is adoption of the new EPPP, Part Two, as an additional examination for licensure that addresses the emerging need to assess functional competency. This issue, like the Board’s previous adoption of the requirement of APA approval of graduate training programs for licensee applicants, emerges from changes occurring both nationally and internationally in how licensure is granted both to psychologists and health providers in general. The Board’s membership in the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards provides guidance and information on professional issues.

These qualities are also part of the standing and ad hoc committees that further contribute to the Board’s mission. Board members typically serve on one standing committee and at least one ad hoc committee. These, too, employ the same processes of information, research, investigation, discussion, perhaps further investigation followed but another round of discussion before ending up on the Board’s agenda for more discussion and, ultimately, a vote by the entire Board.

The best characterization I can think of for Board interactions is to reference the best graduate seminar you ever had: that is the level of consideration and the type of intense participation that occurs regularly in Board discussions. I would also cite a comment credited to Martin Waechter about his service on the Board. He described driving from Eugene to Salem with one set of decisions made while preparing for the meeting, and drive home having changed many of those based on the ensuing discussion. This is a very dedicated, hard-working group of public and professional individuals who care deeply about providing the best oversight for the practice of psychology that can insure safety and integrity for both public and professionals alike.

- Patricia Bjorkquist, Ph.D., Licensed Psychologist Board Member Ψ

## SUPERVISOR REGISTRY

*Are you interested in providing residency supervision? Does your information on the Registry need updating?*

The Supervisor Registry was developed in 2007 in response to feedback received in the 2006 annual customer satisfaction survey. The purpose of the Registry is to facilitate linking residents with supervisors to meet the one-year post-doctoral supervision requirement for licensure in Oregon. The Registry allows Residents to review a list of supervisors who have self-identified as available to provide supervision. They can see the supervisors’ location, contact information, languages spoken, training and specialty areas.

The Board is always looking to expand the list of available supervisors, particularly emphasizing diversity in terms of culture, geographic location, and practice areas. Supervisors who wish to be initially listed on the Registry (or to update their Registry information) will need to submit to the Board an Application for Placement on the Registry form. Residency supervisors must have been licensed and in active or semi-active status for at least 2 years, either in Oregon or another jurisdiction (or combined). A supervisor must be competent in the clinical specialty areas in which the resident will be practicing and with the populations with whom the resident will be providing psychological services. The Application, Registry, and other helpful resources including the Orientation to Residency Supervision training are available on the Board’s [Become a Supervisor Webpage](#). Ψ

## Legislative Report

Following are some measures that passed during the 2019 Legislative Session that impact the Agency.

### *Cultural Competency Continuing Education ([House Bill 2011](#))*

This law now requires boards, including the Board of Psychology, to adopt rules that require licensees to complete cultural competency continuing education (CCCE). The Board does currently require 4 credits of CCCE be completed during each renewal period; this was encouraged pursuant to House Bill 2611 (2013), but not required at that time. Under the new law, the Board must encourage- but not require- completion of CCCE that is approved by the Oregon Health Authority (OHA). This information can be found on the OHA Office of Equity and Inclusion's [CCCE Webpage](#).

### *Public University Exemption ([House Bill 2030](#))*

This amendment to Oregon Revised Statute 675.090(1)(f) exempts persons who are employed by public universities from the requirement to be licensed to practice psychology. Persons falling under the exemption may engage in mental health services only to the extent that it is within their authorized scope of practice within the employing university. Those holding a doctoral degree in psychology who are employed by a public university may practice psychology without a license for no more than 24 months. Also, note that pursuant to OAR 858-010-0036, this 24-month time limit does not restart if the person ceases practicing and then begins again, and does not reset if the person begins working at a different exempt site. The person may not use any title incorporating the word "psychologist." Currently, the list of public university exempt sites includes University of Oregon, Oregon State University, Portland State University, Oregon Institute of Technology, Western Oregon University, Southern Oregon University, and Eastern Oregon University. This new public university exemption becomes effective on September 29, 2019, so until this date, persons will still need to be either licensed or in a Board-approved residency contract in order to practice lawfully at these university sites.

### *Military Spouse Practice Authorization ([House Bill 3030](#) & [Senate Bill 688](#))*

These measures require professional licensing boards, including the Board of Psychology, to issue temporary practice authorizations to spouses and domestic partners of members of the U.S. Armed Forces who are stationed in Oregon and who possess substantially similar authorizations in good standing in another state. The new law also requires boards to track and report data on the number of temporary authorization applications received, authorizations issued and refused (and the reasons why), the amount of time used to process and issue authorizations, agency efforts to implement and maintain a process to issue authorizations, and efforts to assist military spouses to obtain authorization. The Board will need to develop rules and procedures for this new mandate by year end. The Legislature did not provide any resources to assist boards in implementing these changes.

### *TIN in Lieu of SSN for Licensing ([Senate Bill 854](#))*

This new law requires boards, including the Board of Psychology, to accept a person's federal individual taxpayer identification number or other federally-issued identification number in lieu of a Social Security Number on a licensure or permit application.

### *Pathways to Licensure for Noncitizens ([Senate Bill 855](#))*

This new law directs boards, including the Board of Psychology, to develop and implement methods to reduce barriers to licensure for applicants who may be immigrants or refugees. The Board will be required to study the manner in which immigrants or refugees become licensed and report to the Legislature by November 30, 2019.

### *Legislation that did not Pass*

House Bill 2813 and Senate Bill 808, which would have required periodic completion of continuing education related to suicide risk assessment, treatment and management, did not pass in 2019. A previous attempt in 2017 (Senate Bill 48) was also unsuccessful. Currently, there is no requirement for psychologists to complete any CE related to suicide risk. House Bill 3404, which would have required specified mental health providers- including psychologists- to report to law enforcement a patient's expression of intent to kill or seriously injure others (i.e., Tarasoff in Oregon), did not pass. Failed House Bill 2454 would have required the Board to grant temporary reciprocity licensure to out-of-state applicants seeking to work in Eastern Oregon Border Economic Development Region.

## ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

During the period of time from April 13, 2019, to July 12, 2019, the Board took the following actions:

**Kimberly B. Spiro, Ph.D.** (Applicant), **STIPULATED ORDER**, effective May 10, 2019. Applicant submitted an application for licensure to the Board in 2018 in which she answered, “No,” to the application question, “Have you previously applied for licensure to the Oregon Board of Psychology?” In fact, Respondent previously applied for licensure with this Board in 2012. This conduct violated ORS 675.070(2)(f) and OAR 858-010-0020(6). Additionally, by providing psychology services for more than 24 months as a QMHP at OSLC Community Programs, Respondent engaged in the practice of psychology without a license, in violation of ORS 675.020(1)(a), as defined by ORS 675.010(4). Applicant was reprimanded and ordered to pay a civil penalty of \$3,500.

**Angela R. Klingensmith, Psy.D.** (Applicant), **DEFAULT ORDER**, effective March 20, 2019. Without receiving notice that her application had been approved and without a Board approved psychologist resident supervision contract, Applicant began to practice as a psychologist, and held herself out to the public as a psychologist. Applicant worked as a psychologist resident from early September 2018 until February 8, 2019 without a license or an approved resident supervision contract, which constitutes the unlicensed practice of psychology. Applicant violated ORS 675.020(1)(a) and (b) and OAR 858-010-0036(2)(a). Respondent was reprimanded and ordered to pay a civil penalty of \$1,000.

**David T. Bice, Ph.D.** (Licensee), **FINAL ORDER ON REMAND**, effective May 10, 2019. The Board issued its Final Order on the case on September 28, 2012. In the Order, the Board imposed terms of discipline. Licensee filed a petition for judicial review with the Court of Appeals on November 27, 2012. The Court of Appeals issued its opinion on October 19, 2016, *Bice v. Bd of Psychologist Examiners*, 281 OR. App. 623 (2016), and issued its Appellate Judgment on May 10, 2017. The Board issued a final order on Remand on May 26, 2017, and withdrew that order for reconsideration on March 9, 2018. Based upon the remand, the Board reconsidered the sanction set forth in its original order. On March 9, 2018, the Board issued a Revised Final Order on remand that set aside other sanctions and affirmed that Licensee was reprimanded. On appeal, the Court of Appeals reversed and remanded the Order on January 19, 2019 for failure to comply with the requirements of ORS 183.650(2). Appellate Judgment was issued on April 16, 2019. The Board reviewed the Opinion of the Court and the Final Order, and issued a Final Order on Remand, which affirmed that Licensee was reprimanded. The Board concluded that by kissing his client on the cheek, Licensee violated ORS 675.070(2)(d)(A) (immoral or unprofessional conduct), by violating a recognized standard of ethics and conduct that constituted a danger to the health or safety of the client by causing her distress, as well as violating Ethical Standard 3.04 (failure to avoid harm). Licensee filed a petition for judicial review and a Motion for Stay with the Board. On July 18, 2019, the Board issued an Order of Stay.

**Nancy Carritte** (Respondent), **DEFAULT ORDER**, effective July 11, 2019. Respondent is not licensed by the Board to practice psychology in the State of Oregon, and does not hold a license in any health care profession in the State of Oregon. The Board found that Respondent has engaged in the unlicensed practice of psychology in Oregon by representing to the public via business cards and a sign on her office door that she is a “Psychologist,” in violation of ORS 675.020(1)(a) and (b). Respondent was ordered to pay a civil penalty of \$1,000. **Ψ**

## QUALIFIED PERSON

Over the years, the Agency has seen several instances of licensees failing to plan for the unexpected and leaving behind a messy situation for their clients, staff, and families. Please, do not let this happen to you!

All licensees have a legal obligation to inform the Board of their designated Qualified Person (“QP”) who will take care of client referrals and maintain client records in the case of death or incapacitation. However, it is also important to take steps beyond the minimal legal notification requirement and actually arrange a plan with your QP. Your QP will need to know how to access various information sources, including email addresses and passwords, and the location of items such as keys and records. This also includes creating and maintaining an updated professional will (or similar document), and ensuring that specified arrangements are in place for your QP to effectively carry out their function. You may consider arranging to reimburse your QP for the time and expenses related to taking possession of your clinical records.

Licensees must keep the Board apprised of their current designated Qualified Person. All new licensees are asked to submit their [QP Designation Form](#) within 60 days of initial licensure. Current licensees must maintain a QP who is an Oregon active or semi-active licensed psychologist. If your QP’s status changes, e.g. they retire, relocate, or make a change to inactive status, or if your QP is no longer able to serve in this role, then you will need to designate a new QP by sending an updated [form](#) to the Board’s office.

Please remember that it is each licensee’s individual responsibility to locate and maintain a QP. Resources are available on the Board’s [Qualified Person & Professional Wills Webpage](#). There is also a helpful article online by Kenneth S. Pope, Ph.D., ABPP and Melba J.T. Vasquez, Ph.D., ABPP at <http://kspope.com/therapistas/will.php>.

- LaReé Felton, Policy Advisor to the Board, Mental Health Regulatory Agency **Ψ**

## New Board Member



### Bryan Hagen, Public Board Member

Bryan is a Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner (PMHNP) having completed his nursing education with the Doctor of Nursing Practice degree at Oregon Health & Science University in 2013. He has worked as a psychiatric provider for nearly 7 years across several settings including community mental health, acute inpatient psychiatry, and private practice. Dr Hagen currently works in a primary care clinic in Central Oregon providing integrated psychiatric care. He is also an expert consultant on PMHNP practice for the Oregon State Board of Nursing. As a native to the Pacific Northwest he of course enjoys regular immersion in the outdoors, with other spare time devoted to the complete restoration of the 1974 BMW he drove through graduate school. Ψ

## New Staff

### Connie Farrier, Licensing Specialist

Connie was raised in Oregon, where she ultimately attended Linfield College and completed a B.S. in Business Management. She had previously worked as a non-profit director for 10 years prior to joining the Mental Health Regulatory Agency. Connie was hired as a Licensing Specialist for the Board of Psychology in July of 2019.

### Sharon Ounapuu, Program Assistant

Sharon was born and raised in Hawaii and relocated to Oregon. Prior to moving, Sharon completed an Associate's Degree in Health Information Technology and worked at a multi-line insurance agency in Honolulu in customer relations. Her first state job in Oregon was with the Oregon State Hospital in 2014, working first as an administrative specialist in the Superintendent's Office and then a billing office coordinator with Patient Financial Services in revenue cycle

## Obituaries

### Deborah Diane Kettle, Aug. 20, 1961 - April 19, 2019

Friends and Family mourn the passing of Debbe Kettle April 19, 2019, in Hillsboro. Born Deborah Cintron in Washington, D.C., she spent her formative years in and around Kansas City, Mo. She moved to Oregon in 1986, a place she would call home for the rest of her life. She spent many years in Astoria, where she participated in local theater and ran a homeless shelter for families. She married and moved to Portland in 2000, where she worked her way through college, earning a BA in Religion and Philosophy, Masters of Divinity and PhD in Psychology. She spent her final years pursuing her passion for helping others through private counseling. In her spare time she enjoyed decorating, cooking, movies and doting on her Basset Hounds. Debbe is survived by her husband Pat, daughter Caitlin, mother Patricia, step-father Cliff, brother Chris and sister Leslie.

## Upcoming Events 2019

### September

- 9/2: Office Closed for Labor Day
- 9/6: **Oregon Jurisprudence Examination\***
- 9/13: **Board Meeting**
- 9/20: Education Committee Meeting

### October

- 10/4: **Oregon Jurisprudence Examination\***
- 10/17: Consumer Protection Committee Meeting
- 10/18: Education Committee Meeting

### November

- 11/1: Oregon Jurisprudence Examination\*

### 11/8: Board Meeting

- 11/9: **Board's Strategic Planning Session**
- 11/11: Office Closed for Veterans Day
- 11/15: Education Committee Meeting
- 11/28-30: Office Closed for Thanksgiving

### December

- 12/6: Oregon Jurisprudence Examination\*
- 12/19: Consumer Protection Committee Meeting
- 12/20: Education Committee Meeting
- 12/25: Office Closed for Christmas Day

*\*Committee meetings are tentatively scheduled each month.*

**Reminder!** Please make sure to update your email address if it changes so that you continue to receive correspondence. Notify us right away- but not more than 30 days- of any change in your contact information.

Please use our [Contact Information Change Form](#) Ψ

OBOP News is the official newsletter of the Oregon Board of Psychology and is edited by board staff. Please visit our website at [www.Oregon.gov/psychology](http://www.Oregon.gov/psychology), email, or contact us with any comments or suggestions.

3218 Pringle Rd. SE, Ste. 130, Salem, OR 97302  
 Phone: (503) 378-4154 - Fax: (503) 374-1904  
 E-mail: [psychology.board@oregon.gov](mailto:psychology.board@oregon.gov) Ψ