



**Examination Committee Meeting Minutes  
Thursday November 4, 2010  
El Segundo, CA**

**Members Present:**

Huong Le, DDS, Vice Chair  
John Bettinger, DDS,  
Luis Dominicis, DDS  
Rebecca Downing, Public Member  
Judith Forsythe, RDA  
Steven Morrow, DDS, MS  
Thomas Olinger, DDS

**Members Absent:**

Stephen Casagrande, DDS , Chair

**Staff Present:**

Richard DeCuir, Executive Officer  
Denise Johnson, Assistant Executive Officer  
Donna Kantner, Licensing & Examination Unit Manager  
Lori Reis, Complaint & Compliance Manager  
Kim A. Trefry, Enforcement Chief  
Jocelyn Campos, Enforcement Coordinator  
Karen Fischer, Administrative Analyst  
Sarah Wallace, Legislative/Regulatory Analyst  
Linda Byers, Executive Assistant  
Kristy Shellans, DCA Senior Staff Counsel  
Greg Salute, Deputy Attorney General

Dr. Huong Le, Vice Chair called the committee meeting to order at 8:10 a.m. Roll was called and a quorum established.

**EX 1 – Approval of the May 5, 2010 Examination Committee Meeting Minutes**

M/S/C (Downing/Dominicis) to approve the May 5, 2010 Examination Committee Meeting Minutes. The motion passed unanimously. Dr. Morrow abstained.

**EX 2 – Registered Dental Assistant Examination Statistics**

Donna Kantner, Licensing & Examination Unit Manager stated that the report is presented for the Board's consideration. Dr. Dominicis expressed concern that the failure rate still seems higher than it should be even though it has gone down since the last report. He went on to ask if this might be because many of the candidates speak English as their second language which seems to be proven in that the practical side of the exam has a higher pass rate. Ms. Kantner responded that this is a new examination and the pass rate is coming up. There is a continual line item analysis every time the examination is given and historically the written exam has had a lower pass rate than the practical. Dr. Morrow asked if there had been any revisions. Richard DeCuir, Executive Officer added that, according to our consultant, Dr. Tracy Montez, the new examination needs to be in place for at least 1 year before any changes are made.

Dr. Bettinger stated that Dr. Olinger had previously asked if there was a way to see statistics for each school. That process is being looked into but is quite time consuming and so has been placed as a lower priority. Dr. Le asked if the statistics could show the difference between the passing rate of students who go to an accredited school as opposed to those with only “on the job” training. Ms Kantner confirms that this can be done.

### **EX 3 – Calendar of Upcoming Dental and Dental Assistant Examinations**

Currently there are no California clinical Dental Board examinations scheduled as staff has been unable to secure a commitment for clinical examination space from any California dental school. The vast majority of applicants apply for the WREB clinical examination. Law and Ethics examinations continue to be given at least monthly. Dates and locations for these examinations are posted on the Board’s website through December 2011. RDA Practical Examinations are scheduled for November 13 and 14 at the University of California, San Francisco; and November 20 and 21 at the University of California, Los Angeles. There was discussion about the difficulty staff had encountered securing space at dental schools in order to administer a practical examination. Ms. Kantner stated that they are continuing to look for alternative sites. Dr. Olinger asked that the statistics and information regarding Dental Hygiene examination locations be included in the Board packet as well.

### **EX 4 – Subcommittee Report Regarding a Request to Review Licensure by Residency Requirements for Individuals Wanting to Take the California State Dental Examination**

At the May 2010 Board meeting, Dr. Casagrande, Chair of the Examination Committee, formed a subcommittee and asked Drs. Olinger and Le to research what other states are doing. Dr. Le reported that some states allow foreign trained dentists to sit for the exam once they have completed the necessary programs. However, in California we do not have a specialty permit. There are pathways for foreign trained dentists to obtain a license to practice dentistry in California. Each state has their own way for these foreign trained dentists to obtain a license. Any change in licensure requirements will require statutory changes. The subcommittee recognized that there are many ways for foreign trained dentists to obtain licensure in California at this time. California does not have a specialty permit but only grants a general dentistry license. To provide a specialty license or permit, the Board would have to sponsor licensure legislation with the proposed changes to include specialty permit or license or grant permission for these candidates to sit for a general dentistry license examination after the training with no restriction. Dr. Le pointed out that there are two issues at hand: **1.** A specialty permit that will allow ALL graduates of CODA-approved or non-CODA approved specialty training programs to sit for the specialty permit examination (an examination for special permit would have to be developed); **2.** A licensure pathway for non-CODA approved dental school graduates who complete a CODA-approved specialty residency program to take the clinical examination for a general dentistry license. Current license allows all licensees to perform general dentistry without restrictions. These candidates would be allowed to provide the same scope of practice if granted licensure through current examination processes. To accomplish this, the subcommittee proposed a convening of the specialty community and an appointed subcommittee to start discussions on various pathways of licensure for the non-CODA approved graduates who have completed a CODA-approved specialty residency program. Dr. Olinger stated that the subcommittee recommended that no action be taken at this time. They are satisfied with the system we have now. Dr. Dominicus asked if any of these specialty slots go unmet because of lack of candidates. In other words, is there a need? Dr. Morrow stated that there are plenty of candidates for the few slots available. He felt that the issue is not filling the quota, but candidates that have not graduated from a CODA approved program. Currently, candidates must graduate from a CODA approved program to be considered for specialty licensing. If the mission of the Board is to protect the citizens of this state then what kind of education do we want these candidates to have in order to become specialists? Dr.

Morrow's recommendation was that the Examination Committee appoint a subcommittee to specifically look at and bring a recommendation back to the committee regarding establishment of a specialty license in California for Board certified diplomats of specialties that are accepted by the American Dental Association and the Commission on Dental Accreditation. Dr. Paul Reggiardo spoke on behalf of the CA Society of Pediatric Dentistry. He opposed the idea of specialty licensure and would support Dr. Olinger in his statement that the statutes as they are now are satisfactory. There is no public benefit to specialty licensure. The scope of practice should be determined by one's training. CODA determines what is involved in training not the Dental Board. As soon as you get into specialty licensure the Dental Board would have to determine what the scope of practice is within that specialty. This could lead to the scope of practice being determined by who sits on the Dental Board meaning the scope of practice could change as the Board members change which would not serve the public well. Dr. Bettinger agreed with Dr. Reggiardo. Dr. Morrow stated that he was not saying that this is a road that he thought we should go down just a road that should be looked at. That's all he was suggesting. Dr. Morrow questioned the subcommittee as to how involved they got at looking into specialty licensing. M/S/C (Bettinger/Forsythe) to put this item on the Examination Committee's agenda for the February Board meeting. The motion passed unanimously. M/S/C (Le/Olinger) to accept the subcommittee report. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **EX5 – Western Regional Examination Board (WREB) Statistics and Update**

Dr. Dominicus reported that the number of states that accept WREB results for dental licensing varies month to month anywhere from 30 – 33. As of that date a total of 2,397 candidates had been tested inclusive of all sites statewide. There was one remaining exam date that year. The results showed an 82% pass rate. There were 8 appeals. Four were denied. WREB will finish their initial testing of the new Dental Electronic Scoring System or DESS. This system is currently being used for the RDH examinations. The new system provides results to the candidates within 10 days. All Dental Examiners would have to undergo training for the new DESS system which will be used exclusively by the year 2012. Calibration of the Examiners themselves is also starting to be done electronically. As for the content of the examination itself, there might be some changes coming up, the most noticeable would be to allow 2 slot preps rather than a slot prep and a regular class II or class III prep. They are trying to do this because more of the schools are being more conservative on the class II approach so they are trying to accommodate this trend rather than have them do one of each. WREB will be increasing the number of RDH exams in California next year due to an increase in RDH applicants. The next WREB Board of Directors meeting will be at WREB's headquarters in Arizona on January 29, 2011.

#### **EX6 – Discussion and Possible Action to Appoint WREB Examiners**

Dr. Bettinger stated that the applicants included in this packet are Examiners who would like a letter from the Dental Board so that they can apply to become WREB Examiners. The reason that these are included is because the Board was under the impression that WREB only had 1 or 2 Examiners from California. Donna Kantner sent out a letter to all examiners asking them to send in their applications if they wanted to be considered. Dr. Bettinger talked to Dr. Casagrande regarding the number of applications received and the feasibility of going through all of them. Dr. Bettinger motioned to recommend that the chair appoint a subcommittee of Dr. Casagrande and Dr. Dominicus, both of whom are well versed in the examination process, and delegate authority to this subcommittee to decide which if not all of these applicants to recommend to WREB to consider as examiners. Kristy Shellans, legal counsel, asked if Dr. Bettinger's motion implied that the subcommittee will subjectively review these applications or will there be some criteria developed to provide for consistency.

Kristy Shellans, asked if this means that the criteria would be that they are Dental Board Examiners in good standing? If this is the case you don't really need a subcommittee you can just say that this is the criteria and all of the applicants can be recommended. Dr. Dominicis informed us that applicants cannot apply directly to WREB. They must have a recommendation from a Board in order to be considered. Dr. Le asked how many examiners WREB is looking for from the state of California. Dr. Dominicis replied that it is up to WREB to decide. They have been slowly recruiting examiners from other Boards; they have filled up most of their spots. But, they do want more examiners from California especially Board members. They give priority to Board Members. Dr. Morrow stated that he hopes that we will develop some criteria and not limit the Board's recommendations to only current and former Board Examiners. Dr. Olinger concurred. He would like to see staff review all applications including those who have never been examiners and develop some minimum criteria for acceptance. M/S (Bettinger/Dominicis) to recommend to the Board, that all applicants in this packet be approved and sent to WREB pending review by staff for any disciplinary actions. Rebecca Downing, Public Member, amended the motion to add that for future reference we use this same criteria of "Board Examiners in good standing" to approve future applicants. There was one applicant in the packet for consideration who had never been a Board Examiner. Ms. Downing clarified that she intended for the motion to state that being a Board Examiner was only one of many different criteria that would be accepted with other criteria as yet to be determined. Ms. Downing withdrew the amendment. Dr. Bettinger pointed out that WREB will use their own criteria to make the final decision as to who to accept. The original motion by Dr. Bettinger is re-stated: to recommend to the Board, that all applicants in this packet be approved and sent to WREB pending review by staff for any disciplinary actions. Donna Kantner informed the Board that there is an addendum with several more applications that came in late. Dr. Le stated that the motion is for only those applications that were in the original Board packet and does not include those in the addendum. The motion passed with Dr. Morrow abstaining.

#### **Public comment**

There was no further public comment.

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 a.m.