



**OREGON BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY**  
Qualifications Committee  
Minutes January 14, 2015

**Committee Members Present**

Alia Adams, CPA  
Patrick Brown, CPA  
Chuck Landers, CPA (*Vice-Chair*)  
David Peterson, CPA  
Alan Steiger, CPA-Retired (*Chair*)  
Michael Schmidt, CPA  
Christina Tate, CPA  
Bryce Wilberger, CPA  
Roger Graham, (*Board Liaison*)

**Excused Absence**

Rachelle Quinn, CPA  
Amber White, CPA

**Staff Present**

Kimberly Fast, *Licensing Manager*  
Kristen Adamson, *Licensing Specialist*  
Joel Parks, *Licensing Specialist*

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The Qualifications Committee (QC) convened for a regularly scheduled conference call meeting on January 14, 2015. Alan Steiger, CPA-Retired, Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m., and announced that the meeting was being recorded.

**2. REPORT OF BOARD ACTION**

**A. Proposed Rule Changes**

Mr. Graham reported that the Board approved all of the committee's recommendations from the November meeting. He also reported that the Board has moved forward with the proposed changes to the rules, and statute changes will go to the legislature later in the year.

**3. PENDING APPLICATIONS**

**A. Current Applications**

**1. Madhuramba Krishnamurthy (Adams)**

Ms. Krishnamurthy passed the Uniform CPA examination in June 2014 as a New Hampshire candidate. Experience was gained at the following employer:

Intel                      30 months                      All Competencies

Ms. Adams noted that Ms. Krishnamurthy participated in Intel's certification program, and she found the write-up to be sufficient to meet the competencies.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL**

Ms. Adams moved to find that there is sufficient evidence to make a preliminary finding that Madhuramba Krishnamurthy has demonstrated the competencies necessary for initial licensing per OAR 801-010-0065.

Mr. Graham asked if Mr. Schmidt, who also works at Intel, if he had any involvement with this applicant. Mr. Schmidt responded that he had not worked with her directly, but there was some involvement in the generation of some financial statements. While he supported the application, he intended to abstain from the vote.

**MOTION PASSED.** 7 Ayes, 1 Abstain (Schmidt)

**2. Echo Lin (Peterson)**

Ms. Lin passed the Uniform CPA examination in April 2007 as an Oregon candidate.

Experience was gained at the following employer:

CareOregon, Inc      100 months      All Competencies

Mr. Peterson noted that Ms. Lin’s application seemed incomplete, missing the additional information such as job descriptions and organizational chart. The work timelines reported were not consistent or explained, with the supervisor reporting 100 months, and the application stating that Ms. Lin had worked for the company since 2001. Mr. Peterson observed that it was unclear whether Ms. Lin’s supervisor had actually been involved with all of the work experience referenced. In addition to the supervisor’s write-up, there was a letter included that had been written 2.5 years prior, and the supervisor had not been verified as a qualified supervisor, but the documentation did not speak to whether the applicant was actually involved in the risk assessment process. In review of Competency B, Mr. Peterson did not see sufficient documentation, but he could make the leap in understanding when they referred back to duties the applicant had which would have required an understanding of the entity in order to be successful. Mr. Schmidt struggled with Competency B, and asked if it made sense to ask for examples so that the committee did not have to make the leap in understanding, and Mr. Peterson agreed. Mr. Landers felt that Competencies B, E, and F needed more expansion, and Ms. Adams thought the entire application was lacking in substantiated examples. Mr. Wilberger felt that Competency D needed expansion as well. Mr. Steiger suggested that the applicant could be given the option of following the new procedure and completing their own write-up.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: DEFER**

Mr. Peterson moved to defer the application of Echo Lin pending additional information on Competencies B, D, E, and F; an organizational chart and job descriptions.

**MOTION PASSED.** 8 Ayes

### **3. Thomas Nordgren (Brown)**

Mr. Nordgren passed the Uniform CPA examination in October 2009 as an Oregon candidate.

Experience was gained at the following employer:

Sumner College          47 months          All Competencies

After speaking with Barry Glasser, Mr. Nordgren's supervisor, Mr. Brown did not observe any issues with the direct supervision, and had confirmed with Board staff that under the new administrative rules, Mr. Glasser's 10-day license lapse would not affect Mr. Nordgren's application. Competencies A, C, D, and G were already approved by the applicant's supervisor at Moss Adams, so Mr. Brown focused his review on Competencies B, E, and F. After speaking with Mr. Glasser, Mr. Brown felt that the applicant has the competency, but the write-up does not document that. Examples provided were basic in nature, and Mr. Brown did not see evidence of risk assessment.

#### **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: DEFER**

Mr. Brown moved to defer the application of Thomas Nordgren pending additional information on Competencies B, E, and F.

**Motion Passed.** 8 Ayes

### **B. DEFERRED APPLICATIONS**

#### **1. Rachel Nishida (Peterson)**

Ms. Nishida passed the Uniform CPA examination in May 2014 as an Oregon candidate.

Experience was gained at the following employer:

Albertina Kerr Centers          20 months          All Competencies

Ms. Nishida's application was deferred for a second time at the November meeting for information on Competencies B, C, and E. After reviewing the supervisor's third submission, Mr. Peterson was comfortable to make a motion to recommend approval.

#### **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL – MOTION FAILED.**

Mr. Peterson moved to find that there is sufficient evidence to make a preliminary finding that Rachel Nishida has demonstrated the competencies necessary for initial licensing per OAR 801-010-0065.

The motion failed for lack of a second. Mr. Steiger opened further conversation on Ms. Nishida's application. Mr. Wilberger did not see how Competency B met the requirements as stated in the OARs, and after reading the latest submission did not feel comfortable that Ms. Nishida had a working knowledge of how the entity or industry worked. Mr. Steiger had concerns with Competencies C and E, where he saw a lot of accounting work but not necessarily analysis or critical decision making. Mr. Landers pointed out that if the application is deferred for a third time, would the committee get any additional information not previously requested that would help.

Mr. Brown asked Mr. Peterson if he had dialogue with the supervisor on what was felt to be missing from the application. Mr. Peterson responded that he had reached out to the supervisor in November, and explained his view of what was demonstrated in each competency's documentation and what he felt was missing. Mr. Brown noted that it could then be safe assumption that there is probably no

more satisfactory evidence to obtain. Based on committee feedback, Mr. Peterson decided to change his recommendation.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: DENIAL**

Mr. Peterson moved to find that there is insufficient evidence to make a preliminary finding that Rachel Nishida has demonstrated the competencies necessary for initial licensing per OAR 801-010-0065.

**Motion Passed.** 8 Ayes

Mr. Peterson asked a process question on how much coaching should take place when consulting with applicants and supervisors following a committee deferral. Mr. Steiger asked Mr. Graham what the Board's expectation was. Mr. Graham responded that he could not speak for the Board, but in his opinion, if a committee reviewer believes that an applicant is qualified, it is acceptable to help them through the process. If it seems to a reviewer that there will ultimately not be competency, he would be concerned about encouraging the applicant repeatedly. As a reviewer, Mr. Graham felt that you get a feel for the applications, and can trust your judgment. Mr. Steiger asked if having the applicant do the write-ups will help this issue, and Mr. Schmidt said that at Intel, applicants are directed and asked insightful questions, but are careful about the fine line between direction and coaching.

**4. Approve Minutes**  
**A. November 14, 2014**

Ms. Adamson pointed out a few grammatical and wording changes that had already been identified, and the committee had no further changes to make.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** Moved by Mr. Wilberger to approve the minutes with the noted corrections.

**VOTE:** 8 ayes

**5. Old Business**  
**A. Department of Revenue MOU**

Mr. Steiger reported that Ms. Adamson received a memo from the Department of Revenue that they are still working on their materials, and will keep the committee updated. The discussion will be continued at the next committee meeting.

**B. New Certificate of Experience Forms**

Mr. Graham noted that some Board members wanted the original competencies on the form, and some wanted newer guidance for applicants. Based on some feedback from Mr. Schmidt, there is some research focus on Competency F, as there are higher cognitive skills the Board and committee would like to see, and adding the research component helps point applicants in that direction. Mr. Steiger confirmed with Mr. Graham and Board staff that some language had been changed to ensure supervisor involvement and approval of the applicant write-ups. Mr. Graham also advised that this is a new procedure and a work in progress, so we may make some tweaks in the future. Mr. Steiger thanked Mr. Graham for his work on the project.

## **6. New Business**

### **A. Committee Member Recruitment**

Mr. Graham introduced Michael Schmidt, a new committee recruit from Intel, and explained that Amber White is another new recruit from the banking industry. He is working on finding another individual, possibly from public accounting.

### **B. Committee Member Expectations**

Mr. Steiger opened discussion on the new document that clarifies the expectations and procedures for committee members put forth by Ms. Quinn. Mr. Landers thought was that he would rather have contact with the supervisor than the applicant. Ms. Adams suggested a standardized answer to applicants when asked specifically if the reviewer will recommend approval. Mr. Peterson and Mr. Steiger responded that they could be assured that the recommendation is made by the full committee, and ultimately application approval or denial is decided by the Board. Ms. Fast noted that it might be best practice to make contact if there is doubt about an application, but wouldn't go so far as to say it is a requirement. Mr. Landers and Mr. Brown stated that they felt better discussing an application after making contact, even if they already have a good idea of what their recommendation will be. Mr. Wilberger asked if the last bullet point could cause a side discussion and could then potentially violate public meeting rules. It was agreed to remove the third to last bullet point, and Mr. Steiger ended the discussion stating that the document is in progress and can continue to be reviewed and edited as needed.

## **7. Adjourned**

Mr. Steiger adjourned the meeting at 10:13 a.m.