



**Oregon Health Licensing Agency (OHLA)  
BOARD OF DENTURE TECHNOLOGY**



11 am, Monday, 5/24/2010  
700 Summer Street N.E., Suite 320  
Salem, Oregon

---

**MINUTES**

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

David Dahl, Vice-Chair  
Geoffrey Berg, DMD  
Ivan Collver  
Cindy Cunningham  
Todd Young

**MEMBER ABSENT**

Shawn Murray, Chair

**STAFF PRESENT**

Randall Everitt, Director  
Samantha Patnode, Policy Analyst  
Sinnamon Harris, Board Specialist  
Kraig Bohot, Public Information Officer  
Tim Molloy, Regulatory Operations Manager  
Sylvie McMillan, Business Services & Licensing  
Manager  
Cerynthia Murphy, Qualifications Analyst  
Dale Blanchard, Network Coordinator

**GUESTS PRESENT**

Ken Holden  
Ronald A. Farris

**Call to Order**

David Dahl, Vice-Chair, called the meeting of the Board of Denture Technology to order at 11:04 am on Monday, May 24, 2010, in the Rhoades Conference Room, located in the Oregon Veterans' Affairs Building, 700 Summer Street NE, Salem, Oregon.

**1 - Approval of Agenda**

**MOTION**

Todd Young made a motion with a second by Dr. Berg to approve the agenda for May 24, 2010. The motion passed unanimously.

**2 - Approval of Minutes**

**MOTION**

Ivan Collver made a motion with a second by Todd Young to approve the February 1, 2010, board meeting minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

---

---

### 3. Reports

- Director's Report

Randall Everitt, Director

- Regulatory Operations Division Report

Tim Molloy, Regulatory Operations Manager, reported about complaints received from January 16, 2010 through May 7, 2010. The agency had received three complaints since the last board meeting. Two were service related concerns and one classified as critical licensing concern.

Molloy explained the new Reported Investigations Tracking table to the board. After discussion, the board decided to change the "date closed" column to "Investigation Closed" and the "determination" column to "Agency Notice Status" in the table for clarity.

- Outreach and Communication

Kraig Bohot, Public Information Officer, presented the *Board of Denture Technology Central Issues* publication set to go out electronically on May 27, 2010. Bohot discussed the highlights concerning the practical examination changes, ongoing legislation, and temporary licenses in this first issue for denturists.

Bohot reviewed the *News You Can Use: Resources for Licensee, Consumers* page update that references the *Central Issues* online publication for key issues for each board and council plus various links to useful information and related Web sites that may be of interest to denturists and consumers alike.

Also set to publish is Oregon Health Licensing Agency's *Licensing Line*. Bohot offered a preview at a new feature within *Licensing Line*, "Meet OHLA Staff." Samantha "Samie" Patnode, OHLA Policy Analyst, is the first staff member featured.

Todd Young asked if the Board of Dentistry were aware of the proposed temporary licenses and the change of the definition of "denture." Everitt responded he had discussed the issues with the Director of the Board of Dentistry and the director did not see a problem.

- Statistical Report

Sylvie McMillan, Business Services and Licensing Manager, discussed the statistical graphs for renewals, regulatory complaints, examinations, average active licenses held by quarter, age diversity and gender of denturists, and Web site traffic.

- 2009-11 Budget

McMillan presented the cumulative revenue and expenditures statement of cash flow for the 7/01/09-3/31/2010 period along with the projected cash flow statement for 7/01/2009-6/30/2011. McMillan stated that the cost allocation changed on February 1, 2010, because one board has a large group which no longer had to be licensed with the agency. The agency reevaluated all the boards and Board of Denture Technology allocation moved from 1.91% to 2.02%. Todd Young asked if the agency were anticipating any changes to the licensing fees. McMillan answered that the costs were stable at this point and the agency did not anticipate any fee changes.

---

---

A question was asked about where the assessed civil penalties against a denturist are allotted and McMillan assured the board that the monies are credited to this board. Each board keeps its own civil penalties, although civil penalties are not figured into the budget. McMillan went on to explain that any direct costs the board incurs, such as assistant attorney general fees, would come out of the board budget. Indirect costs are part of the 2.02%.

David Dahl asked about costs for the examinations if they were held for two days. Cerynthia Murphy, Qualifications Analyst, explained the cost for one day is \$3500 and for an additional day the cost is \$2500. The savings on the second day is because travel costs for the proctors are less considering they are all ready at the site.

#### **4. Executive Session**

Executive session held for the purpose for considering legal advice from the assistant attorney general. No recommendations or final decisions were made in executive session.

#### **5. Items for Board Action**

- 2011 Legislative Concept

Samantha Patnode, Policy Analyst, explained the proposed amendment to the current definition of “denture” and to add provisions for temporary licensure. Originally, Patnode stated, when the legislative concept was proposed she did not have the assistant attorney general’s opinion on teeth whitening trays and the focus was on the definition of the word “denture.” However, Patnode continued, the issue really refers to removable devices in the human mouth.

The board discussed the verbiage of the changes to 680.500(4)(b) “The taking of impressions, bite registrations, try-ins, and insertions of or in any part of the human oral cavity for any of the purposes listed in paragraph (a) of this subsection **and for any removable dental appliance to be worn in the human mouth.**” Dr. Berg led the discussion remarking that the word “any” could have issues because of active appliances. He gave examples of orthodontic procedures that move teeth around. Dr. Berg continued stating that there is the potential to damage teeth that would put the issue in a whole other realm. The board decided to change the language to read, “**and for any removal of non-orthodontic device to be worn in the human mouth.**”

Patnode mentioned that Randall Everitt might wish for one of the denturist board members to accompany him to meetings with the Board of Dentistry and other interested associations and stakeholders to discuss the proposed legislative concept.

#### **MOTION:**

Todd Young made a motion to change the proposed verbiage to read, “**and for any removal of non-orthodontic device to be worn in the human mouth**” with a second by Ivan Collver. The motion passed unanimously.

- Practical Examination Administration

Cerynthia Murphy, Qualifications Analyst, presented the board with the recommendations by the Item Writing and Examination Committee Meeting to vote on.

---

---

In summary, Murphy's issue statement stated that after seven of 10 candidates failed the practical examination in July 2009, OHLA and the Board of Denture Technology Item Writing and Examination Committee began reviewing the administration of the practical examination. The review included the evaluation of examination records, scoring criteria, examination venues and the maximum number of candidates per day.

**MOTION:**

Ivan Collver made a motion with a second by Cindy Cunningham to adopt changes made to Oregon's practical examination, which includes consistent and standardized scoring criteria. The motion passed unanimously.

**MOTION:**

Ivan Collver made a motion with a second by Dr. Berg to continue conducting the examinations at OHSU and proceed with a search of alternative locations. The motion passed unanimously.

**MOTION:**

Todd Young made a motion with a second by Ivan Collver to split the examination dates into two days if more than nine candidates register for the examination. Notification of the date change to candidates will be done as necessary by staff. The motion passed unanimously.

Cerynthia Murphy offered the Web site would note the examinations might be held on two dates if more than nine candidates register and the candidates will be notified 20 days in advance of their actual testing date.

o Candidate Examination Review

Murphy presented the board with a candidate who requires board approval to attempt his sixth denture technology written examination. Murphy reviewed the candidate's status with the board with the following highlights:

1. On September 28, 2010, an issue statement was presented to the board requesting approval for the candidate to take the written denture technology examination for his fifth attempt, and due to English being the candidate's second language, allow interpreter assistance in addition to requiring the candidate take 390 hours of additional training. The board voted to require the candidate to complete 390 hours in practical and theory training, in addition to allowing for interpreter assistance.
2. On January 21, 2010, the candidate submitted written correspondence to the agency stating he did not want to utilize an interpreter, he simply wanted additional time. The candidate was provided with an American's With Disabilities Act Accommodation Request Form, for individuals needing accommodation to the regular testing environment due to a disability; the candidate never submitted the accommodation request form. On February 16, 2010, the candidate failed his fifth examination attempt.

**MOTION:**

Todd Young made a motion with a second by Ivan Collver to allow the candidate a sixth attempt to pass the written examination without any additional hours of practical and theory training. The motion passed unanimously.

---

---

## 6. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

## 7. Other Board Business

### o Denturist and Insurance Companies Issue

Everitt stated the issue was insurance companies were not always cooperating as denturists would submit bills for payment. Some insurance companies would pay the denturist and some were denying coverage to their clients. This issue was brought to the agency's attention when Everitt attended the Oregon State Denturist Association meeting in Florence, Oregon. After research and discussion, the agency is offering to design a letter for denturists, to submit when they bill out, to ask the insurance companies to reconsider paying the denturist. According to association members, the independent insurance companies outside of Oregon are very arbitrary in payment to the denturist. The agency is trying to find a way to provide the denturist of Oregon with language that they can submit along with their billing that spells out the process for the insurance company and at least provide whatever authority the denturist has here in Oregon to bill.

Todd Young remarked that the billing to insurance companies becomes "red-flagged" because of the agency's license numbers are shorter than dentist numbers and do not start with a letter "D." Dale Blanchard, Network Coordinator, addressed the board to state that changing the license numbers would be a huge project as the numbers are the key to the Elite System the agency uses. An attempt to change the license numbers would affect over 120,000 licenses. To replace the Elite database system is too costly. The idea was tabled.

Everitt stated education might be the key to bringing the insurance companies on board. Everitt also spoke about talking with the Director of the Board of Dentistry about the possibility of working up a document of support for the denturist to be sent to the insurance companies.

Ron Ferris, denturist public member, made remarks concerning various insurance companies and non-payment. Ferris stated that the patients should have the choice to solicit licensed denturists. He also mentioned that sometimes denturists are considered "specialists" or are not on the preferred provider list and that is the reason the insurance companies do not to cover denturist costs. Ferris stated that it would take filing {a lawsuit} to resolve the problem. Everitt asked if Ferris was asking the agency to get into litigation. Ferris stated yes, and Everitt told him the agency would not do so. He advised Ferris that what Ferris is considering is more of a civil action that may come from an association rather than a licensing agency.

### o Appoint Committee Member

Todd Young remarked that this was his last meeting as a board member and he currently is on two committees.

## MOTION:

Todd Young made a motion with a second by Dr. Berg to appoint Ken Holden, new board member starting July 1, 2010, take Todd's place on the Item Writing / Examination & Education/Curriculum and Enforcement Committees. The motion passed unanimously.

- Curriculum Review for George Brown College

Murphy stated that George Brown College had an approved curriculum years ago and when a candidate applied for licensure piecemeal, the agency found that the courses did not line up with the credit any longer. Murphy suggested that the education committee review not only George Brown College, but Bates, and Northern Alberta Institute of Technology (NAIT) as well.

**MOTION:**

Todd Young made a motion with a second by Ivan Collver to request and review the curriculum objectives, scope, and sequence for Bates Technical College, George Brown College, Northern Alberta Institute of Technology (NAIT), and Vancouver Community College by the Item Writing / Examination & Education/Curriculum Committee. The motion passed unanimously.

- E-mail Attachments

Ivan Collver had a question concerning copies of minutes and agendas that were e-mailed to him. The misunderstanding was cleared up after the meeting.

The board meeting adjourned at 2:40 pm.

Prepared by: Sinnamon Harris, Board Specialist