

**South Carolina Board of Cosmetology
Board Meeting
10:00 a.m., May 12, 2014
Synergy Business Park
Kingtree Building
110 Centerview Drive, Conference Room 105
Columbia, South Carolina 29211**

Meeting Called to Order

Public notice of this meeting was properly posted at the S. C. Board of Cosmetology office, Synergy Business Park, Kingtree Building and provided to all requesting persons, organizations, and news media in compliance with Section 30-4-80 of the South Carolina Freedom of Information Act.

Pledge of Allegiance

Rules of the Meeting Read by the Chairman

Introduction of Board Members:

Chairperson Melanie Thompson called the regular meeting of the Board of Cosmetology to order. Other Board members for the meeting included, Cindy Rodgers, Janice Curtis, Selena Brown, Stephanie Nye, Eddie Jones, and Pattie Walters.

Staff Members Participating in the Meeting:

Mary League, Advice Counsel; Roz Bailey-Glover, Theresa Richardson, Administrator; Matteah Taylor, Bridget Richardson, Staff; Cecelia P. Englert, Court Reporter, Yolanda Rodgers, OIE, Robbie Boland, OIE, and Andrew Rogers, OGC.

All Other Persons Attending:

Gloria Smith, Dung Nguyen, Lu Tran, Ton My Hoa, Karen Stacks, Cristal Wells, Diane Malony, Carroll Bonner, Chesley Phillips, Jack Clark, Nrk Foong, Colleen Large, Kevin Morrow, Steven Dawson, Kate Shelton, Shanita Brown, Angie Shuler, Lethonia Barnes, Linda Green, Alan Ray, Cynthia Blocker, Muranda Ragin, Pat Oberhausen, and Brooke Holliday.

Approval of Excused Absences:

Approval of minutes for March 17, 2014 and March 18, 2014

MOTION:

Ms. Curtis made a motion to approve the minutes for March 17, 2014 with corrections. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

MOTION:

Ms. Curtis made a motion to approve the minutes for March 18, 2014 with corrections. Ms. Brown seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Approval of the Agenda:

MOTION:

Ms. Curtis made a motion to approve the agenda with any deviations. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Administrator’s Remarks – Theresa Richardson:

Hearing Officer/Hearing Procedure – Mary League

Ms. Thompson agreed to be the Hearing Officer for the disciplinary matters so that Board meetings would not be exceptionally long due to hearings and to help eliminate the back log of cases. The Hearing Officer is responsible to hear the matters and issue a ruling that would be appealable to the Administrative Law Court which is a final order. Ms. League stated the procedure has to be revised because additional individuals may be asked to serve as Hearing Officers to assist Ms. Thompson. Ms. League asked the Board to consider the procedures to be revised as the disciplinary matters are heard by the Hearing Officer. The recommendations will be presented to the entire Board. The disciplinary matters would then come before the full Board for a final order which would serve as the final step and may be appealed to the Administrative Law Court. A final order hearing is an appeal, additional testimonies will not be heard. There will not be another hearing; however, both parties will have the opportunity to explain why they agree or disagree with the Hearing Officer’s recommendation. The Board will then give the fine/sanctions as recommended by the Hearing Officer. Ms. Rodgers wanted more time to think about the new process. Ms. Thompson explained the next hearing date is scheduled for June and there are no hearings scheduled for July and August because there were conflicts with schedules. Depending on which Board member is asked to step in and help, Ms. Thompson can wait until the July Board meeting. Ms. Thompson asked would the Hearing Officer be able to make decisions on cases independently that are not too detailed and then make a recommendation on the really detailed cases. Ms. League stated it would be better to have procedures in place for the Hearing Officer, who initially hears the cases, then the cases may be appealed to the full Board for a final order hearing. The procedure would be: 1) Recommendation from the Hearing Officer will be given to the full Board. The Board will receive the full record. 2) The Board will determine if the hearing officer’s recommendations are acceptable or if the recommendations must be modified. 3) A final decision will be determined if sanctions are appropriate. The final order hearing decision may be appealed to the Administrative Law Court. Mr. Andrew Rogers explained the final order hearing does not generally take a lot of time away from the Board meeting. The recommendation would be presented by a member of OGC not the Hearing Officer. The Board has the opportunity to read through the recommendation and the transcript if desired. Discussion ensued regarding who would be the Hearing Officer or what body of people would this Hearing Officer would come from. Ms. Thompson replied either from the Board or from other recommendations. Ms. Thompson further stated this process needs to be settled so this person as the Hearing Officer can be voted on at the July’s Board meeting.

MOTION:

Ms. Curtis made the motion to accept the procedures presented by Ms. League. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

2014 1st USC Quarterly Report – Kate Shelton:

Kate Shelton with USC appeared before the Board to discuss and answer questions regarding the 2014 CEU 1st Quarter Report. Discussion included but was not limited to “what does open mean in the reports”. Ms Shelton explained the packets reflected as open had not been received. Also

there was discussion regarding cancelled classes. Ms. Shelton stated when the Continuing Education and Conference staff reached out to the providers they were informed the classes either did not have anyone to sign up or no one showed up for the class. Ms. Curtis asked about the classes that were pending due to monetary discrepancy: “processing refund to client and balance due to client”. Ms. Shelton explained the CE providers, provide USC with a verification of attendance (VOA) form for each licensee that attended their class. Once the staff at UCS goes over the VOAs and the count is either over or short of the paid amount the provider is contacted with a letter of explanation and if the provider has overpaid a check is sent back to the provider. The Board asked, “Are there habitual offenders on the length of time providing the packets to USC?” Ms. Shelton stated she has not taken an audit to compare. A list of the habitual offenders can be compiled whenever the Board wants. Ms. Curtis stated she has an attached e-mail from Ms. Taylor asking who the letter should come from pertaining to the late submissions and other problems and when should the letter be sent to the providers. Ms. League stated she previously drafted a letter to the providers, but would the Board like to draft a letter, or would they like staff to do the letters and how often? What are the guidelines and how often would the Board like for the letters to be mailed? Ms. Curtis stated she would like for the letters to go out quarterly but that would be left up to the Board. Ms. League asked how far after the 14-day submission would the Board like for the CE providers to receive the letters. Ms. Thompson stated her recommendation would be on the 16th day. Ms. Thompson asked how the comments are selected. Ms. Shelton explained the staff has been asked to summarize the comments. If comments are made multiple times the staff is asked to only put that comment once. These comments are not randomly selected. If there is a negative comment that comment is submitted. Ms. Thompson stated the negative comments are needed especially during the CE review sessions. Ms. Shelton stated if there are any specifics the Board would like to see please feel free to let USC know and they will make sure that is listed. The evaluations are maintained for 1-year. The VOAs are kept longer.

MOTION:

Ms. Curtis made a motion that the letters go out to the CE providers once they are late 16-days of submitting their packets to USC. Ms. Rodgers seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Financial Monthly Report:

Ms. Thompson stated she understands finance and the Director have been meeting about the budget. Ms. Thompson stated she was under the impression through the meetings that were held it was to suggest improvements of the budget but instead it appears the budget is going further and further in the negative. Since a renewal has come and gone why hasn't there been an improvement? Ms. Rodgers stated she would like someone to explain the budget to the Board because of the continuous negative balance, since Granicus was taken away, fleet cars were taken away from inspectors, and we've been short staffed.

OIE Report – Yolanda Rodgers:

Yolanda Rodgers reported between January 1, 2014 through May 5, 2014 were a total of 57 cases, 27 of which are active investigations, 1 closed case, 17 do not open cases, 1 pending Board action, and 11 pending IRC. As of May 5, 2014 there are 28 active cases. As of May 12, 2014 there are 78 closed cases and 18 do not open cases. Ms. Thompson asked where did the 78 closed cases and the 18 do not open cases come from? Ms. Rodgers explained the 78 closed

cases and the 18 do not open cases are from previous cases. Ms. Curtis asked does the 18 do not open cases include 17 do not open cases? Ms. Rodgers explained that was correct and this report is only reflected from January 1, 2014 through May 5, 2014. The total of 96 cases are prior to the dates of January 1, 2014 through May 5, 2014.

IRC Report – Yolanda Rodgers:

Yolanda Rodgers reported there is not an IRC report for this past quarter. Ms. Thompson asked why? Mr. Andrew Rogers explained it was his understanding that cases were still being investigated and processed by OIE which makes them not ready for an IRC. There was an IRC meeting held on March 11, 2014. At this time 6 cases were moved forward and some were reverted back to investigations which are to be heard at the June 2, 2014 IRC meeting. Within those 6 cases, 2 were recommended for dismissal, 2 were recommended for dismissal with a cease and desist, and 2 were a formal complaint. Ms. Curtis asked are the cases that are dismissed with cease and desist is there a follow-up to make sure of the cease and desist. Ms. Rodgers stated there isn't a follow-up.

MOTION:

Ms. Curtis made a motion to accept the IRC report. Ms. Rodgers seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

OGC Report – Andrew Rogers:

Andrew Rogers reported the Board recently received the citation authority and 100 citations have been issued which is over 1/3 of the 268 open cases in OGC. If a respondent objects to the citation they will be scheduled for a citation appeal hearing. The issuance of the citations should be a reduction in OGC's case load. There are 2 pending drafted CAs, 19 pending drafted formal complaints, 89 pending attorney review cases, 17 pending CA/MOAs, 9 pending board action cases, 11 pending hearings, 3 pending final order hearings, 9 pending final orders/closures, 3 appeals, these 3 cases are awaiting review from the ALC judge, 4 cases have been rescheduled, 1 pending IRC, 1 OGC action and since March 15, 2014 there have been 40 cases to be closed. There are a number of hearings scheduled through-out the year with the exceptions of July and August. The citation authority is a good thing for the licensees as well as the Board because it is a faster turn-around for the licensees to know what their fines are and it frees the Board from having a backlog in hearings.

The report was accepted as information.

Inspection Report – Robbie Boland:

Mr. Boland reported for the month of February there were 356 salons inspected and 5 schools, March there were 474 salons inspected and 7 schools, April there were 433 salons inspected and 12 schools. The total amount of salons inspected to date was 3,911 and 82 schools. Mr. Boland pointed out that another report would be coming to the Board for information only which contained the amount of citation issued. In February there were 19 citations issued and the inspectors are issuing citations strictly by the Board's resolution guidelines. Ms. Thompson asked how many salons are licensed through-out the state. Mr. Boland replied roughly about 5,400.

The report was accepted as information.

New Board Members – Mr. Eddie Jones and Ms. Patricia Walters

Ms. Thompson introduced the 2 new board members, Mr. Eddie Jones and Ms. Patricia Walters.

MOTION:

Ms. Nye made a motion to take a break. Ms. Curtis seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Ms. Thompson called the meeting back to order.

Old Business:

There was none.

New Business:

Clarification of Salon Manager – Aiken Bridges Attorneys at Law for McLeod Medical Center
The letter to appear before the Board was sent May 5th to Aiken Bridges Attorneys at Law. No one appeared to represent them.

Review for Consideration of Continuing Education Changes/Additions

Hair Matters – Cynthia Blocker

Ms. Blocker appeared before the Board to add 3 instructors and 1 guest speaker. Ms. Thompson asked at which classes Mr. Woods would be the guest speaker. Ms. Blocker was not sure of the class dates but she stated Mr. Woods would be speaking in 2 of her 12 classes and he would not exceed 2 hours. Ms. Curtis asked was “Against the Grain” a book that Mr. Woods had written. Ms. Blocker explained “Against the Grain” is a book that was written by Mr. Woods and it is very motivational and inspirational.

MOTION:

Ms. Brown made a motion to approve the 4 changes. Ms. Curtis seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

PCES – Alan Ray

Mr. Ray appeared before the Board to change the location of his classes dated for October 13th and October 27th to the Wingate in Lexington, SC.

MOTION:

Ms. Curtis made a motion to approve the 2 changes for the location to the Wingate in Lexington. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Nails, Skin & Hair of America – Chesley Phillips

Ms. Phillips requested to change the classes scheduled for June 29th and June 30th from the Hilton Gardens Inn in Anderson to the Holiday Inn in Anderson. Ms. Phillips requested for the August 24th and 25th as well as the November 9th and 10th classes to be changed to a different

location which is beyond her control due to a letter received from the Hilton Gardens Inn Hotel in Rock Hill stating they were unable to fulfill the needs of Nails, Skin & Hair of America.

MOTION:

Ms. Rodgers made a motion to approve the 2 class changes from the Hilton Gardens Inn to the Holiday Inn. Ms. Curtis seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

MOTION:

Ms. Rodgers made a motion to approve the Hotel change for August 24th, August 25th, November 9th, and November 10th from the Hilton Gardens Inn to the Holiday Inn in Rock Hill which will not affect the 5 changes for Nails, Skin & Hair of America due it being out of Ms. Phillips control. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

SC Esthetics – Colleen Large

Ms. Large appeared before the Board to notify the Board of the scheduled class for April 7th was canceled due to no attendees.

MOTION:

There was not a motion made but the Board thanked Ms. Large for the notification.

B I G – Karen Stacks

Ms. Stacks appeared before the Board to change the date of September 15th and September 16th which is a Monday and Tuesday. Ms. Stacks wishes to change these classes to September 14th and September 15th which are Sunday and Monday. The class location is the same; although, it should be specified as 1 Park Way E at the Greenville Marriott. Ms. Stacks would also like to add 2 shows: 1) SHB International Hair Show & Expo in Charlotte, NC on June 29th & 30th and 2) Bronner Brother Hair Show in Atlanta, GA on August 2nd – August 4th.

MOTION:

Ms. Curtis made a motion to approve the date changes and location clarification. Ms. Rodgers seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

MOTION:

Ms. Brown made a motion to approve the SHB International Hair Show & Expo in Charlotte, NC on June 29th and 30th. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

MOTION:

Ms. Curtis made a motion to approve the Bronner Brother's Hair Show with the removal of V-Lash and Taliah Waajid which are products. Ms. Brown seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

ACE- Angie Shuler

Ms. Shuler stated she is not appearing before the Board to request a change for ACE but as a facilitator for CEA Annual Convention. The CEA Annual Convention will be held in Hollywood, Florida on July 25th – July 28th.

MOTION:

Ms. Curtis made a motion to approve the CEA Annual Convention to count towards continuing education credit for South Carolina licensees that will attend. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

ACSP – Linda Green

Ms. Green appeared before the Board to cancel the internal workshop on August 17th which is an additional educational class outside of the regular continuing education classes and it is for ACSP trainers.

MOTION:

There was not a motion made but the Board thanked Ms. Green for the notification.

Review for Consideration of Invalid Hours – Elizabeth Emerson

Ms. Taylor informed the Board Ms. Emerson’s attorney asked to postpone Ms. Emerson’s appearance until the July’s Board meeting.

MOTION:

Ms. Curtis made a motion to defer Ms. Emerson until July. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

MOTION:

Ms. Rodgers made a motion to break for lunch. Ms. Curtis seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Ms. Thompson called the meeting back to order.

Review for Consideration of Licensure with Another Board’s Order – Cristal Wells

Ms. Wells appeared before the Board because she has a previous order with the Board of Nursing. Ms. Wells stated she voluntarily surrendered her license with the Nursing Board and she thought the matter surrounding her license had been resolved due to her surrendering the nursing license. Ms. Richardson explained Ms. Wells’ status is still under voluntary surrender which means the situation has not been resolved. Ms. Wells surrendered her nursing license in February of 2014. Ms. Wells had a nursing license in North Carolina as well as South Carolina. Ms. Thompson asked for an explanation of the reason why Ms. Wells’ voluntarily surrendered her nursing license. Ms. Wells explained there was a discrepancy with her nursing transcript. Ms. Thompson asked what was the discrepancy with Ms. Wells’ transcript. Ms. Wells explained the transcript she submitted from a nursing school was a legitimate transcript but it was not hers. Ms. Wells was asked when she graduated from cosmetology school. Ms. Wells believes she graduated from cosmetology school in 2004. Ms. Rodgers asked what cosmetology school was attended. Ms. Wells stated she attended Florence-Darlington Tech. Ms. Brown asked Ms. Wells if she had a nursing license in Georgia. Ms. Wells answered yes but she did not remember about having her nursing license in Georgia. Ms. Thompson asked Ms. Wells to start over and give the Board the states as well as the years of the license she obtained. In 2000 Ms. Wells received her LPN license in South Carolina, in 2006 the RN license was received in North Carolina, and in 2007 Ms. Wells received her Georgia license. Ms. Wells stated between obtaining her nursing

license she always wanted to be a cosmetologist which is why she attended cosmetology school in 2004. Ms. Wells got into trouble with the law in 2008. Ms. Wells stated she was Power of Attorney of an elderly lady and when she died Ms. Wells was supposed to finish paying for her funeral and she did not. Ms. Curtis asked if there was any time served and what was the reason. Ms. Wells stated she was charged with Breach of Trust and served 9 months in jail. Ms. Wells stated she committed food stamp fraud. She explained she was working and getting food stamps at the same time. Ms. Wells stated she is on probation until she completes her restitution. Ms. Wells stated she is no longer on probation for what she served time for. She was placed on probation for a tax evasion. The maximum probation is 5 years and until she pays back a sum of \$10,000 restitution. Ms. Wells explained she was also charged with identity theft because she used a tax identification number that she received instead of her social security number to work.

MOTION:

Ms. Brown made a motion to enter into executive session for legal advice. Ms. Rodgers seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Ms. Thompson called the meeting back to order.

During executive session no motions were made and no votes taken.

Ms. Thompson stated Mr. Jones recued himself during executive session from all discussion because when the application process began he was the Board's Administrator.

MOTION:

Ms. Walters made a motion to deny Ms. Wells a Cosmetology license due to the information that was made available to the Board including Ms. Wells' testimony. Ms. Rodgers seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Review for Consideration of Licensure with an Apprenticeship Background – Grace Phillips

MOTION:

Ms. Rodgers made a motion to deny due to Ms. Phillips being a no show. Ms. Brown seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Review for Consideration of Reinstatement with a Previous Board Order –

Ton My Hoa

Ms. Hoa appeared before the Board to request the Reinstatement of her Nail Technician license which lapsed March 10, 2009. Ms. Hoa was supposed to appear before the Board in January 2014 but at the time of the Board appearance Ms. Hoa already had a trip scheduled to return to Vietnam. Ms. Hoa explained when she returned to the states she found out from an inspector about her license being expired and that she was required to re-take the examination.

MOTION:

Ms. Rodgers made a motion to enter into executive session for legal advice. Ms. Curtis seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

MOTION:

Ms. Curtis made a motion to come back from executive session. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

During executive session no motions were made and no votes taken.

MOTION:

Ms. Curtis made motion to approve Ms. Hoa to take both portions of the examination for reinstatement of her Nail Technician license. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Dung Nguyen

Ms. Nguyen appeared before the Board to request the reinstatement of her Nail Technician license. Ms. Nguyen is currently licensed in Georgia since 1997. Ms. Nguyen's South Carolina license was initially licensed June 13, 2007 and expired March 10, 2009.

MOTION:

Ms. Curtis made a motion to enter into executive session for legal advice. Ms. Rodgers seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

MOTION:

Ms. Rodgers made a motion to come out of executive session. Ms. Brown seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

During executive session no motions were made and no votes taken.

MOTION:

Ms. Nye made a motion to approve Ms. Nguyen's licensure by endorsement. Ms. Brown seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Review for Consideration of Endorsement with Background Check – Lu Ba Huy Tran

Mr. Tran appeared before the Board to request licensure by endorsement. Mr. Tran currently has a Nail Technician license in North Carolina since 2000. Mr. Tran allowed a friend to stay in his home and in 2003 the friend was arrested for drug distribution and since it was Mr. Tran's home he was charged with conspiracy. Mr. Tran served 3 years from 2004 to May 2007 and was required to pay restitution of \$14,000 to \$16,000. Mr. Tran stated he was required to pay restitution because he received the benefits of the drug sales.

MOTION:

Ms. Curtis made a motion to approve licensure for Mr. Tran as a Nail Technician. Ms. Rodgers seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Review for Consideration of School Contract Changes –Virginia College

Nick Pooi Hong Foong appeared before the Board representing Virginia College. Virginia College is proposing 3 changes to become student friendly. The first change is for both the day and evening classes to be held Monday – Friday. The day classes are being held Tuesday – Saturday and the evening classes are held Monday – Friday. The second change is for financial aid. Virginia College is currently requesting 3 payments from the students and the change would be for 4 payments, which will allow the students to receive funding to pay the tuition quicker. The third change is the pre-requisite requirements which will allow the students to possibly place the course of studies on hold until the electives are completed. Ms. Diane Maloney from Virginia College assisted with explaining the payment change. For the first 900 hours the payments are divided into 2 payments. The remaining 600 hours of the payments are divided into 2 payments. Currently the Federal student aid is funded at 1-500 hours, then 501-1000 hours and from 1001-1500 hours. This aspect proposal is to help the college to obtain financial aid sooner. Pell Grants are paid by the amount of hours completed. The Pell Grant funding will be paid at 1 hour, 451 hours, 901 hours and 1201 hours which are the 4 payment schedules.

MOTION:

Ms. Rodgers made a motion to approve all 3 changes that Virginia College has proposed. Ms. Brown seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Review for Consideration of School Admission Process – Kenneth Shuler (Steven Dawson)

Mr. Dawson appeared before the Board to discuss the 10-day admission process, which was created about 12 – 14 years ago. This program was created because one of their schools had a low enrollment rate and the accrediting agency was not pleased with that. Research was conducted and it was found that students were dropping out the first few weeks of school. The 10-day program was then created so students would be able to make a decision if Kenneth Shuler School would be the right fit for them. Students have to complete an application and submit the non-refundable \$100 application fee, which starts a trial period and allows the students to sit in the classroom and get the basic fundamentals of the program they are interested in. The students are not charged for books, kits, or materials. At the 10th day the students decide if Kenneth Shuler is the school for them and an enrollment packet is completed and sent to LLR. This program has significantly improved Kenneth Shuler’s enrollment ratings. Kenneth Shuler has a 10-day agreement and the LLR inspector feels that the agreement is a contract but the students are not under any obligations during the 10-day trial period. Although, the students are not officially enrolled, hours are recorded because they are in attendance. If the students decide to officially enroll the hours received are compiled and submitted with the hours received after enrollment. If the student decides not to enroll they have not paid for any of the hours received during their 10-day trial period. The Department of Education recognizes the 10-day trial period and this letter has been published June 7, 2011 as the “Dear Colleague Letter”. A trial period is favorable as federal funds would not be immediately drawn for a student who may otherwise withdraw within a short period of time. Ms. Thompson stated the Board is not debating the trial period but she is interested in what role the Board plays in the contractual agreement. Ms. Thompson stated she doesn’t understand how the hours received in those 10-day can be calculated into the hours after enrollment.

MOTION:

Ms. Rodgers made a motion to go into executive session for legal advice. Ms. Curtis seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

MOTION:

Ms. Curtis made a motion to come out of executive session. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

During executive session no motions were made and no votes taken.

CLAIFICATION STATEMENT:

Ms. Curtis made the following statement regarding Kenneth Shuler contracts/agreements with students. The Board does not recognize a 10-day contract/agreement and such contract must be approved by the Board. The clarification was agreed upon by the full Board. The Board must approve any written contract a school has.

Review for Consideration of New School Opening – Union County Career and Technology Center

Mr. Morrow appeared before the Board requesting approval of the new Post-Secondary program opening. Mr. Morrow is looking to have the program opened August of 2014.

MOTION:

Ms. Curtis made a motion to approve Union County Career and Technology Center. Ms. Rodgers seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Discussion

There were no discussions.

Public Comments

Ms. Colleen Large expressed her opinion about the CE comments USC sends to the Board members. Ms. Large was under the impression that all comments were being submitted to the Board members. If only the bad comments are being presented and only a few good comments the Board members may not get the full picture of each continuing education class.

Mr. Steven Dawson also expressed his opinion about the comments USC sends the Board members. Mr. Dawson thought it might be a good idea to have a number beside the comments to indicate how many people made the same comment.

Adjournment – 4:31pm

MOTION:

Ms. Curtis made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Rodgers seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.