



**ACUPUNCTURE BOARD
EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING
APPROVED MEETING MINUTES
January 17, 2014**

**Department of Consumer Affairs
1625 North Market Blvd., First Floor Hearing Room
Sacramento, CA 95834**

**Teleconference Meeting Location:
Jeannie Kang, L.Ac., Licensed Member
Jamie Zamora, Public Member
Ronald Reagan State Building
300 South Spring Street, Auditorium
Los Angeles, CA 95834**

Education Committee Members

*Michael Shi, L.Ac, Chair, Licensed Member
Kitman Chan, Vice Chair, Public Member
Francisco Hsieh, Public Member
Jeannie Kang, L.Ac, Licensed Member
Jamie Zamora, Public Member*

Staff Present

Terri Thorfinnson, Executive Officer
Ben Bodea, Education Coordinator
Katie Le, Office Technician
Spencer Walker, Legal Counsel

EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING - 9:00 a.m.

1. Call to Order and Establishment of a Quorum

Chair Michael Shi (Shi), Committee Members Kitman Chan (Chan) and Francisco Hsieh (Hsieh) present in Sacramento. Committee Members Jeannie Kang (Kang) and Jamie Zamora (Zamora) present in Los Angeles. 5-0 Quorum established.

2. Opening Remarks

Chair Shi welcomed everyone to the meeting.

3. (Moved up) Review and recommendation for school approval application for Arizona School: Phoenix Institute of Herbal Medicine and Acupuncture (PIHMA)

Chair Shi moved this item up and noted PIHMA's application was previously discussed at the October 25, 2013 Board meeting and referred back to committee. EO Terri Thorfinnson (Thorfinnson) noted during the site visit they found that the school was a good program with good resources, educational environment and curriculum. She also noted they had a few noncompliance issues which were fixed. Education Coordinator Ben Bodea (Bodea) further laid out several issues which were fixed, including clinic



issues, faculty handbooks, and curriculum issues. He finished by saying the school was in compliance with Acupuncture Board (Board) regulations.

MOTION: Member Chan moved to approve to PIHMA as an approved school. Member Hsieh seconded. Vote: Shi – Yes; Chan – Yes; Hsieh – Yes; Kang – Yes; Zamora – Yes. **MOTION PASSES 5-0.**

Jonathon Lindsey from PIHMA thanked the Board for the approval of their school. No other public comment was made.

4. Review and recommendation for school approval application for New York school: New York Chiropractic College Finger Lakes School of Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine (NYCC)

EO Thorfinnson noted the NYCC campus and faculty was impressive; however there were some deficiencies. NYCC did submit some corrective action to the Board but that did not address all the issues and thus the school remains out of compliance. Bodea reported that their clinic was licensed under New York law, not California, and the supervision of clinical interns was not consistent. He further stated that the issues were addressed with NYCC but they indicated they would not address the issues to provide the supervision California regulations require. He also detailed further curriculum requirements which did not match California's regulations but they were able to correct those issues. As a result of choosing to not bring their clinical supervision requirements into compliance with Board regulations, staff recommended denial of the application.

Member Zamora asked about the school coming into compliance; Bodea answered that he was under the impression NYCC would address the supervision issue, but their final letter stated they could not accommodate such a change financially. Dave Willard, from NYCC, explained that while they were appreciative of the Board and the staff visit, school administration faculty went back and reviewed the process and concluded that what they do is different from what is required by California regulation. He felt it does provide a rigorous and appropriate learning experience and educational process for their students. He concluded by saying NYCC would like to be approved by California, but understood it was not in the cards at this point.

MOTION: Member Chan made a motion to deny NYCC's application to become an approved school. Member Hsieh seconded. Vote: Shi – Yes; Chan – Yes; Hsieh – Yes; Kang – Yes; Zamora – Yes. **MOTION PASSES 5-0.**

Public comment was made pointing out the issue of clinic supervision may be a new interpretation on the part of the Board. EO Thorfinnson pointed out the regulation on supervision is not a new one, and Bodea also noted back in 2011 the Board was enforcing the regulation, to the surprise of some schools.

5. The number of continuing education providers (Policy Discussion)

CALIFORNIA ACUPUNCTURE BOARD

1747 North Market Boulevard, Suite 180, Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 515-5200 FAX (916) 928-2204 www.acupuncture.ca.gov



Bodea reviewed the number of CE providers in California; there are roughly 850 providers for about 11,000 active acupuncturists. He also noted there were 60 to 70 providers a year being added, with most of them offering distance education courses. Chair Shi felt the numbers were a little out of whack and wanted to look into how to better manage the process. Member Kang felt the CE providers fees needed to be increased, and a discussion needed to be had on the types of courses that the Board approves.

Chair Shi asked about the fees for CE providers. Bodea replied that the fee is currently \$150.00 for a two year period at which point they must renew again. In that time, providers are allowed to submit as many courses for review as they wish as long as they are current on the CE Provider fee. He also noted there is also no real qualification of providers. The qualification review comes down to the application itself. Member Kang asked Bodea about the process to weed out unsound providers. Bodea replied the use of Subject Matter Experts and increasing staff was critical.

Public comment was made. A commenter felt it was not the Board's role to be concerned with the number of providers or reduction of that number. He felt there needed be analysis of the costs involved.

The Committee agreed there was need for a study on charging a per-course CE fee. EO Thorfinnson said there would need to be some research done and a workload analysis on the issue, and that she would examine the fees that support the CE workload function. Chair Shi referred the issue back to staff to study the cost structure for provider approval, course approval, and review. Member Hsieh asked how long it might take to research the issue, and Chair Shi replied he'd like to see it at the next meeting.

Public comment was made in support of finding limits for web-based coursework and also whether there is a need to change that.

6. Future Agenda Items

Public comment was made asking the Committee to address the issue of accreditation.

7. Adjournment

Committee adjourned at 11:31am.

THE AGENDA, AS WELL AS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES, CAN BE FOUND ON THE ACUPUNCTURE BOARD'S WEBSITE: www.acupuncture.ca.gov