BEFORE THE ARKANSAS STATE BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY

SPECIAL BOARD MEETING LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS OCTOBER 30, 2006

BE IT REMEMBERED that on Monday, the 30th day of October, 2006, before the Arkansas State Board of Cosmetology and the agency staff at 9:00 a.m. in the South Basement Conference Room of the Main Street Mall, located at 101 East Capitol, Little Rock, Pulaski County, Arkansas, a special board meeting concerning the recommendations of the Legislative Committee took place as follows, to-wit:

IDEN COURT REPORTING TERESA IDEN, CCR

8819 Dawn Drive Mabelvale, Arkansas 72103 idenccr@aol.com (501)261-1106 * (501)436-4333 fax

APPEARANCES:

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

Jane Powell, President
Veda Traylor, 1st Vice President
Patricia Turman, 2nd Vice President
Barbara Ward, Treasurer
LaJoy Gordon, Secretary
Nick Downey
Cliff Keene
Ann Pickering
Sherron West

Kathy Gossage (not present)

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Kathy Wittum, Director Amber McCuien, Administrative Assistant

ALSO PRESENT:

Kent Walker

AUDIENCE MEMBERS RECOGNIZED ON RECORD:

Debbie Neumeier, ATU Ozark
Julie Auterson, ATU Ozark
Heather Whitlock, El Dorado
Tracy Akard, Hot Springs Beauty College
Tamara Cotton, Arkansas Beauty School, Conway
Jenita Hughes, Newport
Scottie Burchett
Jacquita Hayden, El Dorado
Carla Jones, Arthur's Beauty School
Linda Lee
Margaret Thomas
Patricia Anderson, Mellie's Beauty School
Brenda Gulley, Hair Tech
Mattie Woods, Thelma's Beauty School

INDEX	
CAPTION APPEARANCES MEETING CALLED TO ORDER	. 2
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION - WORK SESSION	1
<pre>INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS</pre> by Kent Walker	. 5
PRACTITIONER ISSUES License Expiration Date	· 9
SCOPES OF PRACTICE Braiding services	27 57
<pre>INSTRUCTOR ISSUES Manicurist/Aesthetician Instructor Course</pre>	73
STUDENT ISSUES Clarify Registration	86 96 119 120 130
HEALTH AND SAFETY RISKS TO THE PUBLIC	131
BOARD ISSUES Redefining Exam Administrators	141 163
CONTINUING EDUCATION	141
OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS Modify Aesthetician's Definition	194 196 221
INSPECTORS' PRESENTATION	262
MEETING CONCLUDED	286
REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	288

PROCEEDINGS: (WHEREUPON, the proceedings of the special meeting called by the legislative committee to 3 4 place recommendations before the full board 5 began at 9:00 a.m. and were had and done as follows, to-wit:) 6 7 MS. POWELL: The Arkansas State Board of 8 Cosmetology meeting will come to order. At 9 this time I'd like to ask everyone to make sure 10 that their electronic devices are turned off 11 and are unable to disturb the meeting. 12 MS. TRAYLOR: Are we paying dues today? 13 MS. POWELL: I don't -- I hadn't made any 14 plans for that. This is a special meeting. 15 (Pause.) 16 MS. POWELL: Madam Secretary, will you 17 take the roll, please? 18 MS. GORDON: Everyone is present. 19 MS. POWELL: Except our new member, Kathy 20 Gossage. 21 MS. WITTUM: Ms. Gossage called this 22 morning. She was on her way when she got a 23 phone call that her mother was being taken to 24 the hospital, so she had to re-route. 25 MS. WEST: Do we have a new list with her

1	name on it?
2	MS. POWELL: All right. Are we
3	MS. WITTUM: We mailed them to the ones
4	that didn't have e-mail and e-mailed it to the
5	ones that did.
6	MS. WEST: I haven't received anything.
7	MS. WITTUM: We'll get you copies of those
8	today.
9	MS. WEST: She's from Hot Springs?
10	MS. WITTUM: Yes.
11	MS. CAUDLE: She's actually from Pine
12	Bluff.
13	MS. POWELL: Oh. Is that her residence,
14	Pine Bluff?
15	MS. WITTUM: I'm trying to think of her
16	address. I know she works in that salon.
17	MS. CAUDLE: The address that you put on
18	the e-mail is in Pine Bluff.
19	MS. POWELL: At this time of the
20	legislative committee board meeting, I would
21	like to turn the meeting over to our legal
22	counsel, Kent Walker.
23	LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION WORK SESSION
24	INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS
25	MR. WALKER: Good morning, everyone.

24

25

Today is sort of a culmination of what we have elicited from the statewide meetings. We went to Memphis, Little Rock, Fayetteville, and Texarkana to solicit opinions from school owners and practitioners before we started to make recommendations to the full board for new legislation that should be passed and possible rule revisions. We also had a meeting last Monday here in Little Rock as well, to just go over those and finalize some of the proposed recommendations to make formal motions to bring to the full board today. In total, we had close to ten hours of time spent soliciting opinions from individuals from across the state and everyone had an opportunity to be heard before these recommendations and rule revisions came through and were put before the full board.

All that being said, last Monday we made recommendations -- I guess I should say, Ms. Wittum made recommendations to the committee about the direction in which this board should proceed forward. Anything that is passed today does not automatically become a rule or a statutory change. I want to clear up some of

the common misconceptions about that process. It would still have to go through the proper rule procedures to change, also for statutory changes, those won't happen until the session starts in January and the legislature meets. Today will just give the director, Ms. Wittum, the authority to proceed forward in developing those with the attorneys at the Capitol, and in passing a legislative package in the future. In the rule revisions, where there's something that you-all have changed, the previous rule is noted, then have hearings, and then it will be passed according to a vote.

The committee met last Monday, and you-all should have a copy in front of you of both the agenda and the recommendations. If you don't, they're on that table in the back in the corner. The committee made decisions to either favor the recommendation or to defer it before the full board because they felt, one, there was not enough information to make a decision at that point; and two, they felt that it was of such magnitude that the full board should look at it before they made any recommendations.

25

The way I kind of wanted to proceed today is that if it had passed before the board, meaning they favored it, -- let's take for example, the first one where the committee favored that with a 3-0 vote. I would have the legislative committee just sort of briefly give an analysis and synopsis of why they are in favor of that recommendation, tell what led them to the results of that, if you will. And then anyone in the audience who's against it for whatever reason, to go through it and state that. So if you see three things you don't like then you're welcome to come up and say, "I'm against A, B, C, and D or A, B, and C for these various reasons." So if you're in favor of it, I would say -- I wouldn't get into great detail, but I would say if it's already been as recommended to the full board there's no reason for further testimony or anything else to be heard because these three board members who are on that committee are already in favor of it. So if you're against it for any reason, then I would say -- I'll tell you the proper time to come up and say, "I'm against it for whatever reason."

At that point, the board would consider
the motion from the committee to take action on
it. There are nine members here today, so if
it's a four-four vote, then Ms. Powell would
make a decision, or deciding vote, because it
would take five to pass any of these
recommendations due to the fact that Ms.
Gossage is not here today.

And that's sort of a very long introduction, but I hope it helps you understand our purpose here today. Are there any questions from the board on procedure or anything like that?

(Pause.)

MR. WALKER: No? Okay. Ms. Wittum.

PRACTITIONER ISSUES: LICENSE EXPIRATION DATE

MS. WITTUM: Okay. The first one is

Practitioner Issues: License Expiration Date.

There is one clarification that I would like to make on this and make the board be aware of.

Mr. Walker brought it to my attention that we might want to consider under the lifetime license to make it reaches the age of 65 "and" has been actively engaged in practicing for 30 years as opposed to "or". If we keep it this

24

25

way, there is the possibility that someone coming into the industry late in their life would possibly be eligible for the lifetime license status without actually having invested the number of years in the industry that we probably think that they should in order to get that license. So you might want to consider that into making your decision today.

The recommendation that was made at the legislative committee meeting was to change the two-year -- change to a two-year renewal cycle. That would certainly alleviate a burden on the office, as well as the industry, I think, than having them all come due on December 31st. addition, with the new computer system that we're moving into, we will have the ability to send reminder notices to anyone when their license is coming due. So we'll be able to help them remember that their license is actually coming due readily throughout the year. A practitioner who holds an establishment license would be given the opportunity to have both of those renewed simultaneously, if they so choose. If they don't choose to do that, then the establishment

licenses would still come due at the end of the year like it currently is.

Then the lifetime license -- you might want to consider changing that to "and" instead of "or", but the recommendation was to allow for the possibility of a lifetime license status. And also I do -- did stress with the legislative committee and I want to stress it here today, that even with that lifetime license status that would not eliminate the need for that person to follow the health and safety rules and the licensing requirement that we have currently in place. So they would be eligible to receive a penalty if they were found to be out of compliance with those or in violation.

In addition to that, incorporating photos on the licenses, as well as the permits, is something that we encourage. The redesigning of the license to a badge that would be more feasible for a photo is something that we support. And we would also encourage the school owners to maintain the students' permits with their photo ID and then return it to the office at the conclusion of that student's

enrollment.

The suggestions that were made during the regional meetings that were not supported by the legislative committee were extending the renewal grace period. It was mentioned that we could extend it past the 30 or 31 day period we currently have now. I think with us having the ability to send a reminder notice that there really should not be a need to allow someone more than 30 or 31 days to renew their license.

MR. KEENE: Kathy?

MS. WITTUM: Uh-huh?

MR. KEENE: Did you consider the renewal notice or reminder notice -- when this is written up, they don't use that as an excuse -- I didn't get mine?

MS. WITTUM: Uh-huh, yes.

MR. KEENE: The mail, you know, sometimes when you send it in the mail -- I wouldn't want -- I wouldn't want someone to be able to use that I didn't get a renewal notice as an excuse to get out of something.

MS. WITTUM: Right. I agree. I think we need to -- we, in the office, will need to make sure that we have the right addresses for them.

We also can even go to the trouble of sending
it not only to the home address that we have on
file, but we can also send it to the
establishment address that they're working at
if we need to. We would certainly do our best
to make certain
MR. KEENE: P.O. boxes
MS. WITTUM: we get those out.
MR. KEENE: What about P.O. boxes, instead
of an actual physical address
MS. WITTUM: Well, not everyone has a P.O.
box
MR. KEENE: I know.
MS. WITTUM: and the ones that do have,
we have those in the system and would be able
to send the notices to the P.O. boxes instead
of the physical addresses.
MS. POWELL: They could still renew online
or in person, too.
MS. WITTUM: We would still encourage them
to renew online instead of sending it in to the
office.
MS. GORDON: I have a question on the
renewing of the practitioner's if they were
an instructor, would all this take place just

1	like the ownership of an establishment?
2	MS. WITTUM: Yes.
3	MS. GORDON: It would all be renewed at
4	the same time?
5	MS. WITTUM: If they had more than one
6	license, they would be able to have them come
7	up for renewal at the same time. The
8	establishment license would still come due at
9	the end of the year unless they choose to have
10	it renewed on their birthday as well, for the
11	school owner. But if they have more than one
12	practitioner's license whether it be
13	MS. GORDON: Instructors, aestheticians, -
14	_
15	MS. WITTUM: instructors, cosmo,
16	manicurists, or whatever those would renew
17	on their birthday.
18	MR. KEENE: Are you looking for a vote on
19	this? Or what are you looking for?
20	MR. WALKER: It's however you want to
21	proceed. The people on the legislative
22	committee can explain the reasoning if not,
23	then vote. But first, I would like to elicit
24	opinions from the audience, too.
25	First if we could hear from the committee

1	why they chose to endorse it.
2	MS. POWELL: I believe that the
3	information has been covered in full to the
4	understanding of the committee's perception of
5	this issue from last Monday.
6	MR. WALKER: Okay.
7	MS. POWELL: I do appreciate the change of
8	"and" from the "or". I do believe that was the
9	understanding the committee had at the
10	beginning of last week.
11	MR. WALKER: Is there anyone in the
12	audience who is against any of the proposals
13	listed in number one of the recommendations
14	that were handed out earlier?
15	MS. AKARD: I'm not opposed to that. I
16	have questions.
17	MR. WALKER: Okay.
18	MS. AKARD: How would we really go about
19	doing the photo identifications?
20	MR. WALKER: There's or do you want to
21	
22	MS. WITTUM: Go ahead.
23	MR. WALKER: Well, there's been talk
24	actually of several different approaches. One
25	of which is obtaining the equipment here on-

site or going anywhere that you could normally 2 get a passport photo, Walgreen's in particular, creates those -- makes those, and mail those in 3 4 and have those laminated here. So anywhere 5 that you'd normally get a photograph of yourself, you could mail that in or send it in 6 7 with your application for renewal. But there 8 was concern from several of the locations of 9 individuals who had licenses and were actually 10 floating licenses around to several people at 11 one time as opposed to one person being 12 attached to that particular license. And it 13 was proposed by several members of the audience 14 -- it was either Fayetteville or West Memphis, 15 to attach photos IDs. After bringing that up 16 later on, that seemed to gain strong momentum. 17 MS. AKARD: Do some of the smaller 18 communities have -- have a way of getting 19 passport photos? 20 MR. WALKER: The post office does. 21 believe so. 22 MS. POWELL: Any drug store. 23 MR. WALKER: Any drug store, yeah. 24 there will also be equipment here, as well. 25 MS. AKARD: If the student loses one can

they get another one? MS. WITTUM: Well, the school owners and 3 the instructors would be responsible for 4 holding onto the students'. They won't have to 5 wear theirs. MS. AKARD: Okay. 6 7 MS. WITTUM: You would just hold onto them 8 and then turn them in when they drop 9 enrollment. 10 MS. AKARD: All right. 11 MS. NEUMEIER: So, I'm understanding as 12 they enroll to start their classes, they would 13 have this photo ID made and this would be sent 14 in with their papers, with the enrollment 15 papers for them to start? 16 MS. WITTUM: Yes. 17 MS. NEUMEIER: Okay. And that would be 18 sent -- well, we would keep that at the school 19 in their file. And then after you get their --20 their hours, this would be sent in? 21 MS. WITTUM: The photo would be -- would 22 be provided with their enrollment form. They'd 23 provide us with a photo in the enrollment 24 papers and we would prepare their permit with 25 the photo ID on it and send that back to the

1	school.
2	MS. NEUMEIER: Okay.
3	MS. WITTUM: And the school would maintain
4	that until the student drops enrollment.
5	MS. NEUMEIER: Okay.
6	MS. WITTUM: One thing that we need to
7	make sure of is that we get names for our court
8	reporter to properly document the comments.
9	MS. NEUMEIER: Okay.
10	MS. WITTUM: What was your name for that?
11	MS. NEUMEIER: Debbie Neumeier, ATU Ozark.
12	COURT REPORTER: Debbie Neumeier. Could
13	you spell your last name?
14	MS. NEUMEIER: N-E-U-M-E-I-E-R.
15	COURT REPORTER: Thank you. And just for
16	future reference, I'll get spellings from you
17	during a break.
18	MR. WALKER: Does anyone else have any
19	comments or questions?
20	(Pause.)
21	MR. WALKER: If not, do the board members
22	have any comments or questions?
23	(Pause.)
24	MR. WALKER: I guess we'll take a motion
25	from the I would do it as amended with the

1	"and" as opposed to the "or".
2	MS. POWELL: Do I state that back?
3	MR. WALKER: I would solicit a motion.
4	MS. POWELL: Do I have a motion on item
5	one, Practitioner Issues: License Expiration
6	Date?
7	MR. KEENE: I'll move that we accept this
8	recommendation from the legislative committee
9	for the practitioner licenses with the amended
10	part of reaching the age of 65 change from "or"
11	to "and".
12	MS. GORDON: Second.
13	MS. POWELL: I have a motion and a second.
14	Is there any discussion?
15	(Pause.)
16	MS. POWELL: All those in favor, raise
17	your right hand.
18	(Show of hands.)
19	MS. POWELL: Motion carries. It's
20	unanimous.
21	PRACTITIONER ISSUES: RENEWAL REQUIREMENTS WHEN UNDER
22	PHYSICIAN'S CARE FOR TERMINAL ILLNESS
23	MS. WITTUM: Okay. Number two is
24	Practitioner Issues: Renewal Requirement for
25	Licenses Under a Physician's Care. The

recommendation from the legislative committee is to modify the language in A.C.A. 17-26-209(a)(12) to allow a waiver of the renewal fee 3 4 and the penalty in the event that a 5 practitioner is under the immediate care of a physician due to an extended or long-term 6 7 illness or medical condition. 8 In addition, we would also need to modify 9 A.C.A. 17-26-319 (e) to prevent a practitioner 10 from having to re-examine if that time period 11 extends over five years. 12 The committee favored that recommendation 13 in a 3-0 vote. Does anyone from the committee 14 want to comment on that? 15 (Pause.) 16 MR. WALKER: Are there any comments or 17 questions from the board? Go ahead. 18 MS. TRAYLOR: Well, how are you going to 19 determine whether they're unable to --20 MS. WITTUM: They would have to provide a 21 doctor's statement to that effect. 22 MS. TRAYLOR: Some of them -- any doctor 23 will write them. MS. WITTUM: Our requirement would be to 24 25 have that physician state that they're in their

care. We could consider having some type of follow-up where we contacted the doctor if needed, but once we start doing that we move into having to have a release from the practitioner -- I mean, from the practitioner to be able to talk to that doctor. It just depends on how far we want to go into allowing us to do that.

(Pause.)

MR. WALKER: If anyone from the committee wants to share why they supported this --

MR. DOWNEY: The reasoning for this recommendation -- I mean, for me it was the case where someone that's out here has like a terminal illness or is banged up in an automobile wreck, then they shouldn't have to come back and re-examine. And they shouldn't lose their license over this period of time, because sometimes rehabilitation may take a long time, so if they have no problems as it is, they shouldn't have to worry about their license being revoked after a five year period of time and then have to come back and take an exam again in order to be fully licensed. So that's the reason that we're making the

recommendation.

MS. POWELL: Also, in that the person would not lose their license for failure to meet the licensure requirements.

MR. KEENE: Once this person is released from their doctor, say they were able to work, would -- at that point, would they have to pay all of the years of renewal if they didn't pay because of the illness?

MS. WITTUM: That would be up to the board. The board would have to decide whether or not we would not require them to do that or if we would want them to go back and pay for the number of years that they --

MR. KEENE: And --

MS. WITTUM: -- missed.

MR. KEENE: And would we also consider that if an inspector goes in to somewhere and finds this person working when they were -- our office is under the impression that they were not working, what the recommendations would be?

MS. WITTUM: Well, once they cross the line and violate what's been offered to them then that -- that brings it to the board for disciplinary action. It wouldn't preclude us

from being able to take action against them if they're actually going against what is stated at the office.

MR. KEENE: Okay. So that'll be added to your inspection report, there will be a spot in the inspection report to document that, basically?

MS. WITTUM: Well, it wouldn't matter whether we had it in the inspection report or the inspectors just know it. They would write someone up if they were on a medical leave according to the office but actually walked into an establishment and found them working.

MS. POWELL: It would be considered an inactive license, right?

MS. WITTUM: Uh-huh.

MS. TURMAN: I think if we exempt them from -- they could be the sole-supporter and not have any funds, you know, they may not have the money to pay for their license if they don't have the capability of working. I think if we're looking at one thing, we should look at the other and exempt them from having to pay those funds. I mean, if they don't have any income, it's rather a difficult thing to pay to

renew your license, I think. You're the solesupporter or whatever, and they have to worry about their illness, instead of trying to keep 3 4 those licenses up or come up with the funds to 5 pay for those back licenses, because that could be difficult. 6 7 (Pause.) 8 MR. WALKER: Are there any other questions 9 or comments from the board? 10 MS. GORDON: I just agree with what Pat 11 If that person has been out for that 12 period of time due to the fact that they were 13 ill, it wouldn't be -- you know, justifiable to 14 have them pay for those years they were not 15 able to work, just the year they get ready to 16 reinstate their license. 17 MS. POWELL: I thought that was --18 MS. GORDON: What she said. 19 MS. POWELL: Isn't that what you just 20 said? 21 MS. GORDON: Uh-huh. 22 MS. TURMAN: Yes. 23 MS. POWELL: Well, then what --24 MR. KEENE: So you're saying that you

don't disagree with her.

25

1	MS. GORDON: No. I said I agree.
2	MS. POWELL: Oh, you agree.
3	MS. GORDON: I'm sorry. I said I agree
4	with what
5	MS. POWELL: Okay.
6	MS. GORDON: with the comment she made.
7	I think that's fair.
8	MS. POWELL: All right. I'll have to tell
9	you I can't hear out of one ear. I'm sorry.
10	(Pause.)
11	MR. WALKER: Are there are any comments
12	from anyone in the audience regarding this?
13	(Pause.)
14	MR. WALKER: Would you, please, stand and
15	state your name for the record.
16	MS. HAYDEN: Jacquita Hayden from El
17	Dorado.
18	MR. WALKER: Go ahead.
19	MS. HAYDEN: Is there not a way we can
20	consider you're debating on whether or not
21	they're ill or they're not. Could we not
22	consider, maybe an inactive list and an active
23	list, which would mean if you were sick you
24	could put yourself on as inactive? And then
25	when you become well, you could go back onto an

1	active list.
2	MS. POWELL: That
3	MS. WITTUM: That is what this would do.
4	And then once once someone is approved for
5	this type of waiver, they would be put on an
6	inactive list. That will be how the inspectors
7	will know those people are not supposed to be
8	out there working.
9	(Pause.)
10	MR. WALKER: Any other comments?
11	(Pause.)
12	MR. WALKER: Ms. Powell, I think we're
13	ready for a motion.
14	MS. POWELL: I call for a motion for item
15	two, Practitioner Issues: Renewal Requirements
16	for Licensees under a Physician's Care. Do I
17	have a motion?
18	MR. KEENE: I move that we take the
19	committee's recommendation on the Practitioner
20	Issues: Renewal Requirements for Licenses
21	under a Physician's Care.
22	MS. WEST: And I second.
23	MS. POWELL: We have a motion and a
24	second. Is there any discussion?
25	(Pause.)

MS. POWELL: All those in favor of the motion, please, raise your right hand.

(Show of hands.)

MS. POWELL: The motion carries. It's unanimous.

SCOPES OF PRACTICE: BRAIDING SERVICES

MR. WALKER: Now, I want to preface before we begin this one. This is the first one on the list that the committee deferred, and as such, the committee did not make any positive recommendations to the board. The way I want to do comments for this is to put this -- is split this up, the one pro and one against and make it fair, because the board has no recommendation before them. So once the board is finished with their discussion, we'll solicit opinions from the audience, one in favor and the next one against, and proceed accordingly until everyone's had their chance to be heard for that particular -- or this particular recommendation. Ms. Wittum.

MS. WITTUM: The recommendation that I made to the legislative committee was to develop a hair-braiding curriculum and hair-braiding license that would allow us to address

the braiding issue. NIC offers a national exam in natural hair-braiding, and I've been told by, I think Kirby Morris of NIC, that they would be able to help us find curriculum through other states that have the curriculum so it wouldn't be that we would have to reinvent the wheel. We could actually look at what has been incorporated in the other states. I'll leave it to the committee members to discuss why they were hesitant to agree with this particular recommendation.

I, personally, think it would be beneficial to the industry to have a specialty license in hair-braiding. I think that from the comments that we heard from the regional meetings, and the fact that it's available through NIC, will help us to make something available to the industry. I also want to remind you, in case you've forgotten or are not aware, that we did have a disciplinary case that pertained to this where a person was found to be braiding in a salon and she was brought before the board. She brought information from other states about which ones do not even include braiding in -- under the scope of

20

21

22

23

24

25

cosmetology. A braider -- braiders in some states can work without having to adhere to the cosmetology law. There were also other states that -- curriculum had been developed and a license, specialty license, had been developed in order to address this particular issue.

After looking at both of the possibilities, following the information that Ms. Briggs brought to us, I favor having the specialty curriculum and license because I think it would make sure that those people are receiving the education they need on health and safety issues. Otherwise, if we were to exclude them we can't be certain that they know the health and safety guidelines that they should be following while they're performing services on the public. Also, if we have their license and their information on hand, then the inspectors would know where they're located. They would be able to go and make sure that they're following the guidelines. And they may also run across some who have not taken or followed the legal aspect to go get that education and license to braid.

Those were the comments that I -- oh, I

would like to also point out, just for your information, that I have had a phone call from Senator Tracy Fields speaking in favor of the braiders' issue, but exactly what his comments are, I don't know. He and I have been playing phone tag for the past week, so I don't know exactly which side he would fall on -- if he thinks they should be excluded or if they should be a specialty curriculum and license.

Now I'll turn it over to the committee members.

MS. POWELL: I think at this time the discussion is open to the board. I don't think that I have anything else to add on this.

MS. TRAYLOR: Who's going to train these braiders?

MS. POWELL: My understanding is it would be a school issue.

MS. WITTUM: Of the school -- of the states who have incorporated a specialty course, they do require their braiders to go to a cosmetology school and learn how to do their -- or gain their hours in a cosmetology school in order to be eligible for their specialty license.

MS. TURMAN: Could you tell me is this already in the -- part of the contents of the schools, you know, does the school teach braiding now in their curriculum?

MS. POWELL: I know that braiding is in the curriculum in the Milady text.

MS. GORDON: Uh-huh.

MS. POWELL: Now it is not mandated as to how many hours a school spends on the braiding. It's just part of being in the 1000 hour curriculum in hairstyle.

MS. TRAYLOR: How many hours would you require?

MS. POWELL: Well, that would be determined by our -- I guess the board will have to determine how many hours would be required in that particular program and then have to decide how many hours would be in each course in that program subject matter. As the director has said, there are other states that have done it and I guess they have -- I have not seen -- I am not aware of any information out there, but so -- she has seen or has visited with NIC, I believe Kirby has explained -- or he has explained to her that there was a

3

45

6

7

8

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

2425

curriculum already created.

MS. TRAYLOR: I was in D.C., and I was in Detroit, and I was in Orlando when they were writing the braiders exam. And I believe most of those people came from Detroit that wrote the exam.

MS. POWELL: Ms. Turman?

MS. TURMAN: I have another issue. Ιf you'll recall when the lady was brought before our board, she said that they -- she had also -- it would be a form of art and that we -- if we did not let her practice in a hair salon that she could practice somewhere else, which means that we do not have anything, I mean, for health and safety. If they can go and perform their art somewhere else, then we have no control over the safety and health issues. When she was out there, if I -- I think she said she could go to another store or something to operate and then perform her art that it's classified as art, what she's doing, and that it would not be under the control of the cosmetology law.

MS. POWELL: Well, I believe that is an argument, one of which the board could argue, -

2 BOARD MEMBER: Is that --MS. POWELL: -- it is considered science 3 4 and art what any cosmetologist does. 5 MS. TURMAN: Right. MS. POWELL: So as long as it falls in the 6 7 area of hair, I believe it falls under the area 8 of the cosmetology board. 9 MS. TURMAN: Well, that concerned me that 10 she is -- that she could go out and perform 11 this on the public and it could be classified 12 as art and not be subject to any health and 13 safety regulations. 14 MS. POWELL: Are there any other --15 MR. KEENE: Jane, --16 MS. POWELL: Yes? 17 MR. KEENE: This would still be up to each 18 individual school if they wanted to offer this 19 course, just like they do in aesthetics or 20 electrology. If none of the schools want to 21 offer the course, it's really kind of -- you 22 may have it on your books that -- have this 23 license on your books but if none of the 24 schools here are going to teach it, it's just 25 going to sit there and all you'll have is those

24

25

people coming in through reciprocity such as the girl that we had the hearing with. She came here from another state. Well, if she can't -- she can't practice her art, her profession, in this state unless there is a license, so what you're doing is, ultimately, you're making it to where people can come here and work.

MS. GORDON: And to make the specialty for braiders would be just the same as if I could make a specialty in relaxers, you know. is in the curriculum. It's covered in our curriculum. Braiding is covered. It should be taught in the schools. So now are we going to separate all the other, you know, make each one as an individual license? Maybe I just want to do relaxers, and I don't want to do perms or whatever. Would this be a specialty license set up just for me if I wanted to do just, you know, go over here and say well, I'm just going to do relaxers. I'm not going to do braiding. I'm not going to do perms. So, you know, why would it be necessary, and it's already in the curriculum that it be taught?

MS. WITTUM: Well, I think the thing that

we need to remember on that argument is that NIC hasn't separated out a specialty in any of the others. They've only chosen to do it in braiding. So by the fact that they allow for that exam, --

MS. GORDON: Yes.

MS. WITTUM: -- that should allow us to give the option to the schools if they want to teach this specific or not.

MS. GORDON: But if I bring enough complaints to NIC that I only want to specialize in relaxers, would they go and make a specialty course just for relaxers? It's the same argument either way it goes.

MS. POWELL: Mr. Downey.

MR. DOWNEY: Since my name is on this as being opposed to it, I think I need to state some of the reasons for being opposed to this. One of them is just like she said, if we keep breaking our licenses down you're going to have people out here that don't want to do anything but to maybe paint fingernails. So they're going to want to have a fingernail painting license. Then maybe somebody won't want to do anything but spray hair spray. We're going to

have a hair spray license. If we keep breaking it down, then the very next thing that's going to come on top of this, I guarantee you, -- and I've seen it in other states. I do national accreditations. I'm on the team that goes out to these other states and I've studied their laws and I have not seen a good braiding course that covers any type of health and sanitation like it should. They're all short, real short courses where they get in and get out in two or three weeks time and get out here violating laws.

MS. GORDON: That's right.

MR. DOWNEY: So we already have a -- we already have a license that covers braiding. If they have to take it through cosmetology with 1500 hours, then they're going to get the health and safety and everything else, salon management and everything else that's needed to have a viable business. Otherwise if we go this route, to a short course and allow these people to just jump out there, we're going to have them crashing all over the place. So I am totally opposed to bastardizing our license and breaking it down into many, many other licenses

like some states have. And if we think we've got a problem when it comes time for renewal and we keep adding licenses and adding licenses, we are going to have a stack of them at renewal time. So I am opposed to it for some of the reasons that other board members have stated.

MS. POWELL: Ms. West?

MS. WEST: Could we hear from some of the schools that are out here, you know, whether it's included in their curriculum or do they plan to include it in their curriculum?

MS. POWELL: Absolutely.

MR. WALKER: Well, I want to make sure that we got all of these comments first, then if anyone who's in favor or against, have them speak according to those groups, if that's okay.

MS. POWELL: Uh-huh.

MR. WALKER: So are there any other questions from the board -- or comments?

MS. GORDON: I just want to add to my comment, too, is the fact that when these people are licensed will they be in a salon, you know, where everyone else is doing hair?

	•
1	And even though they're going to be in a little
2	separate room, if they're not braiding that day
3	and somebody is overloaded will that person
4	come out there and start doing a relaxer or
5	MR. DOWNEY: Yes, they will.
6	MS. GORDON: You know, so those are issues
7	that we need to consider in making this
8	decision. You know that's going to happen
9	either way.
10	MS. WITTUM: I can appreciate that
11	comment, but we have receptionists who are
12	going and shampooing. And
13	MS. GORDON: So.
14	MS. WITTUM: we have receptionists who
15	are going and blow drying hair
16	MS. GORDON: Uh-huh. Same difference.
17	MS. WITTUM: You're not ever going to
18	catch all of the people who are doing what
19	they're not supposed
20	MS. GORDON: Same difference.
21	MS. WITTUM: to be doing, but at least
22	if we knew where some of the braiders were we
23	would have the
24	MS. GORDON: You're not going to stop
25	them.

MS. GORDON: Because they're braiding in the kitchen just like everything else, so.

MS. POWELL: Ms. Traylor.

MS. TRAYLOR: Well, you're talking fragmented licenses. You have a manicuring course. You have electrologists. You have an instructor's course. You have a nail-tech, you know -- you can do nails or you can do manicuring or you can do whatever. So when -- I think you need to be really, really careful or you're going to have to have a school that's going to teach it. You can't require -- our state cannot require a license for a course and they can't find anyone in the state to teach it.

MS. POWELL: Thank you, Ms. Traylor. Do any other members of the board have anything else that they'd like to comment on?

MS. PICKERING: I want to agree with Nick. I think that we would be getting into every area. We're going to have to offer this subject or that subject, and I will have to go along with that. I have -- and I'll give you

an example. I have a dear friend who is a cosmetologist and she went 1500 hours to get braiding, I mean, basically. I mean, she can do anything anyone else can do, but she sacrificed her 1500 hours to specialize in braiding. So I'll have to go along with Nick.

MS. POWELL: Thank you, Ms. Pickering.
Ms. Ward?

MS. WARD: I think that if you do nothing then you can hear people coming in or going out and asking or wanting just to take one particular item instead of taking the whole course. And you'll have a problem with a lot of them just wanting to do one thing and nothing else. They take the whole course and they can always specialize in whatever they want to do. Well then they've got the training in everything and they're able to say they're licensed so that they don't step out of their boundaries of what, you know, what their scope is.

MS. POWELL: Thank you, Ms. Ward.

MS. TURMAN: I feel like if they complete those hours and then they want to specialize -- but they would still be under our -- or what

1	I'm concerned about our goal of this board
2	is to protect the public. And so they're first
3	and that's what we need to be doing, is safety
4	and health issues. And that would never be
5	covered when they that's our that's what
6	should be our main concern is the health issue
7	and the well-being of the public.
8	MS. POWELL: Okay.
9	(Pause.)
10	MS. POWELL: It appears that the consensus
11	of the board is that a braider should be
12	considered to take the same curriculum as a
13	cosmetologist to perform the services in a
14	licensed establishment, correct?
15	MS. TURMAN: Uh-huh.
16	MS. POWELL: Ms. Traylor, did I say that
17	wrong?
18	MS. TRAYLOR: Well, do you make a
19	manicurist take a cosmetology course?
20	MS. POWELL: No.
21	MS. TRAYLOR: Okay.
22	MS. GORDON: But
23	(Multiple comments being made by board
24	members.)
25	MR. WALKER: Can we get questions from the

1	audience or any comments before we make I
2	don't think we've reached an appropriate time
3	to make a decision yet.
4	MS. POWELL: Right. I was I was trying
5	to get a summary of this before we
6	MS. GORDON: Manicurists don't do hair.
7	MS. POWELL: Right. As far as all
8	right. Let me I obviously didn't state that
9	correctly. It is the opinion, it appears, that
10	the board is in favor of a braider obtaining
11	the cosmetology program to perform braiding or
12	any hair service in a licensed establishment;
13	is that right?
14	MS. TRAYLOR: Right.
15	MS. PICKERING: That's true.
16	MR. KEENE: No.
17	(Pause.)
18	MR. KEENE: You're asking if everybody's
19	opinion on it
20	MS. POWELL: No. I'm saying it seems
21	that's what I'm hearing as a the majority of
22	the consensus here, right? That's what I
23	wanted I want to understand if I'm hearing
24	you right. There has been two opinions here.
25	And I obviously, I know that it's obvious,

but I just want to make sure that I understand 2 the majority one, the one that is not in favor 3 of a braider license at this time, correct? 4 that what I'm hearing? 5 (No verbal responses given.) MS. POWELL: Mr. Walker, do you want to 6 7 take comment? I'd like to know how many school 8 owners are out there. That was a question, but 9 I would like for the school owners that are out 10 there -- let's get a number on them and ask if 11 they do braiding in their facilities. 12 MR. WALKER: Well, let's -- those who are 13 in favor, I would ask you to remember to speak 14 separately, one for and one against, and go 15 down until everyone has had an opportunity to 16 speak. If you're in favor of this proposal, 17 please, raise your hand. State your name and 18 if you're a school owner or practitioner, if 19 you would, please. 20 MS. AKARD: I don't know that I'm in favor 21 22 MR. WALKER: Could you state your name, 23 please? 24 MS. AKARD: Tracy Akard, --25 MR. WALKER: And the --

MS. AKARD: -- Hot Springs Beauty College.

MR. WALKER: And we're doing comments in favor of that now.

MS. AKARD: Well, I -- I don't know that it's for or against, it was just she was asking about schools teaching it, and then -- then Veda Traylor said about schools, whether they would teach it.

We're a Pivot Point School. We have a book, a separate set of books in our set, and one of them is long hair. We do teach braiding. We probably spend 20 hours teaching braiding — just braiding. I have four instructors. Only two of us, myself and one other instructor, are proficient in actually teaching braiding. I wouldn't even consider teaching a course and taking people in just braiding. It would be — it just would not be profitable. It would be very difficult to take students to just teach them braiding. I would not — I would not offer that curriculum in my school.

MR. WALKER: Okay.

MS. AKARD: We would have the license available, but I would not offer that

curriculum in my school, just because I would 2 not have the staff available to take one 3 student, or maybe two students, a year that 4 would be interested in that type of curriculum. 5 So I don't know that I'm opposed in offering the license, I just would not offer that 6 7 course. 8 (Multiple conversations taking place at 9 once.) 10 MR. WALKER: Let's have a show of hands of 11 the school owners. If you are a school owner, 12 just raise your hand. If you identify yourself 13 as a school owner, please, raise your hand. 14 (Show of hands.) 15 MR. WALKER: If you teach braiding, can 16 you keep your hand up? 17 (Pause.) 18 MR. WALKER: As part of the cosmetology 19 curriculum. 20 (Pause.) 21 MR. WALKER: Okay. Now, I'll go back and 22 do -- if you are in favor of the proposal. 23 believe there's a hand in the back row. If you 24 would, identify yourself to the committee and 25 to the board, please.

25

MS. JONES: Carla Jones, and I represent Arthur's Beauty College. When you first talked about the natural hair curriculum -- I don't remember what location we were in for the meeting, we went back immediately and got our curriculum together at the school. I think there ought to be a specialty course, because just like Ms. Traylor was saying, you teach manicuring as a specialty off of cosmetology. You have electrology and you have aesthetics. I think there ought to be at least 600 hours. I think they ought to do sanitation and sterilization just like everybody else. can get the guidelines from the other courses that we have for all the other things, and then the rest of them be put into whatever they're going to do on braiding. And as far as the instructors, when we get an instructor's license it says that we are able to teach any phase of cosmetology or hair, skin, or make-up. So we can't -- if we can't teach braiding, we need to learn how to teach it. And then also, it's just like with the nail techs and the aesthetics, I think that once we do get the course started that we ought to have a -- where

1	the instructors that want to do it, can do it -
2	- can do a specialty license in a specialty
3	course on manicuring, the same as that, on
4	hair-braiding. I think it ought to be offered,
5	and if the schools don't want to teach it, then
6	don't offer the course, you know, they have
7	that option.
8	(Pause.)
9	MR. WALKER: Okay. I'll take a comment
10	from someone who is against this
11	recommendation.
12	MS. LEE: I'm just a little confused. I
13	thought only school owners were asked to
14	MR. WALKER: No.
15	MS. LEE: make comments.
16	MR. WALKER: No. Anyone can comment,
17	MS. JONES: It's not just for school
18	owners here.
19	MS. LEE: But I'm just trying to get a
20	clarification,
21	MR. WALKER: It's probably not
22	MS. LEE: Are you asking school owners or
23	instructors or
24	MS. JONES: I'm representing Arthur's.
25	MR. WALKER: No. That was

	
1	MS. LEE: Representing
2	MR. WALKER: Somebody wanted to know who,
3	who owns a school that teaches hair-braiding
4	already, so I had them raise their hands.
5	MS. JONES: I'm here representing Arthur's
6	School.
7	MS. LEE: But you're not a school owner.
8	MR. WALKER: I'm sorry.
9	MS. LEE: Is it school owners only or
10	MS. JONES: I'm representing Arthur's.
11	MS. LEE: anyone from the audience?
12	MR. WALKER: It's for anyone that wants to
13	speak.
14	MS. LEE: Oh, okay. Good.
15	MS. JONES: Thank you.
16	MR. WALKER: Anyone.
17	(Pause.)
18	MS. THOMAS: My name is Margaret Thomas,
19	and I am a school owner. I do braiding. I
20	feel that I should be given or anybody else
21	who wants to do this, should be given the
22	option themselves. I am a strong believer in
23	the sanitation. We can go into a number of
24	homes where they're doing hair in their homes.
25	And we're trying to get this out of their

25

homes, to teach them the proper way for them to do it. And if we don't do something, a lot of our cosmetology students coming out of school won't find a job because these people are taking them to their homes. So I'm a strong believer in, if you don't want to do it, you don't do it, but if you do, please, be allowed to do so. I, too, am a NACAAS evaluator and yes, I agree with Nick. I've gone out and I've seen some very poor curricula. They don't teach, maybe ten hours of sanitation and disinfection. I agree with Nick, but that does not mean that Arkansas is going to have a curriculum like that. We can make our curriculum to the point that if they don't think they can do it, don't come into that course. We, as school owners, should be able to talk to these people and make them understand what the requirements are before they enroll in this course. And I don't think -- most states it's a hundred, maybe a hundred and fifty hour course. What can you learn in a hundred and only fifty hours and teach in that course?

(Pause.)

1	MR. WALKER: Is anyone against this
2	proposal?
3	MS. COTTON: Tamara Cotton, Arkansas
4	Beauty School, Conway. I disagree, because
5	what LaJoy and like Mr. Nick says, it's in the
6	curriculum, if they want to specialize in that.
7	If we start breaking it down, next it'll be
8	hair color. They'll just want a license to do
9	hair color, or relaxers, or whatever the case
10	may be. I just think there's pretty soon
11	we'd have no cosmetology course. It's all
12	specialty courses. So I'm against it.
13	MR. WALKER: And just to be fair, there
14	were two in favor initially, so I'll take one
15	more against and then go back to the for and
16	against. Is there anyone else against it?
17	(Pause.)
18	MR. WALKER: If you could stand.
19	(Pause.)
20	MR. WALKER: You, on the front row.
21	MS. BLAND: Oh, I guess. I'm sorry. As a
22	licensed cosmetologist
23	MR. WALKER: Could you identify yourself
24	for the record?
25	MS. BLAND: Pat Bland. I'm also an
	II

inspector for the State Board, but as a licensed cosmetologist I see and hear of braiders all over our state, as well can all attest to. I don't believe offering a course is going to bring these people in to a school. They're making so much money now it's not going to worry -- I mean, they are not worried about coming to a school to take a course in braiding. And they certainly aren't going to pay for it, but that's just my perspective.

MR. DOWNEY: Good point.

MS. BLAND: They already know how to braid. They're not going to use sanitation. They are sitting at their kitchen table. They are making money, money, -- cutting the rest of us out. But I don't see that offering a specialized course is going to bring them forward.

MR. WALKER: Okay. Is anyone else in favor of this proposal?

(Pause.)

MR. WALKER: Okay.

MS. HUGHES: Jenita Hughes, from Newport.

I'm in favor of it because like she said,

people are working in the home doing it, and

it's cutting us out. Braiding is a big moneymaking venture. I wouldn't be able to offer it
to my -- in my school because of where my
school is, but I do teach it. And like she
said, a lot of them that do it already know how
to do it. So you know, like the instructors
not being -- not qualified, you know, since
there's a lot of guidance, you know, and
cooperation that goes on in a class. But I
think if we start now getting Arkansas to
realize they need to go out in a salon and kind
of start feeding the next generation into the
salons, we'll get them out of the kitchen. I
think that would be a step forward in turning
them into a professional. Thank you.

MR. WALKER: Any comments against this proposal?

MS. COTTON: Well, I just have another thing to say about that, because I want to go back to, like, if someone chose, you know, later on maybe a few years we'll be back to hear on a hair-curling license or something. But what do we do now with our students that want to specialize in one area? I have students, they don't want to do pedicures and

1	they don't want to do this and that while
2	they're in school. They just want to do
3	haircuts and hair color, but cosmetology school
4	is for all of it. That's what we teach. And
5	the student that wants to specialize in one
6	certain area of cosmetology, will take
7	additional classes and education. It's just
8	like, I have students that do specialized
9	braiding classes, because that's what they want
10	to do, but they also use the rest of it while
11	they're in school. So it's like it's picking
12	and again, it's picking and choosing what
13	you want to specialize in. This is real
14	cosmetology.
15	MR. WALKER: Does anyone else want to
16	comment in favor of this proposal?
17	(Pause.)
18	MR. WALKER: Any final comments against
19	this proposal?
20	(Pause.)
21	MR. WALKER: At this time, I guess, it's
22	up for further discussion of that or motions or
23	
24	(Pause.)
25	MR. KEENE: Well, I'd say the difference

23

24

25

here in fragmenting this one out is that there is a national exam on this. There's not one on haircoloring, and chemical relaxing, and polishing fingernails. If there were one, then maybe it would -- I think that would be a good argument. I've never been one that wanted to fragment licenses either. I thought that it puts an undue burden on our office, on our inspectors, but it's happened. It's going on out there. We're experiencing it in this state now, with them coming here trying to work. think that it's something that has to really be considered. And still, the schools still have the choice of whether or not to offer the course or not. We have how many schools in this state, and how many of them offer electrology, yet we're offering that license.

MR. WALKER: Any other comments from board members?

MR. DOWNEY: I've got one comment.

Everybody is holding NIC up as the icon of -whatever NIC does, is right.

MS. TRAYLOR: Yeah.

MR. DOWNEY: NIC will develop a test for anything that's required. If we wanted to do a

fingernail painting course, they'd develop a 2 test for us because they're in the process --3 they're in the business of selling tests. 4 just because they offer a braiding course, --5 well, I mean, a test, the only reason they do is because the state of Ohio opened up braiding 6 7 and they developed it primarily for the state 8 of Ohio in the beginning and just anybody else 9 that wanted to fall into it. But just because 10 NIC offers a test, that doesn't mean that we 11 have to go with that license because they've 12 got other tests, you know, that we don't even 13 It's a choice of the state what tests they 14 want to do, not what NIC offers. 15 MR. WALKER: Any further comments from board members? 16 17 (Pause.) 18 MR. WALKER: Ms. Powell, I quess we're 19 ready for a motion. 20 MS. POWELL: I would request a motion for 21 the Scopes of Practice: Natural Hair-Braiding 22 Services. 23 (Pause.) 24 MS. POWELL: Did we identify this as

25

natural hair? Okay. On Scopes of Practice:

1	Natural Hair-Braiding Services, do I have a
2	motion?
3	MS. GORDON: What are you looking for a
4	motion for?
5	MS. POWELL: Uh
6	MR. KEENE: For us to accept it or to deny
7	it.
8	(Pause.)
9	MR. KEENE: I mean, if there's no motion -
10	_
11	MS. GORDON: I make a motion that we deny
12	the development of a specialty course. Is that
13	what you're asking for?
14	MS. POWELL: Yes, ma'am.
15	MS. GORDON: In the specialties of natural
16	hair or braiding hair in the beauty schools
17	licensing for this purpose.
18	MS. POWELL: I have a motion.
19	MS. TURMAN: Second.
20	MS. POWELL: I have a second to deny the
21	Scope of Practice: Natural Hair-Braiding
22	Services Program.
23	MS. GORDON: Uh-huh.
24	MS. POWELL: All those in favor, raise
25	your right hand.

(Show of hands.) 2 MS. POWELL: All those opposed? 3 (Show of hands. Two in opposition.) 4 MS. POWELL: Okay. We have two opposed 5 and we have one abstention. Veda Traylor abstained. 6 7 MS. TRAYLOR: Because I don't know which 8 side of the fence I would fall off on. 9 MS. POWELL: Motion carries. 10 (Pause.) 11 MS. POWELL: That's right, isn't it? 12 MR. WALKER: Yes. It takes five to pass. 13 MS. POWELL: Okay. Five to pass. 14 motion passes. 15 SCOPES OF PRACTICE: LASER USE 16 MS. WITTUM: Okay. The next one is Scopes 17 of Practice: Laser Use. The recommendation is 18 to develop quidelines based on the expertise of 19 the National Coalition of Esthetics Association 20 and incorporate those into the board's rules. 21 The recommendation includes using language that 22 Colorado is currently using in their state 23 concerning the classification of machines. 24 that, licensed cosmetologists and aestheticians 25 would be permitted to use any Class I device,

which would be electrolysis, red light LED and microdermabrasion, provided that the devices 3 are registered with the FDA. 4 Class II devices such as IPLs, blue light 5 LED, and lasers would not be allowed, as they are more invasive and present a greater risk of 6 7 injury. We'd also make available to the 8 practitioner information about the FDA's 9 website for more information about 10 classification and manufacturer's product 11 numbers would be available. 12 The committee favored this by majority 13 with a 3-0 vote. 14 (Pause.) 15 MS. WITTUM: Are there any questions? 16 MS. GORDON: I just need it explained a 17 little bit more in detail as to exactly what 18 we're saying here, because --19 MS. WITTUM: Which one? 20 MS. GORDON: The recommendations, where 21 you said the recommendation is the same as 22 Colorado concerning the classifications of 23 machines. 24 MS. WITTUM: Uh-huh. 25 MS. GORDON: So licensed cosmetologists

1	and aestheticians would be permitted to use any
2	Class I device?
3	MS. WITTUM: Right. All
4	MS. GORDON: The same as the electrologist
5	is using, is that what you're saying?
6	MS. WITTUM: No.
7	MS. GORDON: Okay. Then that's what
8	MS. WITTUM: The the Class I devices
9	are not laser, or not classified as a laser
10	machine. They are not considered to be as
11	invasive as the others. As you go up in class,
12	you go up in risk of safety.
13	MS. GORDON: So what are we saying here,
14	that they will be able to use Class II?
15	MS. WITTUM: They'll be able to use Class
16	I. The Class II devices and the assorted Class
17	III devices that are out there, they would not
18	be able to use those.
19	MS. GORDON: I've got you. Thank you.
20	MS. WARD: How are you going to ensure
21	that they have training in this other
22	equipment?
23	MS. WITTUM: It's not our responsibility
24	to make sure they have the training. It's our
25	responsibility to make sure they're only using

which would be the Class I devices. Now, it's my understanding from Colorado that when their inspectors go out they check to see if it's a Class I device. They also check to see if the machine and the manufacturer that that machine was purchased from is registered with the FDA. If they are then the licensed cosmetologist and the aesthetician are okay to use that machine. But it if's a Class II device or if the machine or manufacturer is not registered with the FDA, then they are brought before the board for disciplinary action.

MS. WARD: If you have somebody that says, well, I have a cosmetology license. I can use the microdermabrasion -- for instance, and they have no training in it, they could cause damage to somebody's skin. And that's not protecting the consumer. I don't think -- is there any way you can kind of regulate that where we ask them, I mean, to have something that shows that they have training to use the equipment?

MS. WITTUM: We could consider having -- requiring training. The only thing that I would -- I would hesitate on is that some of

the manufacturers that they purchased those machines from may not require the same number of training hours for their machines. And then what are you going to do?

MS. WARD: Well, if they have a certificate or something saying they've been trained in it, not saying that they have so many hours in it. Just saying they've been trained in it, you know, something showing that they've had some type of training.

MS. WITTUM: Okay. We could certainly incorporate that into it, as well.

MS. WARD: That would go to protecting the public from anybody just saying, oh, I can do this because I'm licensed as a cosmetologist, yet I don't have any idea what I am doing.

That would be a protection and would be safer than doing nothing.

MS. POWELL: I have a question on the Class I device -- such as electrolysis, it says here. Have you checked on the classifications of the electrolysis equipment?

MS. WITTUM: No.

MS. POWELL: And if this Class I device is an electrolysis piece of equipment, it would

then allow the cosmetologist and aesthetician to practice hair removal with an electrolysis machine; is that correct, if it's a Class I? 3 MS. WITTUM: If it's a Class I, yes. 4 5 would need to make sure that we do not cross the line into the electrology scope of practice 6 7 for the --8 MS. ANDERSON: May I say something? May I 9 make a comment? 10 (Pause.) 11 MS. POWELL: At this time, --12 MS. TRAYLOR: I think we have people out 13 there wanting to talk. 14 MS. POWELL: Okay. Well, if Mr. Walker 15 doesn't --16 MR. WALKER: Do any of the board members 17 have any questions before we open it up for a session with the audience? 18 19 (Pause.) 20 MR. WALKER: Okay. 21 MS. ANDERSON: I'm Patricia Anderson, from 22 Mellie's in Ft. Smith. This is a big area in 23 our area and we have lots of people doing 24 lasering -- a massage therapist, two are 25 aestheticians. We have an talented

25

electrologist in the area. You know, the law came out in June at the time I had my new school and took over. So of course, that all caught up with me about July/August. So people have been flooding my school and asking questions to clarify the law. When I clarified the law, that would be the salon owners that came in. I called the State Board, and I asked them to clarify the law. When you say this Class I electrolysis machine -- any Class I machine, you need to really know what you're using. Yes, you need to be certified on it. There are certification to take, but you also can do very extensive damage if it's not used properly. Yes, it is an electrolysis, because it does remove hair. So Class I -electrolysis, that word does fit into the category because of the definition of lasering because the lasering removes hair. The types of hair, the parts of the body where it's removed at -- yes, you've got all the above. And, yes, it can do extensive damage if they do not know what they're doing. The practitioner then takes on that liability. In our city, we have lots of practitioners who are doing this

and it is -- it definitely needs to be clarified, but you also need to know what you're clarifying before you clarify it.

Class II is medical. So you have your medical dermatologists. Well, you can't cross the line and go into the med/massage. You have people teaching dermabrasion, and you have all these categories, and before you can really make this a law, you need to know exactly what you're clarifying is my point of view on it.

MR. WALKER: Okay. Yes, ma'am.

MS. GULLEY: I'm Brenda Gulley, from Hair
Tech Beauty College. I teach electrolysis and
I also work as one. And if they're putting
that in -- I'm like her, when they're putting
that in a number one category, they're
requiring 600 hours. So when they put this up
here, electrolysis, I think we're really asking
for something to happen.

(Pause.)

MS. WITTUM: It is that you just -- you don't agree with having the electrolysis in there, or do you not agree --

MS. GULLEY: I don't know if it's part of it.

MS. WITTUM: It falls in the Class I, from 2 what I understand. 3 MS. ANDERSON: It still does electrolysis 4 It is doing the same -- it's giving 5 the same benefit as electrolysis. MS. WITTUM: Right. But what I'm trying 6 7 to understand is are -- do you disagree with 8 classes -- with us going to the classification 9 guidelines, or is it that you disagree with 10 having electrolysis within that Class I? 11 MS. GULLEY: I don't think we need 12 electrolysis in the Class I for cosmetology or 13 just would be removed from the class. 14 MS. WITTUM: Okay. Well, it's my 15 understanding that the electrolysis -- has 16 other regulations than ours falls into the 17 Class I category. 18 MS. GULLEY: And the laser, also, -- I 19 mean, I've had people that have maybe left 20 thinking that the laser is better. But then 21 I've had people -- you wouldn't think this, but 22 they come back with a bad, bad burn. 23 that's, like, when they're going into the 24 medical office with supposedly trained 25 technicians who've got a weekend or two of

1	training, which I understand that they would do
2	better if it was a longer training course, but
3	
4	MS. ANDERSON: Probably we're talking
5	about training and certifications for this,
6	that's really all it is. It's a weekend where
7	someone goes to a training seminar and gets a
8	certificate that says they're trained. It's
9	not necessarily hands-on. They're shown how to
10	use the machine. So they're really not trained
11	as you would consider trained.
12	MR. WALKER: You're talking about in a
13	medical doctor situation, correct?
14	MS. ANDERSON: We're talking about any
15	type of
16	MS. POWELL: Manufacturer's
17	MS. ANDERSON: manufacturer's training.
18	And that's what most of our practitioners in
19	the field have.
20	(Pause.)
21	MR. WALKER: Are there any other comments
22	from the audience?
23	(Pause.)
24	MR. WALKER: I think it's the proper time
25	to give it to the board to discuss it further

and make a motion.

MS. POWELL: Okay. Then I just want to make sure that I understand the intent of this where it states, "...licensed cosmetologist and aestheticians would be permitted to use any Class I device, such as electrolysis --" that they currently are not licensed to do electrolysis, so where does this language -- to include this language here in this, this would allow cosmetologists and aestheticians to use a Class I device to permanently remove hair?

MS. WITTUM: Yes. But what we may want to do is to allow them to use the Class I devices such as red light LED and microdermabrasion, and exclude the electrolysis from there. I would incorporate changes.

MS. POWELL: I believe that we do need -I know the board has visited this issue before
trying to create language in the scope of
practice for the aesthetician, which naturally
involves the cosmetologist. And what one does,
the other does. So therefore, I would
recommend that any language relating to
electrolysis be stricken from this, and that we
would define language for Class I machines for

the cosmetologists and aestheticians. And I believe that the board in the past has always 3 honored the FDA approval of Class I and Class 4 II machinery, and it's recommended usage being 5 medical devices or non-medical devices. So do we need to have, maybe a motion to -- if there 6 7 is any -- see if there is a motion to clean up 8 any language on this or do we need to handle 9 this as it is, with proposed language? 10 MR. WALKER: You -- we amended the first 11 one. We can amend this, as well. And these 12 are very malleable in terms of what we're 13 presenting and what can be finalized. Again, 14 this is not a matter of rule nor a regulation 15 being passed right now. 16 MS. POWELL: So we, --17 MR. WALKER: That would be your --18 MS. WITTUM: And one thing --19 MR. WALKER: -- change --20 MS. WITTUM: One thing that we also need 21 to remember is the position that Barbara had to 22 incorporate training language in there, as 23 well. 24 MS. POWELL: Right. 25 MS. TRAYLOR: I think the word

electrolysis should be stricken from any of
this because they are a separate entity.
BOARD MEMBERS: We don't want to confuse
the different programs.
MS. TRAYLOR: That's right. And so many
of them are out there thinking they can do
electrology now, and I'd just like to see the
word electrolysis stricken from this.
MS. WITTUM: Well, we would have to
specifically exclude it because the FDA
classifies the electrolysis, red light LED, and
microdermabrasion as Class I devices. So we
we would need to
MS. TRAYLOR: It can be a Class I device
and still the aesthetician not be able to use
it.
MS. WITTUM: Yeah. We would have to
specifically say that they cannot use that one.
MS. POWELL: Right. Is that a motion?
MS. TRAYLOR: Yes.
MS. POWELL: I have a motion, do I have a
second?
MR. DOWNEY: Second.
MS. POWELL: I have a motion and a second
to strike the language "electrolysis" from the

1	proposed Scope of Practice: Laser Use.
2	MS. WITTUM: Is that including the
3	training?
4	MR. WALKER: We haven't gotten that far.
5	MS. WITTUM: Okay.
6	MS. POWELL: All those in favor, raise
7	your hand?
8	(Show of hands.)
9	MS. POWELL: All those of opposed?
10	(None opposed.)
11	MS. GORDON: I'm abstaining.
12	MS. POWELL: We have one abstention.
13	MS. GORDON: I don't think I have a good
14	understanding of this.
15	MS. POWELL: The motion carries.
16	BOARD MEMBER: Let's take a little break.
17	MS. POWELL: First, let's finish this
18	right here. I think I'm going to need a motion
19	to include training in this Scope of Practice:
20	Laser Use. Do I hear a motion to include
21	training in the language in Scope of Practice:
22	Laser Use?
23	(Pause.)
24	MS. POWELL: Okay. Let's
25	MR. KEENE: I'll make the motion. I move

1	that a certification or proof of training on
2	the device be presented to the inspectors upon
3	request.
4	MS. POWELL: Okay. I have a motion to
5	include training in the language in the Scope
6	of Practice: Laser Use.
7	MS. TURMAN: I second.
8	MS. POWELL: And a second. All those in
9	favor, raise your right hand.
10	(Show of hands.)
11	MS. POWELL: All those opposed?
12	(No opposition. One abstention.)
13	MS. POWELL: None opposed. One
14	abstention. The motion carries.
15	MR. WALKER: Now we need to vote on the
16	whole thing.
17	MS. POWELL: Board, with the language
18	change striking "electrolysis" and the training
19	issues being met in the language, can I have a
20	motion on the Scope of Practice: Laser Use as
21	presented with the amendments?
22	MR. KEENE: I'll move that we accept the
23	proposed amendments and the recommendation by
24	the committee on the Scopes of Practice: Laser
25	Use.

1	MS. PICKERING: I second that.
2	MS. POWELL: I have a motion and a second.
3	All those in favor, raise your right hand.
4	(Show of hands.)
5	MS. GORDON: I'm abstaining.
6	MS. POWELL: All those opposed?
7	(No opposition. One abstention.)
8	MS. POWELL: None opposed and one
9	abstention. That motion carries.
10	MS. GULLEY: Thank you, Board.
11	MR. WALKER: Let's I have a little
12	after 10:15. We'll take a short break. Is it
13	all right if we reconvene here right at 10:30?
14	(Multiple conversations taking place at
15	once.)
16	MS. POWELL: We'll be in recess until
17	10:30.
18	(WHEREUPON, a short break was taken at
19	10:15 a.m., after which proceedings resumed at
20	10:30 a.m. as follows, to-wit:)
21	MS. POWELL: The meeting will come to
22	order. I want to remind everyone to be sure
23	that your electronic devices are turned off to
24	non-disturbing modes. Mr. Walker?
25	MR. WALKER: We're just going to proceed

through all of the items that were on today's agenda as recommendations. I would ask Ms. Wittum to continue with the Instructors --3 4 number five. 5 INSTRUCTOR ISSUES: MANICURISTS/AESTHETICIANS TO QUALIFY FOR INSTRUCTOR COURSE OF STUDY 6 7 MS. WITTUM: The recommendation is to 8 9

modify A.C.A. 17-26-410 to allow all licensees to qualify for entrance into the instructor course of study. Language would be included to specify that an instructor shall not teach outside his/her course of study and that cosmetology schools must offer cosmetology whether they include the specialty courses or not. The committee favored this recommendation with a 3-0 vote. Is there anyone from the committee that would like to comment on this one?

(Pause.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. WITTUM: If not, are there questions from the board members?

(Pause.)

MS. WITTUM: Okay.

MR. WALKER: With no comments coming from the board, we'll proceed to anyone in the

> Teresa Iden, CCR Mabelvale, Arkansas 72103

audience who is against this proposal. 2 (Pause.) MR. WALKER: Yes, ma'am. 3 MS. AKARD: Tracy Akard, Hot Springs 4 5 Beauty College. I wonder if we're aren't lowering our standards by allowing others than 6 7 cosmetologists to instruct? My concern also, 8 is that others -- manicurist/aesthetics 9 instructors being left at the school besides 10 the cosmetologist. That may be taking 11 advantage -- a manicurist instructor or 12 aesthetician instructor may be left at the 13 school when it really needs to be a 14 cosmetologist instructor that needs to be at 15 the school. And that's a concern, but I feel 16 like it's truly lowering our standards. 17 MR. WALKER: Okay. 18 (Pause.) 19 MS. ANDERSON: I wasn't against it. 20 just have a question. 21 MR. WALKER: Yes, ma'am. 22 MS. ANDERSON: If you had a school that 23 taught cosmetology and you wanted to do a 24 secondary school in another location in the 25 state, is it all sites teaching cosmetology or

can you just teach aesthetics? MS. WITTUM: I believe you have to teach 3 cosmetology. 4 (Pause.) 5 MR. WALKER: Are there any other comments against this proposal from the audience? 6 7 (Pause.) 8 MR. WALKER: If not, I guess the board can 9 make any further comments or questions and then 10 take a motion. 11 MS. GORDON: And when you say all 12 licensees to qualify for entry into the 13 instructors course. That means a person that's 14 licensed as a cosmetologist, right, and not a 15 nail-tech or a manicurist? 16 MS. WITTUM: No, everyone. Currently --17 currently A.C.A. 17-26-410 says that only a cosmetologist can go through the instructor 18 19 course. 20 MS. GORDON: So now --21 MS. WITTUM: Modifying it in this way 22 would take out that restriction so that any 23 licensed manicurist, aesthetician, or 24 cosmetologist would be able to go through the 25 instructor course.

MS. GORDON: Thank you. 2 (Multiple comments being made by board 3 members.) MR. KEENE: Well, I think Tracy brought up 4 5 -- I think Tracy brought up a good point. would not want to see cosmo students being left 6 7 unsupervised -- or supervised only by a 8 manicure or aesthetician instructor. Now, when 9 this is written I would like to see something 10 specified that a supervising instructor needs 11 to at least be a cosmo instructor. 12 MR. DOWNEY: That's already presently in 13 our law for them to be a licensed cosmetology instructor over a school. What we need add is 14 15 that the individual that is left in charge of 16 students should be a cosmetologist. 17 MS. PICKERING: I agree. MS. GORDON: So, tell me again what you 18 19 said. 20 MS. PICKERING: It's already in it. 21 MS. GORDON: In this, though, is that a 22 person can be a manicurist and come back to 23 school and be trained to be an instructor to a 24 cosmetology student? 25 MS. WITTUM: No. Just in their specific

ı	, ,
1	field.
2	MS. GORDON: Okay. That's what I needed
3	to understand.
4	MR. DOWNEY: They would also only be able
5	to work in a school that offers cosmetology.
6	MR. KEENE: That's the what it says right
7	now.
8	MS. GORDON: Okay. I got it.
9	MR. DOWNEY: The school has to offer
10	cosmetology.
11	MS. GORDON: Okay.
12	MR. DOWNEY: In other words, we're not
13	going to have an influx of nails-only schools
14	or skin-only schools. We would still maintain
15	cosmetology schools and they could teach a
16	specialty course with licensed aesthetician or
17	manicurist instructors in the school.
18	MS. GORDON: And is that to be done in a
19	cosmetology school?
20	(Members of the audience begin making
21	multiple comments during board discussion, and
22	attempting to request recognition for the
23	floor.)
24	MR. WALKER: I'm going to do this one
25	time, though, because I have closed the floor,

and when we close comments to the audience, we can't keep having them back and forth, or we'd just go on indefinitely on about it. But I will take this one comment, then for future use, if you have any comment to be made on this, please, do so whenever I solicit them from the audience. Yes, ma'am?

(Pause.)

MS. AKARD: Okay. Well, she was saying that they couldn't teach a cosmetology student, but that would go on.

MR. KEENE: Of course not.

MS. AKARD: I mean, that -- that absolutely would go on. That nail-tech would too be teaching that cosmetologist. And you know absolutely that would be going on, and that's my opposition. That manicurist is not only going to be teaching that manicuring student, but the others. This would be going on and we're fooling ourselves if we think that it wouldn't be going on. That manicurist -- that would be the perfect world that she would only be teaching the manicurists, but when it came time to -- to other things it would definitely happen. And that's why I'm saying

that we would be lowering our standards, lowering our students. And not only because we think that they would be teaching just the manicurist -- I keep saying it, but it would happen. It would happen.

MS. WITTUM: Well, let me just point out that in my mind the manicurist instructor would be able to teach the manicuring phase for a cosmo student. They wouldn't be able to cross the line of their course of study and teach hair or skin. They should stay within their own particular course of study, regardless of which kind of student is out there.

MS. COTTON: I just want to make a comment, also, because I'm thinking about this and the reality -- I mean, when I hire an instructor or pay one, I want them to be costeffective for me to be able to teach everything. So you might want to think about that. If you're just -- how many manicurists do you get if you're just going to pay the person's salary to come in and teach an hour class or something. I don't see it.

MS. WITTUM: I would like to just point out some things. The comments that were made

during the regional meetings were that there are some schools who would be interested in having only a manicurist instructor to be able to teach that particular portion of classes in their school, or the aesthetics to teach the skin portion. When I was at the conference in Maine, I specifically asked about other states and whether or not they restrict their instructor course to only a licensed cosmetologist. From what I could tell, Arkansas is the only state that has that restriction.

MS. TRAYLOR: Uh-huh.

MS. WITTUM: Other states do allow their manicurist and their aestheticians to go through the instructor course, just like anyone else. The instructor course, as far as NIC is concerned, is not restricted to just a cosmetologist. That is only through our restrictions that it's been closed. So if there are some schools who want to allow a manicurist to be a -- a sole instructor, then they should have that option to be able to do so. And I understand from a business standpoint, that might not be the most

7

6

10 11

9

1213

1415

16

17

18 19

20

2122

23

24

25

profitable choice, but it's not for me -- and it shouldn't be for this board, to say what any one school should choose to do. If that option is available, any one of you can choose to either do it or not do it.

MR. DOWNEY: In these regional meetings, some of the school owners reasoning for doing this was to free up their cosmetology instructors, because they said that if they could get, you know, if they had someone that could come in just to teach nails that their cosmetology instructors wouldn't be pulled for two or three students. Or you know, if they've got a big enough course of study and students enrolled --if they've got a big enough -- of course, aesthetics is growing. And if they've got a big enough class they can hire them full time and it would not affect their cosmetology instructor. As it is now most of them are just pulling a cosmetology instructors away from the other students in order to, if they're a small school, in order to have that specialty course. So that was one of the concerns that was voiced at the regional meetings -- or district meetings is that it would allow them to be able

to hire one instructor to free up a cosmetology instructor. That's just another point of view. 3 MS. WARD: How many hours would you 4 require for the manicurist or aesthetician 5 instructor course of study? MS. WITTUM: The instructor course is 600 6 7 hours. It would not change. 8 MS. WARD: Okay. 9 MS. POWELL: So it would be the same 10 instructor course for anyone, whether it's a 11 nail-tech, a cosmetologist, an aesthetician, or 12 an electrologist. It would be taking that one 13 instructor test and then in whatever you were 14 licensed in, you would be qualified to teach it 15 once you pass the instructor examination. 16 MS. TURMAN: So this would be offering the 17 schools a choice if they wanted to send their -18 19 MS. PICKERING: Right. 20 MS. TURMAN: -- nail-techs to -- so that 21 they can have that instructor just for nail-22 tech only if this board chooses? 23 MS. POWELL: Right. 24 MS. TURMAN: Well, let's just say that we 25 offered them a choice and the inspectors found

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that they were teaching cosmo when they should only be teaching nails, then repercussions would be the same if they were -- if they violated that.

MS. POWELL: Right.

MS. WITTUM: Well, I think --

MS. POWELL: I think I'd like to ask what -- what we would do in the event that a school were to hire a -- they have to have a cosmo instructor there and a nail-tech instructor and they're both licensed instructors. teacher leaves and the nail-tech instructor is left there. Would -- what kind of security measures would we be able to have or implement that if that -- that nail-tech instructor would not -- or aesthetician instructor, would not be able to facilitate cosmetology program text that day when she just happened to be left there, but she would be able to cover health and safety, salon business, shop deportment, manicuring, advanced topics in nail art, and all of the curriculum that she would be licensed for. My concern is what would happen during that day if left with a specialty program instructor only?

25

MS. TRAYLOR: She would be doing all the classes. MS. WITTUM: Language could be added to 3 4 require the schools to not allow any instructor 5 to remain on campus unless they've got -- I mean, not to allow any instructor to leave 6 7 without making sure that a suitable instructor is left to monitor the students that that 8 9 instructor was there for. 10 MS. POWELL: Well, I think that you have 11 here, "...included to specify that an 12 instructor shall not teach outside his/her 13 course of study and that cosmetology schools 14 must offer cosmetology whether they include the 15 specialty courses or not." I'd like to be able 16 to see the language that a cosmetology 17 instructor be on premises at all times or --18 MS. WITTUM: Well, and that's what was 19 said by Cliff and Nick already that the school 20 supervisor, or the school adminis -- or that 21 the school instructor on premises has to be a 22 licensed cosmetologist. 23 MS. POWELL: Okay. I'm sorry if I --24 MR. KEENE: They said it was already in 25 the law anyway, but I can see the scenario

1 happening of the cosmo instructor, you know, 2 that their child was in a car wreck or something and they had to leave suddenly and 3 4 then just left a specialty instructor there. 5 would think that either they would --MR. DOWNEY: They would get someone to 6 7 come in. 8 MR. KEENE: Or they would just clock the 9 students out and shut the school down. 10 MS. POWELL: Well, they would do the same 11 as they would do right now without a 12 cosmetology instructor. I think the same --13 the same protocol should be considered. MR. WALKER: We could reference -- I don't 14 15 know the statute number off the top of my head, 16 but the one that Mr. Downey had mentioned in 17 this recommendation, we --MS. WITTUM: A.C.A. 17-26-409. 18 19 MR. WALKER: --409? We could say as 20 applied already as 409, so that would already 21 be covered. You wouldn't have to re-write it. 22 An easy solution if somebody wants to amend it 23 to that and make a recommendation to go 24 forward, I think, would be the way to proceed. 25 (Pause.)

1	MS. POWELL: Okay. I think that does
2	cover it for the board.
3	MR. WALKER: So you can take a motion at
4	this time at this time, if they want to.
5	MS. POWELL: Okay. Do I have a motion?
6	MS. TRAYLOR: I so move.
7	MS. POWELL: Ms. Traylor?
8	MS. TRAYLOR: I so move.
9	MS. POWELL: Ms. Traylor, are you moving
10	on
11	MR. KEENE: What's she
12	MS. POWELL: I'm unclear on your motion.
13	MS. TRAYLOR: That we are now covered
14	under a cosmetology license that I move
15	that they cannot be left in charge of the
16	school.
17	MR. KEENE: That's already law.
18	MS. POWELL: Okay. That's already in the
19	law. So we're going to
20	MS. POWELL: I need a motion for
21	instructors for manicuring and aesthetics,
22	MR. KEENE: I'll move.
23	MS. POWELL: Mr. Keene.
24	MR. KEENE: I move that we accept the
25	committee's recommendations for the

1	Instructors: Manicuring and Aesthetics
2	accept the committee's
3	MS. POWELL: As it was amended
4	MR. KEENE: Okay.
5	MS. POWELL: and include the 409 as it
6	relates to
7	MR. DOWNEY: With it an addition
8	MS. POWELL: Law 409.
9	MR. KEENE: As it relates to law 409,
10	you said?
11	MS. POWELL: Uh-huh. I have a motion
12	MS. TURMAN: Second.
13	MS. POWELL: and a second, Ms. Turman.
14	All is there any discussion?
15	(Pause.)
16	MS. POWELL: All those in favor, please,
17	raise your hand.
18	(Show of hands.)
19	MS. POWELL: It's unanimous. The motion
20	carries.
21	MR. WALKER: Kathy.
22	STUDENT ISSUES: REGISTRATION CLARIFICATION
23	MS. WITTUM: In number six, Student
24	Issues: Clarify Registration, the
25	recommendation is to modify A.C.A. 17-26-415 to

clarify a student must be enrolled with the board's office prior to accredited course or academic hours being obtained. Language would be included to stipulate the following requirements. The enrollment applications must be accompanied by a photo of the student.

Instructors will have two weeks to submit the enrollment form and required documents. And a student who has completed the registration process and whose information is on file would only have to complete a re-enrollment form instead of having to provide all of the other documentation, and also include the fee and the photograph with the re-enrollment form.

One thing that I would like to clarify
that I'm -- after leaving the legislative
committee meeting last week, I just want to
make sure that the committee understands that
my recommendation is that the students would
not get hours prior to them being enrolled with
the board. So the two week grace period that's
being allowed for the instructors to get the
information to us, the student would not
receive hours during that time-frame, but the
school would not be penalized during that two

1	week period to get the information in to us.
2	MR. KEENE: And this allows for that
3	student to be on premises those two weeks,
4	MS. WITTUM: Right.
5	MR. KEENE: where right now the law
6	MS. WITTUM: Right.
7	MR. KEENE: says they can't.
8	MS. WITTUM: But they won't be able to get
9	hours
10	MR. KEENE: Right.
11	MS. WITTUM: for that two weeks. I
12	just want to make sure that that's clear.
13	(Multiple conversations taking place at
14	once.)
15	MS. WITTUM: Do you-all have any
16	questions,
17	MS. TRAYLOR: You were saying that
18	MS. WITTUM: or comments,
19	MS. TRAYLOR: once a a student must
20	be enrolled for two weeks before they can
21	receive any hours?
22	MS. WITTUM: No.
23	MS. POWELL: No.
24	MS. WITTUM: No, no, no. The students
25	would not would not be receiving any hours

until the enrollment form is in the office and has been processed, but this modification would allow for the schools to have two weeks after the student comes into their school to get that enrollment information into the office without facing a penalty.

MS. POWELL: So the student would be able to be in the school for two weeks without, one, being enrolled; and two, without accruing any hours. They would not accrue hours and they would not be enrolled for up to two weeks before the school would be held responsible with penalties for not properly enrolling, is my understanding of it.

MS. WITTUM: Right. I don't know if that was clear to the committee when we were talking about that last Monday.

(Pause.)

MR. WALKER: Any question or comments?

MS. TRAYLOR: Well, why would a student be there for two weeks that wasn't going to get any hours?

MS. WITTUM: This --

(Multiple conversations taking place at once.)

MS. WITTUM: -- this grace period would -- is mostly for the public schools who have no control over the students who show up into their class at any given time. It would allow them the opportunity to get that information together and get it into the office without facing a penalty if the inspector walked in on the same day that that student happened to show up in class.

MR. WALKER: And maybe Mr. Downey and Ms. Pickering could explain some of what happened in that meeting and how that recommendation came about. I think it was Little Rock.

MS. PICKERING: I think -- I'm pretty sure it was Little Rock. And this particular school owner had students to come in two weeks after they've started school, had not seen in registration forms, not anything. And so to curtail that, we came up with what we're proposing. It was not the public school -- I mean, it was not the private school that was having this problem. It was the public schools. Am I right? It was the public school, not just one, but several of them.

MS. GORDON: Like the vo-techs?

MS. POWELL: Well, I think also --

MS. PICKERING: Thank you, vo-tech. Yes.

MS. POWELL: And I think, also, this was an area of concern for the board committee, and whenever the discussion of this. Our public schools, many times, do not know on enrollment date how many students they would have.

MS. PICKERING: Right.

MS. POWELL: That way they have -- in public schools, they have a certain period of time for that couple of weeks that a student may opt out of one program and decide that they want to go into another program.

MS. PICKERING: Right.

MS. POWELL: And in this way it would give them the opportunity to make this transition and the school not be penalized for a student being in their room un-enrolled and forcing them to have some unique way of having enrollment prior to school starting. This gave them somewhat of a grace period.

MS. PICKERING: And the students from a school -- I'm talking about from a public school or a private school, they can enroll at the age of 16. That was brought out that they

can enroll in a cosmetology school at the age of 16 and take that course and finish by the time they finish high school. So that, you know, that was the concern, too, that they're hours are limited per week, or per month, and someone like, say if I enrolled in a cosmetology school, I would go straight through and get my 1500 hours. We have that school in Earle. We have a school and we have a high school that offers this course as a course of cosmetology, two years or so, three years.

MS. POWELL: So there wouldn't be that renewal process. One time and it would cover the three year program.

MS. TURMAN: Do we have anybody from a state school that would like to address this issue that we're here on? Could we do that?

MR. KEENE: I didn't hear the question.

MS. TURMAN: I'd like to have information from the school.

MS. PICKERING: Well, we've had that in the four -- like the meetings, district meetings, that we had that was discussed from a public school. Did I answer or not?

MS. TURMAN: Yes, you did. (Pause.) 3 MR. WALKER: Any other comments or 4 questions from the board members? 5 (Pause.) MR. WALKER: Any comments from the 6 7 audience? Yes, ma'am. MS. CAUDLE: I'm Sheila Caudle and I'm a 8 9 State Board Inspector and from my standpoint of 10 doing all the schools. I've been responsible 11 for doing all the schools and I think it would 12 be a great idea because those high schools when 13 they start back, it is true. It is a madhouse. 14 They don't know what student's going where or 15 into what course. And they have you here today 16 and gone tomorrow. And I think it would be a 17 great idea for our public schools. 18 MR. WALKER: Any other comments? 19 MS. HUGHES: Jenita Hughes from Newport. 20 I have students that are -- went to the prison 21 and they receive their classification and they 22 get assigned to my class. And so when they are 23 assigned they'll come in and fill out the 24 paperwork, and then we send them back to the 25 barracks for two weeks or however long it takes

to get the permit back so I can get them back in the classroom. So when they're filling out paperwork, I just hand them a book and say read this until you get back. They would much rather be in the classroom for that ten days, waiting, you know, for their permit to get back to me for their permit to get back to me so they can start class. A lot of times you'll get a student and sometimes after two weeks they've already decided they're dropping out because they don't like it. I can give them a heads-up before I started registering their hours.

MR. WALKER: Is anyone in the audience against the proposal?

(Pause.)

MR. WALKER: If not and there are no further questions or comments from the board, then I guess you can take a motion.

MS. POWELL: Is there any discussion or does the board move for a motion?

MR. KEENE: I'll move to approve the recommendation from the committee on Student Issues: Clarifying Registration.

MS. GORDON: Second.

1	MS. POWELL: I have a motion and a second.
2	Is there any discussion?
3	(Pause.)
4	MS. POWELL: All those in favor, please,
5	raise your right hand.
6	(Show of hands.)
7	MS. POWELL: It's unanimous. The motion
8	carries.
9	MR. WALKER: Ms. Wittum.
10	STUDENT ISSUES: LENGTH OF HOURS
11	MS. WITTUM: Number seven is Student
12	Issues: Length of Hours. The recommendation
13	is to delete A.C.A. 17-26-416 and allow a
14	student's hours to be valid indefinitely. Are
15	there any comments from the committee?
16	(Pause.)
17	MS. TURMAN: Does this mean that students
18	can go in and out of courses and if they want
19	to go a year, say six months of this one and
20	then they could wait ten years and come back
21	and pick up where their hours?
22	MS. WITTUM: Their hours would be valid,
23	yes.
24	(Pause.)
25	MR. DOWNEY: Our reasons for recommending

this is primarily any student that goes to a college or university gets credit hours and those hours are good for a lifetime. This is something that a student pays for and if you don't allow them to keep those hours it's just like taking their money away from them. So that's why we recommended that we eliminate A.C.A. 17-26-416 which required that the life of their hours be lost after a period of what, two or three years?

MS. WITTUM: Three years.

MR. DOWNEY: And that's our reason for that recommendation.

MS. GORDON: Well, I would agree with that recommendation as a board member, because in the past I know of a student that had a serious car accident and they lost -- you know, they were not able to attend school. Then right after that they got sick with a real serious tumor or something and they lost those hours. And then she -- like, you know, she was saying I can't go back and start over again because I've lost 700 and something hours. And to me that was an injustice to her, because I knew exactly what was going on but, you know, she

lost those hours. 2 MR. DOWNEY: And another thing, the exam is the final decision on whether they're 3 4 licensed or not. And you might think, well, if 5 they had these 700 hours five years ago, you know, they're not going to know that stuff but 6 7 they still have to go through the exam process 8 and that determines whether they are licensed 9 or not. 10 MS. TURMAN: That would be my concern. 11 (Pause.) 12 MR. WALKER: Any other questions or 13 comments from the board? 14 MS. POWELL: Well, I think Mr. Downey is 15 right. The final say is the exam. It's just 16 as it would be had they acquired the hours to 17 be any professional, they've got to pass a 18 board. They have to pass a test. 19 MR. DOWNEY: That individual may be just 20 as good as one that's been in there the full 21 time, and they can pass the exam. The exam is 22 the determining factor of their proficiency. 23 If they can't pass the exam, it's all for 24 nothing. 25 MR. WALKER: Any comments from the

23

24

25

audience that are against this proposal of being valid as being valid indefinitely? Yes, ma'am.

MS. COTTON: As a school owner, I'm going to say that I am opposed to that for the fact that if that student does come in and fail the exam after ten years -- they had so many, say their 700 hours, and then they do the finishing up at my school. It's shows up on my pass-fail rate. You know, you're all fine and dandy to just let them take the exam how ever many times it takes them to actually pass it whether it's one time or twenty times and they continue to pay their \$30. That still goes on my stuff. still have to charge them. Again, we are hands-on education based. In this industry change is -- our books change over a period of time. We have to keep up-to-date, and it wouldn't be -- well, in my best interest as a school owner to be eliminated, so.

MS. POWELL: Thank you.

MR. KEENE: You know, speaking on that, here again, I think that's a business decision of the school to either accept that person as a student or not accept that person as a student.

If you're concerned on how it's going to affect your pass-fail rate for your school, don't accept the students.

MS. COTTON: Well, why don't we just say if you're throwing out, because if we do have a moral issue to provide those people with the best that we can, okay?

MR. KEENE: Yes.

MS. COTTON: I don't think it's fair to them to take their money and say you have hours from ten years ago and I'm going to allow you to go through my school and I'm going to charge you all this stuff and you're going to pay for it, \$30, twenty times or however long it takes you to complete that course. If there's one in ten that could do it the first time, that's great, but reality is that's not going to happen.

MR. WALKER: Yes, ma'am.

MS. HAYDEN: Jacquita Hayden from El Dorado. I'm going to go back to a long ago. I believe that once hours are credited for the completion of the course and they've submitted their permits and taken exams that, yes, I think then the student would qualify to come

25

back and take exams until it's passed. But until that point, I don't want to have to worry about the students coming in that's only gone to a school, and she's done got mad at that school, and she's going to come over here and she's got ten hours here and she's twenty over here, and then I've got to pro-rate my enrollment for the student to complete her course. So what you're doing is you're basically saying, okay, now we can go back in and we can change our rules and regs and for students that had previous hours at another school, NAACAS allows you and we're going to make it possible because if it's in our rules and regs we can do it. For any student that has acquired so many hours and been out of school for six months, I'm going to charge them \$250 an hour for a course. You're opening -- I mean, a field to me of it being possible. Because you're going to put us in a situation of who's got the right record. They have certification that they had ten hours, they contact the school and it's been over five years because we're legally -- that's how long we have to keep our records. There's no

documentation of it. The State Board says, uhoh, had a computer failure, they've lost it, too. What do we do then? But I think once they've submitted their permit after they've, I mean, submit a permit that they can take the exam and they have qualified, and that they are ready for the exam then it's okay. But until that point, I don't feel like you're -- you're saying, okay, if you want to go to high school and we've got a student that's going to be out of high school and they're going to go for three months this year, six months next year -well, it's going to take them twenty years to finish. We don't need that. We want to educate them and get them out in the working field. So I think we need some type of limit on this. Thank you.

18

MR. WALKER: Are there any other comments from others in the audience against this proposal?

22

MS. AUTERSON: I just had a question. name is Julie Auterson. Okay. Back when I went to high school, I took cosmetology, and then we moved to Arkansas. Ten years later, I

25

went back into cosmetology, would those hours be picked up by Arkansas now with this new way? MS. WITTUM: It would depend on whether or 3 4 not it was retro-active. 5 MS. AUTERSON: But it says as far as your hours, would no longer -- would be valid 6 7 indefinitely. If had 900 hours from 8 California, if I wait ten years can I start 9 again in Arkansas with 900 hours? 10 (Multiple conversations taking place at 11 once.) 12 MS. WITTUM: It would depend on whether or 13 not the change, if it were me, were retroactive or if it would allow for the indefinite 14 15 to be -- or if it would only be good for the 16 day that that law goes into effect. 17 (Multiple conversations taking place at 18 once.) 19 MS. WITTUM: Could you add anything to 20 that, since it's a legal question? 21 MR. WALKER: Well, I mean, it's two 22 choices being retro-active or it goes back to 23 the terms of when it passes down. In terms of 24 today, if you went and took hours, take those 25 hours in that school from this day forward,

then it would apply.

MS. AUTERSON: Okay.

MR. WALKER: Or the board could choose to say, you know, any hours that were done 15 years ago, we'll accept as valid. What I'm saying is it would be more of a board decision. I would think, generally speaking you usually go prospectively. That's the way it should go, generally.

MS. AUTERSON: And I can say from a personal, my perspective on that, because I did start over. After ten years, that many hours shouldn't have been valid. So many things change in ten years.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Yes. Uh-huh.

MS. AUTERSON: That 900 hours, you know, you couldn't pass because so many things changed. I would have only needed 600 more.

MS. CAUDLE: I can tell you from what the way that it used to be done in our office, since I have been a long-time employee with the State Board of Cosmetology. Prior to Ms.

Wittum's taking over the office, the way it was done was after students' hours became three years old, those hours were only good for three

years. But if they completed their 1500 hours and applied for exam, at that point in time, everything was -- is what was a phrase used in our office, those hours were at that point in time "frozen" which means that they could go back. They had completed their 1500 hour course, and they could go back and take their exam at any given time provided that they had completed 1500 hours and applied for exam. That was the old way that it used to be done. That way you don't get caught up with ten year old partially finished hours. Either they completed the course, or not is the way it was done.

MR. WALKER: Yes, ma'am, in the back row?

MS. WOODS: My name is Mattie Woods,

Thelma's Beauty Academy. I truly disagree

because there are students out there now -- and

disagree about the indefinite hours forever,

because there are students out there now that

will not take their exam, but they will take it

if they know there is a guideline. Where

there's no guideline, they are not going to do

it. And to wait on someone that had hours five

or ten years ago, they've forgotten that the

first year. You can't just pick up and try to -- to come in and say I have 900 hours -- 900 from 1500 leaves 600. What can you learn after being out ten years and everything has changed tremendously? So, I truly disagree with that, but you know, whatever, I will go along with it.

MS. AUTERSON: Well, they were just coming out with the blow dryer and a curling iron when I went in high school --

MS. THOMAS: That's my point exactly. (Chorus of laughter.)

MS. THOMAS: I'm serious. And I had roller sets. And then, I mean, ten years later, though, everything is changed.

(Multiple conversations taking place at once.)

MR. WALKER: Any other comments?

MS. BURCHETT: Personally, I have a student out there running around right now that completed her 1500 hours, applied for the board, and if she chooses at any time to come and take her exam, then I may as well just toss it up as a failed, you know, exam because she wasn't -- you know, she -- I mean, I don't

think she could pass. She might could. She -she was ready, but she -- you know, she really would need to come back. And then I don't know what happened to the recommendation that I made about the school being the one to say on the exam application whether that student is ready to go back or not. I'd rather take someone with 900 hours from ten years ago because anyone new that comes to my school from somewhere else starts out with the beginner's until I see where they are. And NIC says, within the first 4 to 600 hours they should be able to pass the exam. You know, if your school is structured well enough, you're going to know if a student comes in with 900 hours, or whatever, you're going to know before time for them -- you know, their 1500 hours is up whether they're ready or not. And if you don't then, you know, I'm not real sure what you're doing. So you know, I think that if you pay for hours they should be good. But you've got to, as a school owner, instructor, supervisor, whatever you are, that brings these students in, you need to be able to determine where that student is and hopefully that's happening

anyway. So you know, I don't think they should lose hours.

MR. WALKER: Any other comments? Yes, ma'am.

MS. AKARD: Tracy Akard, Hot Springs
Beauty College. I also don't believe that the students should lose their hours. They have paid for those hours. I went to school 21 years ago. A uniform hair cut was a uniform hair cut. I mean, it's the same hair cut that we're teaching today. Basics are basics. No, we might not have learned out to blow dry, but that's not going to take 1500 hours to learn how to --

MS. COTTON: Oh, I didn't mean that. It was just an example how things change.

MS. AKARD: Yes, things change, but that's one -- that's one of the styles. There's still the same four -- four basic hair cuts that I learned 21 years ago that we're using -- that we're learning now, but so that is a style but it's not basic hair cuts. And they are examined and they do the minimum competencies, so if they can pass an exam they've got -- that is showing minimum competencies and it is about

sterilization and sanitation. And that is about protecting the public. And that's what we're putting out there as protecting the public. We're not -- that's what our job -- I feel like that's the job of the board is to protect the public about hygiene and sanitation. And we're dictating whether they put out the best style. That's not what we're -- that's not what we're for. That's the -- that's for someone else to judge.

MS. COTTON: But I don't want anyone to misunderstand what I said about passing and failing the board and all that. The written test is what I'm talking about. The material in our books change, and I get what you mentioned now, it's not just about styles.

(Pause.)

MR. WALKER: Any other comments from the audience?

(Pause.)

MR. WALKER: One more opportunity, because when it's closed we're going to end it and it will be board discussion. Yes, ma'am.

MS. HUGHES: Jenita Hughes from Newport.

Nick did speak about in college, you know, you

get your hours credit, and you don't lose that, 2 you know, as years go by. But I think you do 3 have to finish the course to get the credit. 4 You couldn't drop out and get credit for the 5 course. (Pause.) 6 7 MR. WALKER: Anyone else? 8 MS. BURCHETT: When we submit hours when a 9 student drops -- you submit what areas they 10 received those hours in, so that would -- to me 11 that would be the same, same difference. But 12 again, to complete 1500 hours and ten years 13 later be able to come back under my school's 14 name and take an exam without me knowing about 15 it -- that's what bothers me. But this doesn't 16 put anything in place there, I guess that's 17 another issue. 18 MR. WALKER: Anyone else? 19 (Pause.) 20 MR. WALKER: All right. It's open for 21 board discussion at this time. 22 MS. POWELL: Well, is there any 23 discussion? 24 (Pause.) 25 MR. KEENE: I guess I want to ask a

question about the way we -- a number of years ago, we would allow a student to take the exam, fail it and come back, I believe one more time. If they failed it the second time, they had to go back to school for 500 hours. We changed that law. How is that, the old way we did it, how did that affect a school's pass-fail rate any differently than if the students didn't lose their hours and they were able to take the exam ten years later? Was that confusing enough?

(Chorus of laughter.)

MS. POWELL: It was confusing enough. (Chorus of laughter.)

MS. POWELL: I think when we excluded that from law -- the students returning after failing the exam, I believe twice, that they'd have to return to school for 500 additional hours. And I believe the thought process of the board at the time, as I remember it, was to remove that from law, that the three year hour law here would accommodate that problem of after three years they wouldn't be coming in and taking this exam repeatedly, I think, over long term -- a long term period. I don't know

that anything that we've ever -- that I've ever seen, really, accommodates this issue of students losing hours. It appeared that at the regional meetings there were people in favor of the students not losing their hours. However few that was, it was still their opinion and today it seems to be more confusing than ever as to which way the public truly feels about this. I can --

MR. KEENE: I mean is this possibly a topic that we should table for later, after we can investigate it a little bit more?

MS. POWELL: I believe that this has been a topic that the director has been facing for over a year. I know that the board has been facing this topic even in, under previous directorship, as far back as Deborah Norton, due to the board not being clear on how this was going to be implemented. I think it's imperative that the board -- however, we're not going to be able to please everyone, but I think it's imperative that that board make a decision on this issue.

MS. GORDON: May I ask a question?

MS. POWELL: Yes, ma'am.

25

MS. GORDON: Okay. If we did this recommendation as it is written here and then amend or put in there the fact that after the school -- let's say I go back to school after ten years. And I decide, well, I have my hours and I decide I'm going to come take the test. I fail the test twice. Could it not be put back like it was to where they had to go back to school? Because I can see this burden being on the school being penalized if this person keeps coming and taking the test under the name of the school and they're not prepared for it. So to protect the school and the student from losing their hours, to where after they've had, you know, take it two times or three times or whatever we recommend, then they have to go back to school simply to protect the school from having the penalty of their school being -- am I making sense or not?

MS. POWELL: Yes, ma'am. But let me say this, even under that idea the school still would have to take the -- it would still be a failure on that school's record, --

MS. GORDON: Or --

MS. POWELL: -- even if that student

hadn't gone back and gotten additional hours.

I can't see where adding additional hours would change that.

MS. GORDON: I understand that it would still appear on that school record for two times, but that would eliminate the person from coming a third or fourth or fifth or however many times and that school being responsible for that person not passing that exam.

MS. POWELL: The school is only responsible for an failure one time.

MS. GORDON: Oh, okay. Well, that's -- that's not what I understood. I --

MS. POWELL: Am I wrong as far as the school, it's responsible for that person failing, the failure, one time. That person is a failure, the failure, one time.

MR. KEENE: So they can take the exam ten times, it only counts against the school once?

MS. POWELL: As far as that person on their -- their national statistics, yes. As far as our pass rate that -- that's here at the state level, am I correct, Ms. Wittum, that our pass and fail rate that you have accumulated for us, the schools, would include that student

24

25

taking the test six times. So in other words, this report here would be showing that student passing and/or failing the test six times.

That's just our report here, right?

MS. WITTUM: Let me -- let me say that I don't currently -- I don't currently do pass/fail rates on the schools. That part of the computer programming was not working properly in FoxPro. It's not up and running in this computer system that we just moved into. The pass/fail rates that I've compiled break it down simply between first time takers, retake practicals, and retake writtens. There are not schools attached to that. Now, SMP sends out information for the schools on their pass/fail rates and it doesn't differentiate between retakes or first times. It's just across the board, however many students came that month, how many passed, how many failed, and it's calculated out to a pass/fail rate.

MR. KEENE: But I think the question is more about how NAACAS rates the accreditation of the school, I think is more of their concern than it is what we may put as their pass/fail rate. I think they're really more concerned

about their --

MS. POWELL: I personally don't want to be responsible for answering for a Department of Ed statistics or NAACAS statistics, but as I understand it when I have a student to fail, they fail. And it doesn't request information as to how many times that person failed or passed. Truly though, it is partially directed as the public has — it's a yes and it's a no answer because that's true. It doesn't say once they fail, they're a failure. Now, if that person does pass, come back and pass, they can be counted as a pass, but it doesn't count them as a failure each time. And I know it, —

MR. KEENE: We've got a lot of NAACAS people here, --

MR. DOWNEY: It's individual. Either they pass or fail.

MS. POWELL: Right. But you know -(Multiple conversations taking place at
once.)

MS. POWELL: It still does not address the student. As they have said, it does not address the student that obtains 500 hours and comes back, or 700 hours and comes back, and is

enrolling to half of the program and then expected to perform at a level of a program that was consecutively facilitated. And then there's the other issue of hours indefinite for those that have actually completed the program. I see this as two different issues here with the public. Those issues of the student having 750 hours, do you count those and keep those indefinitely? And then the ones that have actually completed the program, they just didn't come and take the examination within three years and they lost those hours, well, that seems to be another issue. That's what I'm hearing today. If I'm wrong, somebody tell me.

MS. TURMAN: How can we take the hours away from one person if we're, you know, that's completed 1500 hours and not taken the test, if we're not going to take the 600 hours away from somebody who's taken it ten years ago and they've just decided to come back in. I don't see the difference. Hours are hours. I don't see how we can say --

MS. POWELL: I understand. Ms. Wittum, you're the one with the proposal, maybe you can

clean up this mess we're making. 2 (Chorus of laughter.) MS. WITTUM: I agree with what Nick 3 4 pointed out earlier that has been talked about. 5 Once a student has paid for their hours, they should be allowed to keep those hours 6 7 indefinitely. And if they come and don't pass 8 the exam, then either they didn't learn what 9 they needed to learn or they didn't apply 10 themselves, maybe. There may be some cases 11 where they didn't receive proper training, but whatever that reason is they should be able to 12 13 maintain their hours and not lose them, in my 14 opinion. 15 MS. PICKERING: I agree with Nick and I 16 was on that committee. I totally believe that 17 they should not lose their hours. 18 MS. POWELL: You know, and it's all on the 19 school as their responsibility as to whether 20 they want to enroll that new student --21 MS. PICKERING: Right. 22 MR. DOWNEY: Business decision. 23 MS. PICKERING: Right. It's not mandatory 24 that a school has to accept the student. 25 (Multiple conversations taking place at

1	once.)
2	MR. KEENE: Okay. I'll make the motion
3	that we accept the committee's recommendation
4	to allow the Student Issues: Length of Hours.
5	MS. TURMAN: Wait just a minute, I want to
6	clarify something. Now are we talking about a
7	student's 1500 hours or are we talking
8	MS. POWELL: All hours.
9	MS. TURMAN: Okay. Thank you. All right,
10	then. I'm sorry, Cliff.
11	MS. POWELL: Do I have a second?
12	MS. GORDON: Second.
13	MS. POWELL: I have a motion and a second.
14	Is there any discussion?
15	(Pause.)
16	MS. POWELL: All those in favor of the
17	motion, raise your right hand.
18	(Show of hands.)
19	MS. POWELL: All those opposed.
20	(One hand in opposition.)
21	MS. POWELL: One opposed. The motion
22	carries.
23	STUDENT ISSUES:
24	INCREASE HOURS FOR AESTHETICS COURSE OF STUDY
25	MS. WITTUM: The next one, number eight,

1	is Student Issues: Increase Hours for
2	Aesthetics Course of Study. The recommendation
3	from the committee is to leave the aesthetics
4	course alone for the time being. According to
5	an inquiry to NIC, the cut-score for the
6	aesthetics exam has been modified because of
7	the increase fail rate. So we're hoping that
8	that will address the fail rates, high fail
9	rates, that we have experienced here.
10	(Pause.)
11	MS. WITTUM: Are there any other comments
12	from the board?
13	MR. DOWNEY: Also the cut-rates on the
14	instructor's has been changed. And we've seen
15	a difference
16	MS. WITTUM: Yes, we have.
17	MR. DOWNEY: immediately on examinees
18	getting better pass rates on the instructor's,
19	also.
20	(Pause.)
21	MR. WALKER: Are there any other questions
22	or comments from the board?
23	(Pause.)
24	MR. WALKER: Are there any comments from
25	the audience?

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

1011

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

(Pause.)

MR. WALKER: All right. There's nothing to affirm on this. We just proceed to the next one. There's no motion.

STUDENT ISSUES: VOLUNTEERISM

MS. WITTUM: The next one, number nine, is Student Issues: Volunteerism. recommendation is to modify A.C.A. 17-26-102(9)and A.C.A. 17-26-417 to allow a student to participate in charity or specialty events held outside the school provided the following list of conditions apply: that the student has completed three-quarters of the course of study; that the student is accompanied by and under the direct supervision of a licensed instructor; that the student is not given hours towards the course of study; that documentation is maintained in the student's file outlining the information about that event and the number of hours volunteered. That should help our inspectors. And one more, that the schools provide 30-day notice to the board's office. As it's stated there in (e), an approval process would not be necessary, it's just for the benefit of our inspectors.

The recommendation includes a student not being permitted to provide care to elderly 3 persons confined in a nursing home or hospital. 4 The committee members may want to jump in -- or 5 feel free to jump in and add to this, if you would like, but it was my understanding that 6 7 because of the vulnerability of the elderly 8 within the nursing homes that we would prefer 9 the students not be the ones providing that 10 treatment to them. 11 MR. DOWNEY: Also all nursing homes in the 12 state of Arkansas are required to have 13 cosmetological facilities to take care of that 14 so that was part of the reason for the 15 recommendation. 16 MS. TURMAN: Also, some of them have 17 families. 18 MR. DOWNEY: Yes, family can also take 19 care of them. 20 (Pause.) 21 MS. WITTUM: Any questions? 22 (Pause.) 23 MR. WALKER: Seeing no comments or 24 questions from the board, anyone in the 25 audience against this proposal?

(Pause.) 2 MR. WALKER: Last chance. MS. BLAND: Would this mean that schools 3 4 would be allowed to take students that have 5 completed three-fourths of their course of study into a salon, or a charitable event? 6 7 MS. WITTUM: Yes. 8 MR. DOWNEY: A cut-a-thon or something 9 like that. 10 MS. WITTUM: Yes. 11 MR. WALKER: Yes, ma'am, in the back row? 12 MS. JONES: Carla Jones. I just wanted to 13 say that it stated that they had to have three-14 quarters of the course of study. They have to 15 be accompanied by a supervisor or a licensed 16 instructor. And then it says the student will 17 not be given hours towards the course of study. 18 If they're going to be -- will they be allowed 19 to do this on school time, and if they are why 20 wouldn't they be allowed to get hours for it 21 because they're going to be accompanied by an 22 instructor or a supervisor? 23 MS. WITTUM: That defeats the purpose of 24 volunteering, in my opinion. 25 MS. PICKERING: In my opinion, it would

25

defeat the purpose, too, if it was volunteering.

MR. WALKER: Any other comments?
 (Pause.)

MR. WALKER: Seeing none, I'll turn it back to Ms. Powell, and ask if we can take a motion.

(Multiple conversations taking place at once.)

MS. HAYDEN: Question, real quick. Excuse We just had a comment made. If we take student with us to the morque to process a deceased client, is that considered a course or is -- I mean, a lesson or will that be volunteer? Because to me that's part of what we do as cosmetologists is to consider our clients who pass away and do their hair. And I have been -- I have done that. Not that they've done the client, but they've assisted because it's a way of getting them out of that fear and helping them realize that that's the last thing that you could ever do for that person. I feel very obligated about that. Would that be considered --

MR. KEENE: I do that, as well, and have

even when I was in school. I probably did get hours for going and doing it because that was, 3 you know, 25 years ago. But the whole point of 4 this is volunteerism. If you're receiving 5 compensation and the funeral homes do pay to have those -- body hair done. I never accepted 6 7 the compensation myself. 8 MS. HAYDEN: Never have. 9 MR. KEENE: I gave it back to the family 10 in lieu of flowers, but there is still 11 compensation involved here. If the student is 12 going to receive hours, that's compensation. 13 That's not volunteerism. So yeah, I would be -14 - I mean, I would take them, but they wouldn't 15 receive hours for it, in my opinion, otherwise 16 they're not volunteering. 17 MS. POWELL: Also, under what J.Q. was 18 saying, that issue of wanting to deal with the 19 mortuary could be done under the discretionary 20 hours as opposed to volunteering. 21 MS. THOMAS: May I ask a question, please? 22 I do take --23 MR. WALKER: Could you identify yourself 24 for the record? 25 MS. THOMAS: Margaret Thomas. I go into

the funeral homes and I have taken my students after hours not receiving any time for it, but in the event that I wanted to take them then, this would be a learning process, would it not? On teaching them how to do the deceased's hair? Now, extracurricular activities, we would have to call board and tell them that we're doing it. Well, you don't always have that notice when you're called to do someone's hair in that situation.

(Multiple conversations taking place at once.)

MS. THOMAS: I'm not trying to be smart.

MS. ANDERSON: The funeral homes are responding. They're mandated by law. The last time I was there doing someone's hair, the funeral director stood right over me and stood there while I worked. They are not all facilities that strict if they know you, but if they don't know you they are right over you. Now we don't have the when it comes, but if it comes up and we can teach our students, that will be wonderful because they benefit from it. They do need to see and they do need to know it. One day they'll have to follow in our

4 5

3

6

7 8

9

11

10

1213

1415

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

footsteps because we're not always going to be there for them.

MS. WITTUM: Well, currently Rule 6.13, the way it is written, you can provide the request up to that day before you need to go up there. That's the way Rule 6.13 is written.

(Multiple conversations taking place at once.)

MS. WITTUM: So you would be able to go, if you found out someone passed away and you needed to go to the funeral home tomorrow, you could submit your request today to take your students in there and them be able to receive credit for the hours that you're there. whether Rule 6.13 is changed when the rule revisions are done next year, I can't say, but if this is an issue for them to be able to go to the funeral homes and it be a learning experience that they receive hours for then that needs to be clarified in Rule 6.13 when we go back in to do our rule revisions next year. But currently as it stands, you can submit a request one day, under Rule 6.13, and take your students out the next day and allow them to receive those hours.

MS. THOMAS: If we notify you 24 hours in 2 advance, is that what you're saying? MS. WITTUM: It has to be one day. 3 4 MS. TRAYLOR: How many hours would a 5 student accumulate for that one service? MS. WITTUM: There's no restriction on 6 7 that. They can just get up to 30 hours if 8 they're going to do -- if they're in the cosmo 9 course or --10 MS. TRAYLOR: But what about if it's an 11 hour? It probably takes one hour. 12 MS. WITTUM: Then they would be eliqible 13 to get that one hour. 14 MS. THOMAS: No, it depends on the 15 service, hon. 16 (Chorus of laughter.) 17 MS. THOMAS: I'm not being smart. All I'm 18 saying is I do people that gets geri-curls and 19 that takes more than an hour depending on what 20 services you're providing. You want to provide 21 the same service to that deceased person as you 22 would a live person walking around. So I'm not 23 going to go in there with a student pushing that student through. I do a whole head. I 24 25 don't do half a head. I do the whole thing, so

1	it takes more than an hour depending on what
2	you're doing. Because you've got make-up and
3	all that, nails and the whole nine yards.
4	MS. GORDON: Well, they can get up to 30
5	hours.
6	MS. POWELL: I'm not aware of I was not
7	aware of the extent I'm not like you. I was
8	not aware of any chemical service
9	MS. TRAYLOR: I've never done
10	MS. POWELL: on a deceased person.
11	(Multiple conversations taking place at
12	once.)
13	MS. POWELL: Pardon me?
14	MS. ANDERSON: Sometimes you're working
15	under a family's request, and I've given them
16	cosmetology, barbering, you know, we've done
17	some hair-cuts, to nails, to make-up. It
18	depends on the funeral home and it depends on
19	if they allow you to do them in the prep room
20	or if they allow them to do them after they're
21	already in their casket.
22	MS. POWELL: Okay. Thank you.
23	MS. ANDERSON: It's a whole different ball
24	game depending on which one.
25	MS. POWELL: Thank you. I think at this
	1

1	time I do have a motion trying to made. I did
2	call the meeting to order. Mr. Keene, are you
3	still wanting to make the motion?
4	MR. KEENE: Certainly. I move that we
5	accept the committee's recommendation on the
6	Student Issues: Voluneteerism.
7	MS. WEST: I second.
8	MS. POWELL: I have a motion and a second
9	to approve the Student Issues: Volunteerism.
10	All those in favor, raise your right hand.
11	(Show of hands.)
12	MS. POWELL: It's unanimous. Thank you,
13	Board.
14	STUDENT ISSUES: APPRENTICESHIP
15	MS. WITTUM: Number ten, Student Issues:
16	Apprenticeship. The recommendation is to not
17	implement an apprenticeship program at this
18	time.
19	MS. TRAYLOR: Amen.
20	MS. WITTUM: Do you have any questions?
21	(Pause.)
22	MS. POWELL: There appears to be no
23	discussion from the board.
24	MR. WALKER: Any comments from the

(Pause.)

MR. WALKER: Seeing none, Ms. Powell.

MS. POWELL: All right. Do I have a motion for the Student Issues: --

MR. WALKER: We don't -- we don't have to do one.

MS. POWELL: Okay.

HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS TO THE PUBLIC

MS. WITTUM: Number eleven, Student
Issues: Health and Safety Risks to the Public.
The recommendation to address these particular
issues are to increase the number of inspectors
to enable inspectors to have a more reasonable
territorial distribution, to incorporate the
photos on the licenses as we discussed in the
practitioner issues, and to increase the
penalties.

The suggestions made during the regionals that are not supported by the committee are to promote incentives for inspectors to find violations. We consider this to be more of a creating a hostile environment as opposed to alleviating the problem. And also, utilizing lab services for testing purposes. That suggestion seems to be related to MMA; and

since it's not illegal by the FDA the committee just encourages the board to do more -- be more proactive in educating the industry about the harms of MMA.

Do you have any questions?

MR. KEENE: The one question I have is the increase in penalties, what was the discussion there?

MS. WITTUM: Just to increase, or redefine, the penalties on the fee schedule that you guys have typically used and to go through that and update it and raise some of those penalty areas that are in there. And then we would also publish that fee schedule to make it something for the industry to be aware of.

MR. KEENE: So you're not looking, then, to go from a \$1000 maximum, higher, you're just looking at restructuring that?

MS. WITTUM: Right. Now, we didn't discuss raising the \$1000 and that's something we can discuss if you want to, but we were talking just the individual penalties for violations.

(Pause.)

25

MR. WALKER: Board members have any questions or comments?

(Pause.)

MR. WALKER: If not, any members of the audience who wish to speak against this?

MS. BLAND: I'd like to ask how it was determined to increase the number of inspectors to enable the inspectors to have a more reasonable territorial distribution?

MS. WITTUM: Just to give -- considering the fact that we have approximately 5,000 establishments and there's five of you, if we had more inspectors, we could lower that number to be able to get you out in the areas and hopefully be able to address some of the problems that were brought up during the regionals. That seemed to be one of the things, I think it was at the Fayetteville meeting that we had, that there were several comments about. The fact was stated that they didn't feel like the inspectors were able to adequately cover their territory and catch the people who were doing things that they're not supposed to be doing, or staying on top of the ones who were violating health and safety

issues, you know, having animals in the salons or whatever.

MR. KEENE: Kathy, have you got an analysis on how many more inspectors you think we need?

MS. WITTUM: I haven't done a formal analysis. I know just in what I've seen, I would say we need at least two to three additional inspectors in order to give the inspectors what I would consider to be a reasonable load to carry.

MR. KEENE: Okay.

MS. BLAND: Can I make another one?

MS. WITTUM: Uh-huh.

MS. BLAND: Considering the fact that I don't know what analysis was given to the committee members, but considering the fact that the inspectors were in the office from approximately August '05 until April '06, certainly those numbers would not reflect that they were adequately serving their territory. I know in the past -- I've only been with the board five years, but in the past my 18 counties have been covered in the approximate time, which was once every four months -- and I

can only speak for my territory, every four months as it was supposed to be. So I didn't want the board members to think that we have neglected our duties. We were -- we were helping out in the office so therefore we couldn't adequately cover our territory in the time that we're allotted. I think in the past we have done that with the exception of maybe August '05 to April or May of '06.

MS. WITTUM: Well, let me point out for the inspectors' sake that no one is accusing you of not doing your job. What is being said is that with the growth of the establishments, with the growth of practitioners that we have, five inspectors does not adequately cover the territory and more inspectors are needed in order to provide more quality service to the industry.

MS. BLAND: Right. And I didn't mean to indicate they were. I just was hoping that they would reflect back on several years back, instead of the last year.

MR. WALKER: Back row, yes, ma'am?

MS. HAYDEN: Jacquita Hayden from El Dorado. On this increase of inspectors, if I'm

understanding the financial report of the board, our inspectors are also paid for travel and miles and when you decrease their mileage and their potential area, their salary plus travel expenses, don't you feel then it should be included for salary increase?

MS. LEE: Linda Lee, --

(Multiple conversations taking place at once.)

MS. POWELL: I need order.

MR. WALKER: Can y'all maintain order, please?

MS. LEE: -- and it was not anything -we're wanting you to get a pay raise. It's not
listed here anywhere, but I think that was
discussed that you guys -- when you start
talking that you might even put your life on
the line just to get to some of these places,
you're not getting paid nearly what you should.
And we need to get these inspectors where they
can do it and go back the next day if they have
to, because we all know we do the mother-in-law
clean up when we see them parking their car,
you know?

(Chorus of laughter.)

24

25

MS. LEE: That's just the way it is, but if I don't see them parking their car the next day, I may not empty my trash because I know they're not coming back for three months, you And so one of these things is that if we increase the people so we can catch some of these people that are continuously getting away with it, you know, whether they speak English or not, we've got to get them understanding what the law is. And if we can get these inspectors and get them paid what they're worth and for what they're doing every day, -- it's almost like a police officer, you know? don't know what they're going to walk into so, you know, we could increase more people and then increase their salaries. I think we can get a lot of these things we talk about month after month under control and I think that's where our key is in a lot of these things that we keep complaining about with our inspectors, but there's got to be more people, that's for sure, but that was in their minds.

MR. WALKER: Yes, ma'am.

MS. HORNER: I'm Rose Horner and I'm an inspector. Part of our survival is our mileage

and I know, I have Northwest Arkansas:

Fayetteville, Rogers, Bentonville. That is a huge growing area. In other states, I don't know about their programs but, you know, there is — there probably is need for another inspector but also, like I said, our survival — and I have a husband who pays the bills.

Some of these gals don't. So what I make is, you know, kind of my money but for them it's survival. So there, you know, we do need a pay increase. If you bring three inspectors in, you know, that cuts into our mileage and several of these gals' survival.

MS. WITTUM: Well, as we discussed during an inspector meeting -- and President Powell can speak up if she wants to add anything to this. One, the pay increases is something that is left up to the legislators. I was specifically told not to request salary increases for any staff during the '08 - '09 budget that I just submitted. Once they finish their pay plan study and they're ready to consider salary increases, we'll certainly do everything we can to get that. I would rather fight for more salary than to hang my hat on

any mileage, any day of the week. Also, as I think President Powell very eloquently said during that meeting, the mileage will not decrease to the extent that you're thinking. mean, it doesn't matter if you're going across the state or if you're roaming around in circles and hitting your places more frequently, you're going to get that mileage. So it's not going to be the decrease that I think you're fearing it will be.

MS. CAUDLE: I have worked here for almost 14 years. And there have in that 14 year period — almost 15 years, excuse me. There have always been discussions of a pay increase or a salary increase, but I want you guys to know that if you try to live on what we make it would be virtually impossible. In the 15 years that I've worked here, I make less than \$10 an hour.

(Multiple conversations taking place at once.)

MR. WALKER: Any other comments from the audience?

MS. TRAYLOR: Well, I know there may not be anything that the board can do about it.

And you know, as they say, the legislatures -or the legislators are the ones that draw the 3 line, but our inspectors have been underpaid 4 ever since I can remember. But I -- you know, 5 I agree with them 100 percent. I wish there was something I could do about it. 6 7 (Pause.) 8 MR. KEENE: I move we accept the 9 committee's recommendations on the Health and 10 Safety Risks to the Public. 11 MS. POWELL: I have a motion to accept the 12 recommendation of the committee's request on 13 Student Issues: Health and Safety Risks to the 14 Public. 15 MS. GORDON: I second. 16 MS. POWELL: I have a second. I have a 17 motion and a second. Is there any discussion? 18 (Pause.) 19 MS. POWELL: All those in favor of the 20 Health and Safety Risks to Public 21 recommendation, raise your right hand. 22 (Show of hands.) 23 MS. POWELL: All right. It's unanimous. 24 The motion carries. 25 (Multiple conversations taking place at

once.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

MS. POWELL: We're going to continue. need order, please. We're going to continue a little bit longer.

BOARD ISSUES: REDEFINING EXAM ADMINISTRATORS

MS. WITTUM: Number 12, Board Issues: Redefining who administers the exams. recommendation is to redefine who administers examinations and remove this responsibility from the board members and the inspectors. From the comments that were made during the regional meetings, outsourcing appears to be a viable option. When the committee discussed this last week, they requested that I contact the schools to find out which way they would prefer for us to look at this option. All 56 schools were contacted either by e-mail or phone. Of those, 15 responded. And the break down is: board and inspectors to continue and keep it as is, 7; outsource, 5; either way, 1. We had one person who said they would send a letter or appear at the meeting, and then one that said no comment.

> Do you have any questions at this time? (Pause.)

25

MR. WALKER: Any comments from the board? Questions about it?

MS. TURMAN: What about the financial issue? I mean, you know, would it cost more to outsource?

MS. TRAYLOR: Uh-huh.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, it would.

MS. WITTUM: We would have to contract with a testing company in order to outsource. And either -- I know one of the -- one of the things we're looking at is to increase the That would cover some of the cost of it. And then we also would need to look at, or work with the testing company to decide just how much of it they would do. We can either turn everything over to them or we could do everything except for the actual examination, where they would send someone in on exam day and actually do what you guys are currently doing and the inspectors are currently doing as far as administering those exams. And the cost would vary depending on how much we wanted to turn over to them.

MR. KEENE: And which company you chose to go with.

MS. WITTUM: And which company. MS. POWELL: And whether you did practical 3 or written, right? 4 MS. WITTUM: Well, we would have to have 5 someone who would be able to do both. MS. POWELL: Excuse me? 6 7 MS. WITTUM: Or excuse me, just the 8 practical, because the office staff can do the 9 written. 10 MS. POWELL: Right. 11 MS. PICKERING: Which would be more of 12 burden on the office staff, if you had to do 13 extra work -- is that what you're saying? 14 MS. WITTUM: No. 15 MS. PICKERING: Okay. 16 MS. WITTUM: No. It's not going to make 17 any difference to the office staff at all. MS. GORDON: I'm not sure how we do as far 18 19 as the pay increases or the paying for this or 20 the -- how it works compared to the inspectors 21 getting a raise, but if it's kept as it is 22 would that allow the money to be appropriated 23 that we're going to use to hire an entity to 24 come in and do the testing to be used in that 25 aspect as for them getting a raise?

1	MS. POWELL: I think what you can
2	correct me, if I'm wrong. LaJoy, to answer
3	your question, no.
4	MS. GORDON: Okay.
5	MS. POWELL: Because the money
6	MS. GORDON: That's what I thought.
7	MS. POWELL: and let me clarify that.
8	If money that is appropriated for our
9	inspectors' salaries is
10	MS. GORDON: Is different from this.
11	MS. POWELL: is regulated by the
12	legislature, so
13	MS. GORDON: That's what I
14	MS. POWELL: and it's appropriated in
15	our budget, but it is not transferrable to
16	MS. GORDON: Okay. That's what I
17	MS. POWELL: our inspectors.
18	MS. GORDON: that's what I was wanting
19	the question I was asking.
20	MS. POWELL: Did I answer that correctly?
21	MS. GORDON: Yes, you did.
22	MS. WEST: My question is, are you
23	recommending outsourcing?
24	MS. WITTUM: Uh-huh.
25	MS. WEST: And how I'm wondering if

4

5

7

8

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

I don't test. Pat and I don't test, so I'm wondering how the board feels about that on an individual basis.

MS. TURMAN: Uh-huh. So am I.

MR. DOWNEY: I'd like to make a statement on this. If we went with outsourcing our test, our board -- our law currently requires that the board are the examiners. We are an examining board. If we outsource it, the people that these companies hire to do the testing, they hire right off the street. could have no knowledge whatsoever of They put an ad in the paper, cosmetology. whoever falls in there, they'll give them a little bit of training and they're the ones that would be examining your students. I'm totally opposed to it. I think the board should at least have that insight into how our students are doing, otherwise we're not really going to know other than some report that this company comes up with or SMP comes up with. It's going to cost a whole lot more money. It's going to cost the students a lot more money to take this exam. I know I've been in other states that use these companies and

they're normal fee, for a student, is about 150 2 bucks. 3 MS. TRAYLOR: And they pay their people 4 anywhere from \$200 to \$300 a day to examine, 5 so. MR. DOWNEY: Right now you're getting it 6 7 for --8 MS. TRAYLOR: \$60 a day. 9 MR. DOWNEY: \$60 a day for your examiners. 10 MS. WITTUM: My understanding with 11 visiting with one of the testing agencies at 12 the conference was that they do use licensed 13 cosmetologists, so it probably depends on which 14 testing company if there are some out there who 15 hire people off the street. 16 MS. TRAYLOR: Colorado just hires anybody, 17 because I visited them. 18 MS. WITTUM: Well, but we're not in 19 Colorado. We don't have to do it the way they 20 do it. We can specify how we want to do it and 21 if we want to look at testing company --22 MS. TRAYLOR: I'm not sure that Arizona 23 does it, too. 24 MS. WITTUM: But it doesn't matter what 25 the other states do. We can specify --

MS. TRAYLOR: Well, we've been comparing ourselves with other states all --3 UNKNOWN: All day. 4 MS. TRAYLOR: -- you know, and what they 5 require. But they -- whatever. MS. PICKERING: Could I speak? 6 7 MR. WALKER: Yes, ma'am. 8 MS. PICKERING: As one of the committee 9 members, I've thought a lot about this and I 10 agree with Nick solely because they could hire 11 someone off the street, but then they may hire 12 professionals. But I'm a cosmetologist and a 13 shop owner for 41 years, I just feel like \$60 a 14 day, that's my choice. You know, I choose -- I 15 choose to be an examiner. I know what to look 16 for. I'm interested in the student. I am interested in them passing, not that I give 17 them any favors that they don't deserve, but I 18 19 do it for \$60 a day when I could make \$200 a 20 day if I stayed in Earle, Arkansas and worked 21 that day. But that's a choice I've made. 22 not a salary --23 MS. TRAYLOR: It's a sacrifice. 24 MS. PICKERING: -- position. It's a 25 sacrifice. And I choose to do that and we're

talking about a lot more money. And it's not just that, but there are other principles involved. I have a personal interest in students, because I was a student at one time. That's just the way I feel.

MR. KEENE: Personally, I've been in favor of outsourcing for many years and I've spoken with the testing companies. This board actually passed a motion about three years ago to have a testing company come in here and do a presentation with us that was never followed through on, and that was the one over in Nashville -- PCS.

MR. DOWNEY: PCS.

MR. KEENE: I think that we need to find out what it would cost before we would say no to this. My other belief is that it's not exactly fair to have your board be your judge and jury and that's exactly what this board is. Those students, if we're the one that's grading them and deciding whether or not they pass and give them a license. Then they get in trouble. They come in here and we're having to see them in here, too, and be their judge and jury. I really don't find it to be a fair situation. I

realize when this board was created back in 1955 there weren't testing companies out there that could come in and give the exams and probably happy to it themselves, but that's not the case anymore. Over 50 years have gone by and there's been a lot of improvements out there. There are several testing companies out there to talk to and get prices from. There's also ways that you can offset this price. We have our own testing facility that we can lease to that testing company. So I think before we say that it's not possible or we're not going to do it that we at least need to get an idea of what it's going to cost us to do it.

Also, I have a -- I had a thought about this being -- I realize right now it's in our law that the board administer the exam. I'm not too sure I would want to see that changed that we administer it, but that we -- probably change it more to where we have the authority to outsource it or administer it, and maybe put it into your rule of who it is, or that you're going to outsource. Because we might get in there and outsource and decide we don't like it. We want to be able to get out of that

1	without necessarily having to go through the
2	legislature again.
3	MS. TRAYLOR: You're going to have a
4	contract with them.
5	MR. DOWNEY: Yeah, and they would be up
6	for bids and you may wind up with
7	MR. KEENE: Sure, it will.
8	MR. DOWNEY: you might wind up with
9	somebody like Experia or
10	MR. KEENE: And what's wrong with that if
11	they're doing a good job?
12	MR. DOWNEY: They're not doing a good job.
13	MR. KEENE: That's an opinion.
14	MR. DOWNEY: If you talk to other state
15	agencies,
16	MR. KEENE: I have.
17	MR. DOWNEY: that have dealt with
18	Experia and some of these other companies, or
19	school owners
20	MR. KEENE: And I haven't I've never
21	heard of them being \$300.
22	MR. DOWNEY: they're totally sick of
23	them. They are totally sick of them.
24	MS. TURMAN: I'd like to make a comment,
25	Cliff. I don't understand what they would have

1	to do with them examining and then later
2	getting in trouble for doing something. I've
3	never
4	MR. KEENE: Because
5	MS. TURMAN: had that issue come up.
6	MR. KEENE: Well, you're not giving the
7	exam, though.
8	MS. TURMAN: I know, but they do. And
9	MR. KEENE: I do, too.
10	MS. TURMAN: if they go out and get in
11	trouble afterwards, that has nothing to do with
12	the exam. They have done something that
13	MS. TRAYLOR: They violated the law.
14	MS. TURMAN: and violated the law.
15	MR. KEENE: You don't know that until
16	they've come in here before you and you see
17	your evidence.
18	MS. TURMAN: I don't see it as judge and
19	jury, though. We are
20	MR. KEENE: Sure, you are.
21	MS. TURMAN: Well, we we decide
22	their penalty if
23	MR. KEENE: Uh-huh.
24	MS. TURMAN: they have broken the law.
25	MR. KEENE: If you decide they've broken a

law, then you also --2 MS. TURMAN: But what does that have to do 3 with the exam? 4 MR. KEENE: -- penalize them. My point is 5 you have prior knowledge of that student. That's why we don't let schools give the exam 6 7 to students that are in their same city because 8 they may have prior knowledge of that student. 9 If I walk in that room and I see a student that 10 I recognize, I'm supposed to take myself out of 11 that situation. That's conflict of interest. 12 I see a lot of conflict of interest with the 13 board giving this exam now, when we have 14 options now. I mean, years ago we didn't have 15 an option. You had to give the exam yourself. 16 We've got options now. 17 MR. DOWNEY: That same state trooper that 18 gives you your driver's license is --19 MR. KEENE: The trooper may write the 20 ticket, but he doesn't decide your penalty.: 21 MR. DOWNEY: -- will write you a ticket, 22 too. 23 MS. TRAYLOR: Uh-huh. 24 MR. DOWNEY: Same one that gave you the 25 driver's test, can give you a ticket. What's

the difference?

MS. TRAYLOR: Give you a speeding ticket.

MR. WALKER: Well, this is one that the committee deferred, so we're going to do this as we had done the previous deferred recommendation. We're going to take, number one, those who are in favor of the motion, and secondly, those who are against. And we'll just go back and forth, if you will. So anyone who is in favor of this motion, if you could, raise your hand and identify yourself.

MS. CAUDLE: Sheila Caudle. Restate what we're discussing now.

MR. WALKER: Well, the recommendation that is listed as number 12 in the handout, to allow the board to consider outsourcing for testing. So if you're in favor of that as stated, number 12, this is an opportunity for you to tell the board that. Yes, ma'am.

MS. CAUDLE: I am in favor of it simply because we, as inspectors, we are out there inspecting these schools in places where we see these students and when we show up to give exams there may stand those students there that we have to examine. And the way the

examination is done now, there is no way to excuse ourself from that exam because there's only two people there at a time. And we may have to go ahead and examine that student knowing that we know that student, but there's no other choice at this point in time. We have to go ahead because we can't send 15 students home and say, well, you'll have to come back another day. We'll have to get a examiner here, because — so I am totally for outsourcing.

MR. WALKER: I will take a comment of someone who is against outsourcing now. Yes, ma'am, in the red.

MS. WHITLOCK: I'm Heather Whitlock from El Dorado. My thing is with the outsourcing is that a lot of our students are low income students, and even \$30 sometimes is hard for them to come by. So that's something that really needs to be thought about also is the financial end of it. And that's it. Because you know, they can't afford if you raise the fees, say to 150 bucks, you know, that's a lot of money if they're not working at all and going to school full-time. How do you expect

them to come up with that to be able to pay for their exam?

MR. WALKER: Someone who is in favor of the proposal? Yes, ma'am, back row.

MS. THOMAS: Margaret Thomas. I'm in favor of it if we have those who are knowledgeable in cosmetology rather than just picking anyone off the street to test our students. I feel that they have to have some knowledge of it.

MR. WALKER: I think it would be similar to a large state contract that the board would have the opportunity to interview them if they wanted to make that decision, or they could create a committee to do that.

(Pause.)

MR. WALKER: Okay. Now is there someone who is against it? Yes, ma'am.

MS. COTTON: Tamara Cotton, Arkansas

Beauty School, Conway. I am against the outsourcing, not just for the fee increase because I realize -- that will be a big burden to have to get set up with outsourcing. I've never had a problem with the board inspecting any of my students, examining them, inspecting

24

25

It's just -- it's a burden on the board and if, for some reason, I got that impression then we need to hear that from the board members, but in my opinion who better to examine our students than our cosmetologists and school owners that are here in this state? I'm very uncomfortable with outsourcing and people that may or may not have experience in this field. And then you put an ad in the paper for only cosmetologists or somebody experienced in this field, that's opening up experienced jobs for a lot of people. I mean, you have to have been doing this for a while, and I applaud -- I applaud that in our board. You can't take that away by -- you know, I feel like our standards were lowered in Arkansas when we went to the national testing. I'm just going to get that out there. I just feel that way, and I just feel like they're already lowered and this line of outsourcing is just lowering them further.

MR. WALKER: Someone in favor of it? Yes, ma'am.

MS. HAYDEN: Well, I wouldn't call it favor, but it's my thoughts on it. I say that

24

25

just the same as she says as far as favoring our boards and examining. We have inspectors that inspect our salons. If you had a company out there to come in that was inspecting our salons, how would they know except to go by a sheet to say do they have this, this, or this? As an examiner, from what I'm gathering as we've talked about it during examining overviews and stuff, these people that are on the board do have the same type of list that they have to abide by, whether -- and they're human, so I mean, they're human on that day to be an inspector. If it seems to be a problem, is there not that you could not union up with another board that also has cosmetology and switch out? I mean, you could go to Louisiana and inspect their students and send the Louisiana inspectors up here to where they are definitely cosmetology laymen. But I didn't mean definitely Louisiana, but you understand what I'm saying? To make sure that we are in the cosmetology field because that's what we're all here for is cosmetology.

(Pause.)

MR. WALKER: Is anyone against the

1	proposal?
2	(Pause.)
3	MR. WALKER: Anyone else in favor of the
4	proposal?
5	(Pause.)
6	MR. WALKER: If not, I'll turn it back to
7	you, Ms. Powell.
8	MS. POWELL: We need a motion on item 12,
9	Board Issues: Redefine who administers the
10	examination.
11	MS. WEST: May I ask a question about this
12	first?
13	MS. POWELL: Yes.
14	MS. WEST: Is there any precedent for an
15	exploratory committee similar to our student
16	advisory committee and the legislative
17	committee to look into outsourcing or is that
18	not something you want to do?
19	MR. WALKER: You can do that, certainly.
20	MS. POWELL: I think I think, as chair,
21	we could always implement some type of
22	committee to be under constant review of all of
23	our issues that the board faces but, I think at
24	this time we need to address the issue of the
25	concerns of the public that we have heard thus

far in our regional meetings. It appeared that there was concern. So I think we need to address those concerns with the best of our ability at this time, whether there's a change or there's no change, we need to address the concerns of the public on who administers the examination. And as you can see as a board, there is more than one opinion from our public and our board, so --

MS. WEST: We are divided. And a lot of statements have been made that we don't know if they're exaggerations or -- you know, I don't know what the facts are. I don't know what an outsourcing company will do.

MS. POWELL: Well, I think that the director has looked into the outsourcing expenses at some level. Is that correct, Kathy?

MS. WITTUM: Not in the detail as to what I think Sherron is wanting.

MS. POWELL: Oh, okay.

MS. WITTUM: So if you want to form a committee that would look at what the testing companies would offer to us, then we could certainly do that.

MR. KEENE: I think that would be a starting point on this. I mean, it may not be something that be changed this legislative session because I think there's too many questions here. And we're having a lot of talk out there about what it's going to cost and it's going to increase — but they don't really know that. They don't have any information in front of them about that.

(Multiple conversations taking place at once.)

MR. WALKER: Well, I might suggest that instead of a committee just have a similar motion as passed previously and have them do presentations for the entire board. So there'll be no second-hand information. You'll hear directly from them and a better decision could be made because this seems to be a substantial decision to be hastily made.

MR. KEENE: Then I would make a motion that we have the director schedule the outsource companies, testing companies, to come before this board and give a presentation. And November is not a bad time for me.

MS. TRAYLOR: We done that one time and we

1	never did get
2	MR. KEENE: That was a different director
3	from what we've got now.
4	MS. TRAYLOR: Well, I would think the
5	motion would still hold true.
6	MR. KEENE: There are a lot of board
7	members here that are new that were not a part
8	of that motion, though. It was at least three
9	years ago.
10	MS. WEST: Is that a motion?
11	MR. KEENE: Uh-huh.
12	MS. WEST: I'll second.
13	MS. POWELL: I've got a motion and a
14	second. All those in favor of researching
15	outsourcing information and having it presented
16	to us?
17	MR. DOWNEY: I think we need some more
18	information on it, and
19	MS. TRAYLOR: Yes.
20	MR. DOWNEY: I don't know that it's
21	going to change my mind, but I'd like to hear
22	it.
23	MS. TRAYLOR: Sure. Let's hear it.
24	MS. PICKERING: The presentations are
25	going to be to the whole board, though, aren't

1	they?
2	MS. WITTUM: Uh-huh.
3	MS. POWELL: When would we
4	MS. WITTUM: I'll contact the ones who
5	would be avail or I'll contact all of them
6	and see which ones could come at the November
7	20th meeting to make a
8	MR. KEENE: If you want to try to work
9	this in then we need to do it now.
10	MS. WITTUM: Uh-huh.
11	MS. POWELL: Okay.
12	MR. KEENE: You have a motion
13	MS. POWELL: I have a motion and a second.
14	I did hear a did I? I'm sorry. I did hear
15	a second?
16	MS. WEST: Yes.
17	MS. POWELL: Okay. All those in favor,
18	raise your right hand.
19	MS. TRAYLOR: This would be for bringing -
20	_
21	MR. KEENE: Just a presentation being
22	made.
23	MS. WITTUM: No final decision being made.
24	(Show of hands.)
25	MS. POWELL: It's unanimous.

BOARD ISSUES: INCREASE FEES 2 MS. WITTUM: Number 13, Board Issues: Increase Fees. The recommendation is to 3 4 increase the fees, to remove the fee schedule 5 from the law and place it in the rules and to implement an active and an inactive distinction 6 7 for licensees. 8 The suggestions that were not -- that were 9 made during the regional meetings that were not 10 supported by the legislative committee were to 11 implement a booth-renter fee; and to not hold a 12 salon owner responsible for practitioners who 13 violate the law or the rules while working in 14 the salon. 15 Are there any questions? 16 (Pause.) 17 MR. WALKER: Any board comments? 18 ma'am. 19 MS. WEST: I have a question. And I was 20 at one of those meetings. The (b) part about 21 that one, not holding the salon owner -- I 22 don't think we can do that, not holding the 23 salon or owner responsible for the people who 24 are --25 MS. WITTUM: We currently do hold --

1	MS. WEST: Yes.
2	MS. WITTUM: a salon owner responsible.
3	And our well, the committee did not favor
4	that suggestion. We want to keep it as is
5	where
6	MS. WEST: As is, okay.
7	MS. TRAYLOR: I agree with you.
8	MS. WITTUM: We do hold them responsible
9	if a person working in their salon violates the
10	law or the rules.
11	MS. WEST: Okay. I misunderstood that.
12	MS. WARD: I think that they should hold
13	the booth-renter and the salon owner, both,
14	responsible.
15	MS. WITTUM: That's the way it currently
16	is. And it's not a booth-renter. It's a
17	practitioner. Or it's not a booth-renter to
18	us.
19	MS. WARD: Yes.
20	MR. KEENE: Was during those sessions
21	was there anything said as to why not have a
22	booth-renter license or fee? What made the
23	committee decide to not recommend that?
24	(Pause.)
25	MR. KEENE: It's just going to create more

revenue.

(Multiple conversations taking place at once.)

MR. WALKER: The main discussion took place in Fayetteville on this topic.

MS. WITTUM: And in the report that was made it says, a comment was made that increasing fees would not be opposed but the participant suggested including a booth-renter's license in order to prevent the salon owner from being held responsible. Colorado has been doing this for approximately 30 years. Changing booth-renter to independent contractors was also suggested in an effort to eliminate the burden a salon owner has in reporting income and making report to the IRS.

(Pause.)

MS. WITTUM: I think that was the only --

MR. WALKER: That's all I recall.

MS. WITTUM: -- comments that were made.

And the committee just didn't favor the boothrenter. I know you-all as cosmetologists,

speak up if you want to, but just for me
looking at it outwards, I would say that that's
part of the business of a salon owner and the

board does not need to get involved in the business of a salon owner. If the business chooses to booth rent to their people or even employ practitioners, that's their choice, but we should not favor one way or the other.

That's just my personal opinion.

MS. TRAYLOR: You don't have to rent booths. That's your choice. That's a salon owners choice.

MS. WITTUM: Uh-huh.

MS. TRAYLOR: But, you know, and a lot of them though, Kathy, think that well, if I rent booths then I'm not responsible for them.

Well, they are because their name's out front.

And that's the thing that so many salons do not understand.

MS. WITTUM: Who had asked me a question?

I mean, there wasn't -- there wasn't just all sorts of comments made that would blatantly say we should not do this. I think it was just a general individual belief that it would not be in the best interests of the board.

MR. WALKER: Any other comments or questions from the board?

(Pause.)

MR. WALKER: If not, anyone from the audience? Yes, ma'am, you were first.

MS. ANDERSON: If a salon owner has a contract with that booth-renter, is that legal and binding saying if there are any violations, you are financially responsible? Is that something legal that a salon owner can do with that booth-renter?

MR. WALKER: Well, from my perspective ——
I can only speak for the board's perspective
and that would not be enforceable vis—a—vis the
board inspections. Now if y'all wanted to have
an individual contract and make it that type of
language, then I would suggest you consult your
own attorney and make that, you know,
available. And that may one day come before a
circuit judge, and I certainly can't decide for
them at this point either, so all that being
said is —— I know some good attorneys.

(Chorus of laughter.)

MS. WITTUM: I have talked before with salon owners and practitioners who have had some type of an agreement like that and what it appeared to me the salon owner was doing was, they may would pay that penalty to the board

but then they would recoup it from that practitioner. And that's their business.

That's not ours. And if they can enforce that legally, let them do it, but we would send out a penalty both to the salon owner and to the practitioner.

MS. ANDERSON: As a salon owner, I do have a booth-renters. I do have contract. It is a legal binding document in the salon that it's from, but as far as abiding by the state law, that's stated in there that I would be responsible for any liability in my salon. And they're also responsible for maintaining liability insurance and it's stated in that contract. But so the liability issues are covered, the tax-issues are covered, but liability-wise and tax-wise, my attorney has told me that it comes back to me anyway, you know, if they didn't pay taxes you get a blanket liability.

MS. TRAYLOR: Your name is on the license of that salon, so --

(Multiple conversations taking place at once.)

MR. WALKER: Yes, ma'am.

1	MS. NEUMEIER: Debbie Neumeier, ATU Ozark.
2	I agree with her. I've been told that we have
3	a bindingI am a shop owner, instructor, and
4	cosmetologist. I had the same problem. We
5	have a binding contract at our shop, but taking
6	it to my attorney it's not really worth what it
7	says on the paper. Really, I mean, it's not.
8	I feel that if you give a booth-renter it's own
9	license as per se a shop owner who would be
10	responsible, it gives the shop owner less
11	control over their shop on what happens inside
12	the salon. And you're going to get a lot of
13	these people that do as they please and they're
14	not going to abide by the shop owner's rules,
15	the State Board of Cosmetology rules and it's
16	just going to be a big problem.
17	MR. WALKER: Any other comments?
18	(Pause.)
19	MR. WALKER: I'll turn it back over to the
20	board for any discussion or questions.
21	MS. POWELL: Is there any discussion?
22	(Pause.)
23	MS. POWELL: Do I have a motion?
24	(Pause.)
25	MS. POWELL: Do I have a motion on

Increasing Fees, item number 13? 2 MR. DOWNEY: I'm make it. I'll move that 3 we increase the fees. 4 MS. POWELL: I have a motion. Do I have a 5 second? MS. TURMAN: I second. 6 7 MS. POWELL: I have a second. All those 8 in favor of approving the recommendation 9 Increasing Fees, raise your right hand. 10 (Show of hands.) 11 MS. POWELL: It's unanimous. Thank you, 12 Board, the motion carries. 13 (Pause.) 14 MS. POWELL: At this time, we're going to 15 take a short break and we'll return at 1 o'clock. 16 17 (WHEREUPON, a short lunch break was taken 18 at 12:26 p.m., after which proceedings resumed 19 at 1:00 p.m. as follows, to-wit:) 20 MS. POWELL: I will call the meeting back 21 to order and remind you to please maintain your 22 electronic devices in the off position. And 23 refrain from discussions on the side, please, 24 as it makes it difficult for us to hear. I'll 25 turn the meeting over to Mr. Walker.

CONTINUING EDUCATION

MR. WALKER: We are still on the agenda on the recommendations we've received. We are coming back and we are on number 14, Continuing Education. I'll turn it over to Ms. Wittum.

MS. WITTUM: The recommendation is to implement continuing education for practitioners in the following way: the continuing ed would only address health and safety issues. The board would assume the responsibility to hold the training throughout the year in each congressional district to allow the practitioner to attend. The health and safety training would be incorporated into the penalty grid when it's revised and additional training would be required for violators.

The recommendation includes removing the requirement for instructors to obtain con-ed because they would be getting a health and safety continuing ed.

MR. WALKER: Does anyone from the legislative committee care to comment on that? (Pause.)

MR. WALKER: Are there any comments or

questions from the full board?

MS. POWELL: I think that the board felt that this was an opportunity to implement this continuing ed across the state into the four congressional districts and saw it as a benefit to the congressional districts, and as well to the board as an opportunity to visit with people in the different areas of the state.

And I know that during our regional meetings in Fayetteville, there seemed to be a lot of comments from the public that appreciated the fact that we came to Fayetteville that day, and were in support of the board and just giving them the opportunity to see the board meet in the different congressional districts.

(Pause.)

Does anyone else on the board have anything else to add to this that possibly you recall from the ${\mathord{\text{--}}}$

MS. TRAYLOR: Would this be mandatory?

MS. POWELL: Yes, it would be mandatory that this would be quality of education for continuing ed.

MS. TRAYLOR: How many hours?

MS. WITTUM: What was not discussed was

exactly how many hours. So you might want to 2 come to a consensus today on exactly how many 3 hours you would like to require. 4 MS. POWELL: I'd like to see the board 5 implement this continuing ed on health and safety issues at a minimum of 4 hours and a 6 7 maximum of 8 hours per congressional district. 8 MS. WITTUM: I would suggest not putting a 9 maximum, because if you incorporate it into the 10 penalty grid you may have some repeat offenders 11 who would continually disciplined and 12 instructed to attend. 13 MS. POWELL: I'm sorry. I think -- well, 14 are we talking about two different things here? 15 I'm talking about how many hours we'd be able 16 to give us through continuing ed in a 17 congressional district. 18 MS. WITTUM: Okay. 19 MS. POWELL: And I think what you're 20 talking about is --21 MS. WITTUM: Is the actual number. 22 MS. POWELL: I'm sorry. Go ahead and 23 visit what you were saying. 24 MS. WITTUM: Oh, no. I just wanted to 25 point out that we do need to specify the number

of hours. MS. WEST: So you're saying it's okay to set a minimum of four without giving a maximum? 3 4 MS. TRAYLOR: Do they have to have these 5 before they renew their license? MS. WITTUM: Yes. So within a two-year 6 7 period, moving to a two-year cycle, we would 8 need to set the number of hours for license 9 renewal. 10 MS. TRAYLOR: License, 8 hours, in a two-11 year period. 12 (Pause.) 13 MS. TRAYLOR: Four each year, because 14 instructors have to do eight now and that's in 15 one year. 16 MR. KEENE: And this, don't the 17 instructors -- well this is health, safety, and 18 teaching methods, isn't it? 19 MS. POWELL: Not any longer. It's --20 MR. KEENE: It's not? 21 MS. POWELL: No, huh-uh. It was a -- so 22 many hours were mandated towards teaching 23 methodology but now it's NAACAS standard that 24 it include but not -- they don't regulate how 25 many.

MS. TURMAN: How would we handle it if maybe they were, you know, they could not attend the date? I just wanted to know about 3 4 that because there are going to be those that 5 are unable to attend the date that's in their congressional district. Is there going to be a 6 7 way that they can make up this -- these hours? 8 They can attend -- they could MS. WITTUM: attend any training that we have regardless of 9 10 where it was located. So if they couldn't come 11 to the one, hopefully in their congressional 12 district, they could always attend in another. 13 MS. POWELL: Is there something going to 14 be included in this language that would allow a 15 person that was on an inactive status, and that 16 had decided to renew their license due to not 17 doing continuing ed -- language to allow that 18 person to acquire additional hours so that they 19 could renew their license? 20 MS. WITTUM: We would need to address 21 that. 22 MS. TRAYLOR: What we do now and it's just 23 you have to catch your hours up before you can 24 renew your license. 25 MS. POWELL: Right.

1	MS. WITTUM: Right.
2	MS. POWELL: I think that is kind of
3	that's the way the law is written.
4	MS. TURMAN: I guess I'm a little
5	confused. Eight hours for instructors, now, to
6	get your in order to maintain I mean, to
7	keep theirs up.
8	MS. TRAYLOR: But it would be eight hours
9	for everybody, every two years.
10	MS. TURMAN: Okay. So we changed that
11	from eight hours for the instructors to eight
12	hours every two years for everybody?
13	MS. POWELL: Well, that's the
14	recommendation that it include it would
15	remove the instructors from
16	MS. TURMAN: Okay.
17	MS. POWELL: that requirement.
18	MS. GORDON: Have we discussed a fee or
19	anything?
20	MS. POWELL: Pardon me?
21	MS. GORDON: A fee or anything, you know,
22	price ranges for them taking the cost?
23	MS. WITTUM: We can charge a nominal fee
24	for attending the event.
25	MS. TRAYLOR: Who is who is going to

teach this?

MS. WITTUM: We would -- we would need to get speakers lined up. I think we could look at how it's done in North Carolina, as well as the regional where they enlisted the help of the CDC, or the health department, to talk about health and safety issues. Plus, I mean, if we're charging a nominal fee for it, we could also look at bringing someone in to give even more of an in-depth look at some of those issues.

MS. TURMAN: I, for one, think this is a very good recommendation because after all we are -- and I think sometimes we just absolutely forget. And I think it would be, you know, renewal every two years or every year. I think this would be wonderful. I think it's -- this is something that, you know, we really definitely need to look at and take note of.

MS. POWELL: Would it be implemented in '07 or will it have to wait?

MS. WITTUM: This is a statutory change.

MS. POWELL: Okay.

MS. WITTUM: We're going -- it would happen after the session -- or during the

session next year. 2 MS. GORDON: And it will primarily cover 3 the health and safety issues in the cosmetology 4 field rather than the medical field or -- just 5 basically be -- so that means that you would obtain someone from -- where did you say, would 6 7 be giving --8 MS. WITTUM: Well, the health -- at the 9 conference that we went to, North Carolina used 10 its health department, someone who worked with 11 disease -- controlled diseases, I think, and 12 they came and spoke about the communicable 13 diseases as they apply to cosmetology. 14 MS. GORDON: Okay. 15 MS. WITTUM: There's a whole host of 16 things that we would be able to offer, not just 17 the same training for every single one but 18 maybe give a variety. 19 MS. TRAYLOR: Someone from that committee 20 on NIC might be willing to --21 MS. WITTUM: Right. 22 MS. TRAYLOR: You know, Sue Sanderson does 23 that all of the time. 24 MS. WITTUM: Uh-huh. 25 (Pause.)

MR. WALKER: Is there any other discussion by the board, questions or comments? 3 MS. POWELL: I was wanting to know about 4 the opportunity for hours to carry over from 5 one year to the next. How would that be addressed? 6 7 MS. WITTUM: We haven't discussed it, so 8 if that's something that you would want it 9 would need to be amended in here. 10 MS. POWELL: Well, what is your opinion on 11 that? I mean, I know you think that issues --12 MS. WITTUM: I think if we're giving four 13 hours of this type of a structured training 14 opportunity there should be no reason for 15 people to not be able to get four hours a year 16 in what we're providing, especially when you 17 consider the fact that we'll be making it 18 possible four times in each area. 19 MS. GORDON: And if they should miss it 20 for some reason this year, they still would 21 have the opportunity the next year before 22 renewal to get the full eight hours in. 23 MS. WITTUM: Correct. 24 MS. TRAYLOR: What all would count, I 25 mean, what could you attend maybe not in your

region to obtain these hours? 2 MS. WITTUM: Well, you wouldn't be able to 3 obtain them. The way this is written here, a 4 practitioner could not go anywhere but what the 5 board hosts -- facilitates. They wouldn't go to any other classes. So of the trainings that 6 7 we would facilitate in each congressional 8 district, the practitioners would need to 9 acquire how ever many number of hours per year, 10 or for that two year period, in order to renew 11 their license. 12 MS. POWELL: I like the idea of us getting 13 the eight -- or four hours every two years. 14 MS. PICKERING: How many hours -- could 15 you repeat the hours? 16 MS. POWELL: I think one of the 17 recommendations was the four hours --18 MS. WITTUM: Per year. 19 MS. POWELL: -- per year. 20 MS. PICKERING: Oh, per year. I thought 21 you said every two years -- every year. 22 MS. POWELL: Is that what you said? 23 MS. TRAYLOR: That's what I said, you 24 know, you go to the every two year renewal and 25 they would have to have eight hours in that --

1	MS. POWELL: Right, uh-huh, so it would be
2	four hours a year.
3	MS. TRAYLOR: Or they could get the full
4	eight
5	MS. POWELL: In one.
6	MS. TRAYLOR: in one. Or two, either
7	way.
8	MS. POWELL: Whichever.
9	MS. WITTUM: As long as they have eight by
10	the time that they come up for renewal.
11	MS. TRAYLOR: Right.
12	MS. WITTUM: And then with the board
13	facilitating this, we would have the
14	documentation readily available as to whether
15	or not a person has actually acquired those
16	hours.
17	MS. GORDON: Would the board itself be
18	taking care of this or would it be through the
19	office or
20	MS. WITTUM: The staff would primarily do
21	it. I mean, the board would certainly always
22	be welcome to participate in that.
23	MS. PICKERING: But we would if we're a
24	cosmetologist, we're going to have to take four
25	hours per year.

. 1	1
1	MS. WITTUM: Uh-huh.
2	MS. PICKERING: Not as a board, but as a
3	cosmetologist.
4	MS. WITTUM: Right. You could participate
5	as a board member in the function or in the
6	training, but as a practitioner you would have
7	to also acquire your hours.
8	MS. GORDON: It's going to be like a
9	requirement that we have to be there as board
10	members, the office members?
11	MS. WITTUM: Correct.
12	(Pause.)
13	MR. WALKER: Any other comments or
14	questions from the board?
15	MS. TRAYLOR: I'd like to hear from some
16	of them and what they think.
17	MR. WALKER: Are we all good?
18	(Chorus of laughter.)
19	MR. WALKER: If we could get comments from
20	those who are not in favor of this?
21	(Pause.)
22	MR. WALKER: Yes, ma'am.
23	MS. ANDERSON: I have a concern about the
24	continuing ed outside of the state. Some of
25	our people are going to be going to things

outside of our state. Are any of those things 2 going to count for that continuing education? 3 And what about online training? There is all 4 kinds of online training that's available in 5 lots of our surrounding states that is on sanitation and sterilization and it requires 6 7 the testing at the end of the online training. 8 MS. WITTUM: Neither of those would apply 9 if this recommendation is adopted. 10 MS. TRAYLOR: You still would have to get 11 it within the state. 12 MR. WALKER: Yes, ma'am. 13 MS. GULLEY: I just need to know if, like 14 if they, if the instructors say, this year, did 15 not get their continuing ed and then that 16 passes for next year, are we going to be able 17 to get it that next year, the eight hours? 18 MS. WITTUM: It -- this will not pass 19 through the session prior to the requirement to 20 get the hours for the next -- for the upcoming 21 renewal. All of the con-ed hours to renew for 22 2007 license have to be acquired before January 23 31, 2007. 24 MR. WALKER: Yes, ma'am. 25 MS. HUGHES: Jenita Hughes. I have two

	10
1	questions. Are we talking about just
2	practitioners or are we talking about
3	instructors and practitioners getting eight
4	hours in two years?
5	MS. WITTUM: This would apply to all
6	practitioners. If this recommendation is
7	adopted then there would no longer be a
8	requirement for the instructors to receive what
9	is currently on the books. There would just be
10	across the board the eight hours for the two
11	year cycle.
12	MS. HUGHES: And my second question is you
13	talked about an active and inactive status on
14	your license. Being as a lot of mine are
15	incarcerated for a couple of years, you know,
16	they wouldn't attend a class so are you saying
17	there's an inactive status for them to go to?
18	MS. WITTUM: Uh-huh.
19	(Pause.)
20	MR. WALKER: Any other comments?
21	(Pause.)
22	MR. WALKER: Seeing none, Ms. Powell.
23	MS. POWELL: Item number 14, Continuing
24	Education I need a motion.
25	MR. WALKER: If we did the

1	MS. POWELL: Is there any discussion?
2	MR. WALKER: I'll say this. If we did the
3	eight hours, it's not included in this original
4	proposal so it would have to be amended to say
5	eight hours or four hours every year for the
6	two year period.
7	MS. TURMAN: Madam President, I would like
8	to make a motion that we accept this value for
9	the Continuing Ed for eight hours every two
10	year time frame.
11	MS. TRAYLOR: I second that motion.
12	MS. POWELL: I have a motion and a second.
13	All those in favor, raise your right hand.
14	(Show of hands.)
15	MS. POWELL: All those opposed?
16	(Show of hands.)
17	MS. POWELL: The motion carries.
18	ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS
19	MODIFICATION TO AESTHETICIAN'S DEFINITION
20	MS. WITTUM: Under the Additional
21	Recommendations, number one is to modify the
22	aesthetician's definition to allow them to
23	perform services on the whole body as opposed
24	to being restricted to certain parts of the
25	body and to also perform waxing services.

1	Are there any questions or does the
2	committee want to say anything?
3	MS. TRAYLOR: Does that include the
4	Brazilian wax?
5	MS. WITTUM: Does it what?
6	(Chorus of laughter.)
7	(Multiple conversations taking place at
8	once.)
9	MS. WITTUM: Are there any additional
10	comments?
11	MR. KEENE: I think they're doing them
12	anyway.
13	MS. WEST: This is going to put them with
14	a massage therapist, right?
15	MS. WITTUM: No. This just says that an
16	aesthetician can work on the whole body instead
17	
18	MS. WEST: Okay.
19	MS. WITTUM: of just being able to work
20	from the bust up.
21	MS. WEST: Okay.
22	(Pause.)
23	MR. WALKER: Comments or questions from
24	the board?
25	(Pause.)

1	MR. WALKER: From the audience?
2	(Multiple conversations taking place at
3	once.)
4	MS. TRAYLOR: Brenda, you got a comment,
5	honey?
6	(Multiple conversations taking place at
7	once.)
8	MR. WALKER: Ms. Powell.
9	MS. GORDON: You-all are going to have to
10	inspect that.
11	MS. POWELL: I think you have one more
12	comment from the inspectors.
13	MR. WALKER: I didn't hear you.
14	MS. POWELL: Yes. This lady wants the
15	floor.
16	MR. WALKER: Yes, ma'am.
17	MS. HUGHES: When you talk about the
18	cosmetologist doing all-encompassing and, you
19	know, if you're a cosmetologist you can do
20	aesthetics
21	MS. WITTUM: Aesthetics.
22	MS. TRAYLOR: Yes, aesthetics.
23	MS. HUGHES: or you can specialize. So
24	now that we break it apart, it would be
25	separate so the cosmetologist wouldn't be able

1	to work on the whole body, is that correct?
2	MS. WITTUM: No. A cosmetologist can work
3	on the whole body, period. Their definition is
4	not being changed.
5	MS. HUGHES: What is the definition of A
6	cosmetologist?
7	MS. WITTUM: That they can perform
8	services on the whole body.
9	MS. HUGHES: Bust up
10	MS. WITTUM: No, cosmetologists
11	(Multiple conversations taking place at
12	once.)
13	MS. WITTUM: Thank you for bringing that
14	up.
15	(Multiple conversations taking place at
16	once.)
17	MS. WITTUM: As an aesthetician
18	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Where do you find that?
19	MS. WITTUM: The definitions are under
20	102. The aesthetician is (a)1 and the
21	cosmetologist is (c) and then under 102(b) it
22	explains what the art of cosmetology is for the
23	cosmetologist.
24	(Multiple conversations taking place at
25	once.)

1	MS. ANDERSON: Ms. Wittum, I have a
2	question. And I've been reading this, 102, it
3	says the upper part of the human body in
4	teaching aesthetics, as well. That's what I've
5	been reading upper part as being the upper part
6	of the body, and in that the case, the neck,
7	the face, and hands or arm. So are you reading
8	this upper part of the human body as the whole
9	body?
10	MS. WITTUM: No. We're saying that we
11	would like to modify that.
12	MS. ANDERSON: The 102(b) from the way
13	it's stated?
14	MS. WITTUM: That's what we're
15	recommending.
16	MS. ANDERSON: Thank you. I was unsure.
17	Now, is that for cosmetologists, as well?
18	MS. WITTUM: We thanks to Ms. Hughes,
19	we've added that, too.
20	MS. ANDERSON: Okay.
21	MR. WALKER: We'd need to add that in the
22	motion.
23	MS. POWELL: Okay. We'd be amending?
24	MR. WALKER: Yes.
25	MS. POWELL: And do I have a motion?

1	MS. WITTUM: I think we have another
2	comment.
3	MR. WALKER: Who does?
4	MS. WITTUM: Scottie.
5	MS. BURCHETT: Well, it says under (b)4,
6	removing, temporarily, superfluous hair from
7	the body of any person, so
8	MS. WITTUM: Thank you.
9	MS. BURCHETT: it's already covered.
10	MS. WITTUM: I knew Arnie had said the
11	cosmetologist could work on the whole body.
12	MS. ANDERSON: Where is that, excuse me?
13	MS. BURCHETT: On page four under (b),
14	number four. It does just say from the body of
15	any person.
16	MS. ANDERSON: And that's on here
17	MS. WITTUM: Under cosmetology.
18	MS. ANDERSON: Okay.
19	MS. WITTUM: What we do need to modify
20	(Multiple conversations taking place at
21	once.)
22	MS. WITTUM: What we do need to modify is
23	(b) 2.
24	MS. ANDERSON: That should say hair
	-

MS. BURCHETT: Right. MS. WITTUM: That's what we're talking 3 about it saying. 4 MS. ANDERSON: But we're talking about if 5 a cosmetologist can do it and an aesthetician should. A body treatment is a body treatment. 6 7 MS. POWELL: And that would be covered 8 under two. 9 MS. ANDERSON: And that would be covered 10 under two, cosmetician? 11 MS. POWELL: I think one thing I wanted to 12 say on this upper part of the body thing is it 13 has been described as being confusing for many 14 years, in what a person would consider the 15 upper part of the body. And at one time it 16 would have been from the bust up and once it 17 would have been from the waist up. It depended 18 on who was reading it, and so this kind of 19 clears up that area of definition so that we 20 know that the aesthetician does do a body wrap. 21 And this is just one area that it would include 22 the body as a whole. 23 MS. BURCHETT: If you are a cosmetologist, 24 you are an aesthetician so --25 MS. POWELL: It's the same thing.

1	MS. BURCHETT: it would be covered.
2	MS. POWELL: Yes, except that in our
3	language here where you can see the definition
4	of massaging and cleansing under item two. It
5	and then as it goes into beautifying the
6	face on three. It's the same thing for the
7	cosmetologist to do the same.
8	MS. BURCHETT: So you're saying
9	cosmetologists could work on the entire body
10	even if it were massaging or whatever. It
11	wouldn't have to just be removing hair.
12	MS. POWELL: Exactly. You're teaching it,
13	
14	MS. BURCHETT: Uh-huh.
15	MS. POWELL: you'd have to cover it,
16	MS. BURCHETT: Right.
17	MS. POWELL: first and foremost in
18	cosmetology and then to address it to work on
19	the public as an aesthetician or a
20	cosmetologist.
21	MS. BURCHETT: Thank you.
22	MR. WALKER: Any other comments?
23	MS. ANDERSON: Does this terminology in
24	your massage, is it that we can teach
25	massage in our cosmetology schools now and be

	·
1	under our accreditation? Their terminology
2	there is that you've been referring to as the
3	upper body and the upper portion, and so that
4	terminology might be good to apply to this and
5	I can't give it to you because I don't teach
6	it. It is in our text and that might be good
7	terminology to add for clarification purposes.
8	MR. WALKER: Anyone else?
9	(Pause.)
10	MR. WALKER: Ms. Powell.
11	MS. POWELL: I need a motion from the
12	board to
13	MR. KEENE: I'll move that we accept the
14	committee's recommendation along with the
15	changes that were made to this. I can't
16	remember what all they were and where they
17	were.
18	MS. WITTUM: The cosmetology definition.
19	MR. KEENE: Okay. The cosmetology
20	definition.
21	MS. WITTUM: The subsection (b)2 and then
22	3 probably needs to be redacted.
23	MS. POWELL: I have a motion.
24	MS. WEST: Second.
25	MS. POWELL: All those in favor, raise

your right hand. (Show of hands.) 3 MS. POWELL: It's unanimous. The motion 4 carries. Thank you. 5 ADD WAXING TO MANICURIST DEFINITION MS. WITTUM: The next one is to add waxing 6 7 services to the manicurist definition. 8 legislative committee disagreed with this 9 recommendation and would prefer not to add 10 waxing services to the manicurist definition. 11 Any comment? 12 MS. TRAYLOR: I agree. 13 (Pause.) 14 MR. WALKER: It's open for board 15 questions. 16 MS. WEST: Just for point of reference, is 17 it education, they would require more education 18 for waxing? 19 MS. WITTUM: Currently they can't wax at 20 all. Manicurists cannot wax at all. 21 MS. WEST: Cannot wax at all. 22 MS. WITTUM: And I will say just for the 23 non-cosmetologists here that I have had several 24 requests or comments made because of hair being 25 on the hands. We and the manicurist would want

1	to wax that at the same time they were doing a
2	manicure, but after the legislative committee
3	meeting I was sitting and looking over the
4	hearing orders for the upcoming November
5	meeting and there is a reason why we do not
6	need to add waxing to the manicurist's
7	definition. So
8	MS. TRAYLOR: They could do the toes, too.
9	MS. WITTUM: I certainly agree with the
10	legislative committee's decision here.
11	MS. WEST: Does that mean that the
12	manicurists now, you know, do the paraffin wax
13	on your hands and on your feet?
14	MS. WITTUM: They're not supposed to be
15	doing that.
16	BOARD MEMBER: Really.
17	(Multiple conversations taking place at
18	once.)
19	MR. DOWNEY: That's not hair removal.
20	MS. WITTUM: Oh, okay.
21	MS. GORDON: It's a moisturizing
22	treatment.
23	MR. DOWNEY: That's all it does.
24	MS. POWELL: That's a paraffin bath and
25	not what she's trying to explain what was

proposed to the legislative committee was hair 3 MS. WITTUM: Hair removal. 4 MS. POWELL: -- removal. 5 MR. DOWNEY: Hair removal. MS. WITTUM: Yes. 6 7 MS. POWELL: And the paraffin bath is not 8 a process to remove hair. 9 MS. WEST: Do you need a motion for that? 10 MR. WALKER: Well, I was going to take any 11 comments. Audience, have any discussion, 12 comments, questions? 13 (Pause.) 14 MR. WALKER: Seeing none, there's no 15 motion necessary because we're not acting upon 16 this. LANGUAGE ADDITION TO SPECIFY 17 ALLOWABLE OUT-OF-SALON WORK CONDITIONS 18 19 MS. WITTUM: The number three is to add 20 language to A.C.A. 17-26-103(b), 17-26-312, and 21 17-26-313 to allow a licensee to work outside 22 of an establishment under certain conditions 23 for pay or to volunteer services for charity. 24 This change, we would need to proceed with 25 caution, so as to not allow for mobile salons -

2 MS. TRAYLOR: You don't want that to 3 happen. 4 MS. WITTUM: -- because the board has not 5 wanted to do mobile salons. MS. TRAYLOR: Yeah, that would just about 6 7 open the door for them because they're already 8 hot on that trail. 9 MR. KEENE: What would be the conditions 10 where you would allow -- what was the thinking 11 of the committee or whoever recommended this? 12 MS. WITTUM: I recommended it. And 13 because of the licensees that I've communicated 14 with who are leaving their establishments to do 15 other than -- to do services on other than 16 incapacitated people. All of these are to go 17 and do charity events and things of that 18 nature, because currently what the law says is 19 that the licensee can leave the licensed 20 establishment and go do work outside of the 21 salon as long as they are working on someone 22 who is incapacitated. 23 MR. KEENE: Right. MS. WITTUM: So this would just allow for 24 25 the people who are obviously going out and

doing weddings and other charities, be it birthdays or whatever, to be able to do it legally.

MS. GORDON: What questions would we use for the measure of not allowing it to be done, bringing in the mobile salons?

MS. WITTUM: Well, we would just have to make sure that it -- that the language is clear that it's only for those charity events or those special events and not to go get in your vehicle and go to a home and take care of people, if that makes sense.

MS. TRAYLOR: That's what they're doing now.

MS. GORDON: Uh-huh.

MS. TRAYLOR: Is going to offices.

MS. WITTUM: Well, we would just have to - whatever you know is being done that you
don't want to be done, we would need to modify
that language as the attorney -- or, excuse me,
let the attorneys know exactly what we don't
want so that we can make sure that that
language covers it. But currently, obviously
you-all know that people are leaving their
establishments and going and doing this.

1	MS. GORDON: Uh-huh.
2	MS. WITTUM: So why not why not put
3	some language in place to where they can do
4	that freely without feeling like they're having
5	to hide it?
6	MS. TRAYLOR: Now, what do you mean,
7	freely?
8	MS. POWELL: Well, if you were to I
9	think our director's intent was to allow for
10	the volunteer services, those for charity.
11	Volunteer, like you would go into a church and
12	you would do the bride's hair at the last
13	minute before the wedding and be able to do
14	that without fear that you are
15	MS. TRAYLOR: Well, I
16	MS. POWELL: misrepresenting or
17	violating a state law or that you are
18	representing a mobile spa.
19	MS. TRAYLOR: Well now, can you charge for
20	that?
21	MS. POWELL: Sure.
22	MS. PICKERING: It's up to the individual
23	whether they want to charge or not.
24	MS. POWELL: I think you know
25	MS. PICKERING: I've had ten ladies, young

ladies, come into my shop and it would have been much easier for me to have gone to the church and do their hair or whatever, but because it violated -- because I could not do that legally, they have to come to my shop.

And I'm not the one that brought that up, but I'm just saying that's a good example. I had rather go to the church legally and do their hair than for that many to come into my shop.

Does that make sense?

MS. GORDON: Uh-huh.

MS. POWELL: But the fact that they would be licensed and they would be stationed in a salon -- they would have had a -- they're not mobile because they have a practitioner license and they're in an establishment. So once they're in an establishment and they're a licensed practitioner, then they would be able to go to a --

MS. TRAYLOR: Okay. That was my question.

MS. POWELL: -- you know. I know that there are conventions that have come to Arkansas and they'll call to solicit stylists to come and offer -- or do manicures or pedicures or whatever for their business --

wives or spouses, I quess, --2 MS. TRAYLOR: But they would have to be --MS. WITTUM: -- but they are from a salon. 3 4 MS. TRAYLOR: Yeah. 5 MS. WITTUM: They have to be from an establishment, a licensed establishment. 6 7 MR. WALKER: Ms. Ward has a question. 8 MS. WARD: I think that is a good idea, 9 but I think we need to be more specific on what 10 type of affair they can have, because you're 11 going to have people just going anywhere and 12 just blowing somebody's hair or getting friends 13 together and doing their hair and saying, well, 14 I can do it because we got together somewhere. 15 If it's for a wedding or a fashion show or --16 you know, something specific. I just think we 17 need to be more specific in what they can do it 18 outside the salon for. 19 MS. POWELL: And I think that's probably 20 why the board had difficulty addressing this 21 issue in the past, as to what -- how you define 22 But I think the language here that does 23 say volunteer services for charity -- here it 24 means without pay. 25 MS. TRAYLOR: Charity means no pay.

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. TURMAN: You've got for pay or to volunteer in it.

MS. WARD: Yes.

MS. WITTUM: I think it would be very difficult to list out every single thing that they might could go out there and do. I mean, it's going to have to be a broad enough statement to cover any of the events that they would like to go to that would be legitimate. You know we're not going to be able to catch every single one of them, but we're not doing it now either. I think the main thing, at least from my perspective, is to give the licensed cosmetologist who honestly wants to be able to go and do a wedding or go to the conventions and take care of -- take care of spouses or whatever for pay, whether -- well, for pay or not for pay, that they can do that without being afraid that one of the inspectors is going to be hot on their tail and actually catch them out there doing it and write a violation.

MS. POWELL: Kathy, actually to implement that could we not put in place, also, to cover Ms. Ward's concerns that the board would have

to be notified, or you, or the office would 1 2 have to be notified of the --MS. WITTUM: I wouldn't recommend it. 3 4 You're talking 30,000 licensees. I don't know 5 how many of them are actually doing it, but I don't want to know every time 30,000 of them 6 7 are going to do a wedding or going to 8 convention. 9 (Chorus of laughter.) 10 MS. WITTUM: We've got enough to do 11 without having to monitor that, too. 12 (Multiple conversations taking place at 13 once.) 14 MS. POWELL: Well, it appears that you 15 have issues of 30,000 people contacting you, 16 but at the same time we have issues of 30,000 17 or less -- well, half of those people going out 18 and not working in an establishment. 19 MS. WARD: I think that leaves it wide 20 open to them going anywhere, doing any -- you 21 Why have a salon if you can just go any 22 place you want and do it? So you've got to 23 have some type of quideline there. 24 MR. WALKER: Is your concern more 25 exclusions of services or types of events that

1 people would be doing in general? 2 MS. WARD: To have them go over where 3 they're going to go and do it, because 4 otherwise they could just go to any place, in 5 your home or anywhere. And why have a salon if you can just do it any place and get people 6 7 together and do their hair. And say well, 8 we're having a party or we're having this or 9 having that --10 MS. TRAYLOR: It's for a charity event or 11 for pay. 12 MS. TURMAN: But my thing is, you know, a 13 charity they wouldn't get paid, but they're 14 going to go and get paid. And sure, that's --15 MS. WARD: I just think we need to be more 16 specific. 17 MS. POWELL: Well, sure. 18 MS. WITTUM: Well, but it can be either 19 one. 20 (Multiple conversations taking place at 21 once.) 22 MS. WITTUM: They may go and do something 23 They may be volunteering. 24 MS. WARD: But I mean, you're going to 25 have to have some type of a quideline to fall

1 between certain things or it's going to be, you 2 know, if it's going to be for a convention or, 3 you know, a fashion show, or a wedding, or --4 have some type of a guideline of things that 5 events could fall under. And it could be kind of general but you'd have a guideline, 6 7 otherwise they can go any place and do it and 8 why have salon if they can just go out any 9 place and do it? 10 MS. TURMAN: They could have a Pampered 11 Chef party and say, oh, let's do hair on the 12 side, you know? 13 MS. POWELL: They can volunteer or for pay 14 to do cut people's hair over here, right? 15 MS. TURMAN: Yeah. 16 (Multiple conversations taking place at 17 once.) 18 MR. KEENE: I know what she means. And 19 you know, the movie studios, when they come in 20 and they have hairdressers and they're actually 21 from other states and they're working in this -22 23 MR. DOWNEY: That's true. 24 MR. KEENE: -- state. No --25 MS. WITTUM: They're excluded.

1	MR. KEENE: When I work for a manufacturer
2	and I'm traveling all over, you know, I don't
3	have a license in every state that I'm that
4	I go into and is that breaking the law, too?
5	Do we have that stipulation in any of our laws
6	that allows for that?
7	MS. POWELL: Didn't you say that they were
8	excluded?
9	MS. WITTUM: Yes.
10	(Multiple conversations taking place at
11	once.)
12	MS. WITTUM: In Arkansas, they're excluded
13	when it has to do with the
14	MR. DOWNEY: Productions of movies, and
15	doctors and
16	MS. WITTUM: Yeah.
17	MS. GORDON: But I understand what she's
18	saying because what if
19	MS. WITTUM: He asked
20	MS. GORDON: I just decided to have a -
21	_
22	MS. WITTUM:
23	MS. GORDON: hair party.
24	MS. TURMAN: Yeah.
25	MS. POWELL: Well, that means our
	II

, I	1
1	practitioners can
2	(Multiple conversations taking place at
3	once.)
4	MS. POWELL: The motion picture people are
5	excluded from the requirements, but
6	MS. WITTUM: Right.
7	MS. POWELL: our cosmetologists are not
8	
9	MS. WITTUM: Are not supposed to be doing
10	it.
11	MS. POWELL: Right.
12	MS. WITTUM: That is currently what it
13	says.
14	MS. POWELL: It would not violate our
15	rules for the opportunity to do the service.
16	MR. KEENE: Well, I'd be in trouble
17	because I certainly have done all those.
18	MS. WITTUM: But currently what the law
19	says is that a licensee is not supposed to
20	leave the licensed establishment except under
21	certain conditions.
22	MR. KEENE: Right.
23	MS. WITTUM: And those certain conditions
24	deal with an incapacity of the person that
25	you're going to work on.

MR. DOWNEY: If they're healthy you're not 2 supposed to be doing them out of the salon. MR. KEENE: Do what? 3 MR. DOWNEY: If they're healthy you're not 4 5 supposed to do them out of the salon. They've got to be incapacitated in the bed. 6 7 (Chorus of laughter.) 8 (Multiple conversations taking place at 9 once.) 10 MS. WARD: There are people who have a 11 salon in their home. What's to prevent them, 12 one, that we give them a license to do things 13 and because they've got a chair or got a sink 14 there and inviting a few people over every --15 you know every week and they've got a business 16 going on the side. 17 MS. WITTUM: They can do that anyway if 18 they're -- if they've got a licensed 19 establishment --20 MS. WARD: No. 21 MS. WITTUM: -- in their home. 22 MS. WARD: I don't mean that. I mean they 23 just have a -- I know people who've just got a 24 chair and a sink. And they do their immediate 25 family, but why not invite the neighbors?

	20
1	There were neighbors that wanted to come over,
2	but they didn't know you had to come to the
3	salon. But this is opening it up that they can
4	just have anybody come over and doing them.
5	That's what I'm concerned about. And it's not
6	the establishment. It's just having different
7	clients over or driving some place and just
8	saying, okay, I'm going to do somebody's hair
9	and once I get done and having people just drop
10	by. And we've got to give some type of
11	guidelines to attempt to protect the salon and
12	the people who might stop by, you know?
13	(Multiple conversations taking place at
14	once.)
15	MR. WALKER: Any other comments from board
16	members?
17	(Pause.)
18	MR. WALKER: All right. Are we ready?
19	(Pause.)
20	MR. WALKER: I thought we were out of here
21	pretty quickly, but I don't think so.
22	(Chorus of laughter.)
23	MR. WALKER: Yes, ma'am.
24	MS. AKARD: I would think that the reason
25	why we needed a the concern that we would

have would be about the sanitation. Without — that would be the, again, the reason that we have this state board is the sanitation. If we're going to allow them to work outside of the salon then we have to be careful about the sanitation. And even then, I don't really know whether — whether the concern is other than we have to make sure that they are following the sanitation guidelines.

MR. WALKER: Yes, ma'am.

MS. HORNER: Kathy?

MS. POWELL: Give your name, please.

MS. HORNER: Rose Horner.

MS. POWELL: Yes.

MS. HORNER: The Jones Center in

Fayetteville, they were wanting to do -- and you and I talked about it, a charity and have a volunteer cosmetologist to come into the Jones Center and give free haircuts to kids. And they had to have an establishment license.

There was no money exchanged, so is that this?

MS. WITTUM: This -- this would -- in order for Jones Center to put on a charity being under this, they would not have to have an establishment license. The licensed

cosmetologist or manicurist, aesthetician, whomever, could go and provide those services to those children without Jones Center having to have a license.

MS. POWELL: It's because of the physical.

MR. WALKER: Yes, ma'am.

MS. CAUDLE: But they are mentioning the health and sanitation issue of -- of this, but if they're doing it at these special functions, no one would have any way of knowing if they're practicing good health and sanitation procedures because no one will be there to check them because it's a special event.

MS. WITTUM: Well, I think there is just a level of trust in our cosmetologists that they would follow those health and safety requirements where ever they're performing services.

MS. CAUDLE: In some situations you know they don't.

MS. MORGAN: Kathy, for years cosmetologists have been going out to their customers and doing their wedding and they -- we're not going to be out at the church to police them anyway. I -- and we have a couple

of them here in Little Rock. Clear Channel, they got licensed just so that they could have Mother's Day Out and special events there. Channel 4 also had a license to do their special events with licensed cosmetologists. So you -- open the door.

MR. WALKER: Yes, ma'am.

MS. WHITLOCK: Okay. My question is what is the difference? You said you don't want all these phone calls or whatever coming into the office. What is the difference in volunteering and having to notify State Board so many days in advance in the other area that we covered, and this?

MS. WITTUM: Well, the other area we talked about that was the student.

MS. WHITLOCK: But what if you take students to this also? I mean, what -- why not, if you really want to allow practitioners to be able to go a way, go out and do this -- if we go to the mortuary, you want to be notified. So why not have to be notified for this also?

MS. WITTUM: Well, I think there's a difference between students and licensed

practitioners for one thing, but we have already said that we are wanting to allow students to be able to go out and do the volunteering and go to these types of events. And so why not let our licensed practitioners be able to do it without fear of violating the law?

MS. WHITLOCK: But why not have them contact you also, is what I'm saying, because there are so many things you don't want them to do as in a mobile salon. Why not have the board have to approve it? You want it approved if students are going out also, so why is it not being approved also for practitioners?

MS. WITTUM: Well, it's not being approved with the students. It -- we just needed to know for the inspectors when they're going out to inspect the schools that these students may not be on the premises at any given time -- if we're talking about volunteering. Now, if we're talking about Rule 16, there is an approval process but that's a different story. The -- I see a tremendous difference between our students and our licensed practitioners. And I do not want to babysit 30,000 or have to

24

25

be responsible for knowing where 30,000 practitioners are going to be at any given time. That's not my job. It is my job to keep up with whether or not the students are there in the school or whether they're going off-campus to do something.

MS. WHITLOCK: But isn't it your job to make sure that all health, safety, and sanitation procedures are being followed?

MS. WITTUM: Yes, it is. But I don't go out to everyone of the licensees to make sure that every single one of them are following the health and safety guidelines. I mean, if the inspectors come across them and they find that they're not following suit then it's their job to write the violations and we'll follow suit with that. But we cannot physically, our office, cannot physically monitor the practices of every single practitioner out there. This law, this recommendation, is only to give the licensees the benefit of knowing they can go do their job whether it's within their licensed establishment or it's at a wedding that they're being hired to come and do or that they're volunteering to do or some charity event that

24

25

they're volunteering their time to, without fear of violating this law that is currently on the books.

MR. WALKER: Any other comments?

(Pause.)

MR. WALKER: Ms. Powell?

(Pause.)

MS. POWELL: Since --

MS. TURMAN: We keep going back to this that they say they're doing it anyway. guys that still doesn't make it right. they're doing it and it does not make it right. I -- I've heard that so often today. That does not make it all right, I don't care what it is. If it's -- and it just sounds like to me that you're condoning it. I'm upset because I'd often say, I want them to be able to go out and do that, but to make it legitimate. But we -how can we allow them to just gather and say, okay, it's -- it might be all right if it's volunteer. And yet when it says, pay, that opens up a whole new ball game, because not very many people are going to do volunteer. But when you mention that pay and that terminology right here of conditions for pay or

to volunteer services or charity -- well, when you pay it is not volunteer services for charity.

(Pause.)

MS. TURMAN: So, I mean, we've got to protect the hairdressers, too, that's in these establishments making their living. If we have some restrictions on this, it would be fine. But what about a Pampered Chef party? Oh, we'll do the hair on the side? Well, we're going to go do something else and we're going to do hair on the side. And come on over, we're going to have a huge party. That isn't right. I don't care if they are doing it. It's our job to -- and we may not catch a lot of them, but this is not right just because they're doing it. We have to have some kind of guidelines.

(Pause.)

MS. POWELL: Is there any further discussion from the board?

(Pause.)

MS. POWELL: One thing that could be done is to define the conditions. We could define whether to pay or not pay. We could define

that it be with board approval or deny the
recommendation. So is there any other
discussion from the board?
(Pause.)
MR. KEENE: No, but I'll make a motion.
MS. POWELL: Do I have a motion?
MR. KEENE: I move that we accept the
committee's recommendation for allowing
licensees to work outside of their
establishment under certain conditions or to
volunteer their services for charity.
(Pause.)
MS. TURMAN: Well, what are
MS. POWELL: I have a motion.
MS. TURMAN: What are the conditions?
MR. KEENE: List a few.
MS. TRAYLOR: You made the motion. You
list them.
MR. KEENE: The motion is certain
conditions, I think we have a very competent
director that can come up with those
conditions. I think she's listed, and quite a
few of them were listed today.
MS. POWELL: Did you
MR. KEENE: If you disagree

1	MS. POWELL: want to amend
2	MR. KEENE: No, I don't want to amend it.
3	I don't think it needs to be amended. I think
4	it's perfectly fine.
5	MS. POWELL: Okay. Would you repeat the
6	motion for me then, please?
7	MR. KEENE: I move that we accept the
8	committee's recommendation on having, allowing,
9	licensed practitioners to work outside of an
10	establishment under certain conditions and to
11	volunteer services for charity.
12	MS. POWELL: I have a motion.
13	MS. PICKERING: Second.
14	MS. POWELL: I have a motion and a second.
15	All those in favor, oh, is there any
16	discussion?
17	(Pause.)
18	MS. POWELL: All those in favor, raise
19	your right hand.
20	(Show of hands.)
21	MS. POWELL: I have four. All those
22	excuse me, let me see that one more time. All
23	those for?
24	(Show of hands.)
25	MS. POWELL: All those opposed?
	II

	217
1	(Show of hands.)
2	MS. GORDON: I'm abstaining.
3	MS. POWELL: Any abstentions?
4	(Show of hands. One abstention.)
5	MS. POWELL: One abstention. Motion
6	carries.
7	MR. WALKER: No.
8	MS. WITTUM: Huh-uh.
9	MS. POWELL: It won't?
10	MR. WALKER: It won't carry. You need
11	five.
12	MS. POWELL: Well, -
13	MR. WALKER: You have nine, and unless you
14	break it doesn't pass.
15	MS. POWELL: (INAUDIBLE.)
16	MR. WALKER: Because there is nine members
17	present.
18	MS. POWELL: Oh.
19	MS. TRAYLOR: You have to have five to
20	adhere to the
21	MS. WITTUM: You can either break the tie
22	or we can let that one die and call for them to
23	make another one.
24	(Pause.)
25	MS. POWELL: Okay. We'll try this again.

Motion failed. MR. WALKER: I had four in favor, so it 3 does fail. We need five to pass it. 4 MS. POWELL: Okay. Would anybody else 5 like to -- I'm just seeing if someone would like to make another motion? 6 7 MS. WITTUM: Is the board interested in 8 doing additional research on this or do you 9 just want to do away with it completely? 10 MS. TURMAN: I have a question. If we do 11 additional research, I think -- I think it 12 would be good for the cosmetologist to be able 13 to go out and do that. We just need 14 limitations. That's what I'm interested in. 15 MS. GORDON: I agree with Pat. I think we 16 need to have some more. The conditions, we 17 need to understand exactly what they entail 18 before we get --19 MS. TRAYLOR: So they can understand 20 exactly what they can do. 21 MS. GORDON: Right. 22 MS. TURMAN: And not make it so general. 23 And I don't think it should be left up to the 24 office staff to have to take care of it. And 25 that's -- and we do, and we go back and we look

$\mathcal{L}\mathcal{L}$
at this and if the rules and regulations are
wouldn't be left up to the office staff because
you have you guys have enough to do.
MS. POWELL: Okay. Do I hear a motion?
MS. TURMAN: I make a motion that we do a
study on this.
MS. TRAYLOR: I second that.
MS. POWELL: I have a motion and a second.
All those is there any discussion?
(Pause.)
MS. POWELL: There's a motion on the table
to do research on this recommendation. All
those in favor, raise your right hand.
(Show of hands.)
MS. POWELL: All those opposed?
(Show of hands.)
MS. POWELL: Motion carries.
REMOVAL OF FELONY CONVICTION RESTRICTION
MS. WITTUM: Number four is to remove
subsection (10) in A.C.A. 17-26-105 referring
to felony convictions. The committee favored
the above recommendation with a 2-1 vote. The
public comment that is above it is actually
intended to go with that particular one. There
was a person who voiced concern for persons

with felony convictions rendering services, then used the example of not wanting them to do work on her children. And the committee can offer any additional comments if they'd like.

MR. DOWNEY: My reasoning for recommending this was the fact that, you know, we state that if an individual has committed a felony, they have a statement of entry, and they'll spend their time, then they have answered their debt to society. It doesn't necessarily mean that they're going to come back and do the same thing again. So they have been rehabilitated, paid for their crime, so they should be allowed to work.

MS. TRAYLOR: I thought at one time that if they were convicted of a felony that we'd automatically revoke their license.

(Pause.)

MS. TRAYLOR: Then they had to come before the board before they ever got them reinstated.

MS. WITTUM: Well, the current law says that you can revoke once you know about that felony conviction. One of the concerns that I have is that there is no provision in place, no practice in place, for us to check the criminal

1	history of the licensees. So either there
2	needs to be something in place for us to make
3	this law worth having on the book or it needs
4	to be removed.
5	MS. TRAYLOR: Well, what needs to I
6	think there's so much going on right now that's
7	in the newspapers. I know about these things,
8	but what how will you go about checking
9	these?
10	MS. WITTUM: Well, we would have to
11	we'd have to pay the State Police to run
12	criminal histories.
13	MR. WALKER: On every
14	MS. WITTUM: On every everybody.
15	(Multiple conversations taking place at
16	once.)
17	MS. WITTUM: And that would have to be
18	done before you could renew their license.
19	MS. TRAYLOR: I know we have revoked some
20	licenses before.
21	(Multiple conversations taking place at
22	once.)
23	MR. WALKER: Any comments or questions
24	from the board?
25	(Pause.)

	224
1	MR. WALKER: Any comments from the
2	audience?
3	MS. HAYDEN: I was under the impression if
4	you were a convicted pedophile that you would
5	have to have your own rules and regulations and
6	no contact with children would be one of them,
7	wouldn't it?
8	MS. WITTUM: Under the sex offender laws,
9	I think
10	MS. HAYDEN: Right.
11	MS. WITTUM: that's right. Yes. That
12	that's different than
13	MS. HAYDEN: Right. But, I mean, it
14	wouldn't be something that you would have to
15	keep tabs on because they have, you know, their
16	own set of laws because of that.
17	MR. WALKER: Correct.
18	MR. DOWNEY: And felons are always watched
19	for and they're not allowed to own firearms.
20	They're not allowed to vote. They're not
21	allowed to so, I mean, that's out of our
22	jurisdiction there.
23	MR. WALKER: Yes, ma'am.
24	MS. HUGHES: Jenita Hughes, Newport. I'm
25	kind of like with Nick, I'm thinking of if

they've committed a crime and they've done 2 their time and they get a license that it wouldn't need to be revoked. 3 I think they 4 should be allowed to be licensed. But kind of 5 the opinion that we hold is that if you are a licensed cosmetologist, you have been trained 6 7 in proper conduct and all these things, and 8 then you commit a felony then you would -- then 9 they would have options to revoke their 10 license. MS. TRAYLOR: Well, now that's what I've 11 12 been talking about. 13 MR. DOWNEY: Yeah, I'd go along with that. 14 MS. POWELL: What now? 15 MS. TRAYLOR: That's what I was saying. 16 MS. HUGHES: While you have a license, 17 revoke it. But if you've been convicted in the 18 past, you could still have the opportunity to 19 get your license. 20 MS. ANDERSON: Can you clarify this as far 21 as this -- this is saying the conviction is 22 prior or one that would happen after they were 23 licensed? 24 MR. WALKER: Either, both. 25 MS. ANDERSON: Either.

	226
1	MR. WALKER: Correct.
2	MS. ANDERSON: Either way? Then I would
3	have a problem with it because I have students
4	who are currently registered in school who have
5	served their time. I asked that question
6	one of my first questions to Ms. Wittum when I
7	took over my school. And
8	MR. WALKER: Well, this would take care of
9	that problem.
10	MS. ANDERSON: So this would eliminate
11	that rule, so
12	MR. WALKER: That's correct.
13	MS. WITTUM: But according to legal
14	counsel, not Kent, here, but Arnie from the
15	AG's office at the time you posed that
16	question.
17	MS. ANDERSON: Uh-huh.
18	MS. WITTUM: He said it was his
19	understanding, or it's been his belief, that
20	the board has typically looked at what had
21	happened after they became licensed. But this
22	could be interpreted to read either way.
23	MS. ANDERSON: Okay.
24	MS. TRAYLOR: I think that's what we did.
25	MR. DOWNEY: Yeah, after they're licensed.

2 MR. WALKER: Any other --MS. TURMAN: I would hate to hold something 3 4 against somebody for the rest of their life 5 because they made mistakes when it was early. I mean, if they've paid their dues and -- I --6 7 if you're looking, maybe, at different types of 8 crime, you know, like crimes against children 9 or something. But still, you know, --10 MS. TRAYLOR: Yeah, I would have to say no 11 to the molesting children. 12 MS. TURMAN: Yeah. That's right. But if 13 they've -- if they robbed a bank or something 14 like that, and it's regretful it's held against 15 them for the rest of their life. And I think 16 about --17 (Multiple conversations taking place at 18 once.) 19 MR. WALKER: Are there any other comments 20 from the audience? 21 MS. HUGHES: So if they have a license and 22 they commit a felony and go to prison, they'd 23 just go on the inactive list? 24 MS. WITTUM: Sure. 25 MS. HUGHES: Would we -- yeah, but I mean

do we remove them from the books? MR. WALKER: They couldn't be removed for 3 having a felony, that is correct. 4 MS. WITTUM: They way it currently, yes. 5 Now, if this recommendation is adopted and this language is stricken, then they could go --6 7 they wouldn't necessarily go on the inactive 8 list, but they may not be able to -- they may 9 have to come and re-examine if they go past 10 five years to still maintain their license. 11 Did that answer --12 MS. HUGHES: But you would be taking out 13 the statement that says the license will be 14 revoked if convicted of a felony. 15 MS. WITTUM: Right. Because the felony 16 wouldn't be an issue, but if they were 17 incarcerated for five years or more then they 18 wouldn't necessarily just be able to walk out 19 and still have their license. They would have 20 to come and re-examine in --21 MS. HUGHES: Why? 22 MS. WITTUM: -- order -- because that 23 currently is on the book that if -- if they --24 if the license is expired for five years, 25 unless they paid their penalties -- I mean,

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

paid their renewal fee every year. If they had somebody to take care of that for them.

MR. WALKER: Yes, ma'am.

MS. WHITLOCK: Would it depend on the severity of the crime they committed, or is this just any kind of felony or any kind of that they would --

(Multiple conversations taking place at once.)

MS. POWELL: It seemed like to me that it got confusing at the regional meeting when they were -- their discussion was the reasoning behind asking the board to remove this language that allowed the board to take away someone's license if convicted of a felony was, as I understood legal counsel to say, was that there was nothing in place in our administration to identify or to notify the board of who had these convictions. And this -- you could be clean and clear in January and get your license and in February convicted of something and we would never know that unless we were going to trail somebody closely. And also it -- it had language in there to talk about moral turpitude. And we have yet for legal counsel

25

to be able to tell us what is moral turpitude. And so if it's something that we can't monitor and we can't identify, then it obviously appears that it's something that we should not be trying to micro-manage or regulate. to stay within our boundaries. We assume that the police is taking care of felony issues and it's debatable what is moral turpitude. Through the years I've heard it's sassing your teacher. I've heard that it's cussing your teacher. I've heard that it's skipping school. I've heard that it's a lot of things. So, I mean, if no one -- if legal counsel is not readily able to identify moral turpitude and make it simple and easy enough for us to understand it -- I don't know when it got put in the law. But it's there today, and --MS. WITTUM: And we're not regulating it

MS. WITTUM: And we're not regulating it currently.

MS. POWELL: Right. And it's obviously something that we're not regulating appropriately if we can't identify it and define it. So --

MS. TURMAN: Madam President, I'd like to know how many parole officers notified the

	23
1	board with any violations?
2	MS. POWELL: Exactly. Or how many
3	MS. TURMAN: How many were arrested?
4	MS. POWELL: How many knew they had a
5	cosmetology license?
6	MS. TURMAN: Yeah.
7	MS. POWELL: I believe the intent is good.
8	I believe that if the committee recognized that
9	the the mission was impossible.
10	MR. WALKER: You can do it, it would just
11	cost more money.
12	MS. WITTUM: Yes.
13	MS. POWELL: Not just more but
14	MR. DOWNEY: But bunches.
15	MS. POWELL: Kent, we have someone from
16	the audience that would like to be recognized.
17	MR. WALKER: Yes, ma'am.
18	MS. COTTON: I just since we've brought
19	up so often today about how other states do
20	stuff like that and does anybody else think
21	of that? Because I have a real problem or
22	to other professions even. We're always
23	wanting to compare ourselves with other
24	professions such as doctors, lawyers, and like
25	that. So tell me how, as professionals, would
	II

we feel if we license people especially 2 instructors and school owners that may be a 3 felony person like that. So how does that --4 what about how other professions handle it? 5 Does anyone know? MS. WITTUM: Our legal counsel would have 6 7 information on the lawyer. 8 MR. WALKER: I know of two. I know medical and legal. Medical you have to 9 10 disclose to the board if you've been convicted 11 of a felony, and also again to the hospital 12 once you have residency so they're aware of it. 13 And for attorneys, you have to disclose that, 14 as well. 15 MS. COTTON: Okay. Can we not use some 16 quidelines similar to that since we all want to 17 be professionals? 18 MS. TRAYLOR: That they would have to 19 disclose it to the board. 20 MR. WALKER: I mean, you can do that --MS. POWELL: How? 21 22 MR. WALKER: -- but there's nothing to say 23 -- because in the legal field it's easily 24 verified because your peers are the ones that 25 usually convict you so that's pretty easy to

determine. Medical board, I think, the fact of losing that six figure income is what keeps them being honest to the Medical Board. I mean, y'all can do whatever you like in those terms. It could be self-disclosure, but then you'd have to create some kind of rule and reg for people that didn't fully comply truthfully.

MS. COTTON: Okay. But that would give us guidelines to go right in this profession, correct?

MR. WALKER: You can do that, certainly.

MS. COTTON: Instead of just taking it out altogether because morally -- y'all think about that. I said if you're licensing people out there, and I know for a fact there's all kinds of felonies out there already licensed as cosmetologists --

MR. WALKER: Well, this --

MS. COTTON: -- and you set forth some good guidelines and rules and regulations from this day forward, then people are required to follow those.

MR. WALKER: I think the only thing that I would have difficulty with from my perspective is you have to determine which felonies are

worth being addressed by the board to look at 2 either suspending or revoking licenses 3 entirely. Then there would be an odd tiering 4 that would have to take place that I don't know 5 if the board wants to do or not. But for example, if you had a DWI III, it's a felony. 6 7 And is that worth the board considering in 8 terms of a suspension or a revocation of 9 license? 10 MS. COTTON: I would think so. 11 MR. WALKER: And I don't know. You spend, 12 usually it's a year in jail for something like 13 that. And I --14 MS. TRAYLOR: How about the woman that 15 came up here that had five of them? In a 16 month. 17 (Pause.) 18 MS. TRAYLOR: And she came to the judge 19 drunk. 20 MR. WALKER: I mean, that's -- that's 21 something for y'all to decide. There's nothing 22 to mandate that you have to, I'll say that. 23 if you want to take that on then --24 MS. TURMAN: I'd just like to know who's 25 going to have time to do this? I know we -- we

-- how can we afford it? But you know there's 2 the problem. MS. TRAYLOR: They need to notify the 3 4 board that they were in compliance. And then 5 the board decides if they wish to see you revoked or whatever. 6 7 (Multiple conversations taking place at once.) 8 MS. PICKERING: Is there a way that if you 9 10 even suspect that there's a pedophile, that we 11 can identify them and --12 MR. DOWNEY: They already are. 13 MS. PICKERING: They are? 14 MR. DOWNEY: They're mandated that they 15 have to notify everybody in the community. 16 MS. GORDON: Do they have to notify --17 (Multiple conversations taking place at 18 once.) 19 MS. POWELL: All right. Let's have one at 20 a time. I need order, please. 21 COURT REPORTER: If you don't mind your 22 court reporter having something to say here, I 23 was a teacher for ten years. So as far as like 24 when you're talking about what the lawyers do, 25 I will share with you what the Department of

21

22

23

24

25

Education, some of the things that they do. Of course, they do background checks on everybody. So that's -- your major thing there is that you can have people disclose all you want, but how are you going to know whether they did or not?

MS. GORDON: Right.

COURT REPORTER: I mean, you're not going to know unless you do background checks. That's going to cost money. And I mean, it would be an ongoing, never-ending process at that point. I'm not saying that you don't need to have some kind of security measure. I mean, I don't think that you should not care about the character or moral character of the people that you are licensing, but at the same time I don't see how, unless you're willing to take on the cost of, you know, putting in the background checks -- and not just once, but every time you're licensed because, like she said, you can get your license today and tomorrow you can have a felony on there. know that the Department of Education, it's not just any felony, it's a felony for -- or automatic dismissal for violent crimes, which means like domestic battery, assault, obviously

crimes against children and things like that.

And what they have to do is it's not just an automatic, period. They have the right, in the statutes, to make an appeal to the board and the board can grant a waiver. And that's -- I hope that information is helpful.

MS. TRAYLOR: My problem is the children, being around children or working on children.

MS. POWELL: LaJoy?

MS. GORDON: As far as the background checks, I think if you go to a school to be hired, you -- you're responsible for paying for your own background check. Is that right?

COURT REPORTER: Yes, you are right.

MS. GORDON: You know, like the individual, say I want to get hired here, then I'm responsible. I pay the money up front for my background check. That's how it works, I think, in the school district.

MR. WALKER: Then you could do that with an additional license fee, I mean, that's possible. But again from my perspective, the board or whoever else that will do this eventually will be having to tier out the different felonies and what's worthy of

1	revocation and suspension and what's not.
2	MS. GORDON: Well, she just said that, I
3	think. They do them what did you say, most
4	serious like violent offenses?
5	COURT REPORTER: Every felony comes before
6	the board, but they have a right to grant a
7	waiver in their statutes.
8	MR. WALKER: That's up to y'all.
9	(Multiple conversations taking place at
10	once.)
11	MS. TRAYLOR: You have to have, you know,
12	
13	(Multiple conversations taking place at
14	once.)
15	MS. TRAYLOR: have some guidelines.
16	(Multiple conversations taking place at
17	once.)
18	MS. WEST: Before we were we would hire
19	people, you know, your large corporations have
20	to have a drug test, and a TB test, and also
21	they have to swear that they have not been
22	convicted of a felony. That's any large
23	company, anymore.
24	MS. POWELL: Well,
25	MS. WEST: Other than WalMart.

	239
1	MS. POWELL: Yes. For employment, right?
2	MS. WEST: Yes, for employment. But why
3	couldn't we do that for licensing? And they
4	would they pay for the drug test.
5	MS. GORDON: We used to have to do the TB
6	test and we were responsible for getting that
7	test to the board.
8	(Multiple conversations taking place at
9	once.)
10	MR. WALKER: I mean, I see those as
11	separate issues. If you want to amend them to
12	include them, I guess y'all could do that. I
13	think we've got to decide now if we're going to
14	remove this, or table it, or vote it down, is
15	where I see it as where we are now.
16	MS. TRAYLOR: Madam Chairman, I move that
17	we table this until some more research has been
18	done on it.
19	MS. POWELL: I have a motion.
20	MS. GORDON: Second.
21	MS. WITTUM: What kind of research do you
22	want done?
23	MS. TRAYLOR: Well, as to what you can do
24	and what you really can't, how much proof you'd
25	have to have, you know. I know what it says

now and I know what we had before, but I don't think we ought to just give a clean slate. I think we need to think about what we want to do 3 4 about it. Right now, I don't know what I want 5 to do. I could not vote with clear conviction because I have some issues about certain 6 7 things. 8 (Pause.) 9 MR. WALKER: You have a second on that. 10 MS. POWELL: I have a motion and a second 11 to table the recommendation. All those in 12 favor, raise your right hand. 13 (Show of hands.) 14 MS. POWELL: All those opposed? 15 (No opposition.) 16 MS. POWELL: Is there any abstention? 17 BOARD MEMBER: I abstain. I don't know what I want to do, but I was concerned about 18 19 two issues. 20 MS. TRAYLOR: Well, that was me. That's 21 the reason I'd like for it to be tabled and get 22 some research. 23 REMOVE SALON SQUARE FOOTAGE SPECIFICATION - 168 ft2 24 MS. WITTUM: Number five is to strike 25 subsection A.C.A. 17-26 -- or subsection (c) in

A.C.A. 17-26-405 that stipulates 168 square feet floor space for a new salon.

(Pause.)

MR. WALKER: Are there any comments from the committee?

MR. DOWNEY: My comment is if a business owner can do with and believes they can operate in less than 168 square feet, which some can, that should be a business person's decision to make and not us as a board telling them how much space they have to have. This was drawn from 1955 with states surrounding us, what they were using, 168 square feet. I think if you check you'll find in their old laws we basically just, at that time -- I wasn't there, but --

(Chorus of laughter.)

MR. DOWNEY: They took the law and used theirs. But I don't think that we should have to have go in there and actually take a measuring tape and if they're one foot square off -- off one square foot, that we wouldn't allow them to be licensed. And I think we need to just strike that from the law. It's old. It's been there forever.

1	MS. TRAYLOR: Are you going to strike the
2	schools?
3	MR. DOWNEY: The schools?
4	MS. TRAYLOR: Uh-huh.
5	MR. DOWNEY: This has nothing to do with
6	the schools.
7	MS. TRAYLOR: Well, I know, but the square
8	footage it does.
9	MR. KEENE: No, it doesn't.
10	MS. POWELL: No.
11	MR. DOWNEY: All we're saying is 168
12	square feet in your salons.
13	MS. WITTUM: This does not address the
14	schools.
15	MR. DOWNEY: This doesn't address schools.
16	MS. TRAYLOR: Well, it's expressly for
17	square footage and I feel like it
18	MR. DOWNEY: In the salons, not schools.
19	MS. TRAYLOR: I know.
20	MS. PICKERING: I agree with Nick. I
21	think that ought to be the school the salon
22	owner to decide what size they need. It may be
23	one operator that might could do with less than
24	I could with my square footage.
25	MS. POWELL: Well, I seem to remember the

24

25

board having to be visited several times on several occasions. I've seen people that have come up and petition the board to grant them leniency of not having 168 square feet. I've seen the board always be lenient on that, and allow them to practice in a smaller than 168 square feet area. And then, yet, turn around and re-issue that regulation for someone opening up a salon the day after. I see that as a conflict of -- conflicting issue there. Ι see people that are grand-fathered in that are less than 168 square feet. And if we're going to recognize it as a favorable issue, then we need to recognize it consistently. If it was good once, it should be -- and if it's been good once, it should be good again.

MS. TRAYLOR: Has anyone ever had a -- do they adopt the law, you know, for each hairdresser there had to be an additional so many square foot?

(Multiple conversations taking place at once.)

MS. POWELL: Director Wittum, can I ask
you -- one of the suggestions that I just heard
was that in dropping the 168 square feet in the

1	establishment, that it would also need some
2	language on the 50 additional square feet for
3	each practitioner.
4	MS. WITTUM: That would be true.
5	MS. POWELL: Also?
6	MS. WITTUM: Yes.
7	MS. POWELL: And it's described as floor
8	space for a new salon, and I'm assuming that
9	would be
10	MR. WALKER: You just wouldn't have it in
11	the -
12	MS. TRAYLOR: It wouldn't be in the law.
13	MR. WALKER: law.
14	MR. KEENE: The 50 additional feet is in
15	the it's in the rules to apply it. It's
16	not in the law.
17	MR. WALKER: And I don't see in the
18	statute. But that y'all would have to
19	change that later on.
20	MR. KEENE: Right.
21	MR. WALKER: And I think that would be
22	dependent upon the legislation passing.
23	(Multiple conversations taking place at once.)
24	MS. WITTUM: It's not in the law.
25	MR. WALKER: So I don't think it's the

1	proper time to visit that because it won't be
2	before you until this actually would be deleted
3	by the legislature. I need you to make rules
4	accordingly to that.
5	(Pause.)
6	MR. WALKER: Are there any comments from
7	the audience related to this?
8	(Pause.)
9	MR. WALKER: Seeing none, Ms. Powell.
10	MS. POWELL: Okay. Does the board have
11	any further discussion of this issue?
12	(Pause.)
13	MS. POWELL: Do we have a motion on this
14	issue?
15	MR. KEENE: I move to accept the
16	committee's recommendation to delete the rule
17	A.C.A. 17-26-405(c) that stipulates 168 square
18	feet.
19	MS. POWELL: I have a motion.
20	MS. TRAYLOR: I'll second that motion.
21	MS. POWELL: And a second. Is there any
22	discussion?
23	(Pause.)
24	MS. POWELL: All those in favor, raise
25	your right hand.

(Show of hands.)

MS. POWELL: It's unanimous. The motion carries.

MR. WALKER: And with that, we have completed the agenda, and also the legislative committee's recommendations. Are there any comments from the board?

(Pause.)

MR. WALKER: Ms. Powell, I'll give the floor back to you, then.

LANGUAGE REVISION RELATING TO SCHOOL SUPERVISOR

MS. POWELL: A proposal to the legislative committee on last Monday was to modify language in law A.C.A. 17-26-409 under the school supervisor, where it describes the language of immediate supervision. I'd like to see the board give consideration to remove the immediate supervision or to define the immediate supervision.

As I see it, the school supervisor is to act as the liaison for the school between the board and the public and the school. It's like a principal. Where as the instructor is identified as a different person. And at the time I believe that this law was in place, it

24

25

was before the age of computers, cell phones, fax machines, and the immediate ability to communicate with the State Board or accrediting agencies, or the public or anybody. And to have a school supervisor to be immediate, I would think that immediate — that it ought to be taken out because the board immediately would be sufficient — a phone call away. I would not think they would have to be on premises.

(Pause.)

MS. POWELL: With an instructor. I don't believe a supervisor has to be on premises with an instructor at all times. An instructor should be able to facilitate their job without having the supervisor immediately beside them eight hours a day. If this is the case, that means I can't be the supervisor of my own school. I've got two schools. Well, I truly consider myself a supervisor, but instructors are there. And -- but I should be able to be immediately contacted by anyone without being on the premises. I should be the liaison between the board and the school. But I have to basically hire someone and call them the

supervisor because I can't be at two places at the same time. That's if you're reading the terminology of this word 'immediate' to mean on premises. And I'm certainly the supervisor of my business. Now, instructors are there, and — but I should be able to be immediately contacted by anyone without being on premises. I should be the liaison between the board and the school.

So that is my understanding of -- I know I discussed this once before....

So that is my understanding of -- I know I discussed this once before a few years ago with the board. I almost think that immediate would seem to be the issue. I'm in favor of the school having supervisors. I think they're necessary, but I think the language to me is that word, immediate.

(Pause.)

MS. POWELL: Do I have any other feedback from the committee members that were present at the legislative committee meeting where we had discussed this?

MS. PICKERING: All right. I was there and I agree with you, Jane. I think that

immediate ought to be taken out because you can't be in both schools at the same time, not just you, but anyone else. It's not just to favor you, but I agree.

MR. DOWNEY: And I agree with Jane, it's as we discussed before, it was brought up years ago and years ago. And just as long as they're able to be contacted and they're the ones that are the liaison for the board with that school. And that's primarily what the supervisor was set up for was so the board could communicate with each school through someone who had three years experience and knowledge and be able to know about that particular school where a newly-hired instructor may not be able to do for them, so that's the reason I agreed with it.

MS. POWELL: Ms. Turman.

MS. TURMAN: Madam President, I'm sorry to give you a different angle. I am a supervisor in the business world, retired and yet I work part time as a supervisor. If, when you have to be there at all times, and something very — there maybe a trauma, if you're not competent enough to take over for them if they have to

leave, they really don't need to be there. 2 MS. POWELL: Right. MS. TURMAN: So I think that should be 3 4 removed. I mean, you have got to get out of 5 the building some time. I don't care what kind of supervisor you are, you cannot be in that 6 7 building constantly. You have to go. 8 MS. POWELL: Well, I know that they do in 9 the public schools in the supervisor's 10 position, but I think that the language is 11 confusing when it pertains to a private school. 12 WALKER: So for my own clarification, 13 you're looking to just delete the immediate 14 supervision part so every school shall at all 15 times have a licensed cosmetologist --16 cosmetician or cosmetologist -- is that 17 correct? 18 MS. POWELL: A super -- you know I'm 19 Well, I think it says school 20 supervisor, that every school shall at all 21 times --22 MR. WALKER: But it would still be a --23 MS. POWELL: -- be in charge of and under 24 the supervision of a licensed cosmetician, 25 cosmetologist, and/or operator with at least

	23.
1	three years duh, duh, duh, duh.
2	MS. WITTUM: So you just want to remove
3	the word immediate?
4	MS. POWELL: Right. I would like to as
5	long as that is clear understandable language
6	that the supervisor is not necessarily on the
7	premises.
8	MR. DOWNEY: And while we're at it, I
9	think every where else we've tried to delete
10	the old terminology of cosmetician from every
11	thing else, so
12	MS. POWELL: Right.
13	MS. WITTUM: Yes.
14	MR. DOWNEY: we need to get rid of
15	that, too.
16	MR. WALKER: Let's take some comments from
17	the audience. Well, any comments from the
18	board before I do this? Any questions?
19	(Pause.)
20	MR. WALKER: Okay. Yes, ma'am.
21	MS. JONES: I just want a clarification.
22	Are you saying that I can have an instructor at
23	the school that is licensed without having had
24	three years experience as long as she can call
25	the supervisor?

MS. POWELL: Huh-uh. MS. WITTUM: No. The only thing that Ms. Powell is recommending to change from the 3 4 school supervisor provision is to take out the 5 immediate -- the word immediate. So she would still have to have a licensed cosmetologist who 6 7 has three years experience supervising the school. Is that correct? 8 9 MS. POWELL: Yes. The supervisor is still 10 the person that is the supervisor with three 11 years experience. And she's not on premises 12 24/7. 13 MS. JONES: But the person that's left on 14 premises still has to have three years 15 experience? 16 (Multiple conversations taking place at 17 once.) 18 MS. POWELL: No. The three years is the 19 supervisor's qualifications, as I see it. 20 MS. WITTUM: Okay. 21 MS. POWELL: The instructor qualifications 22 are they be 21, has passed the instructors' 23 examination, has received eight hours of 24 continuing education training -- duh, duh, duh. 25 MS. TRAYLOR: Somewhere -- I didn't think

	23.
1	they could be left in charge of a school until
2	they had had three years experience.
3	MS. POWELL: Well, as the supervisor
4	MS. TRAYLOR: No, it wasn't supervisor.
5	It was instructor. That's what it was. That a
6	school cannot leave an instructor without three
7	years of experience under in full control of
8	the school.
9	MS. POWELL: Well, as far as an
10	instructor, you license an instructor to teach
11	and they're supposedly licensed and qualified
12	upon the time they reach their 600 hours and
13	take the State Board examination.
14	MS. WITTUM: We need to clarify some
15	things. Kent is understanding this change that
16	you're suggesting now to modify when you
17	look at it compared to number five over here,
18	about the instructors for the specialty
19	courses,
20	MR. WALKER: It's just simple. Do you
21	still want a licensed cosmetologist on premises
22	at all times?
23	MS. POWELL: Yes.
24	MR. WALKER: Okay.
25	MS. POWELL: Yes.

MR. WALKER: All right. That's all I wanted to know. MS. POWELL: There is a licensed 3 4 cosmetologist instructor on premises at all 5 times. And what this is proposing to do is to eliminate the three-year experienced supervisor 6 7 being on premises all day, eight hours a day. 8 MS. JONES: That's what I was asking. Is 9 that meaning that if I have two instructors, 10 one that has three years and is acting as my 11 supervisor, and another one that has maybe a 12 year and a half or two years, can they be left 13 on the premises alone without that supervisor, 14 as long as they're in the immediate area where 15 we can call them or get them on the phone. 16 MS. POWELL: If they're a licensed 17 cosmetologist instructor, yes, ma'am. MS. JONES: They can stay on the premises 18 19 because --20 MS. POWELL: They're an instructor. 21 MS. JONES: -- with the supervisor --22 MS. POWELL: Yes, when they're off 23 This only gives hours and years of 24 experience to a supervisor. 25 MS. JONES: Okay.

MS. POWELL: It gives -- instructor qualifications are under 410, listed separately. I'm only discussing the school 3 4 supervisor, --5 MS. JONES: Right. MS. POWELL: -- with the three years 6 7 experience. She has three years experience. 8 She's still going to have three years 9 experience because she's a school supervisor, 10 but she's not on premises immediately all eight 11 hours was my proposal. 12 (Multiple conversations taking place at 13 once.) 14 MS. POWELL: That she would be able to 15 leave the school with an instructor there, a 16 cosmetology instructor, there. 17 MS. JONES: With over three years 18 experience. That's all I needed to know, 19 because I --20 MS. POWELL: I --21 MR. DOWNEY: In other words, she can go to 22 the beauty supply house and pick up some 23 supplies without having to worry that the 24 inspector is going to come in and that school 25 supervisor is not there, so let's write them

up. 2 MS. JONES: Or if I have a -- my 3 Saturdays, I have classes on Saturday where I 4 have to have, you know, because of the law and 5 the three year supervisor has to be there. Can I have an instructor there that doesn't have 6 7 those three years as long as she can call 8 supervisor? 9 MS. POWELL: That's what my proposal is. 10 MS. JONES: That's good. 11 MS. POWELL: That school -- I don't have -12 - I mean, I'm not saying anything. That's the 13 proposal here today. 14 MS. LEE: I just want to make it real 15 clear. I have 25 students, a student -- an 16 instructor that has one year experience and she 17 can be there with 25 students with one year 18 experience. 19 MS. POWELL: That's your instructor 20 qualifications right now, removing your 21 supervisor from the building with three years 22 experience. 23 (Multiple conversations taking place at 24 once.) 25 MS. POWELL: That's my proposal. I mean,

we're -- I proposed it. It's just a proposal 2 right now. 3 (Multiple conversations taking place at 4 once.) MS. POWELL: I don't -- maybe I didn't 5 explain that very clearly. 6 7 MS. BURCHETT: Scottie Burchett. If you 8 read the law as it's written right now it has 9 "or" in two places which would eliminate that 10 three years anyway. It's already --11 MS. POWELL: Well, it's three years --12 MS. BURCHETT: I know how it's understood, 13 but it says three years of practical experience 14 in the practice or teaching of all the branches 15 of cosmetology except the branch of 16 electrology, -- in a licensed cosmetological 17 establishment or a licensed school of 18 cosmetology. So it kind of already says --19 MS. POWELL: It -- it -- well, it's always 20 allowed someone with three years experience as 21 a cosmetologist or as an instructor the ability 22 to be on premises in that -- in that 23 supervisory position. But my proposal is to 24 remove that --25 MS. WITTUM: Remove the word immediate.

	230
1	MS. POWELL: immediate, yes. I want
2	school supervisors. I mean, I'm not saying
3	and they need three years experience, I think.
4	I just don't think they have to be on premises
5	immediately 24/7.
6	MS. WITTUM: Did I hear a motion from the
7	board?
8	MS. POWELL: No, I don't think anybody has
9	motioned on this one.
10	MR. WALKER: But you want the three years
11	to go away also, is that right?
12	MS. WITTUM: No.
13	MS. POWELL: No.
14	MS. WITTUM: Just that word immediate.
15	MR. WALKER: That's kind of confusing
16	(Multiple conversations taking place at
17	once.)
18	MS. POWELL: You're right, Kent. You're
19	right.
20	(Multiple conversations taking place at
21	once.)
22	MS. ANDERSON: I have a question. If I
23	had a day class and an evening class, do I have
24	to have separate supervisors for each class or
25	one supervisor can cover the whole school even

1	though it covers more than eight hours.
2	MR. KEENE: Yes.
3	MS. ANDERSON: What would be the if I
4	have a day class and an evening class
5	MS. POWELL: I'd want
6	MS. ANDERSON: or I have more than an
7	eight-hour session the instructor was there
8	for, would that instructor be able to cover
9	both sessions, that supervisor?
10	MS. POWELL: I would think that a
11	MS. ANDERSON: Cover both sessions
12	MS. POWELL: supervisor of a school is
13	the
14	MS. ANDERSON: or
15	MS. POWELL: supervisor,
16	(Multiple conversations taking place at
17	once.)
18	MS. POWELL: 24 hours a day. I mean,
19	you're not losing your job description just
20	because you go home at night.
21	MS. ANDERSON: Uh-huh.
22	MS. POWELL: It's the school supervisor.
23	MS. TRAYLOR: It's the instructor
24	facilitates learning.
25	MS. POWELL: Yes. So do I have any

anybody else that wants to discuss on this or
do I have a motion from the board
MS. TRAYLOR: Do you want a motion?
MS. POWELL: that we can make this
change in language or not?
MS. TRAYLOR: Madam Chairman, I move that
we delete the word
MS. POWELL: Immediate.
MS. WITTUM: Immediate.
MS. TRAYLOR: immediate from the law
we drop that, but everything else stays.
MR. WALKER: A.C.A. 17-26-409
MS. PICKERING: I'll second that.
MS. WITTUM: 409
MS. TRAYLOR: A.C.A. 17-26-409, okay.
MS. PICKERING: I second that.
MS. POWELL: I have a motion and a second
to delete the language "immediate" from law
A.C.A. 17-26-409, "immediate" being stricken.
Is there any other discussion?
(Pause.)
MS. POWELL: All those in favor, raise
your right hand.
(Show of hands.)
MS. POWELL: All those opposed?

	201
1	(No opposition.)
2	MS. POWELL: And one abstention. The
3	motion carries. Gee, that was fun.
4	(Chorus of laughter.)
5	MS. TRAYLOR: Wore me out.
6	(Chorus of laughter.)
7	MR. WALKER: I believe that does conclude
8	it now. MS. POWELL: Now, are you sure?
9	MR. WALKER: Well, do you-all have any
10	further comments or anything?
11	BOARD MEMBER: No.
12	MR. WALKER: If not, this portion of the
13	board meeting is complete, I believe.
14	(Multiple conversations taking place at
15	once.
16	MS. WITTUM: Board members, don't leave
17	just yet. The inspectors would like to pitch
18	an idea to you guys, so if you-all would just
19	hang on we'll hear that when it clears out.
20	MS. POWELL: We're going to take a ten
21	minute break.
22	(WHEREUPON, the legislative committee
23	recommendation session was concluded at 2:53
24	p.m., and proceedings of the board's other
25	business continued at 3:06 p.m. as follows, to-

wit:)

INSPECTORS' PRESENTATION TO THE BOARD

MS. POWELL: I think we have an item for the board that involves our inspectors. I'll turn this discussion over to the director and she can explain it to the board.

MS. WITTUM: Inspectors, do y'all want to come --

MS. CAUDLE: Okay. What we're --

MS. WITTUM: -- and --

MS. CAUDLE: What we're asking for is, we have this brand new equipment that we're taking into the salons. We don't mind using the equipment because it's great. But what I want to ask for each of you to do is to take it around to each and every one of you board members, I want you to lift our equipment up in that bag.

(Equipment bags physically handled by board members.)

MS. CAUDLE: We're lifting that in and out of the vehicle twenty-plus times a day. And in the old days, this is what we took in (indicating.) We took in a clip board, two pieces of paper, and an ink pen to write our

inspection. We don't mind using the laptop.

The laptop is wonderful. What we're asking is when we go into the salons to do our inspections to be able to carry a briefcase, such as the one sitting beside the table here (indicating.) And leave each and every person at that salon just a little handout here that we write down the violation. When we do our inspection report, it will be done in our laptop which will be submitted directly to the office anyway. And the owner of the salon will sign that. That will be submitted to our office.

So all we're asking for is when we go into those salons not to have to pick up all of this equipment which Rose is going to show you what we have to do over here (indicating) to hook it up. She has to pull the notebook out, and then we have to find a plug-in. And most of the time we have to get down on our hands and knees in the floor somewhere in the salon to find a plug-in, because all the plug-ins are used up. And then we have to take the printer out, plug it all up. And then when we complete the inspection, then we have to print off the

copies for us and for the office at this time. Now when we go live we will not have to print off copies for the office because it will be saved in our laptop.

So all that we're asking for is to be able to carry our notebook, laptop, in a briefcase such as this (indicating), where we can take it out. Do our inspection and have the official inspection on our laptop, where each salon owner will sign. And then if there are infractions, be able to write them out on this piece of paper and leave this (indicating) which would also be in here which means we would have to reach in and take it out, but to be able to leave this with the salon owner instead of having to take the printer, this heavy bag, and everything into each and every salon.

MR. KEENE: So at the end of the day you would just, when you got done with whatever work where ever it was, you'd sit down and put it all in?

MS. CAUDLE: No. Actually, -- no, it would already be in. We haven't worked that out. Kathy is still working on that with GL

Suite, but it would have to be uploaded either once a week or once every two weeks or 2 something directly to the office. Which means 3 4 the office staff will no longer key in any 5 inspection reports or anything because it will all be keyed in when we upload it, which is 6 7 going to be a tremendous help to the office. 8 MR. KEENE: Okay. 9 MS. CAUDLE: We -- I mean, y'all the 10 computers aren't the problem. The computer is 11 not at all the issue. The issue is the weight 12 of the equipment and carrying everything in. 13 MS. TRAYLOR: Well, the last time we had 14 an inspection, I believe the inspection report 15 was three pages. 16 MS. CAUDLE: Yes, ma'am. That's what it 17 is right now. 18 MS. TRAYLOR: That's ridiculous. 19 MS. TURMAN: The only concern I have is 20 when you've got your finished report, it's done 21 within the salon. And let me assure you, I 22 think you guys do work hard, but there isn't 23 any room for any error. Just like, I know 24 MS. CAUDLE: Absolutely. 25 MS. TURMAN: -- what the, when you're

doing it right there when you're in that salon because, you know, one time we had an issue with saying, okay, they can't say you've guys have changed, you know, doing anything like this or adding notes or anything like that. It -- it's done exactly when you're in the salon, you do your print-out. And when you're in that salon you give the salon owner or whomever you give that copy to and it goes -- then the other copy goes right into the office. There's no misconception there, --

MS. CAUDLE: That's right.

MS. TURMAN: -- not any, that you would change that.

MS. CAUDLE: There's no way to change that after they inspect -- and you forget it and save it on that screen anyway, so there won't be any room for error. The only error will be transferring the -- and what we will have to do is sit down and go line by line down that inspection form on that laptop and write it out under which rule it falls under before we leave that salon. And that's going to be up to each individual inspector, and I think that we're all competent enough to do that.

3

4 5

6 7

9

8

1011

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

2324

25

And as you can see, all this time I've been standing here talking, and she's still not ready for an inspection. That's how long it takes to get this equipment up and going.

MS. WITTUM: The issue here that the inspectors are posing to the board is that it -- what's going to change is the actual document that is left with the salon. Instead of it being the actual inspection report, it would be this condensed form that they would be able to either just do a check-mark if there's no violations, a check-mark if there are violations with abbreviated information on the form to acknowledge what those violations were. And then the inspector signs it to alleviate the problem that I think -- the concern that I think you're raising Pat is that anyone who's brought up here on discipline action would receive a copy of the detailed inspection report with the civil penalty letter just as they do now. And then they would be able to compare it with that abbreviated form. they see any differences, they can certainly bring those to the board's attention during the hearing.

1	MS. TRAYLOR: Kathy, I know the rules say
2	that you have to post these inspections for the
3	salon. You can't post three pages to where the
4	public can see them.
5	MS. WITTUM: Well, this would eliminate
6	MS. TRAYLOR: Eliminate that problem
7	MS. WITTUM: yes.
8	MS. TRAYLOR: to a degree it
9	MS. WITTUM: It would be one page
10	MS. TRAYLOR: would.
11	MS. CAUDLE: It would be one page and it
12	would stay in the salon and that's it. And our
13	official inspection would be on our laptop.
14	That would be filed with the office.
15	MS. POWELL: So this
16	MS. TRAYLOR: I don't have a
17	MS. POWELL: would just
18	MS. TRAYLOR: problem with that at all.
19	MS. GORDON: So what you're doing is
20	trying to eliminate carrying I'm not
21	MS. CAUDLE: Carrying all
22	MS. GORDON: understanding.
23	MS. CAUDLE: that weight.
24	MS. GORDON: So this
25	MS. CAUDLE: Well, what we're trying to do

25

is eliminate carrying that roll-around bag. Even though it has rollers in it, it does not jump in and out of that car. You have to pick it up and in and out. And when you're out in the country, those rollers will not roll on gravel. And as you-all know we all have rural areas that is a lot of gravel. In fact, I work Conway County and there's very few areas that you have any pavement or asphalt. But with this, if we are allowed to do this, we can stick our laptop or our notebook in our briefcase and also have these pieces of paper in there for -- to leave with the salon. don't have to plug up anything because we can charge the battery in the car. All we have to do is put down our briefcase when we get in. Take our laptop out. Do our job. Sit down. Look over our inspection to make sure of what we marked. Denote it on here (indicating), what we marked. Leave a copy of this with the If there's no violations, there's a place to mark "no violations" to leave a copy with the salon. And go on to the next salon without breaking our backs and our necks carrying this stuff around.

1	MS. TURMAN: So you'll have your laptop
2	with you?
3	MS. CAUDLE: Yes, ma'am. Absolutely.
4	We're not we're not trying to not use the
5	equipment. We're trying to not carry all of
6	this equipment into each and every salon.
7	MS. POWELL: Sheila, when you enter your
8	information on your inspection report summary,
9	
10	MS. CAUDLE: Uh-huh?
11	MS. POWELL: and that information is
12	taken from your inspection report,
13	MS. CAUDLE: Yes, ma'am.
14	MS. POWELL: that is, do I understand,
15	three pages or
16	MS. CAUDLE: It is
17	MS. POWELL: or what is
18	MS. CAUDLE: It is now, but it's not going
19	to be that long.
20	MS. POWELL: Is that three pages, like
21	three pages because of carbon or is it three
22	pages of items?
23	MS. CAUDLE: It's three pages because
24	there were lines added to the inspection and
25	that's what we're using on GL Suite right now.

1	So GL Suite everything is not worked out
2	there yet.
3	MS. POWELL: So the
4	MS. CAUDLE: This is two pages the old
5	way. It's three pages on the new one.
6	MS. POWELL: Oh, okay.
7	MS. WITTUM: And that's likely to not
8	change even with GL Suite because with that
9	carbonated they're able to do I mean, minute
10	print and it's double-columned.
11	MS. CAUDLE: Right.
12	MS. WITTUM: GL Suite is not set up that
13	way. It's got the
14	MS. CAUDLE: GL Suite is a single column.
15	MS. WITTUM: it just has all of the
16	issues. It has them one right after the other,
17	so you go from top to bottom.
18	MS. POWELL: Okay. I guess my question
19	there here, Sheila, is that on this summary,
20	MS. CAUDLE: Uh-huh.
21	MS. POWELL: when you manually fill in
22	this summary of violations, you're going to
23	have Rule 4.2,
24	MS. CAUDLE: Okay. Uh-huh.
25	MS. POWELL: Licensure.

MS. CAUDLE: Uh-huh.
MS. POWELL: And let's just say that was a
violation.
MS. CAUDLE: Okay.
MS. POWELL: What information are you
going to manually enter on this? Are you going
to give an explanation or does your actual
report have like a number on it, a simplified
formula for it's data entry so that there's not
a conflict of
MS. CAUDLE: My actual report
MS. POWELL: information
MS. CAUDLE: we're going to go through
here by the law and rule/regulation numbers.
And that's what this is on here. And if it was
4.2(A), that concerns the inspection of a
facility.
MS. POWELL: Okay.
MS. CAUDLE: Okay? But if the inspection
of the facility was not allowed, that would a
'no', which would be a violation of the
Cosmetology Board's law and rules/regulations.
MS. POWELL: So you would put 'no'?
MS. CAUDLE: So I would check 'no' on the
laptop. On here (indicating), I would write

out inspection of facility not allowed or denied.

MS. POWELL: Okay.

MS. BLAND: Just like we do now.

MS. CAUDLE: Just like we do now. When we do these inspections right now and we check the 'yes' or 'no' columns, if there's 'no' columns checked we have to go to this back page and explain why that 'no' column is checked. So it's going to be the same, same procedure, it's just going to be transferred to this piece of paper where we're going to put it under the right regulation.

MS. POWELL: And I can see that. My only concern here is that when you are manually writing in something -- I tend to believe that lesser is better.

MS. TURMAN: Yeah.

MS. POWELL: And so I would -- I would think it would be better for the board and the inspector to eliminate any opportunity for confrontation or disagreement on what they got and what you said to be when you enter data on your summary that it would be not overly explicit --

1	MS. CAUDLE: We're going to check then
2	we're going to come over on this paper and
3	we're just going to state what it says on here,
4	either allowed or not allowed.
5	MS. POWELL: Okay.
6	MS. GORDON: And you'll leave
7	MS. POWELL: Well, excuse me.
8	MS. GORDON: a copy of this with
9	MS. CAUDLE: A copy of this stays
10	MS. GORDON: them?
11	MS. CAUDLE: with the salon.
12	MS. GORDON: And the
13	MS. CAUDLE: And the inspection is on the
14	laptop which is uploaded to the office.
15	MS. WITTUM: There will be a difference
16	between what is put in the computer in GL Suite
17	and what is written on the condensed form in
18	that in the computer we want detailed
19	information.
20	MS. CAUDLE: Right.
21	MS. WITTUM: You need that at the hearing.
22	On the abbreviated form they could just be
23	they could be brief.
24	(Multiple conversations taking place at
25	once.)

MS. WITTUM: If it was an unlicensed 1 2 person, they'd write their name and identifying information down so that the salon owner knows 3 4 which person was unlicensed or if they had a 5 lapsed license at the time. (Multiple conversations taking place at 6 7 once.) 8 MS. WITTUM: The abbreviated information 9 that's on there just simply needs to be enough 10 for that salon owner, especially if that person 11 was not there at the time of the inspection, to 12 know --13 (Multiple conversations taking place at 14 once.) 15 MS. CAUDLE: -- qualifies as dirty, okay? 16 Under where it says 'Barbicide - dirty or 17 clean' or 'Change when cloudy or dirty', I 18 would put Sheila's barbicide was dirty. So 19 that salon owner would know that I was the one 20 responsible for not cleaning my barbicide. As 21 an example, just state the fact. 22 MS. POWELL: Right. I just want to make 23 sure that the inspectors are conscientious in 24 filling out a summary. 25 MS. CAUDLE: I don't think --

	2/6
1	MS. POWELL: There's not any
2	MS. CAUDLE: that they'll have any
3	problem with that.
4	MS. POWELL: opportunity for the person
5	to come in and say, well, you didn't tell me
6	that when you were here.
7	MS. TURMAN: Yes.
8	MS. WITTUM: But,
9	MS. POWELL: I would want to know in your
10	summary you had documented
11	MS. CAUDLE: Barbicide.
12	MS. POWELL: Right. But I don't know that
13	you would give the
14	MS. CAUDLE: We do that now.
15	MS. POWELL: I understand. Excuse me. I
16	want to make sure that you would document on
17	the summary like, dirty barbicide, but when you
18	went into the computer and did your real report
19	you'd be more explanatory. I don't want it to
20	be because you didn't write all this stuff down
21	here about so-and-so and they said such-and-
22	such. I wouldn't want it to be an opportunity
23	for them to say
24	MS. WITTUM: Well, anything that is marked
25	in the automated spreadsheet inspection report

1	would need to be addressed on this in an
2	abbreviated format.
3	MS. CAUDLE: Right.
4	MS. POWELL: Right.
5	MS. WITTUM: But anything any 'no' that
6	they have marked in the computer
7	MS. CAUDLE: Has to be addressed.
8	MS. WITTUM: has to be addressed over
9	here (indicating). Now there's always going to
10	be people who come in and say that's not the
11	way they said it.
12	(Multiple conversations taking place at
13	once.)
14	MS. GORDON: I'm still I don't
15	understand this with the
16	(Multiple conversations taking place at
17	once.)
18	COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. Could you
19	please
20	MS. POWELL: We need one conversation at a
21	time.
22	COURT REPORTER: speak in turn.
23	MS. TURMAN: I'm sorry.
24	MS. WITTUM: I think that this will work
25	for the inspectors. The concern that they have

had since the equipment has been purchased and they realized exactly what it was going to entail to be automated, they've dealt with what they consider to be a heavy load to carry --

MS. TRAYLOR: It is.

MS. WITTUM: -- and the inconvenience of the surfaces that they have to roll the bags on and things of that nature. Plus the fact that some places don't have elevators and they're having to carry it upstairs. This will still allow us to be able to give something to the salon owner, for them to have in their hands, at the time that they get their inspection. They get their civil penalty information and can compare it and then bring it to our attention if there's anything that they consider to be in conflict between those two.

MS. POWELL: Plus it gives them immediate access to information in the office, and if they so choose to print, then --

MS. CAUDLE: If we need to print, we'll have the equipment available. We just won't have to lug it in and use it every time.

MS. POWELL: Right.

MS. WITTUM: Uh-huh.

1	MS. TRAYLOR: Well, I don't have a problem
2	with it myself.
3	MS. PICKERING: I don't either.
4	MS. CAUDLE: It would just make our lives
5	much easier not having to lift that because you
6	know
7	MS. TRAYLOR: I couldn't
8	MS. CAUDLE: I have arthritis in my
9	neck and back anyway.
10	MS. TRAYLOR: I could not lift that in and
11	out of a car all day.
12	MS. CAUDLE: It gets a little difficult by
13	the end of the day.
14	MS. TURMAN: You said something about the
15	length. Are you going from three pages down to
16	
17	MS. CAUDLE: No, ma'am.
18	MR. DOWNEY: It'll still be on three
19	pages.
20	MS. CAUDLE: It won't change.
21	MS. TURMAN: Okay.
22	MS. CAUDLE: Our original inspection form
23	is in this laptop. We will be able to pull
24	that up and complete that form. And there's a
25	little place for comments on there. When we

2 form where the owner of the salon will sign it. Okay. What we're going to do is after we do 3 4 this form in our laptops, we're going to sit 5 down with this sheet of paper and we're either going to check 'no violations.' 6 7 MS. TURMAN: Okay. 8 MS. CAUDLE: And sign it and date it and leave it with them. Or we're going to check 9 10 'violation' and we're going to list out what 11 violations --12 MS. TRAYLOR: That you have -- that they 13 were. That --14 MS. CAUDLE: -- that they had. 15 MS. TRAYLOR: -- you put on the computer. 16 MS. CAUDLE: Right. In either event, they're going to be left that form telling them 17 'no violations' or what violations we found 18 19 while we were there. 20 MS. TURMAN: Right. And you really detail 21 those violations, you know, as you write them 22 up each time? 23 MS. WITTUM: You'll have that. It will be 24 in the computer. 25 MS. TURMAN: Oh, the office computer --

complete that, that is the original inspection

1	okay.
2	MS. GORDON: And then when will you use
3	the set up to print all this
4	MS. CAUDLE: That's what we're not wanting
5	to do.
6	MS. WITTUM: But it will there are many
7	other purposes for the printer. It just won't
8	be in this particular scenario.
9	MS. GORDON: That's what I'm saying.
10	MS. CAUDLE: We just won't have to carry
11	all this equipment in to set it up.
12	MS. POWELL: When you're at the facilities
13	inspecting will the facility that you're
14	inspecting person, view the original violations
15	on the computer screen?
16	MS. CAUDLE: Yes, ma'am. They're going to
17	have to sign it.
18	MS. POWELL: Oh, they'll sign it on the
19	laptop?
20	MS. CAUDLE: Yes, ma'am.
21	MS. POWELL: So they have to give the
22	signature on the
23	MS. CAUDLE: Yes, ma'am.
24	MS. POWELL: all of it in the computer?
25	MS. CAUDLE: Yes, ma'am.

1	MS. POWELL: So it shows that they've seen
2	
3	MS. CAUDLE: That they've seen the
4	complete inspection report and initial
5	MS. POWELL: the actual inspection
6	report?
7	MS. CAUDLE: what is marked and they
8	sign it and they also initial each page.
9	MS. HORNER: The new ones that are printed
10	off the computer, they are physically initialed
11	on each page by the salon owner.
12	MS. POWELL: So those are seen immediately
13	upon the
14	MS. CAUDLE: Yes, ma'am.
15	MS. POWELL: violation. And then
16	you're just going to leave them
17	MS. CAUDLE: Just going to leave them
18	MS. POWELL: them a
19	MS. TRAYLOR: That's all we need. You
20	don't have room for
21	(Multiple conversations taking place at
22	once.)
23	MS. GORDON: So when you use this system
24	that you're talking about, your printers will
25	be eliminated from carrying into the salon,

1	MS. CAUDLE: From carrying it into the
2	salon.
3	MS. GORDON: So when you get back to your
4	
5	MS. CAUDLE: All we will do
6	MS. GORDON: designated area, will you
7	print
8	MS. CAUDLE: with our laptops.
9	MS. GORDON: Okay. I understand that.
10	(Multiple conversations taking place at
11	once.)
12	MS. POWELL: Is there any further
13	discussion from the board or questions? Ms.
14	Traylor.
15	MS. TRAYLOR: The way I understand it is
16	the fine money is to offset the expenses of the
17	hearings. Am I right?
18	(No verbal response.)
19	MS. TRAYLOR: We bring the inspectors in
20	and they testify. Can we not pay them
21	something out of that fine money for them
22	coming in? Why not? We pay somebody else?
23	MS. WITTUM: They are salaried employees
24	and the legislature determines what their
25	salary is going to be.
ı	I I

1	MS. TRAYLOR: But if they come in to
2	testify, we cannot pay them to come in and do
3	that?
4	MS. WITTUM: No. They're doing their job.
5	That's part of their job description.
6	MS. POWELL: Is there any other further
7	discussion on this issue of the proposals by
8	the inspectors?
9	MS. TRAYLOR: Do we need to vote on it?
10	MS. WITTUM: No. We just wanted to make
11	sure that you knew that this change was
12	something that they wanted to do. We basically
13	wanted to get your blessing, because once it
14	starts going out it will be different. So I'm
15	sure you're going to get phone calls or hear
16	something from people about this.
17	MS. POWELL: So when you hear the phone
18	calls that says there's two different forms,
19	duh-duh-duh-duh.
20	MS. WITTUM: Understand.
21	MS. POWELL: You'll know.
22	MS. WITTUM: You'll know exactly what they
23	mean.
24	MS. POWELL: So one's a summary. They get
25	a report and they sign a report and they're

1	given a summary.
2	MS. CAUDLE: Right.
3	MR. DOWNEY: I think it should be in the
4	minutes of the board meeting that we all
5	approve or disapprove this, so I think it needs
6	to be
7	MS. TRAYLOR: Right.
8	
	MR. DOWNEY: brought up into a motion
9	that we accept this method of doing it.
10	MS. POWELL: Is that a motion, Mr. Downey?
11	MR. DOWNEY: That is a motion.
12	MS. TRAYLOR: And I second that motion.
13	MS. POWELL: I have a motion and a second
14	to approve the proposal from the inspectors
15	the inspector's proposal. Is there any other
16	discussion?
17	(Pause.)
18	MS. POWELL: All those in favor?
19	(Show of hands.)
20	MS. POWELL: It's unanimous. The motion
21	carries. Is there any further business?
22	(Pause.)
23	MS. POWELL: Okay. Hearing none, this
24	meeting is adjourned.
25	(WHEREUPON, the meeting was concluded and

1	adjourned at 3:30 p.m.)
2	* * * * * * * *
3	OFF THE RECORD
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Teresa Iden, CCR Mabelvale , Arkansas 72103

BEFORE THE ARKANSAS STATE BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY

I, TERESA IDEN, Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Arkansas, Supreme Court Certificate No. 646, do hereby certify that I recorded the proceedings of the special meeting and work session called before the Arkansas State Board of Cosmetology by it's legislative committee and heard before the on the 30th day of October, 2006. Additionally, I certify, as well, that that the foregoing transcript of the proceedings and the testimony of said proceedings was taken by me in stenovoice and was thereafter reduced to typewritten form by me or under my direction and supervision; that the foregoing pages numbered 1 through 255 constitute a true and accurate record of the proceedings held to the best of my understanding and ability.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this proceeding was taken; and further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially interested, or otherwise, in the outcome of this action; and that I have no contract with the parties, attorneys, or persons with an interest in the action that affects

or has a substantial tendency to affect impartiality that requires me to relinquish control of an original deposition transcript or copies of the transcript before it is certified and delivered to the custodial attorney, or that requires me to provide and service not made available to all parties to the action.

WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL as such Court Reporter on this the _____ day of ______, 2006.

TERESA IDEN, CCR CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER ARKANSAS SUPREME COURT CERTIFICATE NO. 646

EXPIRES: 12/31/2006

Teresa Iden, CCR Mabelvale , Arkansas 72103