

MEETING MINUTES

OREGON STATE BOARD OF GEOLOGIST EXAMINERS

MARCH 3, 2011

Members Present

Richard Heinzkill, Public Member
Chris Humphrey, RG, CEG, Board Vice-Chair
Dr. Vicki McConnell, RG, State Geologist
Dr. Stephen Taylor, RG, Board Chair
Rodney Weick, RG, CEG
Mark Yinger, RG

Staff Present

No Staff Present

Visitors Present

Twyla Lawson, Dept. of Administrative Services
David Olson, Chair, Oregon Landscape Architect Board
Tim Van Wormer, Oregon Landscape Architect Board (phone in)
Christine Valentine, Administrator Position Candidate
Diane Treadway, Administrator Position Candidate
Shelley Matthews, Administrator Position Candidate
Earth Science Students, Western Oregon University
Dean Scheck, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Western Oregon University

Chair *Taylor* called the Work Session portion of the meeting to order with an introduction and roll call at 8:41 AM in Hamersly Library Room 301A, Western Oregon University, Monmouth, OR. The work session agenda was reviewed and no changes were made to the initial draft presented in the Public Notice. The primary focus for the day involved interviewing and hiring a new Board Administrator, in coordination with Twyla Lawson, recruitment consultant from the Oregon Department of Administrative Services (DAS). The administrator search committee was comprised of *Rod Weick*, OSBGE Board Member, *Vicki McConnell*, OSBGE Board Member, *David Olson*, OSLAB Chair, and *Tim Van Wormer*, OSLAB Board Member.

8:45 AM – Board Member *Weick* provided a summary overview of the administrator search process and the committee workings leading up to the interview of the three finalists: Christine Valentine, Diane Treadway, and Shelley Matthews. *Weick* also explained the agreed-upon interview process that was worked out ahead of time with Twyla Lawson. Each of the three candidates were equally allotted a 50-minute time slot, with application of the following procedures: (1) an introductory statement by Search Chair *Weick*, (2) a 10-minute personal qualifications statement by the candidate, (3) a series of 7 Board-related interview questions, each assigned to a respective Board member, (4) candidate responses to the interview questions, (5) questions from the candidates to the Board, and (6) rubric scoring notes compiled by the Board members during the proceedings. The administrator position is part of OSBGE, with input from OSLAB on their perspectives. OSLAB members Olson and Van Wormer participated in both the initial screening process and the interviews of the three finalists. OSLAB input and discussion was prominently factored into the OSBGE decision-making process. Chair *Taylor* was tasked with keeping the morning work session on schedule, timing interview sessions, and coordinating with DAS consultant Lawson on management of candidate transitions.

Board Member *Weick* provided the following introductory statement to each of the three candidates:

“You are one of three finalists for the semi-independent Oregon State Board of Geologist Examiners Administrator position and through contractual arrangement the Administrator for the semi-independent Oregon State Board of Landscape Architects. Please note that this position serves as executive manager and oversees the daily business of both the agencies. This position is an employee of the Oregon State Board of Geologist Examiners under the direction of the five-member Board appointed by the Governor. The Oregon State Board of Landscape Architects contracts with the Board of Geologist Examiners for the Landscape Architects Board administrator services. The Administrator is responsible for all Board operations including the management of the Board’s budgets and personnel. The Administrator serves at the pleasure of the Board of Geologist Examiners. This is a full-time, unclassified service position located in Salem, Oregon. The person hired into this position will serve both Boards equally.

These interviews are being conducted during an open public meeting session of the Board of Geologist Examiners. The public will have opportunity to comment on all three candidates in this public forum.

The Board of Geologist Examiners members present today represent the interview panel. The same Board members will ask each candidate the same seven questions to ensure consistency. A copy of the questions is provided to you during this interview. Each interview session is 50 minutes, which includes 10 minutes for you to discuss you experience, skills and fit for this position. Within the 50 minutes, we will reserve time for any questions you may have for us after we have gone through the formal questions. We will complete our interviews during this morning’s Board work session and will make a decision on the candidate for the Administrator position during the afternoon Board meeting. Shall we begin?”

The following interview questions were presented to each candidate, by the listed Board Member:

- (1) *Weick*: “This position serves as the executive manager and oversees the daily business of both the agencies. This position is an employee of OSBGE under the direction of the five-member OSBGE Board appointed by the Governor. OSLAB contracts with OSBGE for board administrator services. The Administrator is responsible for all Board operations including the management of the Board’s budgets and personnel. What strengths do you bring to this position that will help you accomplish this charge? In which areas do you need to grow?”
- (2) *Humphrey*: “The Administrator must maintain effective working relationships with the Governor, the legislature, the community, licensees, and other interested parties. Give an example(s) of how you have worked collaboratively with individuals and organizations such as these to forward you current or previous organizations goals. Give us examples of techniques you used or would use to foster your relationships with them.”
- (3) *McConnell*: “Describe a time when you had problems getting people to work together to support a common agenda. What methods did you use? Were you successful? What other methods do you use to reach consensus?”
- (4) *Heinzkill*: “Describe your approach to making decisions and solving problems. Describe a difficult decision you had to make that had a broad impact on your current or previous organization. What process did you use to make this decision? In retrospect, what would you have done differently?”

- (5) *Taylor*: “Give an example of a change you saw coming or something you thought was necessary to change. How did you go about planning for it? How did you persuade others in authority that the change was necessary?”
- (6) *Yinger*: “Please describe your experience developing and maintaining organizational policy and any planning and development of legislation. Give an example of legislative or policy development and the lessons learned from that experience. What were the results or outcomes?”
- (7) *Weick*: “What questions do you have of us?”

The above process was systematically applied to each of the three finalist / interviewees, and the Board members took notes and scored responses accordingly as part of the selection process. Each candidate provided an introductory statement of qualifications, followed by sequential rounds of the above-scripted questions. The following is a summary of the morning interview timeline and general qualifications of each of the three finalists:

8:53 AM: Introduction of candidate Christine Valentine.

Valentine holds a B.S. in Marine Science (Long Island University) and M.S. in Natural Resources Management (Oregon State University). Her work experience includes (in chronological order): Coastal Project Review Coordinator for the State of Alaska, Coastal Permit Specialist/Program Coordinator for the Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development, and Community Development Coordinator for the Oregon Business Development Dept.

9:03-9:08 AM: Valentine personal statement.

9:08-9:43 AM: Interview questions, Valentine responses, Board-candidate discussion.

9:43-9:56 AM: Break

9:56 AM: Introduction of candidate Diane Treadway.

Treadway has engaged in post-secondary community college education (Portland Community College, Chemeketa Community College, Central Oregon Community College) and possesses significant work experience in the areas of community organization and social service. Her work experience includes (in chronological order): Claims Investigator for the Oregon Dept. of Justice, Juvenile Probation Officer for the Jefferson County Juvenile Department, Director of the Jefferson County Commission on Children and Families, Liquor Regulatory Specialist for Oregon Liquor Control Commission, Operations Manager for the Clackamas County Office for Children & Families, Program Development Specialist for the Deschutes County Commission on Children & Families, and Quality Assurance Reviewer for Prevent Child Abuse America.

10:01-10:11 AM: Treadway personal statement.

10:11-10:50 AM: Interview questions, Treadway responses, Board-candidate discussion.

10:50-11:00 AM: Break

11:00 AM: Introduction of candidate Shelley Matthews.

Matthews holds a B.S. in Business Administration (Portland State University) and M.S. in Geography – Natural Resources Management (Portland State University). Her work experience includes (in chronological order): Assistant Controller for the Valley Wine Co. (Beaverton, Oregon), Senior Accountant for Columbia Distributing, Finance Supervisor and Education Coordinator for the

Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission, Environmental Intern for the Port of Vancouver, Environmental Specialist for Laura Berg Consulting, and Budget Coordinator / Clean Diesel Grant Administrator for the Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality.

11:03-11:13 AM: Matthews personal statement.

11:13-11:50 AM: Interview questions, Matthews responses, Board-candidate discussion.

11:50 AM – The OSBGE and representative OSLAB Board members debriefed with the DAS representative on the morning interview session. Chair *Taylor* recommended a round-table comment period, giving each individual a chance to comment on the process and candidates. The debrief session was open to the public and the finalists chose not to participate and left the building as their individual sessions ended. Each Board member commented on their impressions of the three candidates, and provided a preliminary synopsis of their respective rankings from 1 to 3. *Weick* and *Taylor* tallied the informal rankings, the discussion was shelved for lunch.

12:09 PM – Chair *Taylor* closed the work session and invited a group of ~20 Western Oregon University Earth Science students and the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences into the meeting room for lunch and social. The Board and visitors introduced themselves in round table fashion. Taylor provided an outreach slide show informing the visitors about the work of the Board, the public practice of geology and professional registration in the state of Oregon. The students were receptive and the floor was open to questions for Board members regarding professional practice and career options. Lunch was concluded at 1:05 PM and the outreach engagement deemed successful.

1:05-1:10 PM – Break

1:10 PM – OSBGE and OSLAB Board members continued the interview discussions from the morning work session. Chair *Taylor* once again called for a second round-table comment period, revisited, with each board member commenting on their impressions of the three candidates. Rankings of each finalist from 1 to 3 were compiled a second time, each member discussed the merits of the candidates, and their respective justification for their rankings. Based on the group ranking process (n = 8 reviewers), Valentine was identified as the top candidate for the position as related to her education level, knowledgeable interview responses and extensive experience with state operations in Salem. The group was equivocally divided on the relative ranking of Matthews and Treadway as second and/or third. All three candidates were highly qualified professionals and did an excellent job with the application and interview process. The ranking and final recommendation by the search committee would be presented to the Board for a formal vote at its quarterly meeting, later in the afternoon.

1:28 PM – OSLAB and DAS representatives departed the meeting room, the Board took a short break.

+++++

Chair *Taylor* called the quarterly meeting of the Board to order at 1:37 PM.

1. **Visitor Introductions:** No visitors were present.
2. **Agenda:** The agenda was presented. Given the time of day, *Taylor* recommended reorganizing the agenda to provide time efficiencies for needed actions: add item 7f. Budget Committee Report (2011-2013 Budget), move up in agenda to follow in tandem with item 4. Administrator Report. Move existing item 10c. Office Management Plan and Staffing to follow item 3. Minutes. *Weick* motioned to approve the agenda with modifications as noted, *McConnell* seconded. The Board unanimously voted to approve the agenda with modifications and additions as stated.
3. **December 2010 Minutes:** The minutes were presented and no edits were offered. *Weick* moved to approve the December, 2010 meeting minutes as presented, *Taylor* seconded. The Board unanimously voted to approve the minutes.

10.c. Office Management Plan and Staffing:

Taylor reviewed the necessary task for the day, to vote on a recommendation for a hiring decision related to the Administrator vacancy. *Weick*, chair of the search committee, provided a brief review of the morning interview sessions. *Taylor* called for one more round table discussion of Board member perspectives on the topic. Each member presented their views on the process and candidates. *Weick* presented the results of the search and recommended to the Board that Valentine was the top candidate for the position, and that a hiring offer should be made post haste.

Group discussion followed as to what the class and step offer should consist of. The administrator position is classed as Professional Executive Manager-D with steps ranging from 1 to 10. The Board agreed that given Valentine's experience, a mid-step offer was warranted, with a contingency for one step increase after a 6 month review period. The Board agreed to the approach.

The second discussion item involved which candidate to designate as the number two choice, in the event that the primary offer to Valentine could not be negotiated. Discussion followed with further pros and cons on each of the candidates, with the Board designating Matthews as second choice.

Weick motioned that the Board approve Valentine as top candidate for the vacant Administrator position, and that Chair *Taylor* engage in direct hiring negotiations to secure the candidate, and that Matthews be designated as the second choice. *Taylor* seconded the motion. Further discussion ensued. *Taylor* called the question, the motion carried with majority vote.

Chair *Taylor* thanked *Weick* and *McConnell* for their diligent efforts on organizing the search process, engaging DAS HR, and facilitating discussions with OSLAB. Their work and leadership between the months of December 2010 and March 2011 were essential in filling the vacancy. *Thank you Rod and Vicki, great team work!*

4. **Administrator Report:** Given the position vacancy, *Taylor* presented the administrator report.
 - a. **Summary of Staff Activities:** *Taylor* provided a summary of office activities since December 2010. Bulleted highlights follow:
 - Staff Member *Arrobang* continued stellar work in managing the office during the administrator vacancy period. Chair *Taylor* continued working closely with staff to maintain cohesion of Board business during this transition period.

2:41 PM 5-Minute Break

- Staff continues to monitor renewal numbers. The budget plan factored in a 5% non-renewal projection for the biennium. The last few months of renewals are coming in a bit higher than that projection. In addition to the monthly renewal data, Chair *Taylor* asked staff to also include a running quarterly report on historical number of registrant exams, to fortify efforts in monitoring revenues and maintaining a balanced budget. Since March 2008, the Board administers an average of ~13 fundamental exams at each sitting, and is holding steady in this regard. The practice and CEG exams are lesser in number and more variable over time, with an average of ~7 and 2 per sitting, respectively. A significant drop to zero CEG examinations in December 2010 and March 2011 is notable, and may signify a new trend in the professional demographic.

b. Updated Revenue/Expense Report for Current Biennium: The Board reviewed the report. In reviewing the Balance Sheet, *Taylor* noted that the budget was on track and Board finances are generally in a positive state.

3:10 PM

c. Approve Check log: *McConnell* moved to approve check log #3234 through #3270 and #9134 to #9137. *Taylor* seconded. The Board unanimously voted to approve the check log.

d. 3-Year Comparison of Changes in Monthly Renewals: The numbers are comparing well to the anticipated budget projections for the biennium, especially considering the state/national economic conditions. The Board reviewed with no further discussion

e. Update on Edward Jones CD Balance: The Board reviewed the statement with no further discussion.

Combined Items 4.f. 2011-2013 Biennial Budget and 7.f. Budget Committee

Chair *Taylor* initiated a planning discussion on the 2011-2013 Board Biennial Budget. He emphasized the need for action on the budget and proposed that a special session be held in the latter part of March to finalize the budget, and assure that the related administrative rule could be filed by the start of the July 1, 2011 fiscal year.

A draft 1 budget sheet was prepared by Chair *Taylor* and Staff *Arrobang* for the meeting. *Taylor* presented the draft budget to the Board for review, comment and edits. *Taylor* led the Board through a line-by-line review of the budget items, including projected revenues and anticipated expenses for the next biennium. The budget model assumes a 5% reduction in registrations due to the economy, reinstates travel of the Administrator and Board Members to the ASBOG annual meeting / council of examiners, projected ASBOG fee increases, and adjustments in staff compensation packages.

Taylor provided a summary of job performance criteria related to Staff Member *Arrobang* during the past 5 years of employment at the Board. He especially noted her work ethic and the outstanding job she did in tackling the full scope of office duties during the 8-month absence of an administrator.

Given the growth in responsibilities and duties related to *Arrobang*'s position, *Taylor* proposed that the Board consider reclassifying the position to encompass a broader scope of duties aligned with an FTE split between Accounting Technician and Executive Assistant. Related budget analysis suggests that such a reclassification would be affordable. *Taylor* argued that given the scope of duties and responsibilities engaged by *Arrobang* over the past year, the reclassification is warranted and justified. The Board discussed the proposal, all agreed that *Arrobang*'s work was excellent, that

the position has grown over time, and that final budget analysis should be conducted to make sure such a promotion would be financially viable. Given the budget timeline, all agreed that any such reclassification should take effect on July 1, 2011.

The Board charged Chair *Taylor* with finalizing the draft 2011-2013 budget and to move forward with the *Arrobang* reclassification process. *Taylor* agreed to revise the budget as discussed, and arrange for a special budget session later in the month.

5:10 PM – Chair *Taylor* announced that the remainder of the March 2011 was tabled for further action at the next meeting on June 3, 2011. The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'ST', written in a cursive style.

Steve Taylor, PhD, RG
Chair

The minutes of the March 3, 2011 Work Session and Quarterly Meeting were approved with revisions reflected herein at the June 3, 2011 Quarterly Board Meeting.

Christine Valentine, Administrator

