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EXAM COMMITTEE MEETING - Upon adjournment of the Education Committee Meeting

Agenda Item #1 - Call to Order and Establishment of a Quorum

Chair Kitman Chan (Chan) called the meeting to order and noted he was now chair of the committee. Roll was taken. Chan – present in Sacramento; Hsieh – absent; Shi – present in Sacramento; Aguinaldo – present in Los Angeles (joined the meeting late).

3-0 Quorum established.

Agenda Item #2 - Opening Remarks

Chair Chan did not have any opening remarks.
Agenda Item #3 - February 20, 2014 Exam Results Update

Executive Officer Terri Thorfinnson (EO Thorfinnson) presented the exam results. She noted the overall pass rate was 49%, first time test takers pass rate was 60%, and re-takers were 20%. Committee members had no comments.

A public comment was made regarding the exam results specific to a school; the commenter felt the numbers were incorrect and overall pass rates were inconsistent. A second commenter also was concerned about the pass rate.

Agenda Item #4 - Budget Change Proposal for Audit of NCCAOM Exam

This was an informational item only; Thorfinnson notified the committee she was seeking a budget change proposal for purposes of contracting for the audit of the NCCAOM exam. Member Aguinaldo asked why the budget change was necessary since the Legislature wanted the Board to move toward a national exam; Thorfinnson replied it was needed to plan in case the opportunity comes for a switch, and the BCP submission was needed before an upcoming deadline. Member Aguinaldo, for the record, disagreed with the budget change proposal and felt the audit was not needed.

Le Ondra Clark, from the Senate Business and Professions committee, addressed the issue and agreed with Member Aguinaldo. She added the Board can do the audit if it wished. There was additional discussion about the need for an audit; however since it was an informational item the Committee was not able to take a position on it.

There was no public comment on this item.

Agenda Item #5 - Cap on the Number of Times Repeat Test Takers Take CALE Policy Change

EO Thorfinnson provided some history on the re-taker issue. She noted the Committee had previous discussions on the issue with a little bit of consensus; however, there was no consensus exactly on the number of times that people should take it vis-a-vis the remedial training requirements. Member Shi recalled the issue has come up previously during Board meetings and that schools have spoken up in favor of some type of remedial work. He felt that five years of time with five fails of the exam as a limit would be a good starting point.

EO Thorfinnson asked the committee if it was in the Board's interest for public safety to require remedial education, or is it the five attempts with a five-time cap that protects the education and the public safety element? Member Aguinaldo felt it could be both. Member Shi felt it would be difficult to require all schools to have a similar remedial program and suggested the Board would not really have control over it; it would simply be guidance. He believed putting remediation as a requirement would mean the Board
would be on the hook for prescribing what that could entail; thus he did not feel the Board should impose such a requirement.

Thorfinnson felt there was more discussion needed on the issue. Chair Chan noted there was more information needed from the schools, specifically what appropriate Board action may be. Member Aguinaldo noted there seemed to be agreement that five re-takes of the exam in a five year time frame, but also felt there needed to be more input from the schools about remediation.

Public comment was taken on the item. One speaker felt a five year limit was arbitrary, but the remediation issue was a simple one. Another commenter disagreed with the five year limit. Another commenter suggested the committee make a recommendation to the Board to pursue legislation on the issue. Another commenter disagreed with the whole process of remediation, and additional comment was made regarding the overall problems with the CALE exam and concerns about the security of the exam.

The Committee decided to further discuss the issue at a future committee meeting, including the limit on home many times a person can retake the exam and the time length to do so.

**Agenda Item #6 - Future Agenda Items**

Several public comments were made urging a move to the NCCAOM exam as a future agenda item.

**Agenda Item #7 - Adjournment**

Committee adjourned.
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