

Open Letter to the OESAC Board and Other Shareholders

MALPRACTICE AND DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINT

To whom it may concern,

April 14, 2021

In the past, many of Technical Learning College onsite operator continuing education courses were approved by the OESAC Board for continuing education. Recently, several of our OESAC previously approved courses were not re-approved and the answer TLC received from the OESAC Board was “TLC materials covered core training materials necessary for onsite operator certification and not for continuing education and this finding was final”.

TLC requested an onsite need-to-know criteria (relevancy criteria) for both the pre-certified and post-certified onsite operators from the OESAC Board. To date this data has not been provided or found on the OESAC website or bylaws. Even if TLC training materials did provide primary onsite operator information or not, without a formal needs-to-know assessment, the Board's approval process is subjective especially if other training providers have similar training approved and TLC's training materials were consistently approved until recently. Unlike TLC' many of these other training providers lacked any need-to-know evaluations, detailed course objectives, training assessments, assignments or printed training materials. Most of these other approved training materials do not contain any methodology for CEU time determination.

If the Board needs access to our training material to re-evaluate this final rejection decision, then the Board needs to re-evaluate all other trainer's materials to a known standard that is not published in the OESAC policy manual bylaws, otherwise we will consider this a continuation of disparity, malpractice and discrimination.

Disparity/Malpractice/discrimination Discoveries:

1. No published OESAC onsite operator continuing education training criteria. Our training materials were assessed by 40 different government agencies including the Oregon Contractors Board as continuing education training materials. Our staff is recognized as SMEs, civil engineers and have written most of the early operator training materials.
2. TLC has twenty years of prior and consistent OESAC onsite training approval.
3. Other onsite training providers having the same or very similar training materials or subjects approved during the disputed subsequent time. We will not provide specifics or discrimination charges, but this information is easily discoverable. Some of this approved training is Zoom training containing core operator training.
4. Where is it written in the OESAC policy manual bylaws that core onsite training or pre-certification training is not considered continuing education training? This is not the case for water or wastewater continuing education training materials. This new subjective standard is either correct for all operator classifications or for none of them.
5. Without relevancy criteria and an OESAC policy manual training standard, TLC should receive a refund of application fees due to bad faith practices. This disparity needs to be resolved because of lack of necessary need-to-know criteria documentation, non-objective training course decisions and not being published in the OESAC policy manual bylaws.

We will forward to your response to all our shareholders and students.

Technical Learning College
Jeff Durbin