

**California State Board
of
Barbering and Cosmetology**

**Board Meeting
Minutes of May 19, 2025**

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Tonya Fairley, President
Kellie Funk, Vice President
Anthony Bertram
Megan Ellis
Dr. Yolanda Jimenez
Colette Kavanaugh
Tamika Miller
Danielle Munoz
Calimay Pham
Steve Weeks

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Kristy Underwood, Executive Officer
Carrie Harris, Deputy Executive Officer
Allison Lee, Board Project Manager
Sabina Knight, Legal Counsel
Monica Burris, Executive Analyst
Addison Beach, Chief of Enforcement
James Zimmerman, Chief of Licensing

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

None

1. AGENDA ITEM #1: Call to Order/ Roll Call/ Establishment of Quorum

President Tonya Fairley convened the meeting at approximately 10:00 a.m. Roll call was conducted, confirming the presence of a quorum.

2. AGENDA ITEM #2: Petition for Reinstatement Hearings

The Board held a Petition for Reinstatement Hearing for two individuals: Angelina Pedraza, who petitioned for the reinstatement of her Cosmetologist License (#KK374035), and Francisco Lemus, who sought reinstatement of his Barber License (#B85000). Following the hearings, the Board entered a Closed Session in accordance with Government Code section 11126(c)(3) to deliberate on the petitions.

3. AGENDA ITEM #3: Board President's Welcome (Tonya Fairley)

Board President Tanya Fairley welcomed attendees and introduced herself as an industry member, stylist, and salon owner. She acknowledged the presence of students and thanked the school staff for their efforts in bringing them to the meeting. She announced the appointment of Sinar Lomeli as a new public board member and noted there will be an opportunity for public comment.

4. AGENDA ITEM #4: Board Member Updates – Informational only

Steve Weeks provided remarks recognizing the efforts of staff members. He emphasized their importance in implementing board policy and acknowledged the positive operational outcomes resulting from their work. These included reductions in pending DRC appeals, response times for licensing questions and applications, and citation and fine times. He noted increased usage of the new inspections platform, improved pass rates across all license types compared to the previous year, and enhanced public outreach through social media and direct engagement. Mr. Weeks also highlighted the board's operating surplus with 14 months in reserves and commended staff for effectively regulating over 650,000 licensees and 53,000 establishments.

5. AGENDA ITEM #5: Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) Update Which May Include Updates on DCA's Administrative Services, Human Resources, Enforcement, Information Technology, Communications and Outreach, and Legislative, Regulatory, or Policy Matters.

Kristy Underwood provided the DCA update in place of the Board and Bureau Relations representative, whose position is currently vacant. She summarized the Governor's Reorganization Plan introduced in January as part of the proposed 2025–2026 state budget. The plan includes splitting the current Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency into two entities: the California Housing and Homelessness Agency and the Business and Consumer Services Agency. The newly proposed Business and Consumer Services Agency would oversee the Department of Consumer Affairs and focus on licensing, enforcement, and consumer protection.

On April 4, the plan was submitted to the Little Hoover Commission, initiating a 90-day formal review period. Public hearings were held on April 23 and 24, during which the DCA Director, agency secretary, and other department leaders testified in support of the plan. The Commission is currently drafting a report with recommendations for the Governor and Legislature. If not rejected by either the Senate or Assembly within 60 days, the reorganization plan will automatically go into effect on the 61st day. If approved, the new agency structure would be created in July 2025 and become operational by July 1, 2026. Ms. Underwood stated that detailed information is available on the agency's website and affirmed the Board's support for the reorganization, highlighting its potential to enhance consumer protection.

Kristy Underwood continued with an update on the state's hybrid telework transition. She reported that on March 3, 2025, Governor Newsom issued an executive order mandating all state agencies and departments to revise their telework policies, requiring employees to increase in-office work from two to four days per week starting July 1, 2025. On March 13, 2025, the California Department of Human Resources (CalHR) released implementation guidance, including conditions under which agencies may grant exceptions to the four-day requirement. The DCA has been working with affected programs to identify additional workspace needs and is holding bi-weekly meetings with board and bureau leadership to provide updates and address questions. The transition will require adjustments for many staff members and affirmed that leadership will continue to be updated on developments. Additional details will be included in her Executive Officer Report later in the meeting.

Ms. Underwood announced the appointment of Levi Hall as the Department of Consumer Affairs' new Compliance and Equity Officer, effective April 28. In this role, Mr. Hall is

responsible for leading and coordinating department-wide quality improvement efforts to ensure regulatory compliance. His oversight includes the SOLID Planning and Training Services, the Organizational Improvement Office, the Equal Employment Opportunity Office, and the Internal Audit Office. He also serves as a liaison to the department's Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Steering Committee. As Equity Officer, he will focus on advancing DEI and accessibility policies, training, and initiatives across all department programs. Mr. Hall brings over 12 years of experience in leading multidisciplinary teams and strategic program development, including more than nine years in EEO compliance and program management, with nearly three years at DCA. Ms. Underwood noted her professional experience with Mr. Hall and congratulated him on the new role.

Kristy Underwood concluded the DCA update by recognizing Public Service Recognition Week, observed during the first week of May. On behalf of DCA, she extended appreciation to the Board, Executive Officer, and staff for their continued hard work and commitment to consumer protection, expressing gratitude for their partnership and daily service.

6. AGENDA ITEM #6: Discussion and Possible Approval of the February 10, 2025 Board Meeting Minutes

Motion: Dr. Yolanda Jimenez moved to approve the February 10, 2025 Board Meeting Minutes. Calimay Pham seconded the motion.

Public Comment: There were no public comments received.

Roll Call Vote: Motion to approve the February 10, 2025 Board Meeting Minutes carried: 9 yes, 0 no, and 1 abstain (Danielle Munoz), per the following roll call vote:

- Committee Members voted "Yes": Tonya Fairley, Kellie Funk, Anthony Bertram, Megan Ellis, Dr. Yolanda Jimenez, Colette Kavanaugh, Tamika Miller, Calimay Pham, Steve Weeks

7. AGENDA ITEM #7: Executive Management Reports

a. Administration and Operations

Kristy Underwood reported that the Administration and Operations unit is fully staffed, welcoming Noel Cassens as the new manager. She updated on staff training and confirmed all staff will return to the office four days per week starting July 1, with additional office space secured due to downsizing. Despite some initial reluctance, staff have adapted well and maintained strong performance. Ms. Underwood also noted the budget remains strong.

b. Licensing, Examinations, and Disciplinary Review Appeals

The licensing unit is fully staffed except for one vacant manager position. Email volume remains high but manageable due to improved workflows. Examination pass rates and survey data were reviewed, with concerns noted in the apprentice program. Approximately 50% of establishments and 36% of individual licensees report utilizing independent contractor models, consistent with previous survey trends.

Ms. Underwood reported that the Disciplinary Review Committee remains current with its caseload. The next meeting is scheduled for June in Sacramento, with a summer session planned for Southern California.

c. Enforcement, Inspections, and Cite and Fine

Ms. Underwood reported on the Enforcement unit, which currently has 20.5 positions with three vacancies. Two new managers are expected to start soon, and the unit anticipates being fully staffed within the next two to three weeks.

The first quarter complaint breakdown showed that 33% relate to health and safety issues, with 53% involving unlicensed activity. Complaint intake remains on track, with an expected total of around 5,000 complaints for the fiscal year.

Tanya Fairley asked if the 53% of complaints related to unlicensed activity represent an increase from the prior quarter. Ms. Underwood responded that she would need to review the figures further. Ms. Fairley then clarified whether unlicensed activity refers to scope-of-practice violations or unlicensed individuals and establishments. Ms. Underwood confirmed it includes both, with fewer cases related to scope-of-practice violations.

Ms. Underwood highlighted that the number of cases referred to the Attorney General so far in fiscal year 24-25 has already surpassed the totals from the previous two years. She credited this increase to the hard work of enforcement staff and the addition of special investigators who focus on practice of medicine cases and consumer harm. These cases lead to formal disciplinary actions beyond fines and citations.

There were five licenses revoked between January and March. Additionally, probation case numbers have declined largely due to the efforts of the probation monitor, who has been proactive in submitting noncompliance cases to the Attorney General for potential revocation. This has helped ensure licensees are held accountable when probation terms are not met.

In response to questions from Ms. Fairley, Carrie Harris explained that probation revocations are handled through an administrative law judge, who has 30 days post-hearing to issue a decision. After a mail vote by the Board, the decision becomes effective 30 days from the mailing date. Ms. Underwood clarified that licensees are made aware early in the process and may continue to practice during proceedings until formal action is finalized.

Ms. Underwood continued by providing updates on the School Inspections and Cite and Fine program. The inspections unit currently has two vacancies in Alameda and San Bernardino, while the cite and fine unit is fully staffed.

There are 271 approved schools, with 17 open cases under review. Data was also provided on schools participating in the extern program and their affiliated establishments.

Inspection and citation numbers have dipped slightly, due in part to staff on leave and the ongoing transition to the Mobile Inspection Project (MIP). Six inspectors are already using the

new digital platform, while 11 others are undergoing training. The shift from handwritten to electronic inspections marks a significant operational change, expected to improve efficiency once fully implemented.

Finally, Ms. Underwood directed the Board's attention to the citation data, along with notices of payment requests and payment plan information included in the report for their review.

d. Outreach

Ms. Underwood gave an outreach update, commending staff for their social media efforts and highlighting the success of the Board's presence at Premiere Anaheim. This year, they were given a more visible and professional booth space on the main show floor, which significantly increased engagement with attendees.

Ms. Fairley emphasized the value of Board presence at industry events, noting that many attendees were eager to ask questions and valued direct access to accurate information, particularly regarding product and device approvals.

The Board plans to attend the Face & Body show in Santa Clara this August, which focuses on aesthetics. Additionally, Ms. Funk shared she will attend the Las Vegas International Esthetics Conference and looks forward to reporting back.

e. Strategic Plan Update

Kristy Underwood concluded with a strategic plan update, noting that the report includes only items still in progress. Completed items have been removed to streamline the update, and she anticipates more progress to report at the next meeting.

8. AGENDA ITEM #8: Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Rulemaking Proposals:

a) AB 485 (Ortega) – Labor Commissioner: unsatisfied judgments: nonpayment of wages

Ms. Underwood introduced the new format for sharing legislative bills, explaining that links were sent instead of printed copies to reduce paperwork. She also noted that a committee meeting was not held this quarter, as none of the current legislation was considered significant enough to warrant one. However, the Board still has the opportunity to take positions on bills as the legislative session progresses.

She then discussed Assembly Bill 485, which would require state agencies to deny license applications or renewals to employers with unsatisfied wage judgments. While this bill affects many industries, it could have significant fiscal impact and would require coordination with the Labor Commissioner's office to link databases. Ms. Underwood recommended the Board take a "watch" position on the bill.

Legal Counsel Sabina Knight added that the Board routinely monitors relevant legislation and only needs to take formal positions when it wants to engage with bill authors. She reassured the Board that updates will continue regardless of formal motions.

b) AB 504 (Ta) – Worker Classification: Manicurists’ employee or independent contractor

AB 504 sought to address worker classification issues specific to manicurists, aiming to resolve ongoing concerns related to AB 5. However, Ms. Underwood confirmed that the bill is not moving forward at this time. She noted that it was left on the list for reference, but staff has verified with the author’s office that the bill will not be advancing.

c) AB 625 (Nguyen) – Barbering and Cosmetology

Ms. Underwood then discussed AB 625, noting that while it remains listed, the author has confirmed it will not move forward. She stated this is good news, as the bill would have impacted the Board’s scope of practice.

d) AB 667 (Solache) – Professions and vocations: license examinations: interpreters

Kristy Underwood introduced AB 667, which would require all licensing boards to provide interpreters for licensing exams. She explained that the barbering and cosmetology already offers exams in multiple languages and provides interpreters at no cost, making it one of the few boards that already meet the bill’s proposed requirements. Steve Weeks asked whether the board restricts how often an interpreter can be used. Ms. Underwood confirmed that it does, and that interpreters must meet specific criteria. Since the bill would not affect current practices, Ms. Underwood recommended either a support or watch position. She added that previous concerns about early bill language were resolved through collaboration with the California Immigrant Policy Center.

e) AB 742 (Elhawary) – Department of Consumer Affairs: licensing: applicants who are descendants of slaves.

AB 742 is a reintroduced bill from last year that would give licensing priority to applicants who are descendants of enslaved individuals. Ms. Underwood noted that the bill is currently in Assembly Appropriations and on the suspense file due to its significant fiscal impact, which includes the creation of a new agency to administer the provisions. She recommended maintaining a watch position, consistent with the board’s approach to this legislation last year.

f) AB 1514 (Assembly Members Ortega (Chair), Elhawary, Kalra, and Ward) – Labor contracts

Ms. Underwood then introduced AB 1514, noting that while the bill is not yet in print, the Board has been formally informed that it will likely include language to exempt manicurists or extend their sunset provision. While no action is required at this time, the bill is expected to have positive implications for manicurists.

g) SB 236 (Pierson) – Cosmetics: chemical hair relaxers.

Senate Bill 236 focuses on the regulation of chemical hair relaxers by placing limitations on certain ingredients used in these products. While the bill does not directly impact the Board, it could affect licensees who use these products in their practice. If passed, the Board would disseminate information to licensees but would not be responsible for enforcement. The bill is currently in Senate Appropriations, likely under review at the time of the meeting. A watch position was recommended.

h) SB 470 (Laird) – Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act: teleconferencing.

SB 470 would extend provisions of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act to allow for hybrid public meetings. Previously, meetings had to be held in person with strict teleconference rules requiring public access to every call-in location. The bill allows hybrid meetings, enabling a majority to meet in person while others call in virtually, including virtual committee meetings. Ms. Underwood noted this is how the Board has been operating since COVID. If the bill does not pass, it would result in an estimated \$55,000 increase in annual costs. Staff recommended the Board support the bill and requested a motion to that effect.

Motion: Tonya Fairley made a motion to support Senate Bill 470. Kellie Funk seconded the motion.

Public Comment: No public comments were made regarding SB 470.

Roll Call Vote: Motion to support Senate Bill 470 carried per the following vote: 10 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstain.

- Committee Members voted “Yes”: Tonya Fairley, Kellie Funk, Anthony Bertram, Megan Ellis, Dr. Yolanda Jimenez, Colette Kavanaugh, Tamika Miller, Danielle Munoz, Calimay Pham, Steve Weeks.

i) SB 641 (Ashby) – Department of Consumer Affairs and Department of Real Estate: states of emergency: waivers and exemptions

Kristy Underwood presented SB 641, which would authorize DCA boards to waive certain licensure requirements for licensees and applicants affected by declared emergencies at the federal, state, or local level. She used the Los Angeles fires as an example, where the Governor had issued an executive order to delay renewal fees for affected individuals. The bill would shift that authority to the DCA boards, allowing more flexibility in future emergencies. Although there would be a personnel cost to implement such waivers—estimated at \$111,000—it is considered a helpful tool for supporting licensees during crises. The board staff recommended a support position.

Tonya Fairley asked about a provision in the bill requiring licensees to provide an email address. Ms. Underwood confirmed that this would apply to all licensees and expressed support for the change, noting that it would improve communication. She added that the board should request that email addresses be kept confidential to avoid mass distribution.

Steve Weeks inquired about the cost of collecting and managing email addresses. Ms. Underwood explained that most updates would occur during renewals through the Breeze system, so it wouldn't significantly increase workload.

Kellie Funk noted the bill's additional benefit of improving email outreach, and Danielle Munoz asked whether email usage parameters would need to be specified. Ms. Underwood replied that while many licensees already provide emails, there remains a significant portion who don't use or want email. However, including this requirement in the bill would help broaden the board's reach and communication efforts.

Motion: Tonya Fairley moved to support Senate Bill 641; states of emergency, waivers and exemptions. Steve Weeks seconded the motion.

Public Comment: There were no comments from the public related to SB 470.

Roll Call Vote: Motion carried per the following vote: 10 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstain.

- Committee Members voted "Yes": Tonya Fairley, Kellie Funk, Anthony Bertram, Megan Ellis, Dr. Yolanda Jimenez, Colette Kavanaugh, Tamika Miller, Danielle Munoz, Calimay Pham, Steve Weeks.

Public Comment on Agenda Item #8 in Its Entirety: Fred Jones from the Professional Beauty Federation shared an update on AB 1514. He confirmed that an agreement has been reached in principle with all key stakeholders, including the Assembly Labor Committee, which plays a central role in AB 5-related matters. He noted that while there is ongoing litigation and complexity surrounding AB 5, AB 1514 is expected to serve as the vehicle for extending the current sunset for manicurists.

Mr. Jones stated that the bill will likely allow time for further analysis—by relevant labor agencies, not this board—into labor law violations in nail salons. Depending on the findings, future outcomes could include a full extension or removal of the sunset, or potentially a permanent end to booth rental rights. He concluded by characterizing the bill as a way to "kick the can down the road" for a couple more years while those deeper issues are evaluated.

9. AGENDA ITEM #9: Report on the April 14, 2025, Enforcement and Inspections Committee Meeting

Danielle Munoz, Chair of the Enforcement and Inspections Committee, provided an update on the committee's recent meeting and recommendations. The committee met on April 14, 2025, to finalize proposed changes to the board's administrative fine schedule, with a focus on consumer safety. Most staff recommendations were accepted, but adjustments were made to fines under Sections 980.4 and 993 for consistency. Public comments largely supported increasing fines. Staff will now draft regulatory language, and a full proposal will be presented at the next board meeting. Ms. Munoz thanked committee members for their thoughtful contributions, noting that the process balanced consumer protection, industry integrity, and public input.

10. AGENDA ITEM #10: Discussion and Possible Action on Apprenticeship to be Included in the 2026 Sunset Report

Tonya Fairley opened by expressing her deep commitment to improving the program so that licensees who participate have a fair and equitable path to licensure. Kristy Underwood provided a detailed update, noting this was the second presentation of the draft report and that new content had been added to reflect recent staff investigations and findings. She explained that while the Board shares oversight of the apprenticeship program with the Division of Apprenticeship Standards (DAS), the Board has growing concerns about program integrity, tuition practices, and consumer protection.

Key issues highlighted in the report include tuition and fees being charged to apprentices, many of whom paid between \$5,000 and \$15,000 for a program that is not meant to charge tuition and lacks student protections available in traditional schools. Staff conducted interviews with 115 apprentices and recorded their tuition ranges. They also noted that none of these apprenticeship programs offer the safeguards required of Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education (BPPE) approved schools, such as refund policies or tuition recovery funds. The report also addressed the persistently low examination pass rates among apprentices, which have been a concern for years.

Another major issue involves the misuse of program sponsor approvals, with some sponsors franchising their approval to unrelated businesses that enroll students under different names and charge fees independently. These operations often mislead students into thinking they are enrolled in a Board-approved program. Ms. Underwood emphasized that while some sponsors operate responsibly, these troubling practices have become widespread. The findings will be incorporated into the Sunset Report draft scheduled to be presented at the next board meeting.

In response to Ms. Fairley's question about whether any progress has been made among the involved agencies, specifically DAS and BPPE, Ms. Underwood stated that while there have been some productive conversations—particularly with one LEA—no real action has been taken. She noted that staff continue to push forward, sending documentation and maintaining communication with the hope of prompting action.

Ms. Underwood continued by outlining concerns related to on-the-job training. She explained that apprentices are required to be 100% supervised while receiving hands-on training, yet staff routinely find apprentices left alone in establishments and providing services without supervision. This not only undermines their learning but also can result in a \$1,000 fine to the apprentice.

She noted that many apprentices bring complaints directly to the board. The board receives no revenue to support this oversight beyond the \$25 apprentice application fee. Despite this, staff dedicate significant time and resources to managing these issues. She highlighted the work of Enforcement Chief Addison and his special investigators, along with licensing staff and the leadership team, who are all heavily involved in addressing the ongoing challenges.

Danielle Munoz suggested a more public-facing outreach approach, similar to state employment informational events, to educate prospective apprentices through high schools or

community events. Ms. Underwood agreed and shared that staff are developing materials to send directly to apprentices at the time of licensing, especially given the high percentage of Spanish-speaking individuals being misled about program conditions.

Kristy Underwood emphasized that many apprentices wrongly believe they must operate as booth renters, which is illegal. Instead, they are entitled to earn a wage, yet the board has found many not being paid. Ms. Munoz asked if this could be linked to low Spanish pass rates, and Ms. Underwood confirmed the connection.

Steve Weeks inquired about the timeline for potential legislative change, and Ms. Underwood noted that recommendations would be included in the next sunset review. Tonya Fairley emphasized that during her Senate interview, officials expressed interest in strengthening the board's control over apprenticeship programs. She added that while some programs are run well and deserve recognition, the overwhelming number of violations overshadows the good ones. Until more authority is granted, the board will continue to face challenges.

Ms. Munoz asked whether strong legislation currently exists. Ms. Underwood responded that they plan to recommend legislative changes during sunset review and affirmed that drafting new legislation with an author's support would be a helpful path forward.

Regarding funding, Ms. Underwood explained that apprenticeship program sponsors can seek reimbursement for related training hours through their LEA. This funding originates from Proposition-approved educational funds. However, a recent discovery revealed an LEA paid out nearly \$20,000 to a sponsor for apprentices who may not exist or were never licensed, meaning any training completed would not count. The LEA in question has been cooperative and was unaware of the licensing requirement.

Ms. Underwood also referenced federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) funds, which are accessible through CalJOBS. Some apprenticeship sponsors have listed their programs with tuition rates as high as \$10,000. One sponsor received funds for 33 apprentices despite having a pass rate below 40%, which she noted strays from the intent of apprenticeship programs.

Kristy Underwood explained that beyond federal funds like WIOA, there's also the Apprenticeship Innovation Fund (AIF), which is state-funded and administered through DAS. This fund, provided via grants, aims to help offset the costs of running apprenticeship programs. However, recent findings have revealed that some programs received over \$484,000 in a single year from AIF, while still charging tuition as high as \$7,500 to apprentices. There are no checks or balances on how these funds are distributed or used, which has allowed program sponsors to access multiple funding sources—including AIF, WIOA, and related training reimbursements—while continuing to charge tuition to apprentices.

Tonya Fairley expressed concern over the lack of oversight for apprenticeship program sponsors, pointing out that once a sponsor is approved, there's no further review, no fee, and no reevaluation. Ms. Underwood confirmed this is the case, acknowledging that the absence of any formal renewal or oversight process has enabled these problems to persist for years. She emphasized that the apprentices are not being adequately protected, and this systemic gap in accountability remains a major concern for the Board moving forward.

Kristy Underwood transitioned the discussion to wages and workers' compensation. She explained that when a program sponsor is approved by DAS, their apprenticeship standards require that apprentices must earn a wage. However, in interviews with 103 apprentices, they found that 52 were booth renters paying for their own on-the-job training, 27 were paid commission only, which is entirely prohibited, 17 were paid only for the services they performed, and seven said they were not paid at all because they thought they were in school.

The overall success of these apprenticeship programs is a significant concern. From 2018 to 2021, 47% of barber apprentices never even applied to take the exam, leaving their fate unknown—whether they're working unlicensed or were never real individuals in the first place. Similarly, in cosmetology, 42% of those who obtained apprentice licenses never applied to take the exam. This uncertainty raises questions about whether these apprentices gave up, switched careers, or misunderstood what was required of them.

When asked about other industries, Ms. Underwood explained that while some, like large construction companies, rely heavily on apprentices and integrate them into their workforce, the beauty industry operates differently. Many salons rely on booth rentals or independent contractors instead of directly employing apprentices. This structure, she noted, makes it less likely for apprentices to become future employees of the establishments where they're training.

Ms. Fairley added that the beauty industry is unique: it's driven by independent entrepreneurship, with apprentices often planning to open their own businesses instead of working for someone else. Ms. Underwood agreed, emphasizing that the beauty of this industry lies in its flexibility and the numerous opportunities it offers beyond the traditional employer-employee model.

Kristy Underwood acknowledged the difficulty and heartbreak staff experienced in reviewing the apprenticeship program and hearing from apprentices who were taken advantage of or caught in fraudulent programs. She posed three main questions for the Board: whether the apprenticeship program should be maintained as a pathway to licensure, whether the value of "earn while you learn" is justified given low pass rates and high tuition, and whether legislative changes should be pursued to allow better oversight and funding for the board to manage the program effectively. While she personally feels the program isn't working overall, she noted that a few programs do an excellent job and could serve as models for reform. She emphasized that the sunset report offers a golden opportunity to suggest improvements or recommend ending the program altogether.

If the program is retained, Ms. Underwood recommended several statutory changes: apprentices must be employed by a licensed establishment and earn an hourly wage; program sponsors cannot charge tuition (only for books, uniforms, or kits); program sponsors cannot franchise or loan out approvals; sponsors must verify that the establishment provides workers' compensation insurance and offers all services within the apprentice's scope of practice; apprentices cannot rent stations but must be hourly wage earners; and program sponsors must pay a fee for approval and periodic renewal. Additionally, she proposed creating a formal disciplinary process similar to what exists for licensed professionals, attaching the apprenticeship agreement to the apprentice's license to ensure clear understanding, and clarifying the board's authority to enforce these provisions directly in its code.

Ms. Underwood also responded to concerns about apprentices paying for their kits and books, noting it's common in other trades and doesn't seem unreasonable. Steve Weeks asked for clarity on what hourly wage means, and Ms. Underwood confirmed it aligns with the state or local minimum wage, whichever is higher. She closed by urging the Board to decide whether to recommend elimination or reform, and if keeping it, to adopt the proposed changes in the sunset report. She welcomed further Board discussion, public comment, and potentially convening task forces to refine recommendations before the sunset report's year-end deadline.

Tonya Fairley supported keeping the apprenticeship program, sharing her personal experience of successfully hosting apprentices through a reputable program. She acknowledged the serious problems and exploitation within some programs, which pose risks to public safety, but argued that ending the program would unfairly harm those who rely on it as an affordable training option. She urged the board to take control and make changes during the sunset review to fix the issues and better protect the public and apprentices. She also volunteered to serve on a task force, committed to making the necessary reforms.

Danielle Munoz echoed support for keeping the apprenticeship program, appreciating Ms. Fairley's experience and insight into how the program can work well. She agreed that the program shows promise and should not be eliminated, but emphasized the need for stronger legislation and greater awareness to address existing issues. Ms. Munoz also highlighted her personal focus on improving the low pass rates for Spanish-speaking candidates, noting that fixing the apprenticeship program could help with broader public safety and education concerns. She concluded by stressing the importance of ensuring there is clear recourse and support for students who have been harmed by unscrupulous programs.

Steve Weeks raised concerns about whether the apprenticeship program can ever be fully contained, noting the considerable staff time spent on this issue. Ms. Underwood responded that while initially skeptical, staff now sees potential in the program provided that there is robust oversight. She noted strong legislative and industry interest in apprenticeships. She explained that some programs skew pass rates by accepting too many apprentices and that there's no requirement to teach in Spanish, so pass rates for Spanish speakers are hard to assess. She also emphasized the need for new legislation, noting support from other states and the federal level.

Tonya Fairley highlighted a significant communication gap with DAS and how difficult it was to get basic information. Danielle Munoz framed this as a consumer protection issue, suggesting partnerships with consumer protection advocates. Ms. Underwood agreed that good programs should be supported and that a task force is needed to address issues and restructure the program. She noted that licensing fees should not cover industry fraud and that accountability for sponsors is key. Ms. Fairley added that immediate action should be taken when clear violations, like charging booth rental fees, are found. The board agreed on the need for a task force, with member Colette Kavanaugh volunteering to join. Ms. Underwood confirmed this could all be incorporated into the sunset report, which will be reviewed twice more. The consensus was to improve the program rather than abandon it, and to push for legislative changes while the political climate is supportive.

Public Comment:

Timothy Stansel, a longtime barber and apprenticeship program leader from Rancho Cucamonga, and Dwayne Anthony Houston II, a barbershop owner and former apprentice, shared their perspectives. Mr. Stansel thanked Tonya Fairley for her strong advocacy and discussed his experience training apprentices and running a solid program in San Bernardino County. He emphasized the program's role in providing jobs and opportunities, particularly for young people not pursuing college, and expressed his willingness to participate in any task force efforts.

Mr. Houston echoed this support, noting that all his successful barbers came through apprenticeship programs, which he described as more effective than traditional barber schools for training practical, hands-on skills. He called for reforms to make training more aligned with how barbers learn and to ensure oversight and accountability. Both speakers urged the board not to eliminate these programs but to strengthen them for the benefit of the industry and the community.

Shireina Allen, a celebrity hair stylist and salon owner, shared her experiences and emphasized the critical role of apprenticeship programs. She described how the practical, hands-on training she received in apprenticeship settings taught her essential sanitation and business practices that beauty colleges alone did not cover. She advocated strongly for keeping these extended education opportunities available and stressed that the board should expand, not reduce, such programs, especially for those already facing economic and personal challenges. She also concluded by noting that braiders should be required to have a license.

11. AGENDA ITEM #11: Discussion and Possible Action on School Oversight to be Included in the 2026 Sunset Report

Kristy Underwood shared that school oversight has been a longstanding concern discussed in multiple sunset reviews. Previously, the board had sole oversight of schools before BPPE was established. The board has since repeatedly requested sole oversight again during past sunset reviews, but those requests have not been successful. Ms. Underwood stated she does not believe such a request would succeed today.

She suggested that the Board could request BPPE to take on full oversight, as other boards have done. The Board would still handle health and safety inspections in schools, particularly on clinic floors. Currently, the Board doesn't require school renewals or charge fees for school approvals, placing a significant workload on their school analyst.

Tonya Fairley inquired whether they needed to make a decision on school oversight at this meeting or if it could be deferred to the next one, noting its connection to the broader apprenticeship program discussions. Ms. Underwood confirmed that it could wait and indicated she would provide further recommendations for consideration at the next meeting.

Public Comment:

Ken Williams, a school and salon owner as well as a former board member, strongly advocated for the Board to have sole oversight of beauty schools. He argued that the BPPE lacks expertise in beauty education and pointed out that California is unique in having dual

oversight, unlike other states. With 40 years in the industry and running a school established by his grandmother in 1929, he emphasized his deep commitment to protecting the industry. He submitted detailed recommendations to the Board and hoped these would be included on the next meeting agenda.

Fred Jones from the Professional Beauty Federation urged the Board to maintain a firm position advocating for sole oversight of beauty schools. He also proposed that if BPPE refuses to grant sole oversight, the Board should consider requesting a share of their substantial licensing fees. He criticized BPPE for failing to address problematic schools while burdening compliant schools with annual desk audits. Highlighting that about one-third of BPPE-licensed schools are beauty schools, he argued that BPPE is reluctant to relinquish these lucrative licensing fees. He concluded by encouraging the Board to pursue those fees if sole oversight is not granted.

Kelly Funk asked for clarification on who has been denying the Board's requests for sole oversight since 2012. Ms. Underwood explained that the requests have been part of multiple sunset reviews but have never advanced into legislation. Ms. Funk then inquired whether the BPPE might be influencing the legislature's decisions, to which Underwood responded no.

Patty Glover from Citrus College's cosmetology department explained that as a community college program, they are not regulated by BPPE except for their externship program. She noted that if the Board had full oversight of all schools, they would remain under the BPPE's regulation since they are a public school.

12. AGENDA ITEM #12: Discussion and Possible Action on Endorsement to be Included in the 2026 Sunset Report

Kristi Underwood clarified that while the memo for this agenda item includes a motion, no formal action is needed at the moment because the issue will be incorporated into the sunset review process. She explained that the change is a simple addition to the licensure by endorsement process—specifically, clarifying that a certification from another state must confirm that the licensing exam was taken and passed in the United States. This clarification will be included in the first draft of the sunset report, and the Board will have the opportunity to make a motion on it at that time.

Public Comment: Mr. Fred Jones raised a question about whether the board could ask applicants for the date of a U.S. based examination within the application process, given that the broad language of Section 7331 might allow for this without needing legislative updates.

13. AGENDA ITEM #13: Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Rulemaking Proposals:

- a. **Update Regarding Rulemaking to Amend Title 16, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Sections 910, 918, 919, 926, 941, 965.2, 971, 974.1, 974.2, 983 and 984 (Section 100 Technical Clean-Up)**
- b. **Update Regarding Rulemaking to Amend Title 16, CCR section 911 (License by Endorsement (Reciprocity), Application and Out of State License Certifications)**

- c. **Update Regarding Rulemaking to Amend Title 16, CCR sections 913, 913.1, 914.1, 914.2, 915, 917, 918, 918.1, 919, 919.1, 920, 921, 921.1, 921.2, 922, 924, 924.1, 925, 926, 927 (Apprenticeship)**
- d. **Update Regarding Rulemaking to Amend Title 16, CCR section 917 (Pre-Apprentice Training)**
- e. **Update Regarding Rulemaking to Amend Title 16, CCR section 931 (Interpreters for Licensing Exams)**
- f. **Update Regarding Rulemaking to Amend Title 16, CCR sections 940, 941, 950.10, 950.12, 962, 962.1, 962.2 (Schools and Externs)**
- g. **Update Regarding Rulemaking to Amend Title 16, CCR section 972 (Disciplinary Guidelines)**
- h. **Update Regarding Rulemaking to Adopt Title 16, CCR section 974.4 (SB 384: Remedial Education Program)**
- i. **Update Regarding Rulemaking to Amend Title 16, CCR section 977 et seq. (Health and Safety)**
- j. **Update Regarding Rulemaking to Amend Title 16, CCR Section 998 (Hairstylist Licensing Fee)**

Kristy Underwood provided an update, noting that the pre-apprentice training regulations have been finalized and will go into effect on July 1. They are currently implementing these changes, including distributing information to sponsors and apprentices and conducting staff training. Ms. Underwood said there are no decisions required for the rest of the regulatory updates, as those have already been decided by the board and are now at various stages of processing. She concluded that everything is moving forward smoothly and anticipated more updates at the next board meeting.

14. AGENDA ITEM #14: Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

A licensed hairstylist with 40 years of experience spoke about an ongoing issue she's facing in her building. She shared how an unlicensed lash technician started performing nail services, creating unsafe conditions for others in the building. She said she repeatedly contacted the board and provided evidence, including appointments on a booking app, but received no satisfactory response. The speaker noted that a board inspector visited the site on November 30 and confirmed the presence of unlicensed activity, but later, she was told no evidence was found. She expressed frustration that despite providing all this information, the unlicensed activity continues. Sabina Knight, the board's legal counsel, advised her to speak directly with the enforcement manager, Addison—who was present at the meeting—to address the matter more effectively.

Jaime Schrabek from Precision Nails reported that the Face and Body Expo, after decades of operation, has been canceled for 2025. Although organizers plan to return in 2026, this is uncertain. The cancellation was announced recently after the event moved from San Jose to Santa Clara.

Ken Williams noted that he has provided enough copies of his suggestions for all board members and expressed hope that they will review them and consider including them on the agenda for the next meeting.

Shireina Allen shared her experience beginning braiding at age 11 to support her family. She emphasized that although legislation exempts braiders from licensing, the industry—including braiding, barbering, and cosmetology—is growing rapidly. She stressed the importance of licensing and education for braiders, highlighting risks like traction alopecia and improper hair care, especially when dealing with relaxed hair and extensions. Ms. Allen explained that braiders need training in sanitation, chemical knowledge, and proper hair care techniques to prevent damage and the spread of scalp conditions like psoriasis. She also noted the importance of understanding how different shampoos affect hair after braid removal to avoid tangling and damage.

Doris Mosley, a cosmetologist and trichologist, supported the points made earlier by highlighting the need for licensing and education for braiders. She expressed concerns about the lack of proper training, which can result in traction alopecia and other issues, as well as the potential health hazards of synthetic hair extensions. She emphasized the importance of knowing the scalp and hair before working on it.

Ms. Mosley also urged the board to reinstate the 600 hours of practical training that was removed, as she observed firsthand that many students are lost without this hands-on experience. She stressed that passing the written test doesn't guarantee practical skills, which are critical to succeeding in the field. With over 50 years of experience, she underscored that while written exams are important, the real test begins when working directly with clients.

Kristy Underwood explained that braiding was exempted from licensure requirements due to a lawsuit unrelated to the Board. She emphasized that any change in this area would require legislation, typically not initiated by the board but possibly by the industry itself. She recommended that anyone with ideas about changing licensure requirements for braiding should contact their local assembly member or senator, noting that legislators do listen and often reach out to the board for input.

15. AGENDA ITEM #15: Suggestions for Future Agenda Items

Calimay Pham suggested that for the purpose of more productive discussion, it would be helpful to review what the board recommended during the last sunset review, along with the resulting legislative actions. She noted there was some confusion among industry members and the public about what the board supported versus what was mandated by the Legislature, and understanding that history would be particularly helpful for newer board members.

Danielle Munoz asked if the task force would be added to the next agenda. Kristy Underwood confirmed and noted that many of the same topics would return for discussion, but she encouraged board members to reach out to her at any time with additional agenda items.

16. AGENDA ITEM #16: Adjournment

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at approximately 1:38 p.m.