



**CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF
BARBERING AND COSMETOLOGY
LICENSING AND EXAMINATION COMMITTEE MEETING**

MINUTES OF APRIL 20, 2015

Department of Consumer Affairs
1747 North Market Blvd
HQ2 Hearing Room 186, 1st Floor
Sacramento, CA 95834

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Mary Lou Amaro
Joseph Federico
Richard Hedges
Dr. Kari Williams

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Kristy Underwood, Executive Officer
Tandra Guess, Board Analyst
Marcene Melliza, Board Analyst

1. Agenda Item #1, WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Dr. Kari Williams, Board President, called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

2. Agenda Item #2, ELECTION OF COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON

Upon motion by Mr. Hedges, seconded by Dr. Williams, Mr. Federico was elected by a 4-0 vote as Chair of the Licensing and Examination Committee.

3. Agenda Item #3 PUBLIC COMMENT

John Moreno, Bakersfield Barber College, shared his concerns regarding the changes in the barber exam and the use of mannequins, especially when it comes to using a straight razor to shave.

Mirela Marinescu, International School of Beauty, has the same concerns and hopes that one day the exam procedures will be changed back and performed on live models.

Mr. Federico commented that one of the reasons for the change was to become in alignment with the NIC standards. As a school owner, Mr. Federico understands Mr. Moreno and Ms. Marinescu's concerns, but as school owners they are able to update and change their curriculum and make it mandatory that their students have to do many live shaves, so they can ensure themselves that they are putting out graduates that are perfectly able to perform these services. State Board is here to ensure public safety standards, and not to evaluate how well the barber can shave.

4. Agenda Item # 4 APPROVAL OF LICENSING AND EXAMINATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES.

Upon motion by Dr. Williams, seconded by Ms. Amaro, the minutes from the July 16, 2013 Licensing and Examination Committee meeting were approved by a 4-0 vote.

5. Agenda Item # 5, REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF LICENSING REQUIREMENTS FOR ESTABLISHMENT OWNERS AND DETERMINATION IF ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS ARE NEEDED.

Ms. Underwood explained that this topic had been discussed in the past, and staff brought it back to the committee to see if they wanted to discuss further at their next meeting. Currently a person can apply for an establishment license without any prior education or knowledge of the Industry, and be in charge of an establishment. Staff believes this license is far too easy to obtain and often see owners with outstanding fines cancel their establishment license and have someone else apply for a new license.

Mr. Hedges said this has been an ongoing issue with the Board. The Board needs to define regulations that if an owner sells or cancels their establishment license, that they should be required to provide proof of the sale, otherwise they should be made responsible for the establishment's fines.

Mr. Federico suggested a technological approach. Maybe the Board can create an online course that is required to be completed prior to receiving an establishment license. Another requirement he suggested was for an owner applicant to attend a DRC hearing.

Mr. Hedges also agreed that a online exam should be a requirement. It would be a great tool for corporations that have individuals in charge of establishments to take the online exam as well.

Ms. Underwood commented that there is already a statue that requires a licensee in charge and it has been determined that an owner can be a licensee in charge. She believes that original intent of that statue was to make sure the licensee was someone that actually had been thru school and was aware of the regulations of the industry.

Public Comment

Fred Jones, PBFC, suggested that an owner can be a licensee in charge, only if they hold an individual license from one of the five scopes of practices from the Board. If an owner is not a licensee, perhaps if these online course were to come available, it would be a requirement that the owner complete the course, otherwise the owner should not be the licensee in charge.

Jaime Schrabek, Precision Nails, asked if the fines are still attached to salons and why not to the individuals that completed the application as the owner. She suggested the Board increase their establishment application fee from \$50.00 to \$250.00 and require liability insurance as part of the application requirements.

Ms. Underwood confirmed that if the owner does not have an individual license from the Board, the Board does not have authority to go after those persons for the fines. Also, the Board cannot stop the sale of the establishment to another person.

Mr. Jones also commented on the transfer of business ownership and if new regulation was created to transfer the fines with the land (salon's address), this could help the board in collecting on fines left from previous owners.

Mirela Marinescu, International School of Beauty, wanted to know if Salon Suites were different from a booth renter and if they needed an establishment license.

Mr. Federico confirmed that the Salon Suites each have separate mailing addresses, so each unit is required to have an establishment license. A booth renter working at the address of a licensed establishment would fall under that license. The Board only issues one establishment license per address.

Ms. Underwood confirmed with the committee that staff will pursue different options on this issue and to bring to the next committee meeting.

6. Agenda Item # 6, AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. Hedges would like to discuss the idea of creating regulations to help transfer good and bad acts of the salon with the change of ownership.

Dr. Williams would like to discuss certification.

7. Agenda Item # 7, PUBLIC COMMENT

John Moreno, Bakerfield Barber College, wanted to know if the order of the barber exam has changed and also express his concerns how difficult it will be to shave the hair on the mannequin's beard. He was directed to email barbercosmo@dca.ca.gov his specific questions, and Ms. Heather Berg was also in attendance and offered her assistance to Mr. Moreno.

Fred Jones, PBFC, commented that the point of the practical exam is to show that the student does know the proper steps in keeping the consumer safe during the service and not how well the shave was performed. He forewarned the committee, that if there is any discussion about eliminating the practical exam, that it would not be well received in the industry.

8. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.