

**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  
January 28, 2013**

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 January 28, 2013 in Anchorage, Alaska, Robert B. Atwood Bldg., Room 1270.

**Monday, January 28, 2013**

**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 9:01 a.m. Members present were:

Glenda Ledford, Barber, Chair  
Deanna Pruhs, Hairdresser  
Michael Bolivar, Barber  
Kevin McKinley, Tattooist/Body Piercer/Permanent Cosmetic Colorist.

Not in attendance were:

K. Darae Crews, Hairdresser/Esthetician  
Ms. Crews' husband delivered a note informing the Board that she was ill and unable to attend. Cynthia Spencer asked Mr. Crews to take the Board packet additions to Ms. Crews.

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

Cynthia Spencer, Licensing Examiner  
Sara Chambers, Operations Manager  
Jasmin Bautista, Investigator

Present from the public were:

Debra Long, Instructor  
Charlotte Lushin, Barber  
Jana Powell, Instructor, Shop/School Shear Fire Academy of Hair Design

## **Item 2. Review/amend agenda**

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

Cynthia Spencer stated each Board member had been given an updated agenda, investigative report for Item 6, application review, bloodborne pathogen course information, and a correspondence item for addition to Item 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 Kevin McKinley, seconded by Michael Bolivar, and approved unanimously, it was**

**RESOLVED to approve the amended January 28, 2013 meeting agenda.**

## **Item 3. Ethics Disclosure**

The Board reviewed ethics disclosure forms in the meeting packet.

The Board had no ethics violations to report.

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

**October 1, 2012**

Ms. Ledford reviewed the draft October 1, 2012 and asked the Board if there were any edits/corrections needed; hearing none Ms. Ledford asked for a motion.

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

**RESOLVED to adopt the October 1, 2012 meeting minutes as written.**

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

## **Item 5. Board Discussion**

❖ Proposed Regulations (McKinley)

Kevin McKinley informed the Board that the quarterly, completion, and termination reports as required in 12 AAC 09.185, for tattooists/permanent

cosmetic colorists (PC) and body piercers have been causing many problems for Investigative and Licensing staff due to the reports not being submitted in accordance with the regulation or at all. Mr. McKinley stated he has spoken with Investigator Jasmin Bautista numerous times about how to correct the problem; Mr. McKinley also stated the Ms. Bautista had informed him that these reports eat up a lot of her time. Mr. McKinley went on to state that he has also spoken with Licensing Examiner, Cynthia Spencer about the reports and alternatives, options, or a solution to getting the reports submitted as required.

Ms. Spencer informed the Board that out of the dozen or so tattoo/PC and body piercing apprentices; maybe two files are receiving the reports in a timely fashion. Ms. Spencer also stated there are at least half a dozen apprentices who have been unable to move onto testing due to the quarterly reports and completion report not being submitted; Ms. Spencer informed the Board that several of these apprentices may have left their Trainer(s) on poor terms and were uncomfortable asking the Trainer(s) to submit the reports. Ms. Spencer went on to state that she could devote just about all of her time trying to track down the reports, which leads to information being submitted to Ms. Bautista for further follow up on the investigative end which results in months of letters, phone calls, and maybe the submission of the reports.

Mr. McKinley reviewed the history of 12 AAC 09.185 and stated that this problem did not begin until the quarterly reports were added to the regulation during 2009/2010. Mr. McKinley informed the Board that as an option to relieve time and energy of staff and assisting the apprentices, he suggested removing the quarterly report requirement of subsections (e)(1), (2), and (f); however Mr. McKinley stated that the use of time clocks as stated in 12 AAC 09.185(b)(1) should be fine for tracking apprentice hours and the submission of the completion and termination reports would still be required.

Mr. McKinley also informed the Board that the regulation also allowed for a trainee to have two (2) instructors/trainers; this stopped during previous license examiner Cindy Evans was on staff. Mr. McKinley went on to state that there are many different techniques, processes, etc., that each individual tattoo/PC and body piercer do and a trainee should have the option to learn, however the trainee would need the ability to have more than one trainer; each trainer would be required to submit a statement of responsibility. Mr. McKinley also requested the apprentice permits be "portable", i.e. would allow the trainee to travel from shop to shop with the trainer. Mr. McKinley informed the Board that the shops would have to meet the requirements of 12 AAC 09.110 and a new statement of responsibility should be required reflecting the new change of location; this form should also require a copy of the health/safety/sanitation report. Mr. McKinley also stated that for a business owner who had multiple shops, this would allow a trainer and trainee to travel to another shop in Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, etc.

Michael Bolivar asked Mr. McKinley for clarification; if the regulation changes to remove the reports, the initial application and either completion or termination reports would still be required. Mr. McKinley responded they would be. Mr. Bolivar stated that he felt the Board should require a running tally on hours and practical operations earned and that the Board should not get rid of the forms as this information should be registered with the Division quarterly just like all other apprentices and students. Mr. Bolivar went on to state that he completed 18 quarterly reports for his students and feels that tattoo/PC and body piercers should not be exempt or treated any differently than other licensees.

Mr. McKinley stated he understands the need for the information from the reports; however this regulation requirement has been in effect for two (2) years and is causing more problems for staff and the trainees than was intended by the Board. Mr. McKinley went on to state that his suggestions to change the regulation were his way of getting this topic some discussion, dialogue, and hopefully a solution.

Ms. Ledford suggested also making the apprentices responsible for time keeping and submission of the reports. Mr. McKinley stated having both parties responsible was a good idea. Ms. Ledford went on to state that when she signed a statement of responsibility with her students that she was accepting the responsibility to educate/train the individual and to also be responsible for submitting required paperwork. Ms. Ledford suggested that the trainee keep copies of all reports for their records in case a trainer didn't submit the reports.

The Board discussed the requirements of the report, 12 AAC 09.185 and decided that when a trainer signs the statement of responsibility they are accepting/taking responsibility for the individual trainee and therefore must adhere to the requirements of 12 AAC 09.185 and that as a Board they cannot keep amending or changing regulations for one specific license type if all others can submit reports, etc.

Deanna Pruhs suggested adding a "due date" for reports on the statement of responsibility. The Board asked Ms. Spencer if this was possible. Ms. Spencer stated that at this time with the programs and technology available to her, there was no easy way to attach a "due date" to each individual trainee. Ms. Spencer informed the Board that the Division was still working on a new licensing database program which if implemented may have an option to write programming which may allow a check list/ticker for each apprentice reflecting a date the report would be due; or adding a calendar reflecting months which could be manually checked when reports are received, however Ms. Spencer stated that she did not see this fixing the problem of getting the reports. Ms. Spencer went on to inform the Board that since she started with this program she had sent many letters requesting reports to no avail. A review of many files reflect numerous letters, many files reflect numerous requests, sent from previous

licensing examiners Cindy Evans through Mindy Butler, asking for reports, all of which were also sent to Investigative Staff and still no reports.

The Board agreed that if a trainer for the 380-hour tattoo/PC apprenticeship or 1000-hour body piercer apprenticeship requirements was unable to submit a total of three (3) or four (4) quarterly reports followed by completion or termination forms; then the trainer should not be training anyone.

Jasmin Bautista, Investigator joined the Board at 9:25a.m.

Ms. Bautista greeted the Board and informed them she had received a promotion and during the hiring and training process of new Investigative Staff she would still be assisting with this Board's investigative duties.

Mr. McKinley asked Ms. Bautista for her input regarding the submission of quarterly reports for tattoo/PC and body piercers.

Ms. Bautista stated that during her time with this Board she has received many complaints from trainees and staff about the reports. Ms. Bautista went on to state that she could devote most of her Board allotted time just dealing with the quarterly reports for tattoo/PC and body piercers; however, Ms. Bautista stated that she felt the submission of the reports should be required so information is in the individuals file just in case.

Mr. Bolivar reiterated that a 380-hour training only required the submission of up to two (2) reports and 1000-hours required maybe three (3) and that maybe the trainee could be responsible for submitting the reports and the trainer submit the completion or termination reports. Ms. Bautista informed the Board that a problem with having the trainee submit the reports might be fraudulent hours on the completion or termination reports. Mr. McKinley responded that the trainee would have their time cards as a backup for their hours. Mr. Bolivar stated that the quarterly reports are there to protect the trainee. Mr. McKinley stated that another option or back up to the forms is the time clock so it should be allowed.

The Board discussed adding that the trainer or trainee be allowed to submit the reports and the Board decided that allowing either to submit the reports may cause other problems that were not intended.

Ms. Bautista suggested the Board adopt a "civil fine" as they did during the May 2012 Board meeting for "disciplinary sanctions/fine schedules"; this allowed Investigative staff to deal with unlicensed activities, etc., in a more time efficient manner with good results. Ms. Spencer agreed with Ms. Bautista as a civil fine would allow her letters requesting reports more teeth as a typical letter always contains "may lead to license action" to "may lead to fines totaling...". Most letters with the former wording get no response and if time allows for

Investigative Staff they might get another letter with the same statement and still no reports get submitted.

The Board discussed a fine schedule and asked Ms. Spencer if she would add language to the trainee letters urging the trainee to keep copies of reports for their files. Ms. Spencer responded that language could be added. The Board asked Ms. Bautista to present them with a fine schedule.

Ms. Bautista stated she would draft information and return with at least a draft before the meeting ended. Ms. Spencer informed the Board that if need be the Board could have an email/mail vote for adoption.

#### **Item 6. Investigative Review**

**On a motion duly made by Kevin McKinley, seconded by Michael Bolivar, 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 10:04 a.m., and returned from executive session at 10:15 a.m.

The Board thanked Ms. Bautista for her time and assistance.

Due to problems with the written examinations Ms. Spencer requested the Board take a short recess.

*Recess The Board recessed at 10:15 a.m.; reconvened at 10:30 a.m.*

Ms. Ledford stated that the Board was ahead of schedule and would move on to another agenda item until Sara Chambers arrived for Item 7.

#### **Item 10. Board Discussion, Continuation**

##### **❖ Application Review**

- School Application Review, Alpha Business Group, Inc. d/b/a Mane Place Academy of Hair Design

The Board reviewed the application file of Mane Place.

Mr. McKinley informed the Board that he had conducted the school inspection on January 16, 2013 with Randy Reynolds, Instructor for the school. Mr. McKinley stated that the school set up was nice and Mr. Reynolds seemed ready to open his doors for students.

Mr. McKinley also informed the Board that the setup of the school was incorporated into the current shop, Mane Place; however the only real shared space would be the hair washing/sink stations.

The Board asked if there were any statutes or regulations that would prohibit the shared sink area. Ms. Spencer informed the Board that there were no prohibitions against the shared area per statutes and regulations. Ms. Ledford also added that as the Dept. of Post-Secondary Education had inspected and approved the school it had met more stringent requirements that set by this Board. The Board agreed.

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

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

**RESOLVED to approve the school application of Alpha Business Group, Inc. d/b/a Mane Place Academy of Hair Design.**

**Roll Call Vote**

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

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

- Gladys Seda, Hairdresser by Examination

The Board reviewed the application from Ms. Seda. Ms. Spencer stated that Ms. Seda submitted certificates and documentation for training she earned in Lima Peru. Ms. Spencer went on to state that this was the first application she'd received with education/training earned outside of the U.S. Ms. Spencer informed the Board that typically education/training information, transcripts, certificates, etc., were sent to an accredited credentialing agency, such as World Education Services, for conversion into US equivalency.

Mr. Bolivar pointed out that dates on the provided certificates raise questions as the transcripts reflect 1973 – 1977, and the certificado de estudios reflects a date of 2005.

The Board agreed that the transcripts, certificates, etc., would need to be submitted for a credential evaluation and once received back in the office Ms. Spencer would then re-submit the application for the Boards consideration.

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

**RESOLVED to table the application for hairdresser examination of Gladys Seda until Ms. Seda submits her transcripts, credentials, certificates, proof of training/education, etc. to an accredited credential evaluations service to be converted into U.S. equivalency.**

**Roll Call Vote**

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

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

Sara Chambers, Operations Manager joined the Board at 10:55 a.m.

**Item 7. Budget/Fiscal Report (S. Chambers)**

Sara Chambers introduced herself to the Board and began reviewing that Allocation of FY12 Indirect Funds and the July 2012 Licensing Statistics with the Board. Ms. Chambers informed the Board that their licensing fees may be lowered in time for the August 2013 renewal cycle. Ms. Chambers explained to the Board that the Division conducts an audit of fees for a two (2) year cycle before beginning the determination process of lowering or raising fees; Ms. Chambers also explained that the Division will keep a little bit of financial padding for individual licensing areas just in case there is an unforeseen fiscal cost to a program. Ms. Chambers went on to inform the Board that they may be looking at a \$20.00 decrease in their license fees.

Ms. Chambers informed the Board that if they had any suggestions on fee increases or decreases, addition fees, raising fees, requests of the Division that they make motions for each item as it allows the Division and herself to move forward with clear direction from the Board.

The Board thanked Ms. Chambers for the good news.

Ms. Ledford asked the Board if there were any suggestions and corresponding motions.

The Board also discussed the lack of dedicated Investigative Staff and decided that an Investigator like the Medical Board has would be worthwhile.

The Board agreed that having a dedicated Investigator may cut down on the number of unlicensed shops, health, and sanitation issues that are being reported.

Mr. McKinley informed the Board that he had conducted several shop inspections, in Fairbanks, for unlicensed activities and had filed several reports with Ms. Bautista. Ms. Spencer informed the Board that after the meeting adjourned, she would be taking pictures of the Board members so they could be issued "official" investigative ID cards. Ms. Chambers reminded the Board that they could only check shops for licenses not cleanliness issues. Board members stated they understood.

Ms. Pruhs suggested that Board members each conduct ten (10) inspections, write a report with their findings and submit it to the Legislature in conjunction with the manicuring legislation in order to bring much needed attention to the safety and sanitation issues that the bill was originally written to address through education and training.

The Board discussed the lack of face to face or hands on inspections performed by the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) for shops and salons. Board members stated that many shops/salons are receiving approval by the use of email, mail, faxing floor plans, etc., to DEC; several Board members stated they knew of several shops/salons that have never had a DEC inspector enter their doors. Mr. McKinley informed the Board that DEC does heavily inspect tattoo and body piercing shops and would prefer that this end of the industry not be required to have any additional inspections. The Board agreed and stated that due to the blood, needles, punctures, safety, sanitation issues, etc., is probably why the tattoo and body piercing shops receive more attention from DEC than hair and nail salons.

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

**RESOLVED to request the Division to look into the fiscal and legislative requirements of having a Board dedicated Investigator.**

**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>Kevin McKinley</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Deanna Pruhs</b>	<b>X</b>		

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

Ms. Chambers suggested to the Board that they may also want to compile a list of duties they expect from DEC; Ms. Chambers went on to state that this may lead to a financial increase, but at least the lines of communication between the Board and DEC would be open. Ms. Chambers informed the Board that she would contact DEC in the form of a memo to their Director; she would review the information received back and then present the findings and information back to the Board.

The Board thanked Ms. Chambers and stated that at this time they would just like to find out what services, inspections, standards, etc., DEC is currently doing and using.

Mr. McKinley asked Ms. Chambers, if changes were needed to the DEC agreement would the Board require legislation to effect any changes. Ms. Chambers responded that legislation may be needed as she is not up to speed on the statutes and regulations of DEC.

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

**RESOLVED to request the Division perform an analysis of the Board agreement with the Department of Environmental Conservation pertaining to shop inspections.**

**Roll Call Vote**

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

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

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

**RESOLVED to request the Division Regulation Specialist, Jun Maiquis, perform an analysis of the results to include; financial, legislation, pros, cons; of adding Bloodborne Pathogen course completion and renewal to the curriculum and licensing requirements of Barbers, Hairdressers, Estheticians, and Manicurists.**

**Roll Call Vote**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>ABSTAIN</b>
-------------	------------	-----------	----------------

<b>Kevin McKinley</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Michael Bolivar</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Glenda Ledford</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Deanna Pruhs</b>	<b>X</b>

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

The Board thanked Ms. Chambers for her time and assistance.

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

**Item 8. Public Comment**

Debra Long, Instructor

Ms. Long informed the Board that due to a lack of examination proctors in Fairbanks, recent examination had to be cancelled. Ms. Long requested the Board send a letter to Fairbanks licensees with information on how to become a proctor. Ms. Long stated that the Board had done a mailing requesting licensees become proctors previously. Ms. Long also asked if fines received by the Board were still going into the General Fund.

The Board agreed and requested Ms. Spencer send out a letter or flyer as done previously. Ms. Spencer agreed to mail a notification and informed Ms. Ledford and the Board that all fines generated by the different occupations in the Division are paid directly to the General Fund and not available to the Board.

The Board thanked Ms. Long for her time and participation.

**Item 9. Practical Examination Observation Report**

Ms. Spencer informed the Board that due to numerous complaints regarding the practical examination proctors in Anchorage and the posting of a photograph on Facebook of the January 13, 2013 practical examinations, during the examination, the Division agreed that a Staff member should observe the administration of a practical examination.

Ms. Spencer informed the Board that in response to the photograph being posted the “procedures for the practical examination” informational sheet had been updated to add:

2. Examiners must be available to remain at the examination, **be physically present and watching examinees throughout the complete examination.** (Please do not accept the assignment if your schedule will not allow you to remain for time needed.)

**4. Absolutely NO cell phones are allowed in the examinations. This also includes NO picture taking, texting, Facebook, instant message, Twitter, etc. Cell phones may ONLY BE USED DURING BREAKS for**

**phone calls and texting only.**

Ms. Spencer reported that she arrived at the examination site, met with the proctors before the exams were scheduled to begin and reviewed the “professional services contract” which all proctors are required to sign before being authorized as official examination proctors; specifically sections 3 and 6:

**Article 3. General Responsibility:** the actual administration of the examinations requires individuals to serve as Exam Proctors, i.e. Proctors whom are responsible for ensuring that exams are administered according to the provided instructions, the security and confidentiality of the exam is maintained and the confidentiality of the applicants and their exam answers are maintained.

**Throughout the Examination Administration or Examination Review:**

- 6.19 Not at any time during or after the term of this Contract, disclose any information regarding the contents of the examination, the examination process, the examination review process or the exam candidates.
- 6.20 Read, understand and strictly adhere to all written instructions prepared by the examination company, the professional association if applicable and the Division and in the order listed in Item 8 of this contract, Hierarchy of exam and Examination Review Procedures.

Ms. Spencer went on to report that the examinations went smoothly and the proctors were wonderful. Ms. Spencer informed the Board that she observed the proctors asking only questions pertaining to the individual examination sections as reflected on the individual score sheets; Ms. Spencer also stated that she was impressed with the proctors handling candidates who were nervous and candidates who were having problems with the verbal portions of the exams. Ms. Spencer went on to state that the proctors displayed no favoritism, no candidates were bullied or picked on. Ms. Spencer also stated that one of the three proctors was assigned “time keeping” duties for the different examination sections, and for this a cell phone was used. Ms. Spencer informed the Board that she was pleased with the professionalism of the proctors.

Ms. Spencer reported that during the first portion of the barber/hairdresser exams, all candidates were given instructions for their haircuts and told about the examination cards which contain instructions for each section of the exam. Ms. Spencer stated that following directions on the candidate end was a bit hit or miss; Ms. Spencer stated that she observed several models which clearly had haircuts before the examinations which led to “trims” being performed which is not what the haircut examination instructions clearly state, observed unevenness of layers, and basic not following directions. Ms. Spencer reported that during the “board set” she observed 3rds that were clearly not 3rds.

Ms. Spencer also reported that there are several times during the exams where there are a few minutes of down time while candidates are performing the

different portions of the examination. This time allowed the proctors to review their score sheets and take a moment. Ms. Spencer stated that when the mannequin portion of the examinations began the pace quickened and that it was typical to have candidate's complete sections and be in a holding pattern until the proctors could get to the candidate station and review the results. Ms. Spencer also stated that the proctors would assign one examination section, i.e. perm, tint, etc., to one candidate and another portion to the next candidate; proctors explained that this cut down on "cheating" especially during the verbal portions of the examination as the candidate stations are right next to each other.

Ms. Spencer stated overall she was very impressed with the administration of the examination and patience and professionalism displayed by the proctors.

Ms. Spencer stated there were several suggestions on the administration of the examination:

- 13 to 14 candidates at one time, any more is just too much activity and the space will get a bit cramped with all the candidates, models, and equipment. Suggest at least a 30-minute break between exam groups.
- Administering the Instructor exam during the barber/hairdresser examinations as the instructor examination uses the class-room set up at the examination site which is not located in the main section of the building, could also administer the esthetician examinations, limit to 3-4 candidates at a time. However would require using three more proctors.

Ms. Spencer also asked the Board in regards to the 3rds, which is also a correspondence item on the agenda, there were still problems during the exam with the "correct" way to do the "board set" and asked the Board for direction.

The Board reviewed the Jan 2013 revised hairdresser examination packet. The Board asked Ms. Spencer to move the lower 3<sup>rd</sup> line from the new diagram up the head to above the ear and add to the top section **finger waves**, middle section **rollers**, bottom section: **pin curls**. Ms. Spencer agreed.

The Board reviewed the "board set" pictures from Elizabeth Joy Conner and agreed the set did not meet what the Board wants candidates to be able to perform. The Board agreed that the diagram provided in the hairdresser examination packet with the addition of wording to page 3, I. Hair Style, paragraph following the table, should be amended to add "wearable style" information pulled directly from the Practical Examination Scoring Guidelines (08-266).

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

**RESOLVED to amend the paragraph on page 3 of the hairdresser examination packet and where ever else the information is**

**repeated, under section I, paragraph following the table, should be amended to read: “The mannequin will be used for the finger wave, rollers, and clip portion of the exam. Under finger waves, the examiner will be looking for the evenness, depth, and contour of the finger wave, AND WOULD THE RESULT CREATE A WEARABLE STYLE.”**

Ms. Ledford polled the Board, hearing no disagreement the motion was passed.

Jasmin Bautista, Investigator joined the Board at 1:56 p.m.

**On a motion duly made by Kevin McKinley, seconded by Deanna Pruhs 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 proposed Fine Schedule for the non-submission of apprentice and student reports as required by 12 AAC 09.130, 09.185, and 09.190.**

The Board adjourned into executive session at 2:00 p.m., and returned from executive session at 2:25 p.m.

The Board stated the Fine Schedule was great but information was missing for addressing schools and apprenticeship programs other than tattoo/PC and body piercers. Ms. Bautista stated she would update the proposed Fine Schedule and email the completed version to Ms. Spencer. Ms. Spencer stated that was a good idea; once the revised Schedule was received; she would send the information out to all Board members for an email/mail vote.

The Board thanked Ms. Bautista

#### **Item 10. Board Discussion, Continuation**

- ❖ On-Line Blood Borne Pathogen Courses (Spencer)
  - Cathy Montie Blood Borne Pathogen Control Course
  - Jeff Godin, Ice Training Institute, Bloodborne Pathogens & Communicable Diseases for the Tattoo Artist

Ms. Spencer informed the Board that since the October 2012 meeting several requests have been received from course providers requesting the Board approve their courses. Ms. Spencer stated that she had informed the providers that the Board had, by a quorum vote, to approve online bloodborne pathogen courses offered by the American Red Cross or an equivalent organization; however if the provider wanted their course information added by a hyperlink to the Boards

website, then course information would be presented to the Board for consideration during face to face meetings. Ms. Spencer informed the Board that two providers requested addition to the Board's website.

The Board stated they had reviewed the two courses provided in the meeting packet. Mr. McKinley stated that both of the courses looked great and that several of his employees used the course offered by Cathy Montie.

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

**RESOLVED to accept on-line blood borne pathogen training courses offered by Cathy Montie and Jeff Godin.**

**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>Kevin McKinley</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Deanna Pruhs</b>	<b>X</b>		

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

❖ **Proposed Regulations (McKinley)**

The Board agreed that discussion on the submission of apprentice/student reports had been well worth it and they were hopeful that once the Fine Schedule is approved the reports will begin to be submitted in accordance with regulations.

Mr. McKinley asked the Board if there had been any further thought about allowing a trainee under 12 AAC 09.185 to have more than one trainer and how they felt about allowing the addition of "portable" verbiage.

The Board agreed that a trainee should be able to receive training from different trainers covering the different techniques and methods an individual learns through experience. The Board would accept this as long as the Division provide application/forms like a statement of responsibility from each trainer. The Board stated that allowing a trainee permit to be "portable" would be fine as long as the Division required application and/or form(s) which would reflect different location information like another statement of responsibility which asks for shop name, location, and license number.

Mr. McKinley thanked the Board.

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

**RESOLVED to draft a new subsection to 12 AAC 09.185 and the addition of “portable” verbiage to 12 AAC 09.185 or the creation of a new regulation**

**New subsection**

12 AAC 09.185. TRAINEES IN BODY PIERCING, OR TATTOOING AND PERMANENT COSMETIC COLORING.

**(j) A trainee may have no more than three (3) trainers at a time. Each trainer must submit a statement of responsibility for the trainee. Approved trainers will be listed/reflected on the trainees permit. Any of the approved trainers may submit completion or termination certificates, documenting the theoretical and practical operations completed by the trainee during the incomplete training period in accordance with (g) and (h).**

**New subsection OR regulation**

**(k)A trainee permit is portable to shops licensed by the board under 12 AAC 09.110. The requirements of (d) and (i) must be met at all times.**

**Roll Call Vote**

NAME	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Michael Bolivar	X		
Glenda Ledford	X		
Deanna Pruhs	X		
Kevin McKinley	X		

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

❖ Statue Change Update, Bill 240 (Ledford)

Ms. Ledford informed the Board that the proposed change to manicuring requirements, previously HB 240, was gaining momentum. Ms. Ledford reminded the Board that the Board had been trying to get this bill submitted since the 2010 Legislative Session with no success. Ms. Ledford went on to state that Rep. Lynn Gattis had expressed an interest in the bill and that Ms. Ledford remained hopeful that the bill might gain some traction and be submitted during this 28<sup>th</sup> Legislative Session.

❖ Collect signed Travel Authorization and Receipts

Ms. Spencer passed out and collected travel reimbursement documentation.

*The Board adjourned at 3:25 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted:

