

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
ELECTROLYSIS COUNCIL
GENERAL BUSINESS MEETING
February 25, 2013
9:00 a.m. EST**

**CONFERENCE CALL
1-888-670-3525**

When prompted, enter the following conference code
number: **4389078941**, followed by the “#” sign.

Participants in this public meeting should be aware that these proceedings are being recorded
and that an audio file of the meeting will be posted to the council’s website.

Members and Staff Present

Mr. Jim Scott, Chair	Allen Hall, Executive Director
Dr. Jolynn Greenhalgn, Vice Chair	Anna King, Program Administrator
Dr. Max Wilson	Kim Tillery, Regulatory Specialist II
	Marlene Stern, Assistant Attorney General

Members Absent

Ms. Susan Manwaring

9:06 a.m.

Call to Order – General Business Meeting

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATIONS (EXAMINATION)

1. Carolina Lizarazo

Ms. Lizarazo was not present at the time the Council reviewed her application, but later joined and was informed of the outcome.

Ms. Lizarazo’s examination application was before the Council for review due to an unlicensed activity case (ULA) in 2012. Provided for the Council’s review was Ms. Lizarazo’s application as well as documents relating to the ULA case.

MOTION: Following discussion, Mr. Jim Scott moved to accept Ms. Lizarazo’s examination application. Dr. Jolynn Greenhalgn seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

2. Bao Ngoc Thi Nguyen

Ms. Nguyen was not present on the call. Ms. Nguyen’s application was before the Council for review of a felony charge due to being a habitual traffic offender. This felony was not applicable to the Section 456.0635(2), Florida Statutes questions, and did not automatically preclude her from licensure. Provided for the Council’s review were documents related to this felony.

MOTION: Following discussion, Mr. Jim Scott moved to accept Ms. Nguyen's examination application. Dr. Max Wilson seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

RECONSIDERATION OF LICENSURE APPLICATION

3. Jimmie Nicole Stowe

Ms. Stowe applied for Electrologist licensure on March 2, 2012 and was approved to sit for the licensure exam by letter dated March 6, 2012 and issued a temporary permit to practice under the supervision of a licensed Electrologist, as per her request, on March 6, 2012.

Thereafter, a complaint was submitted by the applicant's former employer for further investigation by the Department of Health. On January 14, 2013, the Department filed a 2-count Administrative Complaint against the applicant in DOH Case No. 2012-13950 with regard to her plea of no contest to one count of misdemeanor battery and her failure to report same to the Department within 30 days of entering the plea.

Provided for the Council's review was Ms. Stowe's application record and a copy of the Department's Administrative Complaint. The Council was asked to determine whether they would like to reconsider the approval of Ms. Stowe's application and revoke the temporary permit.

MOTION: Following extensive discussion, Mr. Jim Scott moved to deny Ms. Stowe's examination application. Dr. Jolynn Greenhalgn seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

APPLICANT CERTIFICATION LISTS

4. Examination Applicants

It was noted that a duplicate line, number 25, should be deleted.

MOTION: Dr. Jolynn Greenhalgn moved to accept the examination ratification list as amended. Mr. Jim Scott seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

At 11:19, the Council adjourned for a five minute break. At approximately, 11:24 p.m., the Council reconvened the conference call.

RULES REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT

5. Rule 64B8-51.006, F.A.C., Rule Governing Licensure and Inspection of Electrology Facilities

During the August 2012 Council meeting, the Council approved proposed rule language and revisions to the Electrologist facility licensure application.

The proposed rule language sought to clarify questions regarding when an entity providing electrology services would be required to pursue licensure. Revisions to the facility licensure application incorporated the following:

- Addition of questions pursuant to the passage of HB 653 (2012);

- Addition of sections to more clearly identify the applicant's business entity type, ownership information and previous licensure and criminal history; and,
- Elimination of the Employment Verification Form and related instructions, based on the proposed rule requiring all facilities to be licensed without regard to whether the licensed Electrologist would provide services as the employee of a physician or as an independent contractor.

During the September 2012 Board of Medicine's (BOM) Electrolysis Committee conference call, the proposed rule language was rejected upon advice that the Electrolysis Council does not likely have the authority to require physicians' offices to pursue facility licensure as well as additional concerns regarding the small business impact on unlicensed entities to pursue licensure. During the October 29, 2012 meeting, the Council voted to table the matter until revised draft language was brought back before the Council amending the portion that details who is covered under this rule.

During the instant meeting, the following items were provided for the Council's review:

- New and transfer of facility application forms, and
- Updated draft language from Ms. Marlene Stern defining an electrology facility owner and establishing that an electrologist employed by a physician licensed pursuant to Chapter 458 or 459 is not a facility owner, as follows below.

PROPOSED RULE LANGUAGE

64B8-51.006 Rule Governing Licensure and Inspection of Electrology Facilities.

(1) Definitions. An electrology facility is that portion of any establishment or place where ~~in a person licensed pursuant to Chapter 478 is practicing electrolysis~~ electrolysis is performed. An electrology facility may be part of a residence.

(2) Electrology Facility Licensure.

(a) ~~No one owner of may operate~~ may operate that facility without a license to do so from the Department of Health. ~~Physicians licensed pursuant to Chapter 458 and 459 who employ a licensed electrologist are not required to obtain a facility license.~~

(b) To obtain the license, the applicant shall provide information to the Department as required by this rule on a form provided by the Department and approved and incorporated herein by reference by the Board as Form DH-MQA 1213, ~~11/09~~, entitled "Application for Electrolysis Facility Licensure," revised 2/13 effective 11/09, which can be obtained from the Council at The Florida Department of Health, Electrolysis Council, Bald Cypress Way, Bin #C05, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3256, and available on the web at: <http://www.doh.state.fl.us/mqa>. The applicant must pay a \$100 application fee, which is nonrefundable, \$100 inspection fee, \$100 licensure fee and a \$5.00 unlicensed activity fee.

(c) The responsibility for a facility licensure lies with the owner of an electrology facility. The term "owner" means the person, sole proprietor, partnership, limited partnership, firm, subcontractor, independent contractor or corporation that operates the electrology facility. Any physician's office or medical facility that employs a licensed electrologist must obtain a facility license by May 31, 2014. An electrologist employed by a physician licensed pursuant to Chapter 458 or 459 is not an owner of a facility.

(3) Electrology Facility Safety and Sanitary Requirements.

(a) - (d) No change.

(e) The electrology facility shall have the following equipment:

1. - 17. No change

18. Unless the facility is new, Mmonthly records of sterilizer biological test monitoring which shall be made available to the ~~Agency or~~ Department upon request;

19. - 20. No change.

(f) - (g) No change.

(4) - (7) No change.

Implemented 456.037(2), (3), (5), 478.49, 478.51 FS. History—New 11-16-93, Formerly 61F6-76.006, Amended 5-11-95, 6-26-96, Formerly 59R-51.006, Amended 12-23-97, 12-22-98, 2-17-00, 3-25-01, 4-8-02, 6-16-03, 7-29-10.

In reviewing the language, the Council was also asked to clarify whether the use of Intense Pulse Lasers (IPLs) meets the requirement of Rule 64B8-51.006(3)(g)10., F.A.C., although the Department of Health's Bureau of Radiation Control does not require registration of IPLs. Per the Council's opinion, an IPL is not required to be registered as per Rule 64B8-51.006(3)(g)10., F.A.C. because an IPL is not a laser.

MOTION: Mr. Jim Scott moved to accept the proposed rule language. Dr. Max Wilson seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

MOTION: Mr. Jim Scott moved to accept the separation of the transfer and new facility application. Dr. Max Wilson seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

MOTION: Mr. Jim Scott moved that the proposed new language would not have an adverse impact on small business. Dr. Max Wilson seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

MOTION: Mr. Jim Scott moved that the proposed rule amendments would not be likely to directly or indirectly increase regulatory costs to any entity (including government) in excess of \$200,000 in the aggregate in Florida within one year after the implementation of the rule. Dr. Jolynn Greenhalgn seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

6. Rule 64B8-52.003, F.A.C., Procedures for Approval of Attendance at Continuing Education Courses

During the May 2012 meeting, it was clarified that the genesis of the current rule development was based on an inquiry by an approved 320-Hour training program seeking to be designated as a technical school in order to be able to qualify, by rule, to provide continuing education credit to licensees. During this meeting, the Council reviewed and approved proposed draft language deleting the term "technical school". This eliminated any possibility for such schools to offer continuing education credits to licensees.

During the September 2012 Board of Medicine's (BOM) Electrolysis Committee conference call, the proposed rule language was rejected upon advice that the proposed language would delete entities that provide a significant number of courses. However, it should be noted that the only continuing education provider category that was deleted in the proposed language was "technical schools". It was suggested by the Committee that the Council consider adding a reference to "Post-Secondary Institutions"¹ to allow the 320-hour training schools to provide continuing education courses. Enclosed for the Council's review was updated rule language from Assistant Attorney General which adds this reference in proposed paragraph (2)(c).

During the October 29, 2012 meeting, the Council voted to table the matter to allow the Assistant Attorney General to bring back drafted language addressing its concerns.

¹ In prior meetings, information was provided to the Council where it was determined that the term "technical school" was obsolete and that the Florida Department of Education designation that appeared to replace this term was "Nonpublic Postsecondary Educational Institutions", as referenced in Chapter 1005, Florida Statutes.

During the instant meeting, the following draft language was provided for the Council's review:

64B8-52.003 Procedure for Approval of Attendance at Continuing Education Courses.

(1) No change.

(2) All courses taken for continuing education credit shall be relevant to the practice of electrology, as defined in Section 478.42(5), Florida Statutes, and shall meet the purpose of enhancing the electrolysis practice skills and electrolysis knowledge of the licensee. All licensees shall be awarded contact hours for continuing education completed under the following categories:

(a) ~~A~~ attendance at all offerings that are approved by the Electrolysis Society of Florida (ESF), or the Electrolysis Association of Florida (EAF), or the American Electrology Association, or the Society of Clinical and Medical Hair Removal; ~~and~~

(b) ~~A~~ all offerings from other states which are approved by the states' licensing agency or professional electrology organization which offerings have been approved by the American Electrology Association, or the Society of Clinical and Medical Hair Removal; ~~or any technical school, college or university course taken and successfully completed for the first time by the licensee in a subject area relevant to electrolysis. and~~

(3) A licensee may earn continuing education credit for taking an academic course offered by a college, university, or post-secondary institution. Any such course shall meet the requirements in paragraph (2), above. Licensees shall be awarded 10 hours of CE credit per semester hour for any such academic course he or she completes successfully. The licensee shall provide verification upon request of the Department.

(3) ~~(4)~~ HIV/AIDS and blood-borne disease continuing education requirements.

(a) Each new licensee is required to complete no later than upon first renewal an approved course on HIV/AIDS education. Approved offerings in HIV/AIDS are those that meet the requirements of Section 465.033, F.S. Courses approved by any Board within the Division of Medical Quality Assurance of the Department of Health pursuant to Section 456.033, F.S., are approved by this council.

(b) One hour of each biennium must be obtained by each licensee in an approved course on blood-borne diseases.

~~(4)~~ (5) Two (2) hours each biennium must be obtained by each licensee in approved offerings on prevention of medical errors, including a study of root-cause analysis, error reduction and prevention, and patient safety.

(5) ~~(6)~~ Up to ten hours per biennium of the continuing education required for license renewal may be in the form of approved home study courses.

~~(6)~~ (7) Up to 2 hours each biennium may be obtained in the area of risk management by a licensee by attending a Board meeting in which another licensee is being disciplined, or by serving as volunteer expert witness in a disciplinary case.

~~(7)~~ (8)(a) A maximum of 6 contact hours shall be awarded per biennium for each of the following or a combination of the following:

(b) No change.

Rulemaking Authority 478.43(1), (4), 478.50(2), ~~(4)(a), (b)~~ FS. Law Implemented ~~456.013, 456.033,~~ 478.43(4), 478.50(2), ~~(4)(a), (b)~~ FS. History—New 6-1-93, Formerly 21M-77.003, 61F6-77.003, Amended 5-11-95, Formerly 59R-52.003, Amended 2-9-98, 2-16-99, 2-17-00, 9-21-00, 8-13-02, 4-26-09.

MOTION: Mr. Jim Scott moved to accept the proposed rule language. Ms. Susan Manwaring seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

MOTION: Mr. Jim Scott moved that the proposed new language would not have an adverse impact on small business. Additionally, the proposed rule amendments would not be likely to directly or indirectly increase regulatory costs to any entity (including government) in excess of \$200,000 in the aggregate in Florida within one year after the implementation of the rule. Dr. Max Wilson seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

The Council moved to Tab 16 to discuss the issues involving 64B8-51.006.

16. Discussion re: Proposed Revisions to Rule 64B8-51.006, F.A.C., Rule Governing Licensure & Inspection of Electrology Facilities

Staff provided information that explained the inspection process for electrology facilities. When the inspector is inspecting a facility, they are not currently required to look for protocols as stated in 64B8-56.002(4)(a).

MOTION: Mr. Jim Scott moved to draft language to include the requirement of protocols being provided upon inspection. Dr. Max Wilson seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

The Council also dropped the matter of altering the requirement of the presence of an epilator on such facilities that only perform laser hair removal.

7. Rule 64B8-52.004, F.A.C., Requirements for Approval of Training Courses for Laser & Light-Based Hair Removal or Reduction

During the May 2012 meeting, the Council approved draft language to allow 30-hour laser CE provider applicants, which have facilities located outside of Florida, the opportunity to submit other documentation to demonstrate compliance with paragraph (1)(b)6. Paragraph (1)(b)6. requires that all provider applicants submit a copy of an electrology facility license and the most recent Department of Health inspection sheet showing compliance with Rule 64B8-51.006(3)(g), F.A.C. During the July 2012 Board of Medicine's Electrology Committee meeting, it was requested that the proposed language be sent back to the Council for review due to concerns about the ability of other states to provide "comparable" documentation for this purpose.

During the August 2012 meeting, the Council modified and approved draft language to define the criteria by which it would review national laser hair removal certification organizations for purposes of certifying licensees in this modality. Provided for the Council's consideration was an updated draft of Paragraphs (3) and (4) of this rule, which included the modifications proposed at the last meeting.

During the October 29, 2012 meeting, the Council approved the following draft text for Rule 64B8-52.004(1)(b)6., F.A.C., presented by Ms. Dudley:

64B8-52.004(1)(b)6. Requirements for Approval of Training Courses for Laser and Light-Based Hair Removal or Reduction.

The Electrolysis Council will approve laser and light-based hair removal or reduction continuing education training courses upon application if the following requirements are met:

6. A copy of the electrology facility license and the most recent Department of Health inspection sheet from the location where the continuing education training course is offered demonstrating compliance with paragraph 64B8-51.006(3)(g), F.A.C. Applicants with training courses offered by entities outside the state of Florida must submit comparable documentation from the applicable state regulatory entity for review by the Council to determine compliance with this paragraph. If no such regulatory entity exists, the applicant must submit a letter documenting compliance with the requirements of Rule 64B8-51.006(3)(g), F.A.C.

With regard to the proposed text presented for Paragraphs (3) and (4), the Council tabled further review and requested that Ms. Dudley make the following revisions:

- Modify paragraph (3) to require that instructors must have one year of “*post licensure*” experience as well as one year of “*post certification*” experience; and
- Modify proposed paragraph (4)(b)1.b. to read as follows: “*b. satisfactorily complete a written examination encompassing the topics in Rule 64B8-52.004(2)....*”

During the instant meeting, the following draft language was provided for the Council’s review:

64B8-52.004 Requirements for Approval of Training Courses for Laser and Light-Based Hair Removal or Reduction.

The Electrolysis Council will approve laser and light-based hair removal or reduction continuing education training courses upon application if the following requirements are met:

(1) Continuing education providers seeking initial approval by the Council shall pay a fee of \$250, and shall ~~apply through the Department of Health’s contracted continuing education system, CE Broker, at www.cebroker.com, complete and submit to the Council the application form entitled “Application for Laser and Light Based Hair Removal or Reduction Continuing Education Provider”, form DOH/MQA/EO/LASER/CEU/07/23/01, which is hereby incorporated by reference and became effective July 23, 2001, copies of which may be obtained from the Council office at 4052 Bald Cypress Way, BIN C 05, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3255.~~ Continuing education providers seeking renewal of provider status shall also pay a \$250 fee each biennium. To receive Council approval, a continuing education program:

- (a) No change.
- (b) Shall have its sponsor submit to the Council at least the following:
 1. - 5. No change.

6. A copy of the electrology facility license and the most recent Department of Health inspection sheet from the location where the continuing education training course is offered demonstrating compliance with paragraph 64B8-51.006(3)(g), F.A.C. Applicants with training courses offered by entitites outside the state of Florida must submit comparable documentation from the applicable state regulatory entity for review by the Council to determine compliance with this paragraph. If no such regulatory entity exists, the applicant must submit a letter documenting compliance with the requirments of Rule 64B8-51.006(3)(g), F.A.C.

(2) No change.

(3) The instructors of each laser and light-based hair removal course must be currently certified and have one year of post-certification experience and one year of post-licensure experience. Verifiable documentation, including the instructor’s work experience in laser applications and certification from a national certification organization approved by Board and Council, of this experience must be submitted to the Council with the application.

(4) A national certification organization must meet the following criteria to be approved by the Council and Board:

(a) The Certifying Entity:

1. Must be a non-governmental organization such as a society or association, whose members participate in, or have interest in, the field of laser hair removal.
2. Must make its membership available to the general public nationwide that is not restricted because of race, color, religion, age, national origin, or disability.
3. Must have a certification program open to nonmembers as well as members.
4. Must be an incorporated, nationally recognized organization in good standing that is involved in setting national standards of practice within its fields of expertise.
5. Must have an adequate staff, a viable system for financing its operations, and a policy- and decision-making review board.
6. Must have a set of written organizational by-laws and policies that provide adequate assurance of lack of conflict of interest and a system for monitoring and enforcing those by-laws and policies.
7. Must have a committee, whose members can carry out their responsibilities impartially, to review and

approve their certification guidelines and procedures, and to advise the organization's staff in implementing the certification program.

8. Must have written procedures describing all aspects of its certification program.

9. Must maintain records of the current status of an individual's certification and the administration of its certification program.

10. Must have procedures to ensure that certified individuals are provided due process with respect to the administration of a certification program, including the process of becoming certified and any sanctions imposed against certified individuals.

11. Must have procedures for proctoring examinations, including qualifications for proctors. These procedures shall ensure that the individuals proctoring each examination are not employed by the same company or corporation (or a wholly-owned subsidiary of such company or corporation) as any of the examinees.

12. Must exchange information about certified individuals with the Council and other certifying entities and allow periodic review of its certification program and related records by the Council.

13. Must provide a description to the Council of its procedures for choosing examination sites and for providing an appropriate examination environment.

(b) The Certification Program:

1. Must require applicants for certification to:

a. receive training in the topics specified in subsection 64B8-52.004(2) F.A.C.; and

b. satisfactorily complete a written examination covering **encompassing** the topics in Rule 64B8-52.004(2) ~~including laser and light-based hair removal.~~

2. Must include procedures to ensure that all examination questions are protected from disclosure.

3. Must include procedures for denying an application and revoking, suspending, and reinstating a certificate.

4. Must provide a certification period of not less than 3 years nor more than 5 years.

5. Must include procedures for renewing certifications and, if the procedures allow renewals without examination, require evidence of recent full-time employment and continuing education credits as specified in subsection 64B8-51.006(3)(g)1. F.A.C.

6. Must provide a timely response to inquiries, by telephone or letter, from members of the public, about an individual's certification status.

(c) Examination:

1. Shall be designed to test an individual's knowledge and understanding of at least the topics specified in subsection 64B8-52.004(2) F.A.C.

Specific Authority 456.025(7), 478.43 FS. Law Implemented 456.025(7), 478.42(5), ~~478.43(3)~~, 478.50(4)(b) FS. History--New 10-3-00, Amended 12-24-01, 12-26-02, 8-17-04, 7-3-06, 2-18-09, _____-_____-12.

MOTION: Mr. Jim Scott moved to accept all proposed rule language. Dr. Jolynn Greenhalgn seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

MOTION: Mr. Jim Scott moved that the proposed new language would not have an adverse impact on small business. Dr. Max Wilson seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

MOTION: Mr. Jim Scott moved that the proposed rule amendments would not be likely to directly or indirectly increase regulatory costs to any entity (including government) in excess of \$200,000 in the aggregate in Florida within one year after the implementation of the rule. Dr. Jolynn Greenhalgn seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

Mr. John Pellet added that his client, the Society for Clinical and Medical Hair Removal, would disagree with the Council's statement that the above new language would not adversely impact

small business. Mr. Pellet also stated that it is believed that there will be an increase in regulatory costs due to this rule change.

8. 64B8-56.002, F.A.C., Equipment and Devices; Protocols for Laser and Light-Based Devices

Mr. Pellet requested that the Council discuss a conflict that appears to exist between Rules 64B8-56.002(2)(b) and 64B8-51.006(3)(g), F.A.C., with regard to the requirement for electrologists to maintain the national Certified Medical Electrologist (CME) credential to continue to provide laser hair removal services in their practice. Provided for the Council's review was historical information as well as correspondence from Mr. Pellet.

Mr. Pellet stated that he would like to clarify a statement made at a prior Board of Medicine meeting regarding the requirement for an electrologist to maintain a current CME. He stated that his opinion does not extend protection to licensees/certifices who are using his statement for the basis of not maintaining current certification.

MOTION: Mr. Jim Scott moved to table the matter until drafted language has been brought back before the Council for approval. Dr. Max Wilson seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

After additional discussion, the Council directed Ms. Stern to modify 64B8-51.006(3)(g)(2) to incorporate the changes noted below:

64B8-51.006(3)(g)(2) Rule Governing Licensure and Inspection of Electrology Facilities.

(g) In electrology facilities wherein laser equipment is used for hair removal, the following shall be provided:

1. No change.
2. Proof ~~of~~ that each electrologist has been certified~~ation~~ as a Certified Medical Electrologist for all electrologists using laser equipment in the facility.
3. - 10. No change.

Rulemaking Authority 478.43(1), (4), 478.50(2), ~~(4)(a), (b)~~ FS. Law Implemented ~~456.013, 456.033~~, 478.43(4), 478.50(2), ~~(4)(a), (b)~~ FS. History—New 6-1-93, Formerly 21M-77.003, 61F6-77.003, Amended 5-11-95, Formerly 59R-52.003, Amended 2-9-98, 2-16-99, 2-17-00, 9-21-00, 8-13-02, 4-26-09.

In addition to the modified language, the checklist instructions for both the transfer of location application (page 25) and the new facility application (page 12) must be modified to reflect the above modified rule language.

MOTION: Mr. Jim Scott moved to adopt the discussed changes to the rule language. Dr. Max Wilson seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

MOTION: Mr. Jim Scott moved that the proposed new language would not have an adverse impact on small business. Dr. Max Wilson seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

MOTION: Mr. Jim Scott moved that the proposed rule amendments would not be likely to directly or indirectly increase regulatory costs to any entity (including government) in excess of \$200,000 in the aggregate in Florida within one year after the implementation of the rule. Dr. Max Wilson seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

REPORT OF ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, MARLENE STERN

9. Rule Status Report

Ms. Stern provided an informational document for review by the Council.

REPORTS

10. Jim Scott, Council Chair

Mr. Scott provided no reports.

11. Allen Hall, Executive Director

- Cash Balance Report
- Expenditures By Function

Informational documents were provided for review by the Council.

NEW BUSINESS

12. CE Updates

- Project Snapshot
- FAQ
- CE Broker New Service Model
- Flyer

Ms. Garnet Nevels, of the Division of Medical Quality Assurance's Bureau of Operations, provided information regarding the introduction of the Department of Health's new licensure renewal system, which is integrated with CE Broker. The new system will require that licensees document all required continuing education in CE Broker in order to be able to renew licenses. The new system will be rolled out in two phases. Electrologists will see the optional reporting phase during the May 2014 renewal cycle. Mandatory reporting of all required CEs will be required for the subsequent renewal cycle in May 2016. Licensees will not be required to subscribe to CE Broker to report credit. Each licensee will have the option to choose the free account. A micro-site has been developed to provide additional information about the new system at <http://www.ceat renewal.com/>. Dr. Jolynn Greenhalgn requested that staff obtain information as to whether individuals who hold more than one license, and choose to subscribe to CE Broker, would be required to have more than one subscription.

At 12:14 p.m., Dr. Max Wilson departed from the call.

13. Election of Officers

This item was tabled to the May 2013 meeting due to a lack of quorum.

14. Delegation of Authority & Conviction Records Guidelines

This item was tabled to the May 2013 meeting due to a lack of quorum. Dr. Greenhalgn requested that more information be made available on the applicability of Section 456.0635, F.S., which makes reference to prohibitions to licensure.

15. Licensure Streamlining Proposal re: Review of Endorsement Applications

This item was tabled to the May 2013 meeting due to a lack of quorum.

OLD BUSINESS

16. October 29, 2012 General Business Meeting Minutes

MOTION: Mr. Jim Scott moved to approve the meeting minutes. Dr. Jolynn Greenhalgn seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

17. December 03, 2012 General Business Meeting Minutes

MOTION: Mr. Jim Scott moved to approve the meeting minutes. Dr. Jolynn Greenhalgn seconded the motion, which carried 3/0.

OTHER BUSINESS AND INFORMATION

18. Council Member Vacancies

An informational document was provided for review by the Council

19. Increasing the Availability of the Florida Electrologist Licensure Exam

An informational document was provided for review by the Council.

20. Emergency Restriction of License- Ms. Ernestina Giron Schupke, EO1259

Informational documents were provided for review by the Council.

21. Electrology Staff Recognition

Informational documents were provided for review by the Council.

The meeting adjourned at 12:19 p.m.