



MEETING MINUTES

Registered Veterinary Technician Committee
July 20, 2010
Sacramento, California

1. Call to Order - Roll Call

Registered Veterinary Technician Committee (RVTC) Chair Virginia Curtis called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. RVTC Executive Officer Susan Geranen called roll; three members of the RVTC were present and thus a quorum was established.

Members Present

Virginia Curtis, Chair
Oscar Chavez, DVM
Craig Cornell, RVT
Tom Kendall, DVM, Veterinary Medical Board Liaison

Staff Present

Susan Geranen, Executive Officer, Veterinary Medical Board
Shela Barker, Legal Counsel
Ethan Mathes, Administrative Programs Coordinator
Liz Parker-Smith, Administrative Analyst

Guests Present

Alberto Aldrete, DVM, VASE
Nancy Ehrlich, RVT, California Registered Veterinary Technicians Association
Erica Eisenlauer, Department of Consumer Affairs
Alex Henderson, DVM, VASE
Nancy Linn, Office of Professional Examination Services
Sonja Merold, Office of Professional Examination Services

2. Approval of March 16, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Dr. Tom Kendall noted Linda Starr was the representing Veterinary Medical Board (Board) liaison at the March 16, 2010 Registered Veterinary Technician Committee (RVTC) Meeting.

- **Craig Cornell, RVT motioned and Dr. Oscar Chavez seconded the motion to approve the March 16, 2010 Meeting Minutes as amended.**
- **The motion carried 3-0.**

3. Examination Report

Ms. Geranen reported there was a delay in processing some of the Limited Term Eligibility Window (LTEW) applications due to fingerprinting issues so some candidates with approved applications have not yet taken the veterinary technician examination. All eligible LTEW applicants should have completed their testing by the end of the year.

A. OPES Report on Transition of RVT Exam to Veterinary Technician National Exam
B. Discuss Subject Matter Expert Selection Criteria

Sonja Merold and Nancy Linn from the Office of Professional Examination Services reported to the RVTC on the validation of the Veterinary Technician National Examination (VTNE). OPES coordinated two workshops of subject matter experts (SME) to compare the California Exam with the VTNE to determine whether the VTNE would be a viable examination for California to use for licensing. The recommendations of those two groups of SME's were that the examinations were comparable and California could use the VTNE as its licensing examination as long as it was administered with a law and jurisprudence examination.

Virginia Curtis, RVTC Chair, asked whether there was a need for an additional examination for the California specific RVT job tasks which could possibly be taken by candidates throughout the United States using an examination vendor and if needed who would develop such an examination. Nancy Linn remarked that the recommendation was only for an additional law examination and the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) could develop such an examination for the Board.

Nancy Ehrlich asked about the exclusion of instructors from participating as subject matter experts in California. She stated that while California prohibited instructors from participating as SMEs, the VTNE exam committee allowed them to participate in item writing. Ms. Linn responded that the concern in California was that it is a very small community and instructors could inadvertently teach to the examination. On a national level; there was less likelihood of that impacting the overall examination validity. Ms. Ehrlich asked about the selection of examination questions as a percentage of professional practice areas. The RVTC has developed examination guidelines based on percentage of practice areas from the occupational analysis. Ms. Linn pointed out the examination plan developed from the occupational analysis is the driver of any examination construction.

The RVTC and OPES discussed examination development methodology and whether the RVTC would be able to evaluate the end product of the California examination. Ms. Linn replied that the RVTC cannot evaluate the examination but that the examination plan serves as the checks and balances for the examination; the California examination and the VTNE are based solely on the respective examination plans.

Ms Geranen noted that although the RVTC members cannot participate in the examination workshops; the RVTC members are encouraged to participate in the selection of subject matter experts who serve to create the examination.

Based on the questions that surfaced during the meeting there was a consensus to gather additional information and bring the issue back for discussion at the next RVTC meeting.

4. Report on Legislative Intent of B & P Code section 4832(b)

Ms. Geranen reported that the genesis of "specific consideration" as noted in Business and Professions Code section 4832(b) was a product of the Legislature having sunset the RVTC as a separate legislative committee and recreated it as an advisory committee to the Board. The Legislature desired to protect the RVTC by mandating that the Board give specific consideration to its recommendations. The RVTC was concerned whether its issues would be acted on when it was created in legislation as an advisory committee by the Legislature.

5. Discussion Items

A. Update on Proposed Legislation for 2010 – AB 1980

Ms. Geranen updated that Assembly Bill (AB) 1980 is moving forward in the review process as there is no fiscal impact. The RVTC discussed the musculoskeletal manipulation provision statute and the RVTC expiration and title protection in AB 1980.

B. Update on Proposed Regulations

Ms. Geranen reported the Board's fee regulation package has been held up by the Consumer Protection Agency due to concern about the Board's fund reserve levels. The fee regulations will be sent back to the Board to update the fee schedules, publish a 15-day notice and hold a teleconference to discuss the changes to the regulation.

C. School Inspections Criteria – CCR section 2065.7

Ms. Geranen reported school inspections and other administrative duties are on hold due to inadequate staffing. Dr. Chavez asked about staff drafting a warning letter to deficient schools. Staff will look into drafting a warning letter.

6. Agenda Items and Next Meeting Dates

Proposed agenda items for the November 16, 2010 Meeting:

Update on transition to national veterinary technician examination
Discuss candidate cost impact from transition to national veterinary technician examination
Examination committee appointments
Update on legislation/regulations
Review Board feedback on school approval regulatory language

7. Comments from Public/Outside Agencies/Associations

There were no comments from public/outside agencies/associations.

8. Adjourn

- **Craig Cornell, RVT motioned and Dr. Oscar Chavez seconded the motion to adjourn.**
- **The motion carried 3-0.**

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.