



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

CONDENSED MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD JANUARY 13, 2026

By the authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and AS 08.86.030 and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.64, Article 6, a scheduled board meeting was held via teleconference/Zoom, January 13, 2026.

These are DRAFT minutes prepared by the staff of the Division of Corporation, Business and Professional Licensing. These minutes have not been reviewed or approved by the board.

January 13, 2026:

Attendance

Members Present: Kevin McKinley, Jennifer (Jenn) Lombardo, Danielle Desarae Hager, Willie Mae Canady, Jessica Pestrikoff, Shannon Thompson,

Staff Present: Cynthia Spencer, Barbara Denney, Damen Bennett Licensing Examiners, Lacey Derr, Program Coordinator, Sara Chambers, Boards and Regulations Advisor, Stafanie Davis, Regulation Specialist

Public Present via Zoom: Teesha Northcott, Jacqueline Polis, Kim Hand, and 2 unknown telephone numbers.

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The board was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Chair Kevin McKinley.

2. Review Agenda

Chair Kevin McKinley asked if there were any amendments to the agenda. Hearing no amendments, Chair McKinley approved the agenda.

Chair McKinley briefed the board and call-in attendees on the added public comment agenda item; he stated speakers would be limited to 1 minute and accepted topics would only be regulatory suggestions. He informed the board that during this board members would only need to listen to presentations and not open the floor for conversations with participants.

3. Ethics Disclosure

Chair McKinley stated that Shannon Thompson works out of his Anchorage 5th Avenue shop as a "booth renter" under her own business.

No other board member in attendance had any ethics violations to report.

The board was ahead of scheduled; LE Spencer suggested that the Board allow Sara Chambers to provide an update on House Bill 243 (HB243).

Chair McKinley agreed and welcomed Sara Chambers.

Legislative Update – House Bill 243 (HB243)

Sara Chambers greeted the board and provided an update on HB243, the board's requested legislation. She informed the board HB243 has been filed and, if passed, will allow staff to take direction from the board and issue licenses. She stated that the bill is simple and straightforward; next step is scheduling for a committee hearing. The board will need to prepare legislative testimony and strategy to support passage before the end of the session (May 2026). Ms. Chambers informed the board that if the bill does not pass this spring, the process will restart next year.

Ms. Chambers stated Chair McKinley has been instrumental in obtaining sponsorship and drafting the bill. She recommended that the board should consider backup spokespersons for hearings if the Chair is unavailable and possibly having the involvement of school instructors to testify in support of the bill, as it impacts entry-to-practice and licensing timelines.

Ms. Chambers stated Legislative hearings may be scheduled with short notice; board should be prepared.

Resources for board members are available through the Board Member Handbook ("Guide to Excellence") available on the Board of Barbers and Hairdressers webpage, Alaska State Legislature website: akleg.gov for tracking HB243. She also stated staff (OLE Spencer and PC Derr) will provide updates as available.

Ms. Chambers encouraged the board to discuss legislative testimony strategy at upcoming regular meeting scheduled for February 3, 2026, and to identify potential backup spokespersons for hearings and consider outreach to school instructors for testimony support.

Chair McKinley thanked Ms. Chambers and asked if there were questions.

Jennifer Lombardo asked about the status of filling the barber seat.

Chair McKinley reported that efforts are underway, including reviewing a list of barbers and planning direct outreach (phone calls) to encourage applications.

Ms. Lombardo suggested sending an email to all licensees to increase awareness. She stated this had been requested during a previous meeting.

PC Lacey Derr confirmed that an email was sent via the listserv on October 20, and the vacancy notice is posted on the website.

Ms. Lombardo stated she signed up for the listserv and did not receive the email. PC Derr stated she will follow up on why Ms. Lombardo did not receive the email despite being subscribed.

Chair McKinley encouraged board members to spread the word and personally reach out to potential candidates.

Mae Canady noted she had referred someone who has not been contacted and asked about disqualification criteria.

Ms. Chambers clarified that appointments are made by the Governor's Office, which is currently very busy. Minimum qualification: an active barber license. Other factors, such as disciplinary history, may affect selection. Applicants should follow up directly with the Governor's Boards and Commissions team at boards@alaska.gov or by phone to confirm receipt of their application.

Ms. Chambers also reminded the board to consider confirmations for any new members at the February meeting.

4. Public Comment.

LE Spencer greeted online attendees Jacqueline Polis and Teesha Northcott. She stated comments would only be accepted for regulatory change suggestions and asked if they would like to speak.

Jacqueline Polis: No regulatory suggestions at this time; expressed interest in assisting when the board addresses statutes.

Teesha Northcott: No regulatory suggestions; indicated willingness to assist the board in her expertise area if needed.

Chair McKinley thanked Ms. Polis and Ms. Northcott. He confirmed there will be another 10-minute public comment window at the next meeting on January 20, 2026 (10:15–10:25 A.M.) for regulatory suggestions.

PC Derr noted she was prepared to pause the meeting over the next 5–7 minutes if public comment needed to resume; the board agreed to proceed to Agenda Item 5: Administrative Order (AO) 360 Planning.

5. Administrative Order (AO) 360 Planning

PC Derr greeted the board and asked if everyone had received and reviewed the email she sent Friday, January 10, 2026.

Chair McKinley confirmed he had received the email and stated it was very helpful.

PC Derr noted the session would involve a more detailed policy discussion related to curriculum requirements and statutory/regulatory alignment. Regulation Specialist Stefanie Davis was present online to assist where conversations may be complex or technical. She noted the board has expressed interest in removing specific practical hours within the curriculum while retaining the subject areas. PC Derr emphasized the importance of ensuring consistent communication across statutes and regulations, so the board does not inadvertently create inconsistencies or restrict future flexibility. She encouraged board members to pause, ask questions, and revisit sections as needed throughout the review.

PC Derr reviewed documents the board would be reviewing during AO 360 planning.

1. Updated Excel Tracker

- Revised to reflect the prior full removal of Section 9.002.
- Includes information gathered from strategic planning.
- PC Derr requested members flag any strategic planning items that may be missing.

2. Working Draft – Peach Highlight + Redline

- The version previously under board review, now with redlines and highlights added by PC Derr.

3. Division Highlighted Copy – Yellow/Green + Pink Marks

- A visual representation of the Division's review identifying discretionary requirements.

12 AAC 09.004 Courtesy License

PC Derr reopened the courtesy license section (12 AAC 09.004), noting prior removal of 9.002 in its entirety and that subsections (E) and (F) of 09.004 had been discussed during strategic planning. She highlighted portions in the working draft indicate discretionary requirements, including the sponsor requirement (sponsor must hold a permanent Alaska license). PC Derr asked the board to consider whether the sponsor is necessary for public safety or whether requirements could be amended/streamlined, by consolidating multiple proofs into a single verification standard.

Chair McKinley described the sponsor as a local check to ensure compliance with Alaska statutes and regulations, deter offsite/unregulated practice, and maintain aftercare and complaint continuity when guest artists depart.

Ms. Lombardo emphasized that aftercare for tattoos/piercings can span 2–3+ weeks, and a local point of contact (sponsor) supports consumer safety and complaint follow-up. She noted that based on her 2017 information, tattooing is licensed in most U.S. states, but requirements are not uniform; some states have minimal or no training standards, while others do not license at all yet have capable practitioners.

Board members discussed that accepting an out-of-state "license" at face value may not guarantee consistent training or safety standards.

Ms. Hager observed potential redundancies: proof of current work experience, working in a licensed Alaska shop, and having a sponsor may be overlapping "fail-safes."

PC Derr asked whether three separate proofs (e.g., sworn statements, client records, employment/student verification) could be reduced to one through a license verification, while maintaining safety.

LE Spencer cautioned that if the Board moves toward license verification in lieu of the current 3(a)–(c) proofs, the regulation must explicitly distinguish a license from a permit. She noted many incoming practitioners historically hold one-year permits with limited prerequisites (e.g., CPR) rather than a full license; permits should not qualify as "license verification."

Ms. Lombardo reiterated that Alaska practitioners must work in licensed shops, which are annually inspected by DEC, and asked what the practical alternative would be if the sponsor requirement were removed, given shop licensure and inspection already in place.

The Board acknowledged this section is complex and interdependent (sponsor role, shop licensure, verification standards, interstate variability). No decision was made; the Board agreed to defer further action and revisit 12 AAC 09.004 at a later meeting to allow more debate and potential streamlining proposals.

PC Derr stated that notes had been updated to reflect that this was a broader conversation and would be revisited possibly during the January 20 planning meeting.

12 AAC 09.005 Examination Requirements

PC Derr introduced revisions to 12 AAC 09.005 and stated fee authority language will be retained. She stated that the Division no longer administers exams; administration is performed by PROV. The section should be updated to reflect the current process and remove Division-centric provisions (e.g., postponement procedures, document verification handled by PROV, notary requirement previously discussed for removal).

PC Derr stated section E was struck as duplicative with the reexamination provisions. Application abandonment policy highlighted by LE Spencer noted if an applicant receives an exam voucher but does not take the first exam within one year, the application becomes stale-dated and is considered abandoned; simple email contact is not sufficient to preserve the application. Reapplication would be required. She continued the objective is to streamline the section, preserve Board authority to require examinations, and align regulatory text with current practice under PROV.

Ms. Hager noted that at the last meeting the Board discussed repealing much of Article 1 (Examination Applications and Standards), with courtesy license retained elsewhere, and that exam content reappears in Article 3 (Examinations), creating redundancy.

Ms. Davis advised it can be beneficial to maintain a consolidated exam requirements section, separate from license-specific sections, because it contains additional information not present in those and avoids duplicating language across multiple license types.

Ms. Canady supported removing blacked-out/redlined provisions and leaving the rest, given the Division no longer administers exams.

Ms. Lombardo suggested, as a general design principle, organizing statutes/regulations by industry for user clarity, acknowledging this may be a larger structural project beyond the current edits.

Ms. Hager asked whether the Board could repeal and relocate a cleaned-up “written exam requirements for licensure” section into Article 3 to reduce cross-referencing.

Ms. Davis confirmed that approach is feasible (repeal/move), noting it would essentially be relocating the consolidated exam requirements into Article 3 with the Board’s edits; this avoids repeating the same requirements in each license section.

PC Derr emphasized the Division’s preference to avoid duplication and rely on cross-references rather than replicate identical requirements across multiple sections.

The Board agreed to remove the redlined items in 12 AAC 09.005 that reflect Division-administered exam processes no longer in use, and to retain language necessary to:

- Preserve Board authority to require examinations,
- Maintain fee authority, and
- Align with PROV administration and application abandonment timelines.

PC Derr stated that notes had been updated to reflect removal of redlined items.

Ms. Lombardo asked whether the Board’s edits and removals discussed today are proposed suggestions to be forwarded to Ms. Chambers and the Division—not final decisions—and would still go through the formal regulation process, including legal review and public comment, with opportunity for further Board consideration and changes.

Chair McKinley confirmed: Yes—hypothetically and procedurally, these are proposals; final adoption depends on the regulation process and public input.

PC Derr outlined the standard process:

1. Division Regulation Specialist review,
2. Department of Law input,
3. Public Notice & Comment, and
4. Return to the Board for additional review and potential modifications.

Chair McKinley added the Board will see drafts multiple times to check for unintended consequences and ensure proposed changes reflect Board intent.

Ms. Chambers contextualized the effort; the Board is setting an intention (early in the year) to reduce regulatory requirements in alignment with the Governor's request. She stated the Board should aim for a middle-of-the-road balance be specific enough to signal targets for reduction (e.g., consolidating three requirements into one), while recognizing the process may span up to two years and will allow tweaks based on meaningful public feedback. Perfection now is not necessary; the Board should give its best shot to identify reductions and refine through the process.

The Board affirmed that all edits discussed to date are proposed and subject to the formal regulation process, with public comment and legal review, and may be changed before final adoption.

12 AAC 09.75(b) Reexamination

PC Derr asked the Board to consider whether the remedial training requirement of 50 hours after three failed exam attempts remains appropriate and necessary for public safety, or if it should be reduced or removed. She noted that current practice involves PROV issuing score reports identifying deficiencies, and the Division's role includes verifying student/apprentice/trainee permits and training reports before re-vouching candidates for retest.

Ms. Canady stated she feels 50 hours appears excessive; a lower or no hourly mandate may be appropriate.

Ms. Lombardo stated requiring set hours before retesting feels unusual compared to other testing regimes; candidates should be able to retest when ready without mandated hours.

Chair McKinley asked for confirmation that PROV provides score reports showing weak areas; asked whether hours must target deficiencies.

PC Derr confirmed Prov provides candidates with detailed results letters reflecting areas of deficiency. She stated the Division does not track how remedial hours align to deficiencies; it only verifies 50 hours were completed via student reports before re-vouching.

Ms. Canady stated many failures relate to test-taking skills rather than practical competency; forcing 50 hours may not address the root cause.

Ms. Hager stated candidates generally self-study to pass; a fixed hour requirement may be redundant and create delays/costs.

PC Derr informed the board that verifying the 50 hours adds multiple staff steps and may be a barrier to licensure without clear public safety benefit.

LE Spencer informed the board that pre PROV, theory exam pass/fail was roughly 50/50, with a sizable group needing multiple attempts. With computerized testing, failure rates dropped somewhat, but ~25–30% still cannot pass the theory exam; approximately a dozen candidates have attempted to pass over 5–6 years without success.

LE Spencer informed the board that staff approves candidates for 3 attempts upon complete application

and application fee. After 3 failures, candidates must re-enroll in a training program if their permit is still active. If the permit is inactive, they must apply for a new permit. Once re-enrollment or enrollment is completed, and if within one year of application, candidates receive three more attempts.

Chair McKinley stated that since unlicensed candidates cannot practice, the public is not exposed to risk due to exam failure; a remedial hour mandate may not be a public safety requirement.

PC Derr informed the board that subsection (d) provides a pathway to keep applications/documents active by taking at least one exam annually, preserving progress without stagnation.

The Board agreed to remove subsection (c) of 12 AAC 09.75, 50-hours remedial training requirement after three failed attempts) and retain the rest of the section. The Board agreed that the hour mandate is not necessary for public safety, imposes operational burdens on staff and candidates, and PROV score reports already guide candidates on areas to improve before retesting.

The Board acknowledged that failing the exam prevents licensure, thereby protecting the public without necessitating a minimum remedial hour mandate.

PC Derr stated that notes had been updated to reflect removal of 12 AAC 09.075(c) and keep the rest of the regulatory verbiage.

12 AAC 09.082, 09.086, 09.090, 09.100, 09.106, 09.108 - License by Examination

PC Derr noted that the Board previously agreed to remove the phrase “or similar organization approved by the board” wherever it appears regarding blood-borne pathogen training—this cleanup applies throughout the regulations. For the License by Examination sections listed above, PC Derr proposed removing redlined text that simply restates that applicants must comply with examination requirements—this language is redundant, as compliance is already required via Division application processes and cross-references to consolidated exam regulations. She stated the objective is to streamline the sections by eliminating duplicative narrative without changing substantive requirements, ensuring edits elsewhere (e.g., examinations) do not create conflicts.

The board agreed that eliminating repeated “in accordance with the exam requirements” language is appropriate and will clean up the sections without altering substance.

Ms. Lombardo asked whether CPR can be removed across body art licensing, noting blood-borne pathogens is standard in the industry while CPR adds cost and is not directly relevant to the work performed.

PC Derr indicated CPR appears multiple times across the regulations; removing it would contribute to significant reductions.

Chair McKinley asked if CPR is a statutory mandate.

PC Derr and staff indicated CPR appears in regulation, not statute; AS 08.13.080(d) generally references training and passing exam, not CPR specifically.

Ms. Thompson, Ms. Pestrikoff; Ms. Canady supported retaining blood-borne pathogens and removing CPR, citing minimal relevance to body art procedures, added expense, and that fainting/lightheadedness—not cardiac events—are the more typical shop scenarios.

Ms. Hager asked whether tattooing increases cardiac event risk; Ms. Lombardo responded no based on long experience, emphasizing standard release forms and disclosure of underlying conditions.

Chair McKinley acknowledged broader public interest in CPR training, but agreed with the Board that CPR does not appear necessary as a regulatory requirement for body art licensure.

Ms. Lombardo asked whether CPR removal would also apply to courtesy licenses.

PC Derr confirmed edits can be made throughout, including courtesy license sections; Board directed

removal throughout.

Board members agreed removing CPR reduces costs and barriers for applicants while maintaining core health/safety via blood-borne pathogens training.

Board members agreed to proceed with removing redundant examination compliance language (redlined portions) across 12 AAC 09.082, 09.086, 09.090, 09.100, 09.106, 09.108, to retain blood-borne pathogen training requirements, with prior decision to remove “or similar organization approved by the board” wherever it appears, and remove CPR requirements throughout the regulations for tattooing, permanent cosmetic coloring, and body piercing, including in courtesy license provisions.

PC Derr stated that notes had been updated to reflect removal of redlined sections and remove CPR requirements for body art licenses, including courtesy licenses throughout regulations.

PC Derr asked Board members if they would like a brief break or continue.

Chair McKinley proposed continuing until 11:30 A.M. and then recessing.

Board members agreed to continue and take a break at 11:30 A.M.

PC Derr noted she had not paused on curriculum hour totals earlier because the Board had previously indicated interest in removing specific practical hour requirements per subject while retaining the overall total hours. She asked whether the Board wished to revisit hour totals before moving on.

Ms. Hager raised potential hour reductions for hairdressing, noting Alaska requires 1,650 hours for hairdressing, whereas other states may structure licensure differently (some combine hairdressing and esthetics under cosmetology, with different hour totals). She suggested Alaska’s hairdressing hour requirement could be reduced given it is not a full cosmetology license.

Chair McKinley clarified the Board does not issue a cosmetology license.

LE Spencer advised that changing required training hours is a statutory project and would require the Board to initiate a legislative request if pursuing reductions.

Ms. Lombardo noted the Board has long discussed moving certain requirements from statute to regulation to allow more agile updates; this topic is on the Board’s radar (previously ranked as a priority item) but likely outside the immediate AO360 regulatory-reduction scope.

Ms. Hager stated her understanding that 1,650 hairdressing hours may not be listed in statute, while some other hour figures (e.g., instructor, manicuring, advanced manicuring, braiding apprenticeship) are in statute; she suggested hairdressing, tattooing, and barbering hour numbers may not be codified in statute.

PC Derr indicated that appears correct but recommended additional review and a fuller discussion at a later time.

Ms. Canady remarked that in many states 1,650 hours historically aligns with obtaining a cosmetology license, and Alaska split licensure into esthetics and hairdressing—suggesting the current hour structure could merit reevaluation in a future agenda item.

12 AAC 09.111(1) - Mobile Shops

PC Derr raised whether 12 AAC 09.111(1)—requiring “the physical location of where the unit will be parked when not in service”—is necessary for public safety and whether the Board needs this information in regulation.

LE Spencer stated that records reflect this requirement originated when DEC conducted mobile unit inspections and arose from DEC inspection logistics, needing a fixed meeting location for mobile units. She noted that currently DEC does not inspect shops that do not provide body arts, and the board created a Certification of Compliance with 18 AAC 23 to affirm safety/sanitation standards.

Chair McKinley added that historically each move of a mobile shop triggered a new inspection, reinforcing the need for DEC to know the unit's location. He said that requiring the parking location now appears invasive and unnecessary, given DEC's role has changed.

LE Spencer reminded members that mobile units are not available for body arts under existing regulation.

Ms. Lombardo asked if staff were issuing Mobile Shop licenses.

LE Spencer stated that since 2013, the Board has issued 5 mobile shop licenses; 2 are currently active.

Ms. Lombardo asked whether required information (owner details, addresses) could be handled via the application rather than regulation.

LE Spencer noted the mobile shop owner license application is separate from the standard shop application; currently it requests a physical address (not simply a mailing address), except for sole proprietors.

Board members suggested changing to mailing address rather than a physical parking location and aligning mobile shop requirements with the standard shop owner framework.

PC Derr highlighted a language discrepancy; many licensing sections use "an applicant shall submit on a completed application form provided by the department." 12 AAC 09.111 uses "the board may issue a shop owner's license to an applicant" with additional items like (1) and (3). She suggested aligning mobile shops with the standard application submission language would allow removal of (1) and potentially (3) without losing necessary data to be captured on the application form.

The Board briefly discussed these changes and agreed to remove (1) and (3) from 12 AAC 09.111 and add standardized language consistent with other license sections, "An applicant shall submit on a completed application form provided by the department."

PC Derr stated that notes had been updated to reflect removal of (1) and (30 and to add "An applicant shall submit on a completed application form provided by the department."

Recess The Board recessed at 11:33 a.m. for a short break; reconvened at 11:42 p.m. Majority of the board confirmed by roll call.

12 AAC 09.115 Verifications

PC Derr proposed repealing 12 AAC 09.115 in its entirety. She noted that this section mandates notarization and requires primary-source submissions (e.g., transcripts sent directly from schools, license verifications sent directly from issuing authorities). In practice, staff can obtain direct-source, real-time license verification online from most states, including disciplinary history, rendering the current notarization/direct-send requirement an unnecessary barrier to licensure. If repealed, verification expectations would default to the specific licensing sections (e.g., "verification of license from the state in which you are licensed") and department procedures, rather than prescriptive notarization language.

Chair McKinley asked whether the notarization/primary-source mandate enhances public safety.

PC Derr indicated staff can meet safety and authenticity needs via official state online license lookups, which are timely and authoritative, without the burden of notarization or direct-mail requirements.

Ms. Pestrikoff, Miss Thompson, Ms. Canady, and Ms. Hager each agreed the section is not necessary, noting it delays applications and holds up paperwork without adding substantive protection.

PC Derr noted direct-from-source requirements are messy in practice (e.g., schools mailing transcripts to students first; re-mailing to the Division), causing processing delays.

The Board agreed to repeal 12 AAC 09.115 Verifications.

PC Derr stated that notes had been updated to reflect removal 12 AAC 09.115.

12 AAC 09.130 School Records - Related Sections: 12 AAC 09.185 (Apprentices), 09.190 (Trainees)

PC Derr requested Board guidance to modernize school record requirements by:

- Removing quarterly report mandates (e.g., “within 15 days” submission timelines) and the requirement that documents must come directly from the school owner/instructor.
- Transitioning to a single “Completion of Training” form or Termination of Training form, submitted at the end of training, signed by both the student and the instructor/trainer.
- Allowing the student to email/mail the final form to the Division (with required signatures), instead of requiring submission by the school/instructor only.
- Keeping schools/instructors responsible for daily timekeeping and retaining records (e.g., timecards, logs) and the rule that no more than 10 hours may be credited per day.

PC Derr noted this approach reduces paperwork burdens for students, instructors, and Division staff, aligns with the digital age, and improves access for students, eases issues experienced during the abrupt school closure scenario (e.g., notary requirements and direct-from-school submission caused avoidable delays), conforms better with common practices nationally; some states do not require apprenticeships or quarterly reporting, and Alaska’s current process is documentation-heavy.

Ms. Hager supported eliminating quarterly reporting but emphasized the final form must require both student and instructor/trainer signatures to prevent self-reporting without oversight.

Chair McKinley highlighted cases where trainers delay or refuse signatures; enabling student submission with required signatures removes a barrier and reduces chasing paperwork.

LE Spencer stated quarterly report processing consumes significant staff time; removing it would be highly beneficial. The Board does not enforce current reporting timelines (e.g., monthly/quarterly) in practice, and investigation outcomes frequently result in NDLA or no action despite identified violations, making the current system a poor use of resources.

PC Derr clarified the proposal does not exempt schools from keeping daily records or hour clocks. Schools are subject to ACPE (Postsecondary Education) requirements, including quarterly reporting to ACPE (for non-exempt schools), providing external checks and balances.

Chair McKinley and PC Derr agreed that the Division can request timecards/logs upon complaint or audit, and apprentices/trainees cannot begin training until permits are issued—these serve as control points.

Ms. Lombardo asked about end-of-training truthfulness checks; Division confirmed it can request timecards if issues arise and that the Board historically has not enforced training documentation deadlines.

Ms. Hager suggested adding explicit language that records must be available upon request, to resolve disputes between students and schools.

Ms. Canady raised concern about end-of-training accountability; Chair McKinley and PC Derr pointed to investigation triggers (student complaints) and the potential to strengthen the fine matrix at a future meeting.

PC Derr proposed moving “not later than 15 days” language and 20 days for termination from quarterly reports to the final Completion/Termination of Training form requirements, maintaining a deadline so students can obtain their records promptly and invoke investigations if records are withheld.

Chair McKinley asked whether this shift aligns nationally; PC Derr indicated it is cleaner and more consistent with modern, digital practices, with some states having lighter reporting requirements.

The Board briefly discussed and agreed to proceed with removing the quarterly report requirement under 12 AAC 09.130 and the direct-from-school/instructor submission mandate. They agreed to adopt a single end-of-training submission model using Completion of Training or Termination of Training forms signed by student(s) and instructor(s)/trainer(s) and may be submitted by the student (email/mail) to the Division.

The Board agreed that daily timekeeping requirements/records must be kept by schools/instructors and be available upon request to the Division, keeping the cap of no more than 10 credited hours per day, and a 15-day deadline to submit Completion of Training and 20-day deadline to submit Termination of Training forms.

The Board recognizes that ACPE provides external oversight (schools still report to ACPE quarterly unless exempt), and that Board enforcement of training documentation has historically been limited.

The Board also noted that alignment is needed for apprentice (12 AAC 09.185) and trainee (12 AAC 09.190) sections to mirror this approach.

PC Derr stated that notes had been updated to reflect:

- **Delete quarterly report requirements and the direct-from-school/instructor submission mandate (and any notary requirements tied to quarterly reporting).**
- **Add end-of-training submission language for Completion of Training and Termination of Training forms “on a form provided by the department” with dual signatures, 15-day/20-day deadlines, and records available upon request language.**
- **Retain the rule that no more than 10 hours may be credited per day.**
- **Prepare conforming edits for 12 AAC 09.185 (Apprentices) and 09.190 (Trainees) to match the new model and remove redundant quarterly reporting language.**

Chair McKinley informed the Board that approximately 45 minutes remain to complete the review and requested that the Board expedite discussion—focus on decision-ready items, keep comments brief, and defer complex topics to future meetings as needed.

12 AAC 09.135 Transfer of Hours and Reenrollment

PC Derr noted the Board has already agreed to remove the notarized copy requirement (redlined). She asked whether the Board wishes to retain or remove the 2-year training expiration in subsection (b), which currently invalidates prior training hours if a student/apprentice/trainee re-enrolls two or more years after termination.

LE Spencer explained the 2-year rule was originally adopted as a refresher safeguard because individuals returning after extended gaps often demonstrated low proficiency requiring near restart of training. The rule also aligned with pre-digital recordkeeping and archive policies paper files retained in-house ~2 years, then archived; now all permits issued on/after June 2015 are digital.

PC Derr emphasized that students/trainees must still pass the examination before licensure, providing a competency check regardless of training age.

Chair McKinley questioned the rationale for two years, noting it feels short and could be frustrating for returning students.

Ms. Canady favored removal of the limit.

Ms. Hager expressed being on the fence.

Miss Shannon viewed the limit as unnecessary in regulation.

Ms. Lombardo and Ms. Pestrikoff did not feel strongly, with a slight leaning to leave if needed; however, both acknowledged the exam functions as the primary competency control.

LE Spencer noted it is not uncommon for individuals to seek transfer of hours after 2 years. including those who pause and later enroll in schools out of state, and the two-year expiration can block recognition of legitimately earned training.

The Board agreed to remove the two-year training expiration in 12 AAC 09.135(b) so that previously earned training hours do not expire and may be credited upon reenrollment, subject to existing requirements and the examination as the final competency check.

PC Derr stated that notes had been updated to reflect removal 12 AAC 09.135(b).

12 AAC 09.140 Instructor–Student Ratio

PC Derr noted the instructor–student ratio provisions are discretionary requirements and reported no issues identified in the current language.

Board Members agreed the section is acceptable as written and identified no changes at this time.

12 AAC 09.143 Manicuring School Curriculum

PC Derr opened the curriculum discussion for manicuring, noting this section specifies topic-specific hours (e.g., “12 hours” per listed subject). She asked whether the Board should approve manicuring textbooks (subsection (b)) and if that requirement is necessary.

Ms. Canady recalled textbook references appearing in school opening checklists/inspections, but not a consistent Board approval process.

Chair McKinley asked whether ACPE handles textbook matters.

LE Spencer Division clarified ACPE regulates school operations, not subject matter content; the Board is the subject matter expert for curricula (cross-reference: 12 AAC 09.170 Theory Syllabus: “The board will, in its discretion, provide a theory syllabus.”). She reported schools commonly use Milady or Pivot Point texts for manicuring; the Division has not received formal requests for the Board to approve a specific book.

Chair McKinley expressed concern with codifying board-approved textbooks, preferring that schools/instructors select appropriate texts, especially as new editions emerge and the industry changes rapidly.

LE Spencer also noted textbooks are heavy and expensive; Board-level approval would be impractical and slow.

Ms. Hager suggested, if needed, referencing an “industry-standard textbook” rather than “board-approved” to avoid teaching without a text.

Board Members ultimately, favored removing the approval requirement entirely.

LE Spencer confirmed the Student Record for Manicuring form currently asks for “title of book used” and that field can be removed to align with the regulation change. She also informed the board that the phrase “Milady, Pivot Point, or similar organization approved by the board” appears in barber/hairdresser sections tied to online theory (25%); that is separate from manicuring and is being addressed elsewhere in the cleanup.

Board members agreed to remove subsection (b) of 12 AAC 09.143 (Board approval of manicuring textbooks), retain curriculum structure and topic-specific hours for manicuring at this time; textbook selection to be at the school/instructor’s discretion.

PC Derr stated that notes had been updated to reflect removal 12 AAC 09.143(b).

PS Derr thanked the Board and announced she will begin wrap-up at 12:50 P.M. to complete the end-of-meeting necessities.

Curriculums for All Regulated Training Programs - 12 AAC 09.143, 09.148, 09.160, 09.161, 09.163, 09.164, 09.165, 09.167, 09.168, 09.169

PC Derr outlined a proposed curriculum cleanup approach applicable across programs:

- Retain total program hours and retain subject lists for each license type.
- Remove minimum numbers for specific practical operations and fixed theory-hour breakdowns (e.g., “20 hours statutes/regulations,” “180 wet sets,” etc.).

- This mirrors earlier Board interest in streamlining equipment and other prescriptive requirements without altering overall training hours.

PC Derr stated for manicuring (12 AAC 09.143), changes are straightforward: keep subjects, remove the specific hour counts per subject. For tattooing (12 AAC 09.169), the suggestion is to replace detailed practical breakdowns (e.g., observed/participated/performed counts) with a single total (e.g., *150 tattoos total*), and remove fixed theory-hour allocations.

Ms. Lombardo asked for context.

Chair McKinley noted the topic was briefly introduced at the prior meeting and flagged for deeper review.

Board Members agreed this is a major item affecting all industries, warranting discussion now and continuation at the January 20 meeting.

Ms. Hager (hairdressing instructor) proposed removing specific practical counts (e.g., “180 wet sets”), calling them outdated and misaligned with modern training needs; Alaska already uses a block-hour model (e.g., 1,650 hours for hairdressing with 185 theory hours and 5 hours statutes/regulations) and could allow instructors to allocate practical experiences based on student needs.

Chair McKinley and Division staff confirmed the proposal does not change total program hours—only removes granular counts and topic hour minimums—to let instructors target deficiencies and accelerate strengths.

Chair McKinley (body art) suggested consolidating tattoo practical operations to “150 tattoos total” rather than segmented observed/participated/performed requirements; similarly remove specific theory-hour topics (e.g., 20 hours statutes/regulations, equipment).

Ms. Lombardo noted body art standards have worked well, but sees value in flexibility and simplification (e.g., a single total practical requirement), with the caveat that guidance can help newer instructors.

LE Spencer relayed that Alaska’s highly detailed curricula and transcripts are more prescriptive than in most states; many states do not mandate detailed counts, often indicating broad subjects (e.g., finger waves, haircuts) and allowing schools to choose appropriate texts.

Board Members discussed offering non-binding examples or a sample distribution, so newer instructors have a starting framework—without converting those examples into mandatory counts.

PC Derr reminded the board for combined sections (e.g., barber vs. hairdresser), ensure public safety topics remain covered (e.g., beard shaving for barbers; makeup for hairdressers) even if specific counts are removed.

Ms. Canady raised out-of-state reciprocity concerns; staff noted keeping total hours and subjects intact mitigates reciprocity issues while removing unusual Alaska-only counts.

Chair McKinley asked if any items remained before closing this section.

PC Derr commended the Board for a productive, in-depth discussion; she will update the Excel tracker to reflect today’s decisions and discussion points. She noted Regulation Specialist Stefanie Davis will attend next week’s meeting. She encouraged Board members to email questions to her before the January 20th meeting so they can be routed to Ms. Davis and addressed efficiently. She reminded Board Members, when considering removal of specific practical requirements, ensure no public safety gaps—particularly where barber (e.g., beard shaving) and hairdresser (e.g., makeup) requirements are intertwined in regulation. She will finish reviewing the remaining curriculum sections and flag any items missed for Board discussion.

PC Derr announced the Board has met and exceeded AOM360 regulatory-reduction targets; current work is a comprehensive regulation cleanup. This is a huge lift—you’ve done phenomenal work.”

Chair McKinley thanked members for robust participation and input, noted the importance of diverse perspectives, and thanked Regulation Specialist Davis for her support.

Ms. Davis thanked the Board and indicated she looks forward to continued collaboration.

Chair McKinley invited brief final comments with ~3 minutes remaining.

Ms. Hager asked Ms. Davis about whether barbering and hairdressing should be split given differing training requirements.

Chair McKinley noted this is a carry-over item for the next meeting; not for closing comments.

PC Derr confirmed she will coordinate with Stefanie Davis in the background on the barber vs. hairdresser split question.

Ms. Lombardo stated she had no additional comments; will save for next meeting.

Chair McKinley acknowledged Ms. Lombardo's instrumental contributions during the meeting.

Ms. Pestrikoff stated she had no comments and expressed thanks.

Ms. Thompson stated she had no comments but noted it was a productive meeting.

Ms. Canady stated she appreciated the discussion-focused approach; acknowledged the meeting's progress even without finalizing every item.

5. Adjourn

The chair declared the board off the record at 12:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Cynthia Spencer, Licensing Examiner III

Approved:

Kevin McKinley, Chairperson
Board of Barbers and Hairdressers

Date: _____