



Board Members

Cliff Johannsen, Ph.D., Chair
Psychologist, Lake Oswego

Patricia Bjorkquist, Ph.D.
Psychologist, Salem

**Celeste Jones, Psy.D.,
Vice Chair**
Psychologist, Newberg

Linda Nishi-Strattner, Ph.D.
Psychologist, Tigard

Dave Ziegler, Ph.D.
Psychologist, Jasper

Janice Schermer
Public Member, Portland

Bryan Hagen
Public Member, Bend

Elizabeth Goy, Ph.D
Psychologist, Portland

Staff

Charles Hill
Executive Director

LaRee Felton
Policy Advisor

Connie Farrier
Licensing Manager

Allison McGonagle
Compliance Specialist

Dan Vile
Investigator

Lucy Younis
Licensing Program Specialist

Julia Budlong
Program Assistant

In this Issue

A Word from the Executive Director1-2

How Board Views Criminal History Issues 2

Political Jeopardy 3

Be the Board You Want to See..... 4

Health Care Workforce Survey Update: REALD 4

Administrative Rulemaking.....4-5

Enforcement Actions5-7

Reminder, Events, & Calendar 8

A Word from the Executive Director

Greetings everyone. I hope that you all have kept well during these last few months. What a year 2020 has been- and I for one am ready to turn the calendar page to 2021! COVID has been with us now for about 9-months and Oregonians need mental health professionals now, more than ever as this pandemic runs its course. These past months have seemed like an eternity, and COVID has taken a toll on almost everyone in one way or another. Worldwide, we anxiously await the arrival of a vaccine. There is hope on the horizon!

Speaking of eternity, it seems like an eternity since MHRA began the work of updating its new licensing database. I have kept a binder of information that has grown to nearly 4-inches thick since we initiated this project. We began budgeting this project in 2016 while working through the legislative process to secure the necessary funding. Next came the work with the Office of the State Chief Information Office (OSCIO) to ensure that we planned accordingly and received the appropriate permissions for cyber security. While working with the OSCIO, we also began collaborating with other state health related boards to try to find a vendor that could supply a licensing database to fit all of our various needs. Eventually, MHRA partnered with the Licensed Clinical Social Workers Board to enter into a contract with a consulting firm from Seattle, Washington to work with us on a needs assessment that would be the framework for a Request for Purchase, so that we could solicit bids for a licensing database.

The next step involved working with the state procurement office to create the RFP. Then, out to bid we went and we ultimately analyzed 3 responses from vendors interested in providing our product. We knew that the licensing database would be expensive, and after completing our needs assessment we learned that a custom database would cost us approximately \$2M. Multiply the \$2M by two if we had to develop two separate custom databases for BLPCT and BOP. Fortunately, our administrative merger of the two Boards meant that we needed to pay for only one database, but \$2M was not affordable for our small Agency. Consequently, we settled upon an “off the shelf” product which allows for some customization that would fit our \$100,000 budget. Finally, we were ready to start the real work of developing the new system and migrating data from our old system.

In October of this year, we rolled out the new BLPCT licensing database and in January of 2021, we hope to roll out the BOP licensing database. In 2016 when we began planning this project, we had no idea that we would be completing such a huge project at the worst possible time, during the COVID pandemic. But, that is what happened. We could not stall the database project any longer. Beginning in March and April of 2020, both boards adopted temporary rules for licensure so that out-of-

A Word from the Executive Director, Cont.

state licensees could quickly and temporarily practice in Oregon. During a 6-month period, MHRA issued nearly 1,000 temporary licenses and permits while keeping up with the normal work of issuing new licenses and approving residents and interns along with renewals, all while implementing a new licensing database. In the BLPCT newsletter, we have dedicated an article that explains much about the BLPCT licensing database. A similar article will follow in the Spring for BOP. Yes, here at MHRA, we are ready to turn over the calendar.

I want to take a moment to recognize **Mr. Jon Weiner** who recently rotated off of the Board of Psychology. Jon committed nearly 5 years to volunteering his time on the Board, and provided unique insight from a public member and legal perspective. We will miss you Jon, and wish you all the best!

I also want to welcome our two newest BLPCT board members, **Andrea Redeau**, LPC from Portland and **Daniel Reeser**, LMFT from Grants Pass. I cannot end this newsletter without recognizing **Lindsay McGrath**, LMFT and **Don Thomson**, LPC who recently termed off of the BLPCT. Lindsay and Don each served 6 years on the BLPCT and dedicated their time and energy to providing leadership while they helped shape the Board during a much needed rules overhaul. Lindsay and Don have left their mark on the BLPCT and we wish them well into the future.

-Charles Hill, Executive Director, Mental Health Regulatory Agency
"Plans are nothing, but planning is everything" – Dwight D. Eisenhower

Ψ

How Board Views Criminal History Issues

As a part of the Board's commitment to protect the public, applicants must provide information on any arrests or convictions. When renewing your license, you must also inform the Board of any new arrests and criminal matters. However, all arrests and convictions are not equally concerning to the Board and we want to be transparent about how we view someone's arrest and criminal record.

All violent arrests and crimes along with most felony convictions are understandably concerning to the Board. However other arrests and convictions are carefully considered to determine if they indicate either a character issue with the psychologist and/or a risk to the public. An issue has recently come to the Board's attention concerning arrests and convictions related to civil demonstrations concerning social justice issues. At times a peaceful march has resulted in an arrest when it does not involve violence and may involve no more than disbanding the march 'too slowly' in the opinion of a police officer. All arrests and convictions are carefully reviewed by the Consumer Protection Committee for a recommendation to the full Board. We also rely on legal advice on all such matters.

Speaking out and demonstrating for social justice is not a concern for the Board, and is, in fact, considered an important role of a psychologist to promote social justice and fairness in society. How a psychologist expresses an opinion is obviously important and will be taken into consideration. Our Nation has a long history of civil disobedience in the name of fairness and justice regarding our laws. An arrest/conviction in the name of advocating for the welfare of the citizenry, if done in a thoughtful and appropriate manner, is very unlikely to become a concern between a psychologist and the Board. However, it is important to mention that all arrests and convictions must be provided to the Board for review. Not providing this information is subject to Board sanctions regardless of the nature of the issue.

The bottom line is be sure to provide the Board with all arrests, convictions and information needed by the Board to consider the matter fully. A psychologist is more likely to face Board sanctions for not being forthcoming with arrests and convictions than for providing full information.

- Dave Ziegler, Ph.D. and Patricia Bjorkquist, Ph.D.

Ψ

Political Jeopardy

In an election year, psychologists are more often asked for statements on social and political issues, even including requests for support of particular candidates for political office. Concurrently, there are several current social/cultural movements and calls for advocacy that psychologists are asked to weigh in on. Psychological research has certainly been a formative influence in social/political change historically, but how best does an individual psychologist respond to requests for a political statement? When and how do psychologists engage in political advocacy? Ethical issues get particularly complicated when psychologists use their professional role in their advocacy (e.g. identifying themselves in their statement as a psychologist or including their educational credentials). Three issues are explored here, including ethical guidance for political advocacy, when and how to shift to personal advocacy, and approaching political differences in the therapeutic relationship.

APA ethics urge psychologists to be “alert and guard against personal, financial, social, organizational or political factors that might lead to misuse of their influence,” a general warning acknowledging the power of a public advocacy statement proffered by a psychologist. More specifically, APA advises psychologists to be mindful when making public statements in their professional role. APA Standard 5.04 Media Presentations outlines that public statements should have adequate psychological or scientific support, stating “...statements are based on their professional knowledge, training or experience in accord with appropriate psychological literature and practice...” (APA, 2002, p. 1067). This suggests that when there is broad psychological and scientific evidence to support one’s professional advocacy, there is less ethical risk.

What if a psychologist wants to publicly advocate for a political cause that doesn’t have broad psychological and scientific evidence, or isn’t aligned with other ethical standards? What if you want to endorse a particular candidate for political office? In these circumstances, one advocates as an individual citizen stating their personal opinions. Thus, these political statements need to be offered as held strictly by the individual. A psychologist in this situation would omit any mention of their training, degrees or current professional occupations, being sure to sign without noting a professional degree or identity. To do otherwise is to lend the weight of the profession to what is a non-professional assertion.

Besides the risk involved in using the power of the professional role in advocacy, psychologists have also debated how public advocacy negates a necessary neutrality in the therapist-client relationship. What if a client discovers that you have differing political opinions than their own? What if that discovery is detrimental to the therapeutic relationship? Psychology has historically been conceptualized as politically neutral and scientifically objective. However, more recent conversations have emphasized the need to understand that every individual psychologist comes to their work with internally-held values. Their values, in turn, influence their perspectives. Rather than claiming objectivity, perhaps less harm is done when one internally acknowledges their own values, how those are different than the client’s, and how those may influence the therapeutic relationship. Nadal (2017) suggests that rather than striving for being apolitical, perhaps a responsible psychologist engaged in political advocacy broaches the therapist-client conversation of political differences similarly to interactions around race, gender, and religion. These conversations begin at the beginning of therapy, with openness to facilitating discussion around identities and possible cultural dynamics (Nadal, 2017).

As proponents of social and emotional wellness, psychologists are interested in shaping sociocultural systems and policy that maximize human wellness. Psychology as a discipline has been historically influential in social justice movements. In order to move forward with both political advocacy and ethical responsibility, licensees are encouraged to consider whether public statements in the professional role are adequately supported by scholarly research, to omit professional identity markers in personal advocacy, and to properly mitigate negative impacts of public advocacy on therapeutic relationships.

- Celeste Jones, PsyD, ABCCAP

Ψ



Be the Board You Want to See

As Oregon grows in size and diversity, it is important that OBOP reflect our population if it is to do its assigned job of protecting the public. And because board members are limited to two three-year terms of service, OBOP is frequently looking for psychologists willing to serve.

The Board has 6 full-day meetings per year with one including a second day that is given to long-term planning. There are options for committee assignments and special projects, as well as participation in meetings and activities of the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards. Additional information can be found on the State website <https://www.oregon.gov/gov/admin/Pages/Boards-and-Commissions.aspx>.

Our Board needs to reflect our licensees and our State, and the best way to insure that your voice is heard is to participate. Working with a diverse professional group of peers on regulatory issues is both challenging and highly rewarding. The Board's three public members also play an important role to bring in the perspective of the public, who the Board is charged with protecting. Non-psychologist Board members can be difficult to recruit, so if you know of someone with a passion to serve and represent consumers of psychological services, we hope that you will encourage them to apply.

- Patricia Bjorkquist, Ph.D.

Ψ

Health Care Workforce Survey Update: REALD

Beginning in 2021, the Health Care Workforce Survey that Oregon Health Authority requires you to complete as part of your license renewal will include more detailed questions on race, ethnicity, language, and disability (REAL+D). These questions are included to support state planning efforts in equitably promoting a diverse and culturally responsive workforce for communities across the state. While your responses to these questions are extremely valuable in this effort, you are also able to decline to answer any of them and your responses will not affect the renewal of your license. Please visit the [REALD Website](#) for more information on these data collection efforts. Contact staff at the Health Care Workforce Reporting Program and the Office of Equity and Inclusion [here](#).

Ψ

Administrative Rulemaking

On November 20, 2020, the Board filed a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for the following proposed rule amendment:

Online Oregon Jurisprudence Exam.

OAR 858-010-0030: This proposal makes amendments that allow the Board to move the jurisprudence exam from an in-person to an online format. It also clarifies the requirements and reorganizes.

The agency requests public comment on whether the options should be considered for achieving the rule's substantive goals while reducing negative economic impact of the rule on business. Please email your comments to laree.felton@oregon.gov or mail them to the Board's office at 3218 Pringle Road SE, Ste. 130, Salem, OR 97302. All comments must be received no later than 5:00 p.m. on December 22, 2020.

On November 20, 2020, the Board filed a Temporary Administrative Order for the following temporary rule adoption:

Compliance with the Governor's Executive Orders during a Governor declared emergency.

OAR 858-020-0115: This new rule sets forth that failure to comply with any applicable provision of a

Administrative Rulemaking, Cont.

Governor's Executive Order, including failure to comply with Oregon Health Authority guidance, constitutes unprofessional conduct. Violations are subject to Board sanction.

Need for the Rule: This temporary rule was adopted at the direction of the Governor's office.

On September 14, 2020, the Board filed a Permanent Administrative Order for the following rule amendment:

Temporary suspension of in-person continuing education requirement.

OAR 858-040-0055: This amendment temporarily suspends the limitation of 20 hours of continuing education (CE) credit awarded for home study and study group during a reporting period. It applies only to renewals that are due between March 31, 2020 and July 31, 2021.

Note: On March 18, 2020, the Board filed a Temporary Administrative Order that temporarily suspended the limitation of 20 hours of CE credit awarded for home study and study group during a reporting period for renewals due between March 31, 2020 and August 31, 2020. This new amendment effectively extends the in-person CE suspension so that it applies to renewals that are due up to July 31, 2021. The Board will continue to monitor the situation and determine if further rule amendments are needed.

Please visit our [Administrative Rulemaking Webpage](#) for more information.



Enforcement Actions

During the period of time from July 10, 2020, to November 30, 2020, the Board took the following actions:

Peter G. Sprengelmeyer, Ph.D. (Licensee), **FINAL ORDER**, effective July 15, 2020. Licensee provided supervision to Subject A and allowed her to work as a psychologist and to provide clinical services to patients from 2005 until 2012 at Oregon Social Learning Center Community Programs in Eugene, Oregon. Throughout that time span, Subject A was not licensed as a psychologist in Oregon and did not practice with a Board approved resident supervision contract. Subject A was employed as a Qualified Medical Health Professional (QMHP), but practiced for more than 24 months in that capacity, in violation of ORS 675.090(2)(a) and ORS 675.070(2)(h). As a result, Licensee allowed Subject A to engage in the unlicensed practice of psychology, as defined by ORS 675.010(4). Licensee violated ORS 675.070(2)(h) and ES 3.04 Avoiding Harm. Licensee was reprimanded and ordered to pay a \$1,000 civil penalty.

Malgosia Z. Cegielski, Ph.D. (Licensee), **STIPULATED ORDER**, effective July 15, 2020. Licensee provided services to Patient A, a four-year-old child whose parents were engaged in a high-conflict custody dispute. Patient A's mother requested a copy of Patient A's treatment records. Licensee first informed the mother that she would provide the records after returning from her leave from work. Licensee later informed the mother that she did not think her records would be useful and told the mother that she should schedule an appointment to review the records with her. Later, Licensee mailed a redacted copy of Patient A's records to the mother, with an apology for the extended delay. The mother took Patient A to a new therapist (Therapist D), both mother and Therapist D repeatedly asked Licensee to provide a copy of the records, to include a treatment plan and chart notes, to the therapist. Licensee failed to comply with these requests. On one occasion, Licensee left a voice mail message for Therapist D, explaining that she was doing "nondirective play therapy" and that it would be best if she would just begin her own process of play therapy and that Licensee's records would not be useful. ORS 675.070(2)(d)(A), ES 3.04, Avoiding Harm, ES 3.09 Cooperation with Other Professionals and ES 6.01, Documentation of Professional and Scientific Work and Maintenance of Records. Licensee was reprimanded, placed on probation for a minimum of two years, ordered to complete four hours of continuing education and ordered to pay a \$2,000 civil penalty.

Enforcement Actions, Cont.

Eloise A. Holdship, Psy.D. (Applicant), **STIPULATED ORDER**, effective October 16, 2020. Applicant submitted an application to the Board to practice psychology in the State of Oregon. Applicant answered "no" to the application question, "Have you ever been investigated by a regulatory board, professional organization, educational institution or employer?" Applicant's answer is not accurate. In fact, Applicant underwent an investigation by this Board in 2016. Applicant was informed of the investigation at the time. The 2016 investigation was closed with no formal disciplinary action. Applicant violated ORS 675.070(2)(f), and ES 5.01 Avoidance of False or Deceptive Statements. Licensee was reprimanded and ordered to pay a \$500 civil penalty.

Erin C. Moran, Psy.D. (Respondent), **STIPULATED ORDER**, effective September 14, 2020. Respondent formerly practiced at the Portland Autism Center as a psychologist. Respondent conducted an evaluation of Patient A, a four-year-old child, and subsequently prepared a Psychosocial Report in 2017 with the stated purpose to determine whether Patient A met the diagnostic criteria for Autism, and if there were any other contributing conditions. Respondent's written report contains many factual deficiencies, to include the following:

- Respondent failed to document the specific dates of service, stating only the month when service began as "May 2017" at the beginning of the report.
- Respondent provided varying ages for Patient A, 4 years, 7 months; 4 years, 10 months; and 7 years, 5 months, the last of which was inaccurate.
- The report inaccurately stated that Patient A had three siblings.
- The report stated that Patient A was attending school, when he was attending pre-school at that time.
- The report stated that Patient A had a school diagnosis of dyslexia and dysgraphia, when Patient A was not enrolled in school at that time, and therefore, did not have a school diagnosis.
- The report stated that Patient A had "good" verbal skills when he had a history of delayed language and lack of spontaneous language for a child of his age.

Respondent violated ORS 675.070(2)(d)(A) and ES 6.01 Documentation of Professional and Scientific Work and Maintenance of Records. Licensee was reprimanded and ordered to pay a \$1,000 civil penalty.

Tom Dooley, Psy.D. (Licensee), **STIPULATED ORDER**, effective September 14, 2020. Patient A, an adult female with a history of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), was referred to Licensee for a psycho-diagnostic examination to determine whether she still qualified for a disability determination by the Oregon Department of Human Service, Disability Determination Services. When Patient A arrived at the address that she was provided, she found herself in a residential neighborhood with no signage in front of what appeared to be a residence to indicate that she had arrived at Licensee's office. Not sure that she was at the correct location, Patient A approached the house and approached the front door, which had an 8 x 11-inch sheet of paper affixed to it that stated: "Tom Dooley, Psy.D." Below his name was printed: "Please ring bell." Patient A rang the bell and was greeted at the door by Licensee, who told her that she was 30 minutes early for her appointment. Licensee then escorted her through the front door and into the living room, where Licensee was conducting a session with another patient. Licensee guided Patient A through the living room, down the hallway and into a small bedroom that he converted into a waiting room, where he had set up a couple of metal folding chairs and a wheeled office chair. Next to the office chair was a card table with a few magazines on top. He left Patient A in the room and closed the door, leaving her alone and feeling very anxious in this closed and unfamiliar environment. Licensee subsequently met with Patient A and prepared an evaluation report that contained a number of diagnostic impressions, based on the DSM-IV. Patient B, an adult male, presented to Licensee on March 8, 2019 for a psycho-diagnostic examination, accompanied by his case worker. They went to the same residential location as Patient A for the appointment, and were greeted by Licensee, who informed them that they were 30 minutes early. Licensee was conducting a session with a patient in the living room at the time. Licensee escorted Patient B and his case worker

Enforcement Actions, Cont.

through the living room, down the hallway, and into the waiting room, left him, and closed the door. Licensee subsequently met with Patient B and prepared an evaluation report that contained a number of diagnostic impressions, based on the DSM-IV. Both Patient A and Patient B had significant mental health histories that included trauma. Both expressed feelings of anxiety and distress from their separate encounters with Licensee. Licensee neither admitted nor denied, but the Board found that Licensee engaged in the conduct, which violated ORS 675.070(2)(d)(A), ES. 3.04 Avoiding Harm, ES 4.01 Maintaining Confidentiality and ES 9.01 Bases for Assessment. Licensee was reprimanded and ordered to practice under supervision for a minimum of six months and ordered to pay a \$1,000 civil penalty.

Christopher E. Huffine, Psy.D. (Licensee), **STIPULATED ORDER**, effective September 14, 2020. Licensee is the Executive Director and owner of a clinic (AIC), in Portland, Oregon. Subject A was employed by Licensee as an Oregon licensed professional counselor and provided mental health counseling services to clients at AIC. On September 25, 2017, Subject A submitted his resignation as an employee of AIC, effective November 17, 2017. Subsequent to Subject A's resignation and departure from AIC, Subject A's name and provider number continued to be used in billing records for clients participating in group therapy at AIC, even though Subject A was not present and was no longer a provider at AIC. This continued until Subject A brought it to the attention of Licensee and threatened to file a lawsuit. Licensee neither admitted nor denied, but the Board found that Licensee engaged in the conduct, which violated ORS 675.070(2)(d)(A), ES. 6.01 Documentation of Professional and Scientific Work and Maintenance of Records and ES 6.06 Accuracy in Reports to Payors and Funding Sources. Licensee was reprimanded and ordered to pay a \$1,000 civil penalty.

Jill Pollock, Psy.D. (Applicant), **STIPULATED ORDER**, effective November 13, 2020. Applicant has formerly practiced as a psychologist in the State of Colorado. On October 15, 2015, Applicant entered into a Stipulation and Final Order with the Colorado State Board of Psychologist Examiners. On September 17, 2018, Applicant submitted an application for licensure as a psychologist in Oregon. Applicant answered "yes" to the application question, "Have you ever been investigated by a regulatory board, professional organization, educational institution or employer?" In her explanation, Applicant stated that she "...had a Stipulation placed on her PsyD license in September 2015...I have not had any other complaints of investigations by any State Board. Please note that this Stipulation impacted my LCSW license in the State of California." Applicant failed to disclose that she had also been the subject of an investigation by the Colorado State board of Social Work Examiners for using the protected title of "licensed clinical social worker" after her license as a clinical social worker had expired on June 30, 2001. This Board took formal disciplinary action against Applicant by issuing a Letter of Admonition, dated March 2, 2015. Applicant violated OAR 858-010-0020(6) making an omission or false, misleading or deceptive statements. Applicant's application to practice psychology in the State of Oregon was withdrawn while under investigation, and Applicant was ordered to pay a \$1,000 civil penalty.

Scott Bandoroff, Ph.D. (Licensee), **STIPULATED ORDER**, effective November 13, 2020. On July 24, 2019, Licensee met with Client A, an adult female, to address her concerns over being the recipient of workplace sexual harassment. Client A reported that men (to include customers) at the Food Co-op where she worked were directing unwelcome sexualized comments to her. Licensee responded by telling her that perhaps men "...wouldn't harass you if you didn't dress like that, because you look rather sexy," or words to that effect. Licensee reports that patient A was attired at the session in a blue low-cut spaghetti strapped dress that she wore in the workplace. Licensee suggested that Patient A might reduce the unwelcome behavior by dressing in a less sexy manner. Patient A expressed her deep discomfort and feeling unsupported over Licensee's comments. Licensee replied by saying "Is it wrong for me to acknowledge that you are genuinely attractive?" Licensee subsequently apologized to Patient A. Licensee violated ORS 675.070(2)(h) and ES 3.04 Failure to Avoid Harm. Licensee was reprimanded, ordered to write a self-reflective paper, and complete a minimum of four hours of continuing education. Ψ

Reminders

Contact Information Changes. Please remember to keep your information up-to-date, especially your email address. This is required by rule and is particularly important with the upcoming new licensing system, which will send renewal reminders only via email. For now, please use our [Contact Information Change Form](#).

Qualified Person Designation. This is a very important legal requirement. Please remember that all licensees must keep the Board apprised of your designated Qualified Person (“QP”) who will intercede for client welfare and make necessary referrals in the case of your death or incapacity. All new licensees are asked to submit their QP designation form within 60 days of initial licensure. Current licensees are reminded that your QP must be 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.

Another crucial step is making the necessary arrangements for maintenance of and access to your client records for your QP. This 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. There are some helpful guidelines posted on the [Board website](#), courtesy of the Oregon Psychological Association. Ψ

Upcoming Events

December 2020

12/04: Oregon Jurisprudence Examination
12/17: Consumer Protection Committee Meeting
12/18: Education Committee Meeting
12/25: Office Closed for Christmas Day

January 2021

1/1: Office Closed for New Year’s Day
1/8: Oregon Jurisprudence Examination
1/8: Board Meeting
1/15: Education Committee Meeting
1/18: Office Closed for Martin Luther King Jr. Day

February 2021

2/5: Oregon Jurisprudence Examination
2/15: Office Closed for Presidents’ Day
2/18: Consumer Protection Committee

2/19: Education Committee Meeting
3/5: Oregon Jurisprudence Examination
3/12: Board Meeting
3/19: Education Committee Meeting

April 2021

4/2: Oregon Jurisprudence Examination
4/15: Consumer Protection Committee Meeting
4/16: Education Committee Meeting

May 2021

5/7: Oregon Jurisprudence Examination
5/14: Board Meeting
5/21: Education Committee Meeting
5/31: Office Closed for Memorial 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 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 Ψ