



DENTAL BOARD AND DENTAL ASSISTING COUNCIL MINUTES

Wednesday, May 11, 2016

Wyndham Anaheim Garden Grove

12021 Harbor Boulevard, Garden Grove, CA 92840

Board Members Present

Steven Morrow, DDS, MS, President
*Judith Forsythe, RDA, Vice President
(Also a Council member)
Steven Afriat, Public Member, Secretary
Fran Burton, MSW, Public Member
Luis Dominicis, DDS
Kathleen King, Public Member
Ross Lai, DDS
Huong Le, DDS, MA
Meredith McKenzie, Public Member
Thomas Stewart, DDS
*Bruce Witcher, DDS, (Also a Council member)
Debra Woo, DDS

Board Members Absent

Katie Dawson, RDH
Yvette Chappell-Ingram, Public Member

Dental Assisting Council Members Present

Vice Chair – Emma Ramos, RDA
Pamela Davis-Washington, RDA
Teresa Lua, RDAEF
Tamara McNealy, RDA
Judith Forsythe, RDA
Bruce Witcher, DDS

DAC Members Absent

Chair – Anne Contreras, RDA

JNT 1 - Call to Order/Roll Call/Establishment of Quorum

President Steven Morrow called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. Steve Afriat, Secretary, called the roll and a quorum was established.

JNT 2 - Approval of the March 3, 2016 Joint Dental Board and Dental Assisting Council Meeting Minutes.

President Morrow asked for a motion to approve the minutes as reported.

The motioner (Judith Forsythe) and seconder (Tamara McNealy) agreed.

Support: Morrow, Forsythe, Burton, Chappell-Ingram, Dawson, Dominicis, King, Le, McKenzie, Stewart, Witcher, Woo, Contreras, Ramos, Davis-Washington, McNealy.

Oppose: 0 **Abstain:** 1

The motion passes.

JNT 3 - Dental Assisting Staff Update.

Sarah Wallace, Assistant Executive Officer gave a staff update. Ms. Wallace reported that since the last Board meeting, the Board has administered 1 RDA examination, 1 RDAEF examination, and is preparing to administer another RDA examination for the month of May. She went on to mention that staff continues to work diligently to learn all the business processes that have come with our new online system Breeze and that some overtime work has been necessary to complete renewals, applications, and respond to the large volume of phone calls and emails coming in on a daily basis. Ms. Wallace went on to point out that the Dental Assistant unit is fully staffed, however with 2 key staff members away on extended leave; the unit continues to make pace with the additional backlog.

Board comment:

Dr. Witcher commented that it has been a great experience working with the 2 new staff members in the RDA unit.

JNT 4 – Update on Dental Assisting Programs and Courses

Ms. Wallace gave an overview of the information provided.

Questions:

Tamara McNealy, DAC member, asked if the Board is approving Orthodontic Assistant Permit courses and at the same time approving Ultrasonic Scaling courses that have been incorporated into the Orthodontic Assistant permit courses. Or are the Ultrasonic Scaling courses being approved separate from the Orthodontic Assistant Permit courses. Ms. Wallace responded that staff is still working through this issue, especially because of the development of the regulations that pertain to Ultrasonic Scaling courses. She mentioned she will need to look into this, but believes the Ultrasonic Scaling courses integrated into the Orthodontic Assistant courses should be getting approved as well.

JNT 5 - Update on Dental Assisting Examinations Statistics.

- Practical
- Written
- Orthodontic Assistant (OA)
- Dental Sedation Assistant (DSA)

Ms. Wallace gave an overview of the information provided.

Board comment:

Tamara McNealy mentioned she noticed OJT statistics were not included in the information provided and asked if it was due to a Breeze issue or just an oversight. Ms. Wallace responded that we are limited on what we're able to pull from Breeze and staff is still in the process of learning how to manually pull all the OJT statistics.

Dr. Stewart asked what the geographical boundaries are for the south, central and northern areas. Ms. Wallace responded that Fresno and Santa Maria are considered central testing areas, UCSF is considered north, and the Carrington College in Pomona, CA is considered south.

Pamela Davis-Washington mentioned she noticed that, regarding the 2011 - 2015 RDA exam pass rates, the 2012 and 2013 pass rates were so much higher than the rest and asked if that was a result of the test being calibrated. Ms. Wallace responded that it was in 2014 when the Board began to see the failure rate.

JNT 6 – Update on Dental Assisting Licensing Statistics.

- Registered Dental Assistant (RDA)
- Registered Dental Assistant in Extended Functions (RDAEF)
- Orthodontic Assistant (OA)
- Dental Sedation Assistant (DSA)

Ms. Wallace gave an overview of the information provided. She explained that staff is still in the process of pulling data relating to licensees with delinquent RDA licenses due to now possessing RDAEF, RDH or RDHAP licenses. However, as soon as the department can provide staff with an extract report and the data is made available, the information will be shared at the next Board meeting.

Board comment:

Ms. McNealy commented that she wanted to thank Katie Le for taking on the task of pulling statistics on licensees with delinquent RDA licenses due to possessing dual licensure.

JNT 7 – Report on the Results of the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) Occupational Analysis of the Registered Dental Assistant (RDA) and Registered Dental Assistant in Extended Functions (RDAEF) Practical Examinations.

Dr. Heidi Lincer, Chief of OPES, provided a power point presentation report on the findings of the (OPES) Occupational Analysis of the Registered Dental Assistant (RDA) and Registered Dental Assistant in Extended Functions (RDAEF) Practical Examinations.

Board Comment:

Dr. Morrow thanked and complemented Ms. Lincer on her thorough analysis of the Occupational Analysis. He pointed out that all of the information provided in the presentation is very useful information, and will help in making necessary decisions. However, there is still a lot to discuss at the Board level in regards to what actions to take.

Dr. Morrow went on to mention that some questions that arise are: Is the practical examination really necessary? Is there evidence to support that the knowledge and task connection competency could be established by written examination only? Or is a practical examination in Dr. Lincer's professional opinion required at entry level for these licensees? Ms. Lincer indicated that those questions would be answered during an upcoming agenda item.

Dr. Stewart asked if the written examination was included in the Occupational Analysis. Ms. Lincer responded affirmatively but pointed out that the occupational analysis did not focus on the current issue the practical examination is facing. Dr. Stewart asked how

the examinations are sequenced. Are they all done together? Are they all considered different experiences? Ms. Lincer responded affirmatively.

Dr. Witcher commented that he believes the Board last updated the RDA written exam in 2010. Dr. Morrow answered affirmatively. Dr. Witcher asked if the law and ethics exam was recently updated as well because of an exam breach. Ms. Fischer responded affirmatively and added that the law and ethics exam is constantly being updated due to the ongoing contract the Board has with OPES. She went on to discuss that Dr. Lincer is speaking on the possibility of combining both the written and law and ethics examinations and have only one examination that will be discussed on another agenda item.

Ms. McNealy commented that the scope and depth of this new combined written examination would really require the Board and DAC members to digest and process it.

She went on to ask if there is a typo in the scope of practice for RDA's found on page 2 of the memo from Dr. Lincer to Karen Fischer titled Evaluation of Clinical Skills related to RDA Scope of Practice as a prerequisite to Licensure, under Summary of Licensee focus groups, clause A. She explained that clause A mistakenly indicates that RDA's can take impressions for direct and indirect restorations, which is within the scope of practice of an RDAEF, not an RDA. She asked if the clause meant to state RDA's can take "provisional impressions" rather than "direct and indirect" restorations. Ms. Wallace clarified that clause A was meant state "provisional". Ms. McNealy moved on to point out a statement found on page 2 of the Occupational Analysis that reads: For licensure program to meet these standards it must be solidly based upon job activities required for practice. She explained that because the Board has an On The Job (OJT) pathway, when looking at the Occupational Analysis, at the state exams and various other options, we should keep in mind that there is another pathway for applicants to take licensure examination and what oversight and consistency will be provided within that area or arena. There is a lot of emphasis on the educational aspect found in the Occupational Analysis; however the OJT aspect should not be overlooked. To ensure consistency, depending on whichever option we go with, how will the Board determine through OJT that that criteria was met in the same manner as the educational? Ms. McNealy commented she wanted to point that out but no discussion was necessary. Ms. McNealy moved on to comment on the information found on the graph on page 9 of the occupational analysis. She clarified that there exists a waiting or delay period when a student qualifies through the educational pathway, based on how often the filing periods occur and how often the exams are offered and also the cost and expense of the exam. Participants do have to wait so they can work in the field, be employed and earn the money in order to take the exam. The Board will also be raising the prices of the exams so that will be another delay factor for candidates. Dr. Morrow asked Ms. McNealy if she is indicating that the delay between the time that they've completed their training and taking the examination is diluting their level of knowledge and skills and therefore reducing the quality of their examination product. Ms. McNealy answered affirmatively and added that the longer a candidate waits, the less proficient they will be when tested. Ms. Lincer clarified that the question found on page 9 is not asking how long candidates waited to take the test. The question is asking how many months or years did the candidate work as an unlicensed dental assistant. Dr. Morrow commented that Ms. McNealy's concept is valid; however the data that's being

presented here is not addressing that issue. Dr. Whitcher added that Ms. McNealy has brought out a good point, but again the data being presented here is more about exam design and development, and not about exam delivery which would go along with scheduling and implementation. This can be discussed at a later agenda item.

Dr. Lai asked what is tested on the practical exam. Ms. Fischer responded that in statute it outlines that there are 4 procedures and the Board can choose 3 of them to test the candidates. Ms. Wallace added that the 3 current procedures being tested on the practical exam are found in the Business and Profession Code, Section 1752.3 which are: placing, adjusting and finishing a provisional restoration, fabricating and adjusting an indirect provisional restoration, and cementing an indirect provisional restoration.

Ms. Fischer thanked Dr. Lincer once again for the arduous work and dedication she put into the Occupational Analysis.

JNT 8 – Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Update of the Registered Dental Assistant (RDA) Law & Ethics and Written Examinations in Accordance with Business and Professions Code Section 139 Requirements.

Ms. Wallace discussed the typical procedure that takes place after the conclusion of an Occupational Analysis and summarized the Boards current examination process for all 3 exams. She moved on to discuss the possibility of combining both the Written and Law & Ethics examinations into one exam and that it may require a statutory change. However combining both examinations would allow for a greater item bank, greater reliability and we would also be able to look to OPES to continue the updating of the exam on a yearly basis as the Board currently does with the Law & Ethics exam. Ms. Wallace went on to discuss that at this point, we would be asking the Board to direct staff to look at the feasibility of combining both exams and also give direction to update the content of these written examinations. She added that at this point in time, the Board does not have the statutory authority to combine both examinations, but we could still move forward with updating the content of both exams. If and when the time comes when we gain the statutory authority to offer 1 examination, we can combine those at that time.

Board comment:

Dr. Whitcher commented he believes it's a lot less labor intensive to do an update certainly than to develop a whole new exam and that the Board can probably use most of the existing item banks. Dr. Lincer responded affirmatively.

Ms. McKenzie asked if combining both exams would create the need for 2 different sections and would a candidate have to pass each section? Or would it be completely lumped together? Dr. Lincer responded that we would have a workshop with subject matter experts to answer that question of how to best distribute the weight and make a new examination outline covering everything. Most likely there would be a separate safety section as there is in the Law and Ethics exam, but the others may be combined into their respective sections. Ms. McKenzie expressed her approval of a combined exam if it would be divided into sections.

Ms. Burton asked how the Board would handle the issue on discipline under Law & Ethics if the exam were to be combined. Ms. Wallace clarified that this is considered a licensing examination and it's only utilized for licensure. The ethics courses and requirements are considered different. Ms. Fischer added that the ethics courses and requirements are tailored specifically to the particular licensee being disciplined. It's not the Law and Ethics exam. Ms. Forsythe commented that on occasion, the Board does require the re-take of the Law and Ethics exam for a reinstatement of a license. For this reason, the Board needs to consider keeping the exams separate for that reason, unless they can be divided into parts A and B.

Dr. Dominicis asked if the exam was divided into parts, would both parts of the exam be taken on the same date. Dr. Morrow responded that the Board is going to direct staff to look into that and bring back to the Board.

Public comment:

Claudia Pohl with CDAA asked if the same Law and Ethics exam is given to RDAs, RDAEFs and RDHs. Ms. Forsythe responded that she believes the RDH Law and Ethics exam is different. Ms. Pohl added that CDAA would not like both exams to be combined. If it is combined, it needs to be separated into parts A and B.

Suzie Dault expressed her thoughts on not wanting to see the exam combined.

Lori Hubble, Executive Officer of the Dental Hygiene Committee clarified that the Law and Ethics exam for hygienists is different from the Law and Ethics exam given to RDAs.

Dr. Morrow asked for a motion for consideration be given to direct staff to work with the Department of Consumer Affairs office of Professional Examination Services to update the Law and Ethics Exam and the Written Exam required for Registered Dental Assistants licensure based on the findings recently completed in the Occupational Analysis of the Registered Dental Assistant profession.

The motioner (Judith Forsythe) and seconder (Thomas Stewart) agreed.

Support: Morrow, Forsythe, Burton, Chappell-Ingram, Dawson, Dominicis, King, Le, McKenzie, Stewart, Whitcher, Woo, Contreras, Ramos, Davis-Washington, McNealy.

Oppose: 0 **Abstain:** 0

The motion passes.

Secondly, Dr. Morrow asked for a motion to direct staff to determine if it would be feasible and statutorily authorized to combine both exams into one to allow for a greater pool of availability test questions which would strengthen the psychometric validity of the examinations.

Dr. Dominicis commented that there's already a low pass rate on the RDA exams and that adding more to that exam is going to lower the pass rate even more. The combined exam will lengthen the test. The longer the test is, the higher the chances will be for failing it. He believes its best to leave it separate.

Ms. Fischer asked if the Board would necessarily lengthen the exam. Dr. Lincer responded the combined exam would not necessarily have to be lengthened.

Ms. Burton added that a low pass rate on the RDA exam already exists and that changing and combining both written exams might not be the appropriate thing to do at this time.

Public comment:

Suzie Dault commented that it's very important to have 2 separate exams because combining them would not give us a very true statistical evaluation of whether or not how much did the candidate understand the Law and Ethics and how much they understood on the RDA written exam. Combining both exams will be like mudding the water.

Lisa Okamoto, CA Dental Hygienist Association, brought up a point to consider keeping both exams separate. She mentioned that the Board has had a lot of discussion about increasing enforcement cases due the lack of knowledge and application of the Dental Practice Act on the practitioner's part. She is not convinced that combining the 2 exams would help that situation.

Tamara McNealy asked for a motion to table this discussion until the Board has enough knowledge and information to make an informed decision.

The motioner (Debra Woo) and seconder (Tamara McNealy) agreed but then withdrew their motion.

Dr. Morrow tabled his 2nd motion until a future date when the Board has enough knowledge and information to make an informed decision.

JNT 9 – Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Registered Dental Assistant in Extended Functions (RDAEF) Written Examination in Accordance with Business and Professions Code Section 139 Requirements.

Dr. Morrow discussed that it's been decided to table this agenda item for discussion for a future Board meeting due the Occupational Analysis report not being complete at this time.

JNT 10 – Update on Dental Assisting Council Regulatory Workshops.

Ms. Wallace gave a summary of the scheduled Regulatory Workshops throughout 2016 for the purpose of developing the dental assisting comprehensive rulemaking package. Ms. Wallace thanked the Dental Assisting Council, stakeholders and our Legal Counsel for their collaboration and participation in getting these workshops up and running.

Ms. McNealy thanked Ms. Wallace, Katie Le and Leslie Campaz for organizing and keeping the workshops running smoothly.

Ms. Forsythe commented that it's exciting to see these workshops moving forward.

JNT 11 – Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Suspension of the Registered Dental Assistant (RDA) Practical Examination in Accordance with Business and Professions Code Section 1752.1(i)(j).

Ms. Wallace gave an overview of the information provided relating to the possibility of suspending the RDA practical examination. She went on to discuss that now that the Occupational Analysis has been concluded, the Board and Dental Assisting Council can discuss and take action regarding the potential suspension of the examination. The Board and Council can take no action to suspend the RDA practical examination, take action to suspend the RDA Practical Examination until July 1st, 2017 and work with OPES to develop a revised written RDA examination based on the finding of the occupational analysis, take action to suspend the RDA Practical Examination and have staff work with OPES to develop an alternative method to acquire licensure which may not include a practical exam, however that option would require statutory amendment to take effect by July 1st, 2017. Ms. Wallace moved on to state that at this point Board staff does not have a recommendation to move one way or another but is prepared to move in either direction that the Board chooses, whether that means to continue administering the RDA practical examination or suspend the RDA practical examination if necessary.

Ms. Forsythe asked if a 4th option can be added to continue to administer the RDA practical examination while working with OPES to create an alternative.

Dr. Stewart commented that it's difficult for him to enter into this discussion without understanding the problem for the low pass rates. Without that understanding, it's hard for me to support any direction and would like to understand what the core issues are and maybe that can be the start of the conversation. Ms. Fischer responded that in past meetings, it's been discussed that in order to determine why some of the candidates are failing the examination, that would require staff to go into each program and examine each student's record to find out everything we can about the student's to see if we could even determine why they would be failing the exam. That was determined to be not only an unpractical solution but unfeasible as well. Aside from the fact that the students are failing the RDA practical exam, at this point the Board should be discussing whether or not a practical examination is necessary.

Dr. Morrow described the straightforward process of taking a written examination. However, a practical examination has significant number of variables that might or might not be controlled, and if those variables are not controlled they can have a significant outcome affect as far as an individual being able to pass that examination because of those variables are outside of the candidates control.

Dr. Le commented on page 87 of the of the Occupational Analysis report relating to the provisional restoration procedures and how the answers indicate that those duties are not done very often. If the Board is testing on provisional restorations, and the candidates don't really perform these duties in the field, what is the value of the exam? She went on to comment that we need to look at what candidates perform most in the field, and test them on those procedures, if we want to keep the Practical Exam.

Ms. Forsythe commented that that's the point of the Occupational Analysis. To find out what the Board needs to be testing on and change the exam procedure.

Ms. McNealy commented on the variables that are out of the candidates control such as the timeline, the 2 pathways, the application process, facility variations, equipment variations that are not consistent, examiner calibration and bottom line student preparation. All these significantly impact the outcome of the exam.

Ms. Ramos commented on Dr. Le's comment that the answer to these questions will vary, depending on who you ask these questions to. These answers are not all true for everyone working in the dental assisting field. Dr. Le responded that she is basing her opinion on the survey answers because that is all the data we have and it is valid data.

Dr. Woo asked if the pass rate a lot higher when we didn't have this problem and didn't we have a different type of examiner at that time? Ms. Fischer responded that neither the exam nor the examiner has changed. What changed was the calibration of the examiners. In other words a dentist came in and taught the examiners essentially how they should be looking at the results of the exam and grading it. Typically within a calibration, at some point you grade the examiners and determine how many are grading too lenient and how many are grading too hard. Based on information we received, the examiners had been grading too leniently. However the examination has not changed it's just the calibration that has.

Ms. Forsythe commented on the standard that exists in California. She went on to discuss that she has been approached by many dentists expressing their concerns of seeing the RDA practical exam go away because when we hire someone, we don't know what that standard is of the dental assistant is that we're interviewing. If we remove the practical exam and replace it with a written exam, they will become an RDA without being tested clinically.

Ms. Burton moved a motion to go for option 3, suspend the practical exam and look for an alternative that does not include a practical exam.

Dr. Stewart encouraged educators to express their thoughts on getting rid of the practical exam.

Ms. McNealy commented on wanting to see the practical get suspended due to the many uncontrolled variables that contribute to the student's failure of the RDA practical exam, the broken exam system and because dental assistants are under the supervision of a DDS.

Dr. Woo expressed her thoughts on how important it is for her, as a DDS, to know who she is hiring and to know what they can and cannot do. The practical exam at the least guarantees some sort of assurance that the licensed RDA does know how to perform certain procedures.

Dr. Tanner commented that the low pass rate is due to the calibration problem between the educators and the examiners. He went on to say that the Board literally destroys the evidence as to whether a candidate passed or failed. Currently there is not a fair hearing process in the RDA exam because a candidate cannot appeal a process on that exam. He also expressed the importance of keeping the RDA exam.

Suzie Dault also expressed the importance of keeping the RDA practical exam for the safety of the public and because it determines whether or not an individual is clinically able to perform a procedure and actually work on a patient's mouth. She added that there is a valid reason why a Practical exam came into effect years ago and that if we take the practical exam away, the Board is not having any care for the public.

Melodi Randolph, Sac City College Dental Assisting program, commented on what she believes are the biggest problems that contribute to the failure rate. She went on to say that the educators are not informed of the criteria on what the candidates will be tested on. She would like for the educators and candidates to be informed what the criteria is on what they will be tested on. She also pointed out that a lot of the duties of a dental assistant are generally supervised, where a DDS doesn't even have to be in the building. She stated that a dental assistant is not supervised at all times. She described the RDA practical exam as a tool to determine minimal competency on candidates.

Zenia with CDA agreed with everything Ms. Randolph expressed and believes that the RDA exam should stay and suggested that the Board organize workshops where educators can come together. She also would like to see the Board tell the failing candidates the reason for their failure of the exam using language that the candidate was taught in school. That way the candidate knows how to correct their mistake.

Dawn commented on the need to keep the practical exam but updating it. She wants to see the practical test candidates on what's currently being done in the field. She moved on to express that being able to know the grading criteria would help immensely in passing the exam.

Dawn Klien, RDA and Educator, commented that it's the job of the educators to give dentist's quality RDA's. And the practical exam is an important tool to help determine the quality of a candidate. She added that if the practical exam stays, the Board needs to let the educators know what it expects of its students in order to pass the exam.

Lisa Okamoto, California Dental Association, commented that it's very important to maintain some type of practical exam to ensure some level of competency and skill. She added that the Board needs to communicate more closely with the educators.

Dr. Dominicis asked if there exists published grading criteria for the RDA exam. Ms. McNealy answered no. She said it's minimal. Dr. Dominicis went on to express that if the grading criteria is published, the passing grade will rise and suggested that the Board members look into this. Ms. McNealy added that the educators have been asking for the RDA practical exam criteria since 2009. But the excuse that we have been given is that for the protection of exam integrity, the Board can't release that criteria. She also stated that she is against the RDA practical exam in its current state because it sets the candidate up for failure. She reiterated that she is not against a practical exam, she is against the exam as it exists today.

Gayle Mathe, CDA, commented on the importance on keeping some measure of being able to determine the clinical competency of the student with a practical exam. She

added that the exam serves as some feedback for the Board to know how educational programs are doing to prepare their students for the exam.

Cindy Ovard, SJVC Temecula, commented that the practical should stay, but the broken system needs to change.

Cara Miyasaki commented that the practical exam needs to stay and that the grading criteria should be released to educators.

Dr. Lincer commented that there needs to be some way to grade the students in a practical way. She added that the practical exam should be new and improved.

Ms. Burton repeated her motion.

Dr. Stewart discussed alternatives to suspending the exam. He stated that suspending the exam might not be the solution, but rather making the changes the educators have expressed to a faulty exam system.

Ms. McKenzie and Dr. Le agreed with Dr. Stewart's comment.

Mr. Afriat asked how often the exam is given and if the motion to suspend the exam passed, what would Board staff do. Ms. Wallace gave an approximate amount of exams offered throughout a given year and informed Mr. Afriat that if the RDA practical exam was suspended, Board staff would contact the candidates and inform them that the exam has been cancelled.

Ms. McNealy asked what the next step is for those candidates that have taken the written exam, if the RDA practical exam is suspended. Spencer Walker responded that if the candidates meet all of the requirements, even if the RDA practical exam is suspended, the candidate would be able to apply for licensure and it would not be provisional, it would be permanent.

Ms. Burton explained her reasons for choosing to pass the motion she had earlier.

Ms. Lincer commented that OPES is prepared to work closely with the Board to identify issues with the practical exam and to fix those issues if they are asked to do that. She added that OPES has worked with other Boards and their practical exams, has the expertise to improve practical exams, and is more than happy to work closely with the Dental Board of CA to improve their practical exam.

Dr. Stewart commented that we need to hear the educators out and continue to work with them and OPES to keep the practical but drastically improve it.

Spencer Walker read the substitute motion: The motion would be to take no action to suspend the RDA practical exam and direct staff to work with OPES to develop a revised practical examination based on the findings of the now complete occupational analysis of the dental assistant profession to be implemented effective July 1, 2017, and for staff to release the grading criteria of the current practical examination and post it on the Board's website as soon as feasible.

Ms. Fischer stated that the Board will meet with OPES to determine what and how much of the grading criteria can be legally released.

The motioner (Woo) and seconder (McKenzie) agreed. to take no action to suspend the RDA practical exam and direct staff to work with OPES to develop a revised practical examination based on the findings of the now complete occupational analysis of the dental assistant profession to be implemented effective July 1, 2017, and for staff to release the grading criteria of the current practical examination and post it on the Board's website as soon as feasible.

Support: Morrow, Forsythe, Burton, Chappell-Ingram, Dawson, Dominicis, King, Le, McKenzie, Stewart, Witcher, Woo, Contreras, Ramos, Davis-Washington, McNealy.

Oppose: 0 **Abstain:** 0

The motion passes.

JNT 12 – Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Subcommittee Recommendation Relating to Dental Assisting Fee Increases

Ms. Sarkisyan gave an overview of the information provided.

Ms. King asked if the fee increase should be justified. Ms. Wallace gave a detailed explanation of the fee audit the private consultant performed. She went on to explain that some fee values will change in order to sustain the Boards expenditures moving forward. What staff is presenting to the Board are the recommended fee amounts that would need to be assessed to sustain our expenditures.

M/S (Davis-Washington/McNealy) Accept staff's recommendation that the Dental Assisting Council accept the proposed regulatory language and request that the Board accept their recommendation to proceed with the initiation of the rulemaking package relating to the dental assisting fees.

Support: Forsythe, Witcher, Ramos, Davis-Washington, McNealy. Oppose: 0 Abstain: 0

The motion passed.

The motioner (Mr. Afriat) and seconder (Ms. Forsythe) agreed. To accept the Dental Assisting Council's recommendation to proceed with the initiation of the rulemaking package relating to the dental assisting fees.

Support: Morrow, Forsythe, Burton, Chappell-Ingram, Dawson, Dominicis, King, Le, McKenzie, Stewart, Witcher, Woo. **Oppose:** 0 **Abstain:** 0

The motion passes.

JNT 13 – Update Regarding Regulatory Language Development to Implement Provisions of AB 1174 (Chapter 662, Statutes of 2014).

Ms. Wallace gave an overview of the information provided.

Dr. Morrow asked for volunteers. Dr. Stewart volunteered.

JNT 14 - Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

Cindy Ovard, SJVC Temecula commented on her experience with the recent site visit their school had.

JNT 15 - Adjourn Joint Meeting of the Dental Board and the Dental Assisting Council.

President Morrow adjourned the council meeting at 4:47 p.m