

**STATE OF ALASKA  
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC  
DEVELOPMENT  
DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSING  
BOARD OF BARBERS AND HAIRDRESSERS**

**MINUTES OF MEETING  
October 1, 2012**

By the authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and AS 08.86.030 and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62 Article 6, a scheduled meeting of the Board of Barbers and Hairdressers was held October 1, 2012 in Anchorage, Alaska, Robert B. Atwood Bldg., Room 1270

**Monday, October 1, 2012**

**Item 1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

The meeting of the Board of Barbers and Hairdressers was called to order by Glenda Ledford, Chair at 8:09 a.m. Members present were:

Glenda Ledford, Barber, Chair  
K. Darae Crews, Hairdresser/Esthetician  
Deanna Pruhs, Hairdresser  
Michael Bolivar, Barber  
Kevin McKinley, Tattooist/Body Piercer/Permanent Cosmetic Colorist.  
Mr. McKinley arrived at 8:25a.m.

Not in attendance were:

Brittany Hutchison, Public Member

\*Ms. Spencer spoke with Ms. Hutchison at 8:05am and was informed by Ms. Hutchison that her participation with the Board was an ethical violation with her current employer Rep. Thompson and would be submitting a letter of resignation no later than Tuesday, October 2, 2012. \*

Present from the Division of Corporations, Business and Professional Licensing were:

Cynthia Spencer, Licensing Examiner  
Jasmin Bautista, Investigator

Present from the public were:

Debra Long

Charlotte Lushin  
Mae Canady  
Mitch Black  
Christine VanVliet  
Catherine Simpson  
Rosalyn Wyche  
Bertram Price

**Item 2. Review/amend agenda**

Glenda Ledford asked Board members and staff if there were any changes to the agenda.

Cynthia Spencer requested discussion of 12 AAC 09.097 and dermaplane procedures be added to Item 5 or 7 Board Discussion, as time allows. Ms. Spencer also informed the Board that there were three applications for review which could also be done under Item 5 or 7.

Ms. Ledford asked the Board if there were any other changes needed; hearing no further additions, Ms. Ledford asked for a motion to accept the changes.

**On a motion duly made by Michael Bolivar, seconded by Deanna Pruhs, and approved unanimously, it was**

**RESOLVED to approve the amended October 1, 2012 meeting agenda.**

**Item 3. Ethics Disclosure**

The Board reviewed information provided in the meeting packet.

The Board had no ethics violations to report.

**Item 4. Review/Adopt Meeting Minutes**

**May 7, 2012 Meeting**

Darae Crews stated that the first paragraph on page 10 was incorrect as she had been an examination proctor with Ms. Wyche and that Ms. Wyche had not been her instructor. Ms. Crews asked for the paragraph to be removed as the information was covered throughout the minutes.

Ms. Ledford asked if there were any other changes needed; hearing none Ms. Ledford asked for a motion.

**On a motion duly made by Darae Crews, seconded by Deanna Pruhs, and approved unanimously, it was**

**RESOLVED to adopt the May 7, 2012 meeting minutes with the removal of the first paragraph on page 10.**

Ms. Ledford polled the Board, hearing no disagreement the minutes were approved.

### **May 15, 2012 Teleconference**

The Board reviewed the draft minutes from the May 15, 2012 teleconference. Ms. Ledford asked the Board if they had any changes to the minutes. Hearing no comments on the minutes; Ms. Ledford asked for a motion.

**On a motion duly made by Michael Bolivar, seconded by Darae Crews, and approved unanimously, it was**

**RESOLVED to adopt the May 15, 2012 teleconference minutes as written.**

Ms. Ledford polled the Board, hearing no disagreement the minutes were approved.

### **July 3, 2012 Teleconference**

The Board reviewed the draft minutes from the July 3, 2012 teleconference. Ms. Ledford asked the Board if they had any changes to the minutes. Hearing no comments on the minutes; Ms. Ledford asked for a motion.

**On a motion duly made by Darae Crews, seconded by Michael Bolivar, and approved unanimously, it was**

**RESOLVED to adopt the July 3, 2012 teleconference minutes as written.**

Ms. Ledford polled the Board, hearing no disagreement the minutes were approved.

### **Item 5. And 7. Board Discussion**

#### **❖ NIC Annual Conference Report (Ledford)**

Ms. Ledford informed the Board that the NIC conference went well and that throughout the conference the most common issue for most State Boards is the threat of de-regulating the profession. Ms. Ledford stated that NIC is more than willing to assist State Boards with these issues and to help during Sunset Audits.

Ms. Ledford also informed the Board that NIC had reviewed all State Board websites for safety and sanitation information accessibility; unfortunately Alaska received a D. Ms. Ledford asked the Board if there were any objections to adding a web link to the Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation. The Board agreed that adding the link was an easy fix and asked Ms. Spencer to add this task to her list.

Ms. Ledford went on to state that NIC uses the current Milady and Pivot Point Salon Fundamentals Cosmetology Exam Prep books for training, education, examination development and candidate examination preparation.

Ms. Ledford informed the Board that there was one tattooist Board member attending the Conference and that the individual stated that tattooist should have their own regulatory Board due to the differences between cosmetology and tattooing.

Ms. Ledford shared several informational handouts from the NIC conference with the Board.

❖ Statute Update **And** Proposed Regulations (McKinley)

Mr. McKinley provided informational handouts for the Board addressing regulations, statute changes and licensing information. Mr. McKinley assured the Board that he would have drafted regulation language to Ms. Spencer for presentation at the Board's next meeting.

Ms. Ledford thanked Mr. McKinley

The Board had no other proposed regulations to present.

Jasmin Bautista, Investigator joined the Board at 9:00a.m.

**Item 6. Investigative Review**

**On a motion duly made by Darae Crews, seconded by Kevin McKinley, and approved unanimously, it was**

**RESOLVED to adjourn into Executive Session under the authority of AS 44.62.310 to discuss with the investigator the investigative report.**

The Board adjourned into executive session at 10:05 a.m., and returned from executive session at 10:55 a.m.

**On a motion duly made by Michael Bolivar, seconded by Darae Crews, and approved unanimously, it was**

**RESOLVED to adopt the COA for case 2012-000299, Monica Ballesteroz as written.**

**Roll Call Vote**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>ABSTAIN</b>
<b>Michael Bolivar</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Glenda Ledford</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Kevin McKinley</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>K. Darae Crews</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Deanna Pruhs</b>	<b>X</b>		

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.**

**On a motion duly made by Michael Bolivar, seconded by Deanna Pruhs , and approved unanimously, it was**

**RESOLVED to adopt the COA for case 2012-0001936, Terrence Ford as written.**

**Roll Call Vote**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>ABSTAIN</b>
<b>Glenda Ledford</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Michael Bolivar</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>K. Darae Crews</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Kevin McKinley</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Deanna Pruhs</b>	<b>X</b>		

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.**

**On a motion duly made by Michael Bolivar, seconded by Darae Crews, and approved unanimously, it was**

**RESOLVED to adopt the COA for case 2012-000392, Ryan Cunningham as written.**

**Roll Call Vote**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>ABSTAIN</b>
<b>Glenda Ledford</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>K. Darae Crews</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Deanna Pruhs</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Michael Bolivar</b>	<b>X</b>		

Kevin McKinley X

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.**

On a motion duly made by Michael Bolivar, seconded by Darae Crews, and approved unanimously, it was

**RESOLVED to adopt the COA for case 2012-000558, Courtney Beddow as written.**

**Roll Call Vote**

NAME	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Kevin McKinley	X		
K. Darae Crews	X		
Deanna Pruhs	X		
Glenda Ledford	X		
Michael Bolivar	X		

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.**

On a motion duly made by Michael Bolivar, seconded by Deanna Pruhs, and approved unanimously, it was

**RESOLVED to adopt the Imposition of Civil Fine for case 2012-000493, Aleaka Tate as written.**

**Roll Call Vote**

NAME	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Kevin McKinley	X		
Michael Bolivar	X		
Glenda Ledford	X		
K. Darae Crews	X		
Deanna Pruhs	X		

On a motion duly made by Deanna Pruhs, seconded by Michael Bolivar, and approved unanimously, it was

**RESOLVED to adopt the Imposition of Civil Fine for case 2012-000112, Allison Bailey as written.**

**Roll Call Vote**

NAME	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Michael Bolivar	X		
Glenda Ledford	X		

Kevin McKinley	X
K. Darae Crews	X
Deanna Pruhs	X

On a motion duly made by Darae Crews, seconded by Kevin McKinley, and approved unanimously, it was

**RESOLVED to adopt the COA for case 2012-000070, Isaac Hairston as written.**

**Roll Call Vote**

NAME	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Deanna Pruhs	X		
Kevin McKinley	X		
K. Darae Crews	X		
Michael Bolivar	X		
Glenda Ledford	X		

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.**

On a motion duly made by Deanna Pruhs, seconded by Michael Bolivar, and approved unanimously, it was

**RESOLVED to accept an extended payment plan, as set by Investigator Bautista, for the civil fine of \$8000.00; previously adopted COA for case 2012000194, Angela Thies.**

**Roll Call Vote**

NAME	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Kevin McKinley	X		
Michael Bolivar	X		
Glenda Ledford	X		
K. Darae Crews	X		
Deanna Pruhs	X		

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.**

Ms. Bautista reviewed the tattooing and permanent cosmetic coloring (PCC) apprentice and application file of Richard A. Polly with the Board. The Board reviewed the entire file; trainee monthly reports, certification of completed student training which were hand delivered to the Anchorage office on December 7, 2011. The Board also reviewed a file memorandum dated December 14, 2011 and a temporary cease and desist dated October 5, 2011.

The Board agreed that the hours of training on the monthly reports, certification of completed student training and memorandum were off on dates and hours; November does not have 31-days. The Board decided that Mr. Polly would need to earn more hours to make up the difference and the training must be done as an apprentice with a licensed tattooist/PCC.

**On a motion duly made by Kevin McKinley, seconded by Deanna Pruhs, and approved unanimously, it was**

**RESOLVED to require Richard A. Polly to earn 143-hours with a licensed tattoo artist as an apprentice and must complete 20.5 hours for each of the six (6) categories required by the State in accordance with AS 08.13.082 and 12 AAC 09.169; hours must be recorded by a time clock and submitted as required by Statute to the Division. Once completed, Mr. Polly would be eligible for the written examination.**

**Roll Call Vote**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>ABSTAIN</b>
<b>Kevin McKinley</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>K. Darae Crews</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Deanna Pruhs</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Glenda Ledford</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Michael Bolivar</b>	<b>X</b>		

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.**

Mr. McKinley stated that his math was in error and that the 20.5-hours should be 24. Ms. Spencer informed the Board an amended motion would need to be made. The Board agreed and made the following amended motion.

**On a motion duly made by Kevin McKinley, seconded by Michael Bolivar, and approved unanimously, it was**

**RESOLVED to amend the initial motion for Richard A. Polly. Richard A. Polly to earn 143-hours with a licensed tattoo artist as an apprentice and must complete 24 hours for each of the six (6) categories required by the State in accordance with AS 08.13.082 and 12 AAC 09.169; hours must be recorded by a time clock and submitted as required by Statute to the Division. Once completed, Mr. Polly would be eligible for the written examination.**

## Roll Call Vote

NAME	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Kevin McKinley	X		
K. Darae Crews	X		
Deanna Pruhs	X		
Glenda Ledford	X		
Michael Bolivar	X		

### THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.

*Recess The Board recessed at 11:10 a.m.; reconvened at 11:16 a.m.*

#### Item 5. And 7. Board Discussion Cont.

❖ Blood Borne Pathogen On-Line Courses (Spencer)

Ms. Spencer reviewed the current list of Board approved Blood Borne Pathogen Courses and pointed out that only two (2) courses were on-line. Ms. Spencer informed the Board that most professions which have first-aid requirements approved on-line courses if they were offered by the American Red Cross (ARC), American Heart Association or an equivalent organization.

The Board stated they had reviewed the two courses provided in the meeting packet and stated they felt that if a Blood Borne Pathogen course was offered by the American Red Cross or equivalent organization on-line the Board would approve certificates/cards of completion. Mr. McKinley stated that the course offered by Kathy Hartman, Body Art Training Group, was great; lots of time and research went into the course development and wanted to make sure if the Board adopted on-line courses offered by ARC Ms. Hartman's would be included. The Board all agreed that the information provided by Ms. Hartman and information on the website was good and Nationally Accredited. Ms. Ledford stated that the information from both courses provided in the packet were equivalent if not more so than information previously used by this Board.

**On a motion duly made by Darae Crews, seconded by Michael Bolivar, and approved unanimously, it was**

**RESOLVED to accept on-line blood borne pathogen training offered by the American Red Cross OR an equivalent organization.**

Mr. McKinley apologized for the interruption but wanted to make sure that the Board and staff were aware that several organizations offered this course with the title "Preventing and Disease Control" and wanted to make sure that a course with this title would also be recognized under this motion.

**On a motion duly made by Kevin McKinley, seconded by Michael Bolivar, and approved unanimously, it was**

**RESOLVED to accept on line “blood borne pathogen” OR “preventing and disease control” training offered by the American Red Cross OR an equivalent organization.**

**Roll Call Vote**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>ABSTAIN</b>
<b>Michael Bolivar</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Glenda Ledford</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Deanna Pruhs</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>K. Darae Crews</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Kevin McKinley</b>	<b>X</b>		

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.**

❖ **Dermaplane**

The Board reviewed the information provided in the Board packet, statutes, regulations, services provided by licensees.

The Board agreed the only license issued by this Board which would allow the use of a straight razor is a Barber and “esthetic” services are not allowed under statutes and regulations.

❖ **State of Alaska Law Examination Questions for NIC Exam Addition (15-20 questions)**

Ms. Spencer informed the Board that this item has been on many meeting agendas with no resolution. Ms. Spencer went on to state that if the Board did not resolve this item during this meeting it would be on one final agenda.

Ms. Pruhs stated she had her six (6) questions and gave them to Ms. Spencer. Mr. Bolivar apologized he had forgot his questions.

Ms. Ledford informed the Board that this had initially been requested from NIC and the Board just needed to compose questions from the current August 2012 statute and regulation book. Ms. Ledford went on to state that Board members would need to write questions with answers and email, mail, or fax them to Ms. Spencer for submission.

❖ **Schedule January, May, October, 2013 Meeting Dates**

The Board set the following meeting dates with all meetings to begin at 9:00 a.m. due to the drive time needed between Wasilla, AK and Anchorage, AK.

The Board also requested the meetings be held in the Robert B. Atwood Bldg., preferably in the same conference room.

January 28, 2013  
May 20, 2013  
October 7, 2013

❖ Schedule Practical and Written Examination Dates

The Board set the following examination dates for Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Juneau. All examination application deadlines are 30-days from the next scheduled examination.

**Anchorage:**

January 13 & 14, 2013  
January 27 & 28, 2013  
February 24 & 25, 2013  
March 17 & 18, 2013  
April 21 & 22, 2013  
May 19 & 20, 2013  
June 16 & 17, 2013  
July 21 & 22, 2013  
August 18 & 19, 2013  
September 22 & 23, 2013  
October 20 & 21, 2013  
November 17 & 18, 2013

**Fairbanks:**

January 13 & 14, 2013  
April 21 & 22, 2013  
July 21 & 22, 2013  
October 20 & 21, 2013

**Juneau:**

January 13 & 14, 2013  
April 21 & 22, 2013  
July 21 & 22, 2013  
October 20 & 21, 2013

❖ Correspondence

The Board reviewed hair braiding correspondence from Rosalyn Wyche. The Board agreed that if Ms. Wyche wanted to present the information to the Legislature she would need to do so on her own time as statutory changes would be required.

❖ 12 AAC 09.097 Hairdresser to Barber Transferring Hours

Ms. Spencer informed the Board that she has been receiving many calls from Alaska licensed hairdressers who were expressing an interest in adding shaving to their scope of practice by becoming licensed barbers. The licensees want to use hours earned for their hairdresser license and apply them towards a barber license. Ms. Spencer informed the Board that she had reviewed several licensee files, including Ms. Ledford's, for historical information on how this process might be done. Ms. Spencer stated historically, the hours could be transferred as long as the practical operation requirements were met and the individual took and passed both examinations. Ms. Spencer went on to state that there was conflicting information on if this would be allowed as the current office interpretation of 12 AAC 09.097 is; no transfer of hours from either a barber or hairdresser license would be accepted.

The Board reviewed the current regulation and decided if a hairdresser wanted to apply for a barber license using hours earned in an apprenticeship or school towards a barber license they must re-enroll as an apprentice or student, meet the practical operation requirements for haircutting and beard shaving in accordance with the curriculum of 12 AAC 09.160, numbers 5 and 9; submit an application for licensure with required fees, and take & pass the examinations. The Board asked Ms. Spencer if a regulation change was needed for this to be accepted. Ms. Spencer stated that a regulation change was not needed as this would be Board Policy; however motion would be appreciated for historical information.

**On a motion duly made by Michael Bolivar, seconded by Darae Crews, and approved unanimously, it was**

**RESOLVED to accept the transfer of hours earned for a hairdresser license to a barber license if the applicant re-enrolls as an apprentice or student, meet the practical operation requirements for haircutting and beard shaving in accordance with the curriculum of 12 AAC 09.160, numbers 5 and 9; submit an application for licensure with required fees, and take & pass the examinations.**

Ms. Ledford polled the Board, hearing no disagreement the Board asked that this be the interpretation of 12 AAC 09.097.

*Recess The Board recessed at 12:00p.m. for lunch; reconvened at 1:05 p.m.*

**Item 5. And 7. Board Discussion Cont.**

❖ Application Review

- Aaron Grant, Barber Apprentice

The Board reviewed correspondence from Mr. Gant requesting the use of 1989.12-hours earned during his barber apprenticeship at Kreative Kutz from July 2008 through July 2010. The Board reviewed Statutes 08.13.082, 08.13.180, and Regulation 12 AAC 09.190(k). Taking into consideration the request from Mr. Grant and applicable statutes & regulations the Board determined the 1989.12-hours earned would not be transferrable to another apprenticeship and Mr. Grant would need to re-enroll and earn the required 1650-hours through a school OR 2000-hours through an apprenticeship program.

- School Application Review
  - Glenda’s Salon & Training Center, Glenda D. Ledford
  - Legacy’s Academy of Hair, Elizabeth-Joy Conner

The Board separated into groups to review the applications. Glenda’s was reviewed by Mr. Bolivar, and Ms. Crews; Legacy’s was reviewed by Mr. McKinley, Ms. Ledford, and Ms. Crews.

Ms. Ledford asked the Board if there was any discussion or questions. Hearing none, Ms. Ledford asked for motions.

**On a motion duly made by Michael Bolivar, seconded by Darae Crews, and approved unanimously, it was**

**RESOLVED to approve the school application of Glenda D. Ledford d/b/a Glenda’s Salon and Training Center.**

**Roll Call Vote**

NAME	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Kevin McKinley	X		
Michael Bolivar	X		
Glenda Ledford			X
K. Darae Crews	X		
Deanna Pruhs	X		

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.**

**On a motion duly made by Kevin McKinley, seconded by Deanna Pruhs, and approved unanimously, it was**

**RESOLVED to approve the school application of Elizabeth-Joy Conner d/b/a Legacy’s Academy of Hair.**

## Roll Call Vote

NAME	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Kevin McKinley	X		
K. Darae Crews	X		
Deanna Pruhs	X		
Glenda Ledford	X		
Michael Bolivar	X		

### THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.

#### Item 8. Practical Examination Discussion

The Board reviewed the examination information provided in the packet beginning with “procedures for the practical examination”. Ms. Ledford stated that the procedures are given to every proctor and are included in all of the study packets. Ms. Ledford asked Ms. Spencer to tell the Board what is included in the packet that goes to candidates who are ready for the exams. Ms. Spencer stated that packets were no longer mailed to candidates as they are available on-line; Ms. Spencer stated that packet information was provided in the scheduling/admission ticket letters mailed to candidates. Ms. Spencer informed the Board that the packet information available on-line is exactly what has been provided in this meetings packet under Item 8. Ms. Spencer stated that if a candidate took the time to review all of the information in the packet they would be well prepared on what to expect during the practical exam.

Ms. Ledford reiterated that the “procedures for the practical examination” were the instructions the proctors used as their instructions as well as the score sheets for each exam.

Ms. Ledford stated that there were four (4) seasoned examination proctors in attendance and asked them to come forward and give a statement on how the examinations, practical and written, were run and to be available for questions.

Ms. Ledford asked Debra Long, Fairbanks lead proctor & former Chairperson, forward to review what is done by proctors for the practical examination.

Ms. Long reviewed the steps taken by proctors at the start of the exams; sign in, candidates providing ID and admission ticket (scheduling letter), assigned testing area/stations, model consent forms, read conduct for examinations; starting with the hairstyle. Ms. Long also stated that the different examination types are set for different times. Ms. Long stated that when scoring the hairstyle the proctors look for 1/3, 1/3, and 1/3 for finger waves, pin curls and rollers, look for ‘S’ pattern, ridge, smoothness, open and closed ends on rollers, placement on base, off base, pin curls looking for no stem full stem and half stem, proctors have guidelines for placements of pin curls and other sections as we follow the score sheets. Typical finger wave has two fingers, look for

continuity, single and double prong clips are acceptable for pin curls. Haircut, looking for candidates following instructions must be layered cut. Ms. Long stated many students come in and only want to take an inch off; instructions clearly state four to eight inches (4-8 inches) long at completion. Ms. Long reviewed the score sheet and that information on this portion is also verbal and if a candidate provides the information backwards, but provides what is being looked for the candidate does not lose points.

Ms. Crews asked what it is about the “Board Set” (on mannequin reflecting hair parts at 1/3 x 3 with finger wave, pin curls, and rollers) that candidates are not doing correctly as she is hearing this portion is typically failed and what proctors feel the most common issues/errors that are occurring during the practical examination.

Ms. Long responded that the common problems she observes during exams are smoothness, clip placement, less than 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 being done, candidates doing procedures backwards. Ms. Long also stated that it can vary as each proctor may score a bit differently; however smoothness, clip placement, less than a 1/3, 1/3, and 1/3 parts, and following directions are typical issues candidates have. Ms. Long stated that in the cases of procedures being done backwards proctors try to encourage the candidate to verbalize what they are doing as an assist to the candidate.

Christine VanVliet, lead Anchorage proctor agreed, with Ms. Long. Ms. VanVliet also stated that when noticed that a candidate is not quite on track proctors will ask for clarification or if the candidate would like to try it again.

Ms. Long stated that the proctors in Fairbanks follow the score sheets for the different exams. Ms. Long also stated that there may be times where a proctor will ask a candidate a question to verify the candidate is providing information/actually doing the procedure being tested on. Ms. Long went on to inform the Board that sometimes candidates get flustered, the proctors can tell the candidate is doing the practical operation required but might give incorrect information and the proctor is just trying to give the candidate a chance. Ms. Long continued to review the score sheets.

Michele Black, Anchorage proctor, stated that some candidates just place rollers, pin curls, etc., in very creative ways; candidates are not getting the 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 hair part and the roller sets are either all on base, off base or half not a combination of the three types.

Ms. Spencer asked the Board if they wanted to add a statement to the “proctor confidentiality and examination administration agreement” form which specifically addressed asking questions that were not covered or listed on the examination packets. The Board asked that the agreement be included on the January 2013 agenda as there might be changes stemming from further examination discussion.

The Board discussed if roller placement needed to be defined or expanded on. Mr. Bolivar stated that if a question was not on the examination score sheet OR in the examination packet why would a proctor ask the question. Mr. Bolivar stated he felt very strongly that any questions being asked should be included in the packet or score sheet. The Board agreed with Mr. Bolivar; if a topic/question was not provided or reflected in the specific examination packet it should not be asked of the examination candidate. The Board also stated they felt all proctors should be on the same page with information provided to and asked of candidates.

Several proctors and Board members asked if there were any other sections of the practical examination that were getting complaints about failing or was it only the “board set”; the consensus of attendees was the “board set” portion was causing problems. The proctors and Board members all agreed that the bottom line of the “board set” was to show that exam candidates are able to manipulate the hair. The Board also asked Ms. Spencer to add another diagram/illustration showing the 1/3 parts to the hairdresser exam packet.

Ms. Crews asked if candidates could take pictures of their “board set” and of their work during examinations and if the exams could be recorded.

Ms. Spencer stated that in this type of examination situation with 10 or more candidates testing in one room at one time it would not be a logistical issue to record each candidate. The Board stated no pictures are allowed to be taking during the examinations and Ms. Spencer stated that if the Board would like she could check with the Department of Law to see if picture taking would be acceptable.

Ms. Black stated to the Board that the schools/instructors should come and observe a practical examination. Ms. Black informed the Board that many students, though they may be well taught and prepared, show up for the exams after a night of partying, with a lacksidal attitude, and just do horrible, then they go back to their school/instructor saying they did excellent when in fact it was not.

The Board asked Ms. Spencer to bring the NIC Practical Examination Procedures information to the January Board meeting.

Ms. Pruhs suggested the addition of “may consist of…” on the hairstyle portion of the hairdresser examination packet. The Board reviewed the hairdresser exam packet and agreed with Ms. Pruhs and asked that “may also include on base, half base, and off base” be added to page three (3) Section I Hair Style (to be done on mannequin) – 45 minutes, “Roller Placement” section of the hairdresser examination packet.

Ms. Ledford stated that the practical examination should be considered a living breathing form and that more discussion will be needed after the few updates and proctor training.

Charlette Lushin, Fairbanks Proctor and Rosalyn Wyche, Instructor, stated that several of the questions being discussed may be and are covered on the written examination and stressed that if information/questions were on the written examination she felt that they shouldn't be asked during the practical. Attending proctors and Board members agreed with the statement.

Ms. Ledford cautioned Board members and attendees that if it's decided to restrict proctors from asking any questions, it may lead to more candidates failing as most proctors ask questions if they failed to notice/see if the candidate did a part of the examination section.

Ms. Spencer stated that an option which may cause the Board some expense would be to limit examination group sizes so more time could be spent one on one with the candidates. Ms. Spencer went on to state that this would cause examination days to run longer and more proctors would probably be needed. Ms. Spencer also informed the Board that if they really wanted to begin recording the examinations they would probably be looking at one candidate testing at a time.

The Board agreed that another proctor training was needed for Anchorage and would set the date after public comment. The Board also urged Instructors and school owners to come and observe a practical examination.

Ms. Ledford thanked the Board and attendees for their input and stated this topic would be on the next meeting agenda. Ms. Ledford announced that the Board would adjourn for a quick restroom break then continue with Item 9.

*Recess The Board recessed at 3:00 p.m.; reconvened at 3:10 p.m.*

### **Item 9. Public Comment**

Bert Price, Barber – works with Roz Wyche

- Mr. Price stated during his exam he used his hands as a guideline to judge the 1/3 part and asked the Board where they want placement rollers, pin curls, and finger waves.
- Written test asked a particular operation question, practical examination do the same operation, then proctor asks question for a third time; why.

Mr. Bolivar responded that the Board decided to add an illustration to the examination packet reflecting the 1/3, 1/3, and 1/3 part and for now as all in agreement use Ms. Ledford's mannequin as example finger waves top 1/3, roller placement second/middle 1/3, and pin curls at bottom 1/3. The Board agreed.

Ms. Pruhs stated you could always say the 1/3 part is ear to crown, ear to nape, and the last 1/3 is below.

The Board stated a follow up question should be asked for clarification from the candidate.

Ms. Crews asked if a proctor would know how the candidate answered that specific operation question. Ms. Ledford stated that the written examination was given after the practical and Ms. Spencer stated written examination scores were sent out of state for grading. Ms. Crews stated then she understood why a proctor may ask for clarification as it would be the first time seeing the operation done. The Board agreed.

Mr. Price thanked the Board.

Ms. Ledford thanked Mr. Price for participating.

Cassie Simpson, Hairdresser

- Failed first practical examination; had problems with the 1/3 part.
- First test asked what to do if over saturate perm. The proctor wanted to know what I would do if the perm solution was dripping; however that was not the question asked.
- Examinations should be the same no matter where you sit, same questions asked across the board.
- Took exams twice and was asked different questions each time.

The Board thanked Ms. Simpson for her participation.

### **Item 10. Division Business**

#### **❖ Budget Report**

The Board reviewed the provided budget information.

#### **❖ FY 2012 Annual Report**

The Board reviewed the FY12 Annual report. Ms. Spencer informed the Board that several sections of the report were required to be submitted by the Board and requested that besides the chairperson, several other Board members be assigned to writing proposed legislative & regulation recommendations, reviewing budget and sunset audit recommendations. The Board agreed and stated members would be assigned at the next face-to-face meeting.

Ms. Spencer asked Ms. Ledford when she would be available for proctor training due to several new proctors on the approved Anchorage list and the complaints being received by the Division were from candidates taking their exams in Anchorage. Ms. Ledford and Mr. Bolivar discussed dates and decided proctor

