

**Board of Chiropractic Examiners
TELECONFERENCE MEETING MINUTES
Licensing, Continuing Education & Public Relations Committee
April 18, 2016
901 P Street, Suite 142A
Sacramento, CA 95814**

Teleconference Meeting Locations:

Board of Chiropractic Examiners 901 P Street, Ste 142A Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 263-5355	Heather Dehn, DC 4616 El Camino Ave. Sacramento, CA 95821 (916) 488-0242	Dionne McClain, DC 6360 Wilshire Blvd., Ste 410 Los Angeles, CA 90048 (323) 653-1014	Corey Lichtman, DC 538 Stevens Ave. Solana Beach, CA 92075 (858) 481-1889
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Committee Members Present

Heather Dehn, D.C., Chair
Dionne McClain, D.C.
Corey Lichtman, D.C.

Staff Present

Robert Puleo, Executive Officer
Dixie Van Allen, Staff Services Manager I
Brianna Lauziere, Staff Services Analyst
Marcus McCarther, Policy Analyst

Call to Order

Dr. Dehn called the meeting to order at 12:32 P.M.

Roll Call

Dr. McClain called roll. All Board members were present at the locations specified on the Agenda.

Approval of Minutes

**MOTION: DR. MCCLAIN MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 30, 2016 LICENSING, CONTINUING EDUCATION & PUBLIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING
SECOND: DR. LICHTMAN SECONDED THE MOTION
VOTE: 3-0 (DR. DEHN– AYE, DR. LICHTMAN – AYE, DR. MCCLAIN – AYE)
MOTION CARRIED**

Review and Discussion of CE Provider Qualification Focus Group Results

The committee continued the review and discussion of CE provider qualification focus group results.

The next topic for discussion was apprenticeship and mentorship program.

The committee reviewed materials sent to the Board from Dr. Christine Barry and Dr. Mark Cymerint.

The committee had a discussion about the number of hours and classes that should be taught for the apprenticeship program.

Dr. Dehn asked the committee if the apprentice program should be 3 years with a minimum of 48 hours teaching.

Dr. Lichtman inquired whether the total of 48 hours was over the length of 3 years.

Mr. Puleo suggested 24 hours per year over the length of 2-3 years. Based on input from both focus groups Mr. Puleo suggested meeting somewhere in the middle with a minimum of 60 hours taught over a 3 year period.

The committee agreed on a 3 year apprenticeship with a minimum of 24 hours teaching per year.

Dr. Dehn asked the committee about guidelines for the mentorship and what are the obligations to the apprentice.

Dr. Lichtman suggested the apprentice observe and teach half of the courses. A log sheet must be kept by the mentor to keep track of teaching hours and activity.

Dr. Lichtman suggested the first year the mentor work hand in hand lecturing with the apprentice, the second year the apprentice teaches half the class, and the third year the mentor observes while the apprentice teaches the whole class.

The committee agreed that keeping a log for apprentice activity would be an effective way to track hours observed, hours taught, and participation.

Dr. McClain suggested adding a section on the log sheet for recommendation made by the mentor and recording the apprentice's skills.

Dr. Dehn summarized that the committee would like to see the mentor submit an activity log of the apprentice's hours observed and taught with an evaluation. The committee decided that the activity log should be submitted on an annual basis with recommendations from the mentor.

Mr. Puleo commented that annual evaluations give the apprentice opportunities to correct any

deficiencies.

Dr. Dehn inquired whether approved CE Providers would also be required to offer a minimum of 24 hours of courses per year.

Mr. Marcus McCarther asked Dr. Dehn about providers in rural areas that may not be able to complete 24 hours each year through the apprenticeship program.

Mr. Puleo stated the Board does not want to penalize those in rural areas and we will have to take that into consideration.

Dr. Dehn inquired whether the Board should handle disputes between providers/mentors.

Dr. McClain suggested listing obligations of mentor to apprentice in law. Business market disputes would be outside of the Boards jurisdiction.

Dr. McClain asked if the Board can track how many hours/courses CE providers teach.

Mr. Puleo will talk with Ms. Genie Mitsuvara, CE analyst, and Ms. Dixie VanAllen, Licensing Manager, about tracking CE provider courses each year.

Mr. Puleo stated there would have to be changes in the law to state the obligations of mentors and apprentices. The Board would have to specifically list the penalties for not following the obligations and determine whether the penalty is loss of mentor or provider status.

Dr. Dehn stated eligible mentors would be providers who have had years of experience teaching and the schools and associations.

Dr. McClain asked Dr. Dehn to summarize the mentor's obligations.

Dr. Dehn listed the mentor's and apprentice's obligations; activity log, annual reports/evaluations, compliance with CE standards, compliance with mentor/apprentice guidelines, completes Board application to be a mentor/apprentice.

Dr. Lichtman asked whether the law should specify when the apprentice can teach alone and when the mentor should be present.

Dr. Dehn suggested that the mentor should teach with apprentice the first year, the apprentice teaches half the courses the second year and teaches alone the third year. The committee had concerns on how to enforce these guidelines.

Dr. Lichtman believes it would be best to enforce these guidelines through annual evaluations.

Dr. Dehn stated the annual reports and course evaluations should determine the apprentice's effectiveness in teaching the courses. The mentor is responsible for providing an effective CE course that meets all of the Board's requirements.

Mr. Puleo stated the mentor should monitor a certain amount of courses each year and annual

reports should be required from both the mentor and apprentice.

Dr. McClain suggested that on the first annual evaluation form should include a written agreement the mentor and apprentice must sign stating that they have complied with the Board's policies and guidelines.

Dr. Dehn agreed that the first year the mentor should be present during the courses. However, Dr. Dehn is concerned that there will be a shortage of mentors wanting to volunteer their time if they have to be present the first year for 24 hours.

Dr. McClain suggested that the mentor be present at least 50% of the first year.

Mr. Puleo suggested that committee list this requirement in the regulation package and see what type of feedback the Board will receive. If the committee wants to have the mentor present 50% of the first year they will have to clarify that by hours because 50% could represent more depending and how much they teach each year.

Dr. Dehn suggested that the mentor be present at apprentice's courses for 100% or 24 hours in the first year and 50% or 12 hours in the second year.

The committee moved along to discuss the outcome assessments.

Dr. Dehn referred to the examples that were provided by Dr. Cymerint.

Dr. Dehn asked the committee if they want a standardized evaluation or let the provider make their own.

The committee agreed that there should be a standardized evaluation.

Dr. Dehn talked about using likert scale questions on the outcome assessment and open-ended questions such as: "What did you learn?"

Dr. Dehn mentioned adding a section at the bottom of the evaluation stating, "If you have any concerns please contact the Board" and provide the Board's email address.

Dr. Dehn stated it would be beneficial to use likert scale questions rating the course and its effectiveness, organization, and knowledge of provider.

Dr. McClain liked the idea of having a question that asked the attendee if they would be likely to take another course by this provider or recommend the course to others.

Dr. Dehn stated that every attendee must complete the evaluation form in order to receive CE credit from the course. The provider would have to keep attendance records and evaluations on file for a certain amount of time for audit purposes.

Ms. VanAllen stated that the Licensing Unit audits every 10 licensees that submit their renewal forms. We could use the same audit process for auditing CE providers.

The committee had a discussion about grandfathering existing providers.

Dr. Dehn stated the schools and associations should be grandfathered as Board approved providers.

Dr. Dehn mentioned that people who do not want to go through the apprenticeship program have the option to become providers through PACE certification.

Dr. Dehn suggested that existing CE providers that want to be grandfathered in must have taught for a minimum of 3 years at 24 hours each year and meet all CE standards.

Dr. Lichtman asked if all providers will have to re-apply.

Ms. VanAllen stated we must hold the grandfathered providers accountable to the same standards as the new providers.

Dr. Dehn summarized that the colleges, associations and PACE certified providers who meet the requirement would be eligible to be grandfathered as CE providers. Current CE providers in good standing that have taught for 3 years/24 hours per year will be required to submit proof along with a pre-certified application to be grandfathered in.

Dr. Dehn mentioned other suggestions brought up at the Focus Groups: the ability to submit anonymous comment on BCE website and eliminate the duplication of documents in CE course applications.

Dr. Dehn asked if the Board would ever be able to accept online payments and applications.

Mr. Puleo stated that the Board does not have the capability at this time.

Review and Discussion on Possible Revisions to Sections 360-366 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations Regarding Continuing Education; Possible Recommendation to Full Board

Agenda item #4 was used as a guide to reference current regulations for the purpose of the discussion regarding CE providers.

The committee decided to move onto agenda item #5.

Review and Discussion Regarding Proposed Outreach Publications; Possible Recommendation to Full Board

The committee reviewed the Licensee Guide brochure.

Ms. Lauziere informed the committee that information was added on page 4 about “Out-of-State Reciprocal Applicants” and “International Applicants” per the Board’s request.

Dr. McClain suggested making a change to “Its Future” section on page 2, second paragraph, the last sentence to “Also, more people are becoming interested in chiropractic care, since chiropractors use nonsurgical methods and do not prescribe drugs and non-pharmaceutical methods of healing.”

Dr. Lichtman found a spelling error on page 4, second paragraph, last sentence to the word chiropractic.

Ms. VanAllen noticed an extra space on page 4, third paragraph, first sentence between the words “in” and “the”.

Mr. Puleo asked the committee to make a motion to accept the changes in the Licensee Guide and finalize the publication.

MOTION: DR. DEHN MOVED TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO THE GUIDE TO THE CHIROPRACTIC PROFESSION.

SECOND: DR. MCCLAIN SECONDED THE MOTION

VOTE: 3-0 (DR. DEHN– AYE, DR. MCCLAIN – AYE, DR. LICHTMAN – AYE)

MOTION CARRIED

Public Comment

No public comment was made.

Future Agenda Items

Dr. Dehn would like to continue the discussion about the CE provider qualification and possible changes to the regulations. The committee scheduled the next meeting for June 7, 2016 at 12:30 p.m.

Adjournment

Dr. Dehn adjourned the meeting at 2:08 p.m.