



**Oregon Health Licensing Agency
Board of Cosmetology
Examination Committee Meeting**

Date: April 19, 2010

Committee Members: Sharon Wiser
Shelley Couch
Linda Bergmann

Staff Cerynthia Murphy, Qualification Analyst
Sinnamon Harris, Board Specialist
Janet Bartel, Investigator/Inspector

Public Attendees: Tammy Kennedy Karen Dieckman
Donna Johnson Robbie Buckley
Heidi Zuniga Mike Snook
Cindy Long Teresa Greene
Cathy McKern Brenda Hoxsey

The Board of Cosmetology Examination Committee was called to order by Sharon Wiser, Chair, April 19, 2010, at 9:04 am at the Oregon Health Licensing Agency (OHLA), 2nd Floor Training Room, 700 Summer Street NE, Salem, Oregon. The purpose of the meeting was to review and discuss the administration of practical examinations and practical evaluations.

Cerynthia Murphy, Qualification Analyst, provided the committee with packets of information containing examination administration and scoring criteria, evaluation review and biennial report forms and the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR), Chapter 817.

Ms. Murphy started the meeting by summarizing OAR 817-030-040, which states the Oregon Health Licensing Agency, Board of Cosmetology recognizes and sanctions the practical examination conducted by career schools in accordance with the Department of Education's criteria and protocols, as its final practical competency examination and the Board or designated staff may periodically review any career school's practical examination procedures and conduct to determine compliance with Department of Education's criteria and to maintain Board recognition of the practical examination.

Ms. Murphy noted the importance of standardization and objectivity for all schools administering the final practical examinations and the need for review of the current standards, including scheduled evaluations, scoring objectivity, proctor criteria and alternatives to the current administration.

Examination Standards

- **Scheduled vs. Random Evaluations and Sanctions**

Ms. Murphy stated the agency currently schedules appointments for school evaluations and recommended alternatives to scheduling, such as random evaluations. Sharon Wisner stated the evaluations should be random to ensure the career schools are conducting the practical examinations correctly each and every time. The committee members agreed and discussed implementation criteria for recommendation to the full board.

Points of the committee consensus:

- The agency will send a letter to all career schools outlining requirements and procedures for the career schools to follow.
- The agency would perform one random evaluation for each career school in a biennium.
- Each career school would need to provide the agency with a schedule of its projected practical examinations for the year (tentatively starting on January 1, 2011).
- Each career school would be required to contact the agency within 72 hours of a scheduled practical examination to cancel.
- All career schools will need to perform each field of practice examination in the same day, i.e. not split over multiple days as it has been in the past, to meet the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) criteria and to allow the agency to evaluate on full field of practice examination.
- Sanctions were discussed for non-compliance (i.e. no notice of cancellation or the exam is not evaluated within two biennia). An example of a sanction may include payment of a fine or covering costs for the evaluators. Ms. Murphy will contact the agency's assistant attorney general regarding citation or reimbursement authority. Another alternative was to not accept transcripts from a career school that was not evaluated in two biennia or found to be out of compliance for two consecutive evaluations until remedied. Brenda Hoxsey pointed out that only two evaluations were not conducted in the last 16 years therefore in all likelihood would not become an issue.

The committee recommended a letter be sent to ODE notifying them of the changes to the evaluation process, once the full board approves the recommended changes.

Tammy Kennedy with Coffee Creek Correctional Facility welcomed the agency to observe their practical examination to ensure it is meeting the same standards. Discussion followed regarding the Department of Corrections being outside the agency's jurisdiction. Brenda Hoxsey stated two correctional facilities, Coffee Creek Correctional Facility and MacLaren, and Mt Hood Community College are administering the program including the final practical examination which are not evaluated. Ms. Murphy stated previous AAG advice was received which does not give the agency the authority to evaluate examinations administered at correctional facilities or at other institutions that fall within the jurisdiction of another state agency due to over regulation, however special provisions were given to accept the final practical examination administered at these facilities. Ms. Murphy offered to contact the agency's assistant attorney general to obtain current advice for agency authority to evaluate practical examinations administered at these types of facilities.

Points of the committee consensus:

- Evaluations should be random to ensure the career schools are conducting the practical examinations correctly each and every time.

Obtain current advice for agency authority to evaluate practical examinations administered at institutions that fall within the jurisdiction of another state agency

- **Scoring**

The committee reviewed the final practical examination standard scoring criteria; Ms. Murphy stated the agency does not have the authority to change the scoring criteria; however the committee may wish to recommend

alternatives to the ODE. Ms. Hoxsey explained the agency evaluates the administration of the practical examination, there is no “point system” for the evaluation; they either meet or don’t meet the established criteria. Ms. Hoxsey stated grading has never been an issue for the evaluation. Ms. Murphy referred the committee to the barbering packet noting the “points possible” and “points awarded” columns and pointed out the subjectivity in the scoring of students by the proctors. Donna Johnson stated that at her school, as an example, if the student “washed hands or was properly draped” is worth five points, it is either yes or no; the student receives all or no points which also reduces the ability for favoritism or personal judgment by the proctor. Cindy Long remarked that she has been in touch with the ODE over the yes/no criteria with the point system and the ODE may be working on this issue.

Points of the committee consensus:

- The committee recommended a letter be sent to ODE suggesting a baseline objective model for scoring be established, including the student completing the entire procedure to receive points, and the committee’s willingness to work with ODE to establish an objective model.

- **Proctor Criteria: Teacher vs Contracted**

Ms. Murphy stated the career schools most often utilize the same person to teach as they do to administer the final practical examination to the students and suggested an alternative such as hiring outside proctors. Ms. Long stated she has ran into challenges in the past when she has hired outside proctors, saying such challenges included proctors not catching pieces of the examination as they were not as familiar with the examination process or expectations. Ms. Long said in addition, even though she had instructed the hired proctor to be extremely strict, most all students were passing the practical their first time through but with staff proctors they almost never did.

Points of the committee consensus:

- Random testing will bring to the forefront any problems so the committee decided to place the question of teacher vs contracted proctors aside.

- **Alternative Administration: School Administration vs Contracted**

Ms. Wisner referred to the biennial evaluation comparison report and stated all career schools have met the criteria and asked why the need for change when the career schools are clearly meeting the criteria. The committee discussed the down side of alternative administration based on previous years when the state administered the practical examination, which included variances in the proctors.

Points of committee consensus:

- The committee is in favor of the practical examinations remaining within the career schools and again stated random testing will bring to the forefront any problems so dependent on the outcome of future reports, this issue could be looked at again in the future if need be.

The committee adjourned at approximately 10:55 am.

Prepared by: Sinnamon Harris, Board Specialist