

GUAM BOARD OF BARBERING & COSMETOLOGY

REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Monday, September 9, 2024 at 9:00 AM (Guam ChST)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/89466917812?pwd=wB87lxXL986IR0nHGMBG9Idl2vSbgp.1>

Meeting ID: 894 6691 7812

Passcode: 662628

MINUTES

Agenda Item		Discussion/Decision		Responsible party	Reporting time frame	Status
I	CALL TO ORDER	Meeting Chaired by A. Taitano, Chairperson		Chair	0923	Call to Order
	Roll Call	GBBC <u>Present:</u> ☑Marcy Tiong, Vice-Chairperson ☑Raymond Santos, Treasurer ☑Joseph Blas, Secretary <u>Virtually Present:</u> ☑Ashley Taitano-Sablan, Chairperson	Other Attendees: <u>Present:</u> Jennifer Bruan, HPLO Breanna Sablan, HPLO Zennia Pecina, HPLO Administrator <u>Virtually Present:</u> Francine Galao, GCC Regina A. Sapp PeterJohn Camacho, DPHSS Deputy Director	GBBC	0923	Quorum Established
	Proof of Publication	Guam Daily Post and Public Notice: 8/30/2024 and 9/5/2024			0924	Confirmed
II	APPROVAL OF AGENDA	Motion to approve: M. Tiong; 2 nd : R. Santos		GBBC	0925	Unanimously Approved
III	APPROVAL OF MINUTES	Motion to approve the minutes, dated 08 July 2024: J. Blas; 2 nd : M. Tiong		GBBC	0925	Unanimously Approved
IV	HPLO ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT	Z. Pecina delivered the administrators' report, mentioning that the rules and regulations document for cosmetology sent to them could not be opened. She requested that the document be resent so they could insert some amendments from the administrative side for review. A. Taitano responded that she would resend the document. Z. Pecina continued by noting that Attorney Strader is still associated with the board, but his absence was noted, and they will follow up with the Attorney General's office to confirm his status as their attorney. She also mentioned that they are still awaiting the appointment of a youth member to the board and will provide an update once this is finalized. Regarding training for the instructors, they are pending dates from NIC for R. Santos and M. Tiong to undergo proctor training, and further information will be communicated once available.		HPLO	0926	Noted

Agenda Item		Discussion/Decision	Responsible party	Reporting time frame	Status
		<p>Z. Pecina stated that B. Sablan would soon provide an update on the "Go Live" for their testing, which is ready to launch. She recalled a discussion from a previous meeting regarding the scoring of test results, indicating that there was interest in understanding how the testing process is conducted. They are currently awaiting a vendor report from NIC, and once it is received, it will be presented to the board. Z. Pecina emphasized the importance of continuing this discussion, as they had committed to keeping interested parties informed. She concluded by expressing appreciation for the opportunity to discuss the "Go Live" testing.</p> <p>B. Sablan reported that a vendor co-presentation is scheduled for the cosmetology schools on September 19th at 8 a.m. She announced a tentative "Go Live" date for the online theory examinations, set for October 1, 2024. B. Sablan mentioned that they will continue working with the vendor to provide technical training. The examinations will be offered from Tuesday to Friday, between 8 a.m. and 12 p.m., and 1 p.m. to 4 p.m., due to the time difference with the vendor. She also noted that she has followed up with NIC regarding the proctor examination and will share the information with the three individuals scheduled for that training once it becomes available.</p>			
V	TREASURER'S REPORT	No Report	B. Sablan	0930	No Report
VI	OLD BUSINESS	A. Rules and Regulations - Ongoing A. Taitano reiterated that the file containing the draft of the new business rules and regulations, which was sent via email, could not be opened as mentioned earlier by Z. Pecina. She will resend the document, hoping the new file will be accessible. The document still needs to have all the administrative elements added, and this task remains ongoing.	GBBC	0930	On-going. Draft Document will be Sent to HPLO
		B. Complaints 1. GBBC-CO-2024-0001 – Date Received: 01/16/2024. A. Taitano reported that the investigation is essentially complete and is prepared to present her recommendation for a vote. Her recommendation is to fine the establishment \$1,000 for hiring an unlicensed individual. Additionally, she suggested that the individual listed on the establishment's license should be prevented from supervising any apprentices for at least a year. This recommendation was submitted to the board for consideration. <i>Motion to Impose a Fine of \$1000 and Postpone the Ability to Supervise for the Person Listed Under the Establishment License: M. Tiong; 2nd: R. Santos.</i>	A. Taitano		Unanimously Closed. \$1000 Fine was Imposed and the Person Under Establishment License will not be Allowed to Supervise.
		2. GBBC-CO-2024-0002 – Date Received: 04/22/2024. R. Santos stated that the investigation is still ongoing, as he has yet to receive the name of the manicurist involved. A. Taitano advised him to consult with the Public Health Department's Division of Environmental Health for assistance, especially since the complaint involves the use of a prohibited instrument. She emphasized that this matter may not only pertain to a licensing violation but also to a sanitation issue. A. Taitano encouraged R. Santos to involve	R. Santos		On-going. Board will Reach out to Environmental Health for Assistance

Agenda Item		Discussion/Decision	Responsible party	Reporting time frame	Status
		the Division of Environmental Health to address the sanitation aspects of the complaint while continuing to identify the individual who performed the service.			
		3. GBBC-CO-2024-003 – Date Received: 06/25/2024 (J. Blas) J. Blas reported that there are no new updates regarding the complaint. A. Taitano suggested that this complaint should be brought to the attention of the NIC since it involves an allegation against one of their proctors. She expressed hope that NIC could determine if they need to take any action or if they would take over the matter. A. Taitano recommended finding a way to inform NIC or establish contact to see if they can provide assistance with this complaint.	J. Blas		On-going. Board will Contact NIC for Assistance.
VII	NEW BUSINESS	A. Application for Examination	GBBC	0935	
		1. Pia Abegail R. Hayahay – Cosmetologist M. Tiong expressed her concern regarding Pia Abegail R. Hayahay, a cosmetologist, stating that if her practice is limited strictly to aesthetics—services that cosmetologists are permitted to perform—there should be no issue. A. Taitano agreed and noted that this was also a concern she intended to address. She mentioned that P. Hayahay's intended place of work is a spa that exclusively offers aesthetic services. A. Taitano shared the same viewpoint as M. Tiong, suggesting that as long as the salon does not offer hair services and only provides spa services, an esthetician would be an appropriate supervisor for P. Hayahay in this case. <i>Motion to Approve: J. Blas; 2nd: M. Tiong</i>			Unanimously Approved
		2. Daryen Guerrero – Cosmetologist M. Tiong raised a concern about Daryen Guerrero, a cosmetologist, who will be apprenticed under a barber. She emphasized that as long as D. Guerrero is apprenticed under a barber, he should not perform any chemical services, as barbers are not permitted to offer these services. M. Tiong stated that D. Guerrero can continue his training in cosmetology while practicing under barbering conditions, provided he does not engage in chemical services. A. Taitano supported this view and added that D. Guerrero should be informed that certain barbering services, such as shaving and straight razor shaving, are not permitted for cosmetologists. She agreed that D. Guerrero's apprenticeship under a barber should not involve any services outside the scope of what cosmetologists are allowed to perform. <i>Motion to Approve; M. Tiong; 2nd: R. Santos</i>			Unanimously Approved
		3. Loren Elizabeth Forbes – Manicurist <i>Motion to Approve; M. Tiong; 2nd: J. Blas</i>			Unanimously Approved

Agenda Item		Discussion/Decision	Responsible party	Reporting time frame	Status
		4. Deanna Lynn Weger – Cosmetologist <i>Motion to Approve; R. Santos; 2nd: J. Blas</i>			Unanimously Approved
		5. Michelle A. Camacho – Esthetician <i>Motion to Approve: J. Blas; 2nd: M. Tiong</i>			Unanimously Approved
		B. Application For Apprentice			
		1. Pia Abegail R. Hayahay – Cosmetologist <i>Motion to Approve: J. Blas; 2nd: M. Tiong</i>			Unanimously Approved
		2. Daryen Guerrero – Cosmetologist <i>Motion to Approve; M. Tiong; 2nd: R. Santos</i>			Unanimously Approved
		3. Loren Elizabeth Forbes – Manicurist <i>Motion to Approve; M. Tiong; 2nd: J. Blas</i>			Unanimously Approved
		4. Deanna Lynn Weger – Cosmetologist <i>Motion to Approve; R. Santos; 2nd: J. Blas</i>			Unanimously Approved
		5. Michelle A. Camacho – Esthetician <i>Motion to Approve: J. Blas; 2nd: M. Tiong</i>			Unanimously Approved
		6. Young S. Cho – Manicurist M. Tiong noted that Young S. Cho, a manicurist, has been an apprentice since 2021, which exceeds the permissible duration according to the statute. In response, A. Taitano explained that if an apprentice fails an examination, they can reapply as a new apprentice, which is a common practice among applicants. Rather than extending the current apprentice license, individuals are encouraged to reapply as new candidates. This process involves issuing a new apprentice number and, if desired, allowing them to continue under the same supervisor, but with the status of a new applicant. M. Tiong noted that the regulation stipulates that any applicant who fails to retake and pass the required exams will forfeit their apprenticeship and must retake the entire exam. She mentioned that several applicants who have not reapplied to retake the exams are affected by this rule. M. Tiong recommended that since many applicants are reapplying to take the exams and the exams are written, the board could consider issuing apprenticeship licenses on a provisional basis. This would allow the applicants to begin their apprenticeship while awaiting their exam results. She suggested that if the board is willing to take this approach, it would be discussed further. A. Taitano proposed issuing a six-month apprentice permit to allow sufficient time for applicants to take the exam at least once. She raised concerns about coordinating the timing for the exam, particularly with the upcoming live testing, and sought			Unanimously Conditionally Approved for 3 Month Extension

Agenda Item	Discussion/Decision	Responsible party	Reporting time frame	Status
	<p>suggestions on how to determine the end date for the permit. She questioned whether to extend the current permits or issue new apprentice licenses. R. Santos responded that instead of extending permits, it would be more practical to keep the existing permits valid until the applicants receive their test results. This would provide grace to those who are already over the permitted apprenticeship duration according to the regulations.</p> <p>M. Tiong suggested that extending the apprentice permits could be an option since the regulation states that if an applicant does not retake and pass the exam, they will forfeit their apprenticeship and be required to retake the entire exam. She acknowledged that applicants would likely prefer to avoid retaking the full exam. Therefore, implementing an extension could motivate them to complete the exam requirements. This extension would encourage applicants to take the exam within a specified timeframe, helping to ensure they comply with the necessary regulations.</p> <p>M. Tiong recommended a three-month extension for apprentice permits, which she believes is reasonable. She noted that some candidates reapplying for exams and apprenticeships have held their licenses for over two years, with some extending back as far as ten years. According to the regulations, applicants who fail the exam a second time are required to enroll in a refresher course, which is not being mandated in this case since the exam is written. M. Tiong pointed out that apprentice licenses cannot be reissued without completion of required refresher courses. However, given that the board is granting an extension, it is hoped that candidates will use this opportunity seriously to pass the exam.</p> <p>J. Blas confirmed that the plan is to approve a three-month extension for the re-examination and the apprentice permit. He noted that this extension would be the final one, and the apprentices should be informed that their apprenticeship will no longer be valid after this period. A. Taitano agreed and added that the extension will be granted on a case-by-case basis. She emphasized that apprentices who have had their licenses for over two years, received multiple extensions, and attempted the re-examination several times should be given this three-month period. Taitano also stressed that further extensions will not be available for these candidates.</p> <p><i>Motion to Conditionally Approve for 3 Months Pending Passing of Examination: J. Blas: 2nd: R. Santos</i></p>			

Agenda Item		Discussion/Decision	Responsible party	Reporting time frame	Status
		7. Noel A. Moreno – Barber <i>Motion to Conditionally Approve for 3 Months Pending Passing of Examination: J. Blas:2nd: R. Santos</i>			Unanimously Conditionally Approved for 3 Month Extension
		8. Nhung Thi Tuyet Do – Manicurist <i>Motion to Approve: R. Santos: 2nd: M. Tiong.</i>			
		9. Emilia C. Antiquena – Manicurist <i>Motion to Conditionally Approve for 3 Months Pending Passing of Examination: R. Santos:2nd: J. Blas</i>			Unanimously Conditionally Approved for 3 Month Extension
		10. Joselito A. Moreno – Barber A. Taitano raised concerns about the eligibility of supervisors for barber apprentices Joselito A. Moreno and Luis Moreno. She questioned whether it is appropriate for a cosmetologist to supervise a barber apprentice, given that cosmetologists are not permitted to perform certain barbering services, such as straight razor shaving. A. Taitano noted that while the barber apprentices could perform haircuts under a cosmetologist, they would be unable to perform other barbering services that distinguish a barber from a cosmetologist. She suggested that if the board is comfortable with a cosmetologist supervising a barber apprentice, it should be clearly communicated to the apprentices that they are not permitted to perform straight razor shaving or other barber-specific services. This is due to the lack of proper supervision for these particular services. <i>Motion to Conditionally Approve for 3 Months Pending Passing of Examination: J. Blas:2nd: R. Santos</i>			Unanimously Conditionally Approved for 3 Month Extension
		11. Luis A. Moreno – Barber <i>Motion to Conditionally Approve for 3 Months Pending Passing of Examination: J. Blas:2nd: M. Tiong.</i>			Unanimously Conditionally Approved for 3 Month Extension
		12. Aichun Z. Villagomez – Manicurist <i>Motion to Conditionally Approve for 3 Months Pending Passing of Examination: J. Blas:2nd: M. Tiong.</i>			Unanimously Conditionally Approved for 3 Month Extension
		13. Akiko Reyes – Cosmetologist <i>Motion to Approve: J. Blas 2nd: R. Santos</i>			
		14. John Jherrel D. Lubas – Cosmetologist <i>Motion to Conditionally Approve for 3 Months Pending Passing of Examination: J. Blas:2nd: M. Tiong.</i>			Unanimously Conditionally Approved for

Agenda Item		Discussion/Decision	Responsible party	Reporting time frame	Status
					3 Month Extension
		15. Kianna Santos – Cosmetologis <i>Motion to Conditionally Approve for 3 Months Pending Passing of Examination: J. Blas:2nd: M. Tiong.</i>			Unanimously Conditionally Approved for 3 Month Extension
		16. Roel John S. Ojastro – Cosmetologist <i>Motion to Conditionally Approve for 3 Months Pending Passing of Examination: R. Santos:2nd: J. Blas</i>			Unanimously Conditionally Approved for 3 Month Extension
		C. Applications for Re-Examination			
		1. Ramon Miguel M. Meneses – Cosmetologist <i>Motion to Approve: J. Blas:2nd: M. Tiong</i>			Unanimously Approved
		2. Young S. Cho – Manicurist <i>Motion to Approve:</i>			Unanimously Approved
		3. Noel A. Moreno – Barber <i>Motion to Approve: J. Blas:2nd: R. Santos</i>			Unanimously Approved
		4. Nhung Thi Tuyet Do – Manicurist <i>Motion to Approve: R. Santos: 2nd: M. Tiong.</i>			Unanimously Approved
		5. Emilia C. Antiquena – Manicurist <i>Motion to Approve: R. Santos:2nd: J. Blas</i>			Unanimously Approved
		6. Joselito A. Moreno – Barber <i>Motion to Approve: J. Blas:2nd: R. Santos</i>			Unanimously Approved
		7. Luis A. Moreno – Barber <i>Motion to Approve: J. Blas:2nd: M. Tiong</i>			Unanimously Approved
		8. Dickie Do – Manicurist <i>Motion to Approve: J. Blas:2nd: M. Tiong</i>			Unanimously Approved
		9. Lan Thi Nguyen – Manicurist <i>Motion to Approve: J. Blas:2nd: M. Tiong</i>			Unanimously Approved
		10. Steven Ray M. Alvarez – Cosmetologist <i>Motion to Approve: J. Blas:2nd: R. Santos</i>			Unanimously Approved
		11. John Jherrel D. Lubas – Cosmetologist <i>Motion to Approve: J. Blas:2nd: M. Tiong</i>			Unanimously Approved
		D. Applications for Establishments			

Agenda Item		Discussion/Decision	Responsible party	Reporting time frame	Status
		1. Spa Ayualam Nikko – Change of Operator <i>Motion to Approve: J. Blas; 2nd: M. Tiong</i>			Unanimously Approved
		2. Atypical – New <i>Motion to Approve: M. Tiong; 2nd: R. Santos</i>			Unanimously Approved
		E. Special Japanese			
		1. Yuho I. Catapang <i>Motion to Approve: M. Tiong; 2nd: J. Blas</i>			Unanimously Approved
		F. Francine Galao F. Galao introduced herself and inquired about any updates regarding the practical examination from NIC since the last meeting. Z. Pecina responded that they are still awaiting information from NIC. She mentioned that a vendor handles the testing and results, and they will provide the data as soon as it becomes available. Z. Pecina assured that the information will be shared with F. Galao promptly to avoid any delays. F. Galao inquired about a tentative date or timeframe for the next practical exam. M. Tiong explained that the scheduling depends on the availability of examiners and the completion of their initial training. Once these details are finalized, they will reach out to the candidates to schedule their exams. M. Tiong noted that candidates will need to be given at least a month’s notice to prepare, so the practical exam will be scheduled with this advance notice in mind. F. Galao noted that the Prague website now includes Guam’s testing information and a link to NIC for available CIBs for various licenses. However, she observed that the Barber Stylist license was not listed among the available tests, which currently include Barber 1, No Chemical, Cosmetologist, Aesthetician, Instructor, and Nail Technician. She asked how the Barber Stylist examination could be added to the list. M. Tiong responded that the inclusion of the Barber Stylist examination depends on the training provided to the examiners. Once the examiners receive their training, which will cover the Barber Stylist exam, it will be added to the list of available tests. F. Galao mentioned that the Barber portion of the curriculum is currently being added and is pending approval. She expressed a desire for students to have the opportunity to apply for any of the three licenses, including Barber Stylist, to avoid the need to take separate exams for Cosmetology and Barber 1. She emphasized that it would be more efficient for students to take a single Barber Stylist exam instead of two different tests.			Noted

Agenda Item		Discussion/Decision	Responsible party	Reporting time frame	Status
		M. Tiong agreed and confirmed that the inclusion of the Barber Stylist exam would be addressed during examiner training. She assured that requesting the addition of this exam during training should not be a problem.			
VIII	NEXT BOARD MEETING	Next Scheduled Meeting: Monday, October 7, 2024 at 9:00am	GBBC	1038	Set Date
IX	ADJOURNMENT	<i>Motion to adjourn: M. Tiong; 2nd: J. Blas</i>	GBBC	1039	Adjourned

Minutes Drafted by: FLAME TREE Freedom Center, Inc.

Date Submitted:

Submitted by the GBBC Secretary:



Date:

10/14/24

Approved by the GBBC with or without changes:



Date:

10/14/24

Certified by or Attested by the Chairperson:

Date: