



DENTAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA
1432 HOWE AVENUE, SUITE 85, SACRAMENTO, CA 95825-3241
TELEPHONE: (916) 263-2300
FAX: (916) 263-2140
www.dbc.ca.gov



EXAMINATION COMMITTEE

October 5, 2006
Culver City, CA

Draft Meeting Minutes

Chair Casagrande called the meeting to order at 1:15pm.

Members Present:

Stephen Casagrande, DDS, Committee Chair
Luis Dominicis, DDS
Ronald S. Mito, DDS
Lewis Turchi, DDS

Members Absent:

Suzanne McCormick, DDS
David Baron, Public

Staff Present:

Robert Hedrick, Executive Officer
Donna Kantner, Regulations Analyst
Dawn Dill, Associate Governmental Program Analyst

Agenda Item 1 – Discussion of Proposed Structural Changes to the Licensure Exam, Including Possible Segmentation and Tentative Schedules for 2007, 2008 and 2009

Chair Casagrande reported that based on discussion with the dental schools, the intent is to take parts of the proposed segmented examination and incorporate them into the clinical board examination as it is currently given. This will allow candidates to choose three time segments of five available segments to complete the patient-based procedures of the clinical examination. He felt that this maintains California's high standards while giving each candidate a choice. Chair Casagrande reported that the ultrasonic scaler will also be allowed during the exam. Executive Officer Hedrick noted that proposed exam dates would be on the Board's agenda in November.

Member Turchi suggested that additional clinical Examiners be recruited. Chair Casagrande noted that the training period for new Examiners is substantial, noting that candidates must be confident in the ability of the Examiners. Edmund Carolan, CDA, offered a notice in the CDA Update for examiner recruitment. Dr. Robert Christoffersen, UOP, asked if this would impact the ability of the RT candidates to take their clinical board exam. Executive Officer Hedrick reported that the RT exam was separate from California's clinical board exam, and would not be impacted. He noted that those candidates who are successful in the RT exam would have the option of taking either the California clinical board exam or the WREB clinical exam to become licensed in California.

Agenda Item 2 – Discussion of Proposed Regulation to Amend Sections 1021 and 1028 of Title 16 California Code of Regulations relating to WREB and licensure via General Practice Residency and Possible Modification of Text

Executive Officer Hedrick reported that the proposed language changes the way in which WREB applications and applications for the Law and Ethics exam as required by the provisions of SB 683, which was signed into law by the Governor on September 30. He noted that the Board is operating under Emergency Regulations approved in March by OAL, however those regulations are due expire on November 10, 2005. He stated that staff will pursue another extension, but as a result of the passage of SB 683, any extension would be superceded on January 1, 2007. The provisions of SB 683 require that the Law and Ethics examination be a stand-alone process, with the result being that as of January 1, 2007, the Board will have no ability to administer the Law and Ethics examination as a part of any other process. He stated that this proposed language is a starting point, and staff will bring a refined proposal to the Board meeting in November for the Exam Committee and the full Board to approve, with the intent to file a new Emergency Regulation package that includes all of the requirements for application for licensure via WREB, application for licensure via the California clinical exam, application for Law and Ethics examination, application for licensure via residency program, and application for license number and registration of place of practice. He noted that the Law and Ethics exam would be administered four times yearly at a fee of \$75, to provide for an exam site and staffing for a separate exam, rather than the current practice of including this exam at the clinical board exam and the WREB exam. He added that the proposed language allows for the submission of an incomplete application by candidates, noting that the current application will be invalid as of January 1, 2007.

Edmund Carolan, CDA, asked why WREB applicants may not file an application as soon as they are scheduled for the WREB exam, rather than waiting for their results. Hedrick noted that this would cause additional workload for staff and increase the number of times that an individual file must be handled when information is submitted piecemeal. He said that when more information is received at once and can be entered into the Applicant Tracking System at one time, it is easier than having to retrieve the file each time a piece of information is submitted.

Hedrick noted that proposed Sections 1028.2 (8) and 1028.3 allow for application for licensure by residency program according to the provisions of SB 683. He added that the law allows the dean of a CODA-approved general practice or advanced education in general dentistry residency program to certify competency according to "core competencies commensurate to those found in the Board's examinations" as delineated by DCA's Office of Examination Resources in the current Occupational Analysis. He advised the Committee that he would meet with the Office of Examination Resources (OER) to confirm that this is current. Member Mito noted that there is a range of experience within a residency program. Member Turchi asked that a letter be sent to the deans of the California schools advising them of the situation. Member Mito asked that the student representative of each of the California schools also receive a copy of the letter.

Hedrick stated that language with the Committee's modifications would be brought to the Exam Committee and the full Board for approval in November, with the intent to file an Emergency regulation package and hold a public hearing in January.

Edmund Carolan, CDA, noted that RT students who want to take the WREB must request a letter from the Board. Hedrick noted that this information is on the website under WREB.

There was no further comment and the meeting adjourned at 3:00pm.