



APPROVED MINUTES

Of the Practice Task Force Meeting
Wednesday, March 25, 2009
13445 Glenoaks Boulevard
Sylmar, CA 91342
(818) 8333-6453

1624 North Market Blvd., Trinity Room (S-307)
Sacramento, CA 95834
Dial in #: (866) 443-7569
Participant Code: 1112

350 Los Ranchitos Road
San Rafael, CA 94903
(415) 499-4053

60740 Dillon Road
Whitewater, CA 92282
(760) 329-1282

School Representatives

Chuck Jordan (GDA)
Kathy Kelly, (GDB)
Bob Wendler (GDD)

Guest

Frank Welte, California Council of the Blind (CCB)

Executive Officer

Antonette Sorrick

Board Staff

Susan Cox

Legal Counsel

Albert Balingit

AGENDA

1. Chair Welcome and Roll Call – (A. Sorrick/C. Jordan)
Executive Officer Sorrick welcomed all participants to the conference and began the meeting at 10:06 AM. Chairperson, Lyons was not present. Executive Officer Sorrick asked Representative Jordan to act as Sub-Chair and conduct roll call for the meeting.
2. Regulatory Discussion
 - A. Section 2276
 - a. Amendment decreasing the number of hours required for first time and repeat guide dog students.
Executive Officer Sorrick read current and recommended Task Force language for Section 2276 (Instruction). The Board recommendation to the Task Force was then expressed to include tasking the Task Force with including language that

would address a minimum number of hours of theory to be taught. Representative Kelly expressed this change in regulation was sparked from a desire to define instruction, individualize instruction, allow for more one-on-one instruction, make the state language consistent with international standards and make the language more relevant due to a reduction in instructor-to-student ratios. Representative Jordan expressed a need for 20 hours of theory for first timers and 15 hours of theory for students training with successor dogs. Representative Kelly thought it better to set the minimum theory at 10 hours regardless of experience with a guide dog. Representative Jordan expressed concern at the ten hour figure. After some discussion, the Task Force agreed to amend the first line to read as follows:

Clients training with their first guide dogs must receive concurrent instruction consisting of a minimum of 15 hours theory and a minimum 30 hours practical in-harness spread over a two to four week period under the supervision of a licensed instructor.

The Task Force agreed to amend the second line to read as follows:

Clients training with successor guide dogs must receive concurrent instruction consisting of a minimum of 10 hours theory and 20 hours practical in-harness under the supervision of a licensed instructor.

The third and fourth lines would continue to read as follows:

The training must be individualized and there is no maximum training time within which the team must achieve safe and effective guide dog mobility.

Instruction must be conducted in the most appropriate venue(s) depending on client need and may be in-residence, in-home or a combination of both.

Task Force Vote: Representative Kelly made the motion to adopt the recommended language as written. Representative Jordan seconded the motion. Motion passed.

- B. Section 2282.1 (Required Training for Guide Dogs – (All)
 - b. Practice Task Force discussion on whether the required training for guide dogs needed to be addressed or amended to be current with standards of practice.

Executive Officer Sorrick read the current language of Section 2282.1. The Task Force made no recommendations to amend this regulation. Legal Counsel Balingit recommended that Executive Officer do a side-by-side comparison of International Guide Dog Federation (IGDF) standards versus the current regulatory language. Executive Officer Sorrick proposed a standardized form for each of the three schools to use that would identify regulatory competencies if the competencies laid out in

Section 2282.1 had been met. A draft of said form will be available for the Task Force to review at the next meeting.

Executive Officer Sorrick will create a side-by-side comparison document between Section 2282.1 and the IGDF guide dog training standards.

3. Statutory Discussion –

A. Business and Professions Code, Section 7210.7 (In-Home Training)

- a. To allow schools to provide in-home training regardless of the guide dog users' experience and even to first time users.
- b. To delete the requirement that allows in-home training only for special circumstances.
- c. To clarify the statute to allow Board licensed out-of-state instructors to provide in-home training in the state of California and to clarify that out-of-state instructors need not be employed by a Board licensed guide dog school.

Executive Officer Sorrick read current and Task Force recommended language. The Board expressed the Task Force deal with the aforementioned issues. After a discussion on these concerns, the Task Force amended the recommended language to read as follows:

Schools and instructors licensed by the Board may provide home training in the use of guide dogs.

Schools and instructors providing home training in the use of guide dogs shall annually provide the Board with the names and addresses of those persons who are receiving home training and shall include those persons who have received home training from the schools subsequent to the last report filed with the Board.

Task Force Vote: Representative Jordan made the motion to adopt the new language. Representative Wendler seconded. Motion passed.

B. Additional Code Section Relating to Definition of Professional Competence, Negligence or Appropriate Professional Conduct.

Executive Officer Sorrick introduced this issue due to its recurrence as a weakness of the Guide Dog Act by the state legislature during the Board's last two Sunset Reviews. Board Counsel Balingit requested that this issued be tabled until he could speak with his colleagues about the practice of defining professional competence, negligence or appropriate professional conduct in Practice Acts. The Task Force will address this issue at the next meeting. Representative Kelly offered to send Executive Officer Sorrick the IGDF's Client Services Principle language.

4. Agenda Items for the Next Meeting – (All)

A. 16 CCR Section 2276

B. Side by side comparison of 16 CCR Section 2282.1 with the IGDF guide dog training standards

C. Business and Professions Section 7210.7

5. Public Comment on Items on the Agenda

None.

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 p.m.