

**KANSAS BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES REGULATORY BOARD**

Eisenhower State Office Building  
700 SW Harrison Street, Suite 420  
Topeka, Kansas 66603-3240

In the Matter of )  
 )  
William C. Oakley, )  
LP License No. 2234, )  
 )  
Licensee/Respondent )

Case No. 24-LP-0206

Pursuant to (K.S.A. 77-537)

**FINAL ORDER DENYING RECONSIDERATION**

The above-captioned matter comes before the Kansas Behavioral Sciences Regulatory Board (the "Board") for consideration of licensee William C. Oakley's request for reconsideration of the Summary Proceeding Order, which became a final order of the Board on April 14, 2025. The Presiding Officer who considered this request for reconsideration is Board member and chairperson of the Board's Complaint Review Committee, Mary Jones, appointed pursuant to K.S.A. 77-529(e) and K.S.A. 77-514.

After reviewing the agency record, including the Summary Proceeding Order and Applicant's request for reconsideration and all other information submitted in support of reconsideration by Dr. Oakley, the Presiding Officer makes the following findings and Order on behalf of the Board denying the request for reconsideration.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. On March 24, 2025, the Board entered a Summary Proceeding Order finding that William C. Oakley ("Respondent") engaged in certain conduct which constituted unprofessional conduct as defined in K.A.R. 102-1-10a(a)(2), (c)(1)(A), (l)(5)(C) and (m). Pursuant to K.S.A. 74-5324(a)(9), the Summary Proceeding Order sought to impose certain sanctions adverse to Respondent to include without limitation suspension of his license as a Licensed Psychologist ("LP"), license no. 2234, for a period of ninety (90) days and requiring Respondent practice under supervision upon the expiration of the period of suspension.

2. The Summary Proceeding Order was served via mail to Respondent's last known mailing address on March 24, 2025.

3. Respondent did not request a hearing on the Summary Proceeding Order. Accordingly, the Summary Proceeding Order became a final order of the Board on April 14, 2025 (hereafter "Final Order").

4. Respondent timely caused the Board to receive a written request for reconsideration of the Summary Proceeding Order, which the Board clarified with Respondent was a request for reconsideration as opposed to a request for hearing on the Summary Proceeding Order.

5. Respondent did not request a stay of the Summary Proceeding Order in conjunction with his request for reconsideration. Accordingly, the sanctions, conditions and requirements imposed by the Summary Proceeding Order went into effect on April 14, 2025 and remain in effect today.

6. Within the request for reconsideration, Respondent requested that the imposition of suspension be reconsidered by the Board based on the following four (4) factors:

- a. Respondent represented that he has not engaged in the active practice of psychology since June of 2024 and asked that this representation be taken into account on reconsideration;
- b. Respondent asserted that he did not fail to complete session notes for community treatment sessions, asserting that no such sessions occurred. Moreover, Respondent asserted that all treatment sessions notes were completed in a timely manner, and that he did complete one brief contact note;
- c. Respondent requested that the Board coordinate with the Missouri Board for Peer Monitoring Compliance ("Missouri Board") relating to the Missouri Board's purported requirement for peer monitoring over the next two (2) years "to establish a unified approach to the peer monitoring requirement"; and
- d. Respondent asserted that there is a typo in finding of fact paragraph 9 wherein the date of contact of "May 14, 2025" should read "May 14, 2024."

7. Whether to impose sanctions and the extent of the sanctions are left to the sound discretion of the Board. The authority to engage in the practice of psychology is a privilege, and the Board in its expertise and discretion, pursuant to K.S.A. 65-74-5324(a)(9), is vested with the authority to impose conditions and limitations on LP licenses due to unprofessional conduct in order to ensure that the public interest is upheld and protected. *See Caporale v. State Behavioral Sciences Regulatory Bd.*, 50 Kan.App.2d 1155, 1160, 338 P.3d 593 (2014) (recognizing the discretion the Board is afforded in its expertise with respect to decisions relating to licensure). *See also Sajadi v. Kansas Bd. of Healing Arts*, 61 Kan. App. 2d 114, 125, 500 P.3d 542, 551 (2021) (citing *Kansas Gas & Elec. Co. v. Kansas Corporation Comm'n*, 239 Kan. 483, 496-97, 720 P.2d 1063 (1986)) (an agency's findings carry a presumption of validity and should not be disturbed simply because reasonable minds may disagree).

8. K.S.A. 77-529 provides the Board with discretion in determining whether to deny a request for reconsideration, modify the final order, or grant the request for reconsideration and/or set the matter for further proceedings.

9. While K.S.A. 77-529 does not address the bases upon which reconsideration can be granted by a reviewing agency. Generally, reconsideration serves as a mechanism to address substantive issues such as new evidence previously unavailable, an intervening change in the controlling law, or the need to correct clear error or to prevent manifest injustice.

10. A review of Respondent's request for reconsideration does not provide a sufficient basis to grant the request for reconsideration.

11. As an initial matter, it is noted that the Summary Proceeding Order became a final order of the Board on April 14, 2025. Respondent did not request a stay of the final order, including the commencement and running of the suspension. Respondent's suspension therefore ran from April 14, 2025 through July 20, 2025. However, it is noted that Respondent still could have the suspension removed from his record on reconsideration.

12. Regardless, in consideration of the seriousness of the underlying conduct, the majority of which Respondent admits to or otherwise does not dispute, the Board does not find a sufficient basis to grant the relief requested by Respondent. It is noted that in Respondent's response to the Board regarding the report of alleged violation, Respondent admitted to the majority of the conduct complained of stating that "[m]y actions clearly violated the code of ethics for psychologists, specifically regarding dual relationships and the lack of proper documentation for therapy-related texts." None of the bases raised by Respondent in support of the requested reconsideration is sufficient to disturb the Board's findings which are clearly supported by the agency record, or warrant modification of the suspension.

13. At the time the Summary Proceeding Order was entered by the Board, the Board's Complaint Review Committee was aware of Respondent's representation that he had not practiced since June 3, 2024. Any additional time spent not practicing, whether self-imposed or otherwise, does not change the Board's perspective regarding the seriousness of the underlying conduct and corresponding suspension.

14. While Respondent may dispute the characterization of the failure to document "any community-based treatment session," there is sufficient evidence in the record to support this allegation from his former employer and the corresponding finding by the Board. In addition, there is sufficient evidence in the record demonstrating that Respondent did not timely complete entries in the patient's record until months after-the-fact when directed to do so by his former employer. Notwithstanding any dispute regarding the sufficiency of evidence on these issues, removal of these facts would not support Respondent's requested reconsideration of the suspension given the seriousness of the other conduct at issue which Respondent has admitted to, does not dispute or is otherwise clearly supported by the agency record.

15. Respondent's request for the Board to coordinate supervision with the Missouri Board is likewise not a sufficient basis to grant the requested relief. Practically speaking, the

Board may approve the same independent clinical-level supervisor approved by the Missouri Board; however, approval of the supervisor is ultimately reserved to the discretion of the Board.

16. Finally, Respondent correctly identifies a typo in paragraph 9 of the Summary Proceeding Order. In entering the Summary Proceeding Order, the Board was aware of Respondent's admission that the final lunch meeting with the patient occurred on May 14, 2024. While correction of the typo is warranted, the fact of the typo is not sufficient to warrant the requested relief on reconsideration.

**ORDER**

After consideration of the Respondent's Request for Reconsideration and the agency record, the Board hereby Orders that Respondent's Request for Reconsideration is hereby DENIED.

It is further ordered that the typo contained within paragraph 9 of the Summary Proceeding Order is changed to reflect the correct date of May 14, 2024.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Entered this 12 day August, 2025.



---

Mary Jones, Chairperson  
Kansas Behavioral Sciences Regulatory Board  
Complaint Review Committee

## **NOTICE OF JUDICIAL RELIEF**

A party may file within 30 days from the effective date of this Final Order Denying Reconsideration a petition for judicial review with the appropriate district court as provided in the Kansas Judicial Review Act, K.S.A. 77-601 *et seq.*

The designee who may receive service of a petition for judicial review on behalf of the Board is:

David Fye, Executive Director  
Behavioral Sciences Regulatory Board  
Eisenhower State Office Building  
700 SW Harrison, Suite 420  
Topeka, Kansas 66603-3240

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

This is to certify that on this 12 day of August, 2025, a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing Final Order Denying Reconsideration was placed in the U.S. mail, first-class postage prepaid, addressed to:

William C. Oakley



And by e-mail to:

Timothy D. Resner  
Frieden & Forbes, LLP  
1414 SW Ashworth Place, Suite 201  
Topeka, KS 66604  
[tresner@fflawllp.com](mailto:tresner@fflawllp.com)  
*Counsel for the Board of the Behavioral Sciences Regulatory Board*

Anne M. Kindling  
Joseph Hollander & Craft, LLC  
1508 SW Topeka Blvd.  
Topeka, KS 66612-1887  
[akindling@josephhollander.com](mailto:akindling@josephhollander.com)

Staff,  
Kansas Behavioral Sciences Regulatory Board