1. Agenda Item #1, Call to Order/Roll Call

Mr. Hedges called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. The Board members introduced themselves.

Public Comment

Lynelle Lynch, President of Bellus Academy, updated the Board on the foundation, Beauty Changes Lives, which was formed by the American Association of Cosmetology Schools. The foundation was formed to lift the perception of the image of the beauty industry by the gift of education. 3 million dollars has been raised in the last year and a half for scholarships. Recently, one million dollars was secured from the Passage family (Pivot Point) in memory of Leo Passage. The million dollars will be used for scholarships for students to enter competitions. Currently, there are four (4) scholarships, two (2) in honor of Vidal Sassoon, which was funded by Proctor and Gamble. There are currently ten (10) scholarships for students wanting to enter beauty college in the amount of $10,000.00 or up to half of their tuition, (10) scholarships for professionals to who
want to attend one week at the Advance Vidal Sassoon Academy in the amount of $5,000.00 to assist in paying for their training and travel expenses. There are Six (6) scholarships in the massage category funded by Massage Envy. These scholarships are in the amount of $2,000.00. In addition, there is the Tippi Hedren scholarship for nails. There are Ten (10) scholarships which will pay 100 percent of the tuition fees, up to $5,000.00. Ms. Lynch is the founding president and continues as Board president. Dr. Howard Murad is funding a new scholarship in January 2015 for ten (10), $2,500.00 scholarships to be offered to estheticians to aid in beauty school tuition. In March, Beauty Changes Lives will be honoring Leo Passage at the Legacy Awards. Interested parties are encouraged to view the organizations website at beautychangeslives.org.

Mr. Hedges stated he would like to work together with the community colleges, boards of supervisors and Beauty Changes Lives organization in assisting inmates of county jails in obtaining education within the beauty industry, so that they may be licensed and employable at the time their incarceration concludes.

Fred Jones, of the Professional Beauty Federation of California, complimented the work done by Beauty Changes Lives and advised the Board that currently there is a nationwide lawsuit against beauty colleges for not paying their students for work done by the student on the school clinic floor. These law suits are attempting to treat the student as employees of the school. He believes the Barber and Cosmetology law makes this illegal. He believes these lawsuits represent and existential treat to the school community. He would like to work with the Board in clarifying existing law language, to prevent future lawsuits. He recounted in the past the Board has taken a strong stand against such attempts and hopes the Board will be motivated to work with the schools and his organization in the preventing of these nuisance law suits.

Mr. Andrew Drabkin asked if these law suits are similar to the current collegiate lawsuits. Mr. Jones did not feel the law suits were related. Mr. Joseph Federico concurred with Mr. Jones.

Mr. Hedges is concerned that these law suits represent an imminent threat to the beauty industry.

Mr. Jones has concerns that the suit poses a danger to the Board’s extern program.

2. **Agenda Item #2, Proposed Legislation – Discussion and Vote on Board Position on AB 1153 Master Esthetician Certification Bill**

Mr. Hedges stated it is his understanding that AB 1153 is no longer being considered by the legislature. Ms. Underwood noted that the Board has received a lot of correspondence both for and against the proposed bill. The general consensus was that the public seemed confused by the bill. General support of the bill seemed to have declined when the ‘grandfathering clause’ was removed from the bill. Within the final version of the bill (title protection, certification, and esthetic scope expansion) there was a lot of industry input in the portion of the scope which allowed for body wraps. It was noted that allowing for body wraps (previously an unregulated service) would require many who were not previously licensed to obtain schooling and licensure. Initial support was for the development of an actual scope of practice for a master esthetician. Confusion existed in the fact that the public thought that the bill was generated by the Board. Mr. Hedges reiterated that AB 1153 was not generated by the Board. The Board took a support if amended position on the original version of the bill, and then a watch position, as amendments to the bill were added. Mr. Hedges encouraged the public to get to know the inner workings of the government and to stay informed. Mr. Hedges would like the draft minutes posted to the Board’s website and noted on the Board’s Face book account. Mr. Federico encouraged the Board to keep the posting short and concise so that people would read the postings.
Mr. Drabkin inquired as to why the “grandfather clause” was removed from the bill. Ms. Underwood stated the legislature felt there was not enough to move forward with a new license type. There was opposition from the dermatologist association, the association wanted to limit Board estheticians to working within the stratum corneum layer of the epidermis. Board staff did not agree with this action as estheticians have always worked within the entire epidermis. Ms. Underwood stated that the esthetic scope of practice and how it relates to the med-spa industry will most likely be discussed at the Board’s Sunset Review Hearing.

Public Comment

Lynelle Lynch, of the California Coalition of Estheticians, thanked the Board and staff for their support and assistance with the progression of AB 1153. The Coalition felt it was necessary to pull the bill due to the progression of changes made to the bill. In its final draft, the bill did not represent the intent of the originally proposed bill. The Coalition recognizes that the subject of a master esthetic bill maybe discussed at the Board’s Sunset Review Hearing and offered its support and collaboration to the Board.

Fred Jones, of the Professional Beauty Federation of California (PBFC), noted that it usually does take a couple of years to really fine tune a bill. He stated that it is generally noted that the Medical community tends to engage in ‘turf battles’ when new ideas come up that they feel encroach within their scope of practice. He stated the PBFC was not in association with the California Coalition of Estheticians due to the fact that the PBFC represents all license types, not just the skin care licensees.

Mr. Jones recognized the Board staff’s efforts at the Face and Body emergency session meeting. He felt the Boards senior staff along with Deedee Crossett did a great job at diffusing the confusion related to the AB 1155 bill and other issues. He felt the attendees left the session renewed, unified and appreciative of the Board. He noted how difficult it is for licensees to stay current with the goings-on of everything happening in Sacramento.

Mr. Jones encouraged the Board to continue in their previously approved pursuit of a Board approved industry certification program. He recognized the fact that the legislature is hesitant to approve new license types. His association feels that the Board approved industry certification program is a viable course to raise the professionalism within the beauty industry. Mr. Jones clarified that the proposed certification program is a program which would allow licensees to gain additional continuing education, from a board-approved industry educator. After a licensee completes the required hours of instruction, the licensee would be eligible to receive a certificate stating they have completed the training at a Board approved industry educator.

Dr. Kari Williams stated she supports Mr. Jones comments and feels the Board should move forward in the pursuit of Board approved industry certification.

3. Agenda Item #3, Adjournment

With no further discussion the meeting was adjourned.