



**DENTAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA
DENTAL ASSISTING COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
January 28, 2022**

NOTE: In accordance with Government Code Section 11133, the Dental Assisting Council (Council) of the Dental Board of California (Board) met on January 28, 2022, via teleconference/WebEx Events, and no public locations or teleconference locations were provided.

Members Present:

Jeri Fowler, CDA, RDAEF, OA, Chair
Traci Reed-Espinoza, RDAEF, Vice Chair
Cara Miyasaki, RDA, RDHEF, MS
Rosalinda Olague, RDA, BA
Joanne Pacheco, RDH, MAOB

Staff Present:

Sarah Wallace, Interim Executive Officer
Tina Vallery, Chief of Administration and Licensing
Paige Ragali, Acting Dentistry Licensing and Examination Unit Manager
Rikki Parks, Acting Dental Assisting Program Manager
Mirela Taran, Administrative Analyst
Emilia Zuloaga, Complaint and Compliance Unit Manager
Tara Welch, Board Counsel, Attorney III, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)

Agenda Item 1: Call to Order/Roll Call/Establishment of a Quorum

Council Chair, Ms. Jeri Fowler, called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.; five members of the Council were present, and a quorum was established.

Agenda Item 2: Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

There were no public comments made on this item.

Agenda Item 3: Discussion and Possible Action on November 18, 2021 Meeting Minutes

Motion/Second/Call the Question (M/S/C) (Miyasaki/Olague) to approve the November 18, 2021 Meeting Minutes.

Ayes: Fowler, Miyasaki, Olague, Pacheco, Reed-Espinoza.

Nays: None.

Abstentions: None.

Absent: None.

Recusals: None.

The motion passed and the minutes were approved. There were no public comments made on this item.

Agenda Item 4: Update on Dental Assisting Examination Statistics

Ms. Rikki Parks, Acting Dental Assisting Program Manager, provided the report, which is available in the meeting materials.

There were no public comments made on this item.

Agenda Item 5: Update on Dental Assisting Licensing Statistics

Ms. Parks provided the report, which is available in the meeting materials.

The Council received public comment. Ms. Claudia Pohl, representing California Dental Assistants Association (CDAA), pointed out that the “Dental Assistant Applications Received by Month” on page 12 of the meeting materials showed that in fiscal year (FY) 2020/2021, there were 2,661 RDA applications received. The “Dental Assistant Applications Approved by Month” table for FY 2020/2021 showed there were 1,907 approved RDA applications. This indicated that roughly 700 RDA applications in FY 2020/2021 were not approved. Ms. Pohl requested the Council provide more information on the data of those applications that were not approved.

Agenda Item 6: Update Regarding RDAEF Licensure Requirements and Administration of New RDAEF Written Examination

Ms. Tina Vallery, Chief of Administration and Licensing, provided the report, which is available in the meeting materials. Ms. Vallery advised that the new RDAEF written examination was intended to be launched on January 1, 2022. On January 24, 2022, Ms. Vallery and Ms. Sarah Wallace, Interim Executive Officer, were informed that implementation of the new RDAEF written examination did not occur on January 1, 2022, as anticipated. From January 3, 2022, until January 24, 2022, the previous version of the RDAEF exam remained in effect and was administered to nine candidates. No additional candidates were scheduled to take the exam between January 25-28, 2022. After consulting with the DCA, Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) and Board Counsel, it was advised that the delayed implementation of the new RDAEF exam did not impact the nine candidates. The administration of the new RDAEF examination will begin on January 28, 2022. OPES will monitor the statistical performance of the item to ensure the examination functions as intended.

The Council received public comment. Dr. Molly Newlon inquired whether there was any other content that was added to the new exam other than the inclusion of a cord retraction and final impressions. In addition, Dr. Newlon asked what the length of the new exam is in comparison to the previous exam.

Agenda Item 7: Update on Dental Assisting Educational Program and Course Applications and Re-Evaluations

Ms. Vallery provided the report, which is available in the meeting materials. She noted that the goal of a re-evaluation is to ensure the programs and courses are in compliance with current laws and regulations.

There were no public comments made on this item.

Agenda Item 8: Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Recommendations of Council Working Group on RDAEF Administration of Local Anesthesia and Nitrous Oxide

Ms. Vallery provided the report, which is available in the meeting materials.

Chair Fowler disclosed that in order to determine whether local anesthesia and nitrous oxide should become an allowable duty for an RDAEF2, relevant data in a non-biased survey is necessary. To accurately obtain good data results, the survey must be sent to all dental professionals who are responsible for administering additional local anesthesia and nitrous oxide in the practice utilizing RDAEFs. Chair Fowler expressed opposition to OPES' first recommendation since there could potentially be discrepancies in data results between the supervising dentist and the RDAEF due to a lack of awareness of the dentist for the need of local anesthesia reinforcement. The reason as to why the survey should be taken separately by RDAEFs and their employers is so data results can be compared between the dentists and RDAEFs to ensure that they are on the same page. The working group proposed that all practices that utilize RDAEFs should be given access to this survey.

Council Member, Ms. Cara Miyasaki, asked OPES whether the recommendations that they have provided are in order of importance. Ms. Karen Okicich, M.A., Research Data Supervisor II, from OPES, responded that their primary reason for their recommendation for surveying the RDAEFs and dentists first was to simplify the process so that one can assess, based on the most involved parties, whether there was a rationale for proceeding forward and then extending it to other dental professionals that would be involved. OPES recommended that there be two separate surveys, so that the questions can be tailored toward the specific profession and their involvement.

Council member, Ms. Rosalinda Olague, inquired whether the Council had thought about a mixed method approach. She suggested the Council conduct both quantitative and qualitative surveys; through qualitative, conduct 25-30 interviews to obtain saturation, and then subsequently combine both methods. Ms. Okicich replied that this approach could be taken. However, it would be beneficial to start with the survey to ensure that there is interest and move toward a qualitative type analysis. Ms. Olague added that she had seen the value of starting with qualitative research to get the end result. She suggested that the Council could consider whether the approach should be adjusted to obtain the information and ensure that validity is present. Chair Fowler mentioned that this survey is

intended to gather how much time was spent if the need for additional anesthesia is required

Ms. Miyasaki agreed with Ms. Olague's comments and verbalized that it could be beneficial to add "other" as an answer on the survey, as some of the answers might be unapplicable. Chair Fowler replied that she did not think it would be a good approach to make the survey more generalized, as the Council needs very specific data whether the patient's procedure is being lengthened due to needing more anesthesia. Ms. Okicich added the OPES would continue to recommend that the Council seek large-scale qualitative data after quantitative data is obtained.

Ms. Olague indicated that vague language existed in a few of the survey questions, specifically survey question numbers 11 and 19. Chair Fowler replied that OPES reworded various survey questions. Chair Fowler asked OPES whether their version of the proposed survey would be presented at the Board meeting. Ms. Vallery replied that the purpose of this agenda item was to put forward what the two-member working group came up with and for the Council to agree if this was the direction they would like to move in. If so, the two-member working group could continue to work with OPES to make revisions to the survey and bring them back for future discussion.

Ms. Miyasaki asked to hear from the Council on their opinion regarding having a small focus group, which would allow the Council to compare the answers received to the survey answers. Ms. Olague replied that she is in support of taking this as a first step but urged the Council to consider the focus groups. Ms. Vallery reiterated that the Board does not have the staff resources to take on the formation of working groups. Ms. Tara Welch, Board Counsel, advised that the Council needs to think about compliance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act and whether the focus group would have to be some type of noticed public meeting and consider the amount of meeting materials Board staff would have to prepare for such a meeting. Ms. Miyasaki inquired if Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) could constitute the focus groups, as opposed to other licensed professionals. Ms. Welch replied that SMEs might have Bagley-Keene exemption status based on being Board contracted but also potentially have statutory protection for examination review. Ms. Vallery indicated that by using SMEs, the work would still fall on Board staff.

Ms. Miyasaki asked the Council to provide their thoughts on having a survey that went out to a smaller group with an "other" or "not applicable" option in the questions in order to narrow down the range of answers. Ms. Olague added that she is in support of the survey but would want to see it in final draft. She does not feel that the questions are where they need to be and asked the Council to consider adjusting the questions on the survey.

(M/S/C) (Olague/Pacheco) to delegate authority to the two-member working group to continue working with OPES to finalize the surveys and bring them back at a future DAC meeting.

Ayes: Fowler, Miyasaki, Olague, Pacheco, Reed-Espinoza.

Nays: None.

Abstentions: None.

Absent: None.

Recusals: None.

The motion passed. The Council received public comment. Ms. Claudia Pohl, representing CDAA, commented that with respect to survey question number two, it seemed that there could be a dentist employee or practicing dentist who is neither an owner nor associate. Ms. Pohl suggested the Council may want to consider having a dentist employee or practicing dentist as an optional answer for that question. Ms. Pohl also noted that only survey question numbers 19 and 21 deal with nitrous oxide. She suggested the Council may want to consider having additional question(s) relative to nitrous oxide or incorporating that topic into some of the questions that talk about local anesthesia.

Agenda Item 9: Adjournment

Chair Fowler adjourned the meeting at 11:07 a.m.