

# **UNAPPROVED**

## **BOARD OF FUNERAL DIRECTORS AND EMBALMERS MINUTES OF CONTINUING EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, May 3, 2006  
6603 West Broad Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Richmond, Virginia 23230  
Conference Room 1**

**Department of Health Professions**

### **CALL TO ORDER**

A meeting of the Virginia Board of Funeral Directors and Embalmers was called to order at 1:04 p.m.

### **PRESIDING**

Billie Watson Hughes, Chair

### **COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Robert Burger

### **OTHER BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Joseph Jenkins, Jr.  
Michael Leonard  
Randolph Minter  
Willard Tharp

### **COUNSEL:**

Jack E. Kotvas, Assistant Attorney General

### **STAFF PRESENT:**

Elizabeth Young, Executive Director  
Annie B. Artis, Operations Manager  
Elaine Yeatts, Senior Policy Analyst

### **QUORUM:**

With five members present, a quorum was established.

### **GUESTS PRESENT:**

Caren Brown, Virginia Mortuary Association  
Joe Jenkins, III, Virginia Mortuary Association  
Meredyth Patridge, Regulatory Support Services, Inc.  
Sherri Douglass, Regulatory Support Services, Inc.  
Rick Sikon, John Tyler Community College

**Virginia Board of Funeral Directors and Embalmers  
Legislative/Regulatory Committee Meeting  
May 3, 2006**

2

Frank Walton, Norfolk State University  
Susan Motley, Virginia Funeral Directors Association  
Jenny Kutson, Virginia Commonwealth University  
Craig Washington, Virginia Mortuary Association  
Barry Robinson, Virginia Mortuary Association

**ORDERING OF THE AGENDA:**

Mr. Minter made a motion to accept the agenda as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tharp. The vote carried unanimously.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

There was no public comment.

**REVIEW OF MINUTES**

The committee reviewed the Board meeting minutes of March 7, 2006.

**CURRENT LAWS AND REGULATIONS**

Ms. Young stated the information was provided for review. She stated it included numerous concerns regarding providers and how the Board currently reviews continuing education courses. Ms. Young stated that Delegate Alexander introduced a bill to repeal parts of the continuing education law. She stated there have been numerous complaints that a course may grant five hours of CEUs; however, the coursework review takes 1-2 hours. Ms. Young stated that no complaints have not been formally submitted to the Board.

Ms. Yeatts gave a brief overview regarding how other boards within the agency developed their continuing education and select CEU providers. She stated the Board of Optometry has an organization that approves their providers called Certified Optometric Education (COPE). Ms. Yeatts stated once the course is approved, COPE assigns it a number. She stated that the Optometry board includes in the language that if merchandise is sold, the course will not be approved by Virginia; however, it may be a COPE approved course. Ms. Yeatts stated that there are a lot of companies that have good courses; however, they do offer courses that also the sale of products. It is the responsibility of the licensee to determine which classes are acceptable to the board.

Ms. Hughes stated that there were a lot of undocumented complaints coming from funeral service licensees. Mr. Tharp stated that the board realizes we do not have an ideal program; but it does determine procedures for regulating coursework. Mr. Minter stated that the purpose of the regulations is to enforce the standards of funeral practice.

## CURRENT LIST OF PROVIDERS

Ms. Young provided the list of the current continuing education sponsors. The list is also on the agency website.

## PROPOSED CHANGES

Mr. Minter thought it was a good idea to let the associations, (VMA, IFHV and VFDA) and the schools (John Tyler Community College and Norfolk State University) approve all continuing education providers. Mr. Leonard suggested that representatives from each organization and schools form a committee to review all continuing education courses. Mr. Walton asked if it would be feasible to have the applications funneled through the schools rather than through the Board. Ms. Yeatts stated that as an option the Board may contract services out. Mr. Tharp asked if courses could be taken by way of satellite. Mr. Sikon agreed that courses could be taken via satellite; however, there was the issue of integrity. Mr. Minter stated that if the three organizations and two schools were used, he believes the Board can trust them and if assistance is needed; they would contact the Board. Mr. Robinson suggested if the providers did not follow the syllabus, bring them before the Board. Mr. Sikon stated that if courses were done on-line, he and Mr. Walton would be able to recognize the validity because they have the competency.

Ms. Douglass explained the process that was used in West Virginia. She stated that they had very strict standards; standardized forms and certified providers that had blanket approval for a year. She stated that a separate committee of the Board was created to process approximately fifty provider applications. She stated that the certified provider had to provide evidence of having at least twenty hours of experience. Ms. Partridge asked if the cost would escalate for the attendees and also would this spark competition amongst the organizations, schools and associations. Mr. Minter suggested that the organizations go through the schools or the organizations in order to contract with them, and if any problems arise go back to the school or organization.

## RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD

Mr. Minter made a motion to approve as providers, the two mortuary schools, John Tyler Community College and Norfolk State University and the three associations, VMA, IFHV and VFDA. The motion was properly seconded by Mr. Leonard. The vote carried unanimously.

Mr. Minter made an amended motion to approve as providers, the two mortuary schools, John Tyler Community College and Norfolk State University, the three associations, VMA, IFHV and VFDA and state and federal government agencies. The motion was properly seconded by Mr. Leonard. The vote carried unanimously. **OR**

A motion was made by Mr. Minter to have the Continuing Education Committee provide a course to outline guidelines to the two colleges and three associations. The motion was

properly seconded by Mr. Tharp. The vote carried unanimously.

Ms. Young asked the providers to revise the CEU application and return to her before June 6, 2006.

There was discussion in regard to having a Board appointed subordinate to review individual applications for all programs and provide a recommendation to the Board. Mr. Minter suggested that a few recommendations be submitted to the board.

Mr. Leonard recommended that Ms. Young provide a cost analysis to the board to test the feasibility of contracting out for services.

**The following are recommendations from the associations:**

IFHV:

- Specifically state in regulations the Board's authority to **revoke a sponsor's approval** status should that approved sponsor present courses for CE credit which fail to comply with required statutory and Board regulations regarding content of CE courses offered for credit. Such would include offering courses for CE credit which are business management or designed to enhancing profits offline homes, fail to be of the length stated, or violate any other criteria in Board regulations related to acceptable continuing education credit hours.
- Limit the list of approved sponsors of CE courses acceptable to the Board to accredited colleges or universities and recognized funeral service associations. It would not preclude others from presenting CE courses providing they were sponsored by a college, university or recognized association. A limited list of approved sponsors would allow for closer scrutiny by the Board to ensure compliance with Board regulations. A limited list of approved sponsors has a higher level of responsibility to comply with Board regulations.
- Require that all programs or course offerings by an approved sponsor, when courses are offered for CE credit, have each course stipulate a clearly designated title which reflects the course content, the name of the speaker such **Dr presenter** of the course and a brief description of the course for purposes of assuring the course content meets the Board's criteria for a course eligible for CE credit.
- Have regulations specifically state that the Board has the authority, as a type of disciplinary sanction, to require additional continuing education courses run in designated subject matter.

VFDA:

- Consistently refer to continuing competency vs. continuing education, Closer to the original intent of the regs.
- Define continuing competency

Suggested definition:

Competence is the combination of skills, knowledge, attitudes! values and abilities that support the ongoing effective performance of a funeral service practitioner.

- Clear up other inconsistencies such as providers vs sponsors. Provider is less confusing than what sponsor means.

Explore options for funding a full time professional continuing competency administrator to carry out more defined and regulated course offerings. This I Ad al include the use of bar code/scanning database backing software that some of us use. . Otherwise, expectations should reflect availability of human and financial resources and to administer the program.

- Suggested Continuing Competence Requirements (revised)

1. It is the professional responsibility for all licensees to maintain (heir competence to practice funeral service. Licensees will be asked at the time of annual renewal to attest that they have completed five continuing competency units from a provider licensed by the state board of funeral directors and embalmers (see list)

2. “Continuing competence unit (CCU) means 50 clock minutes of educational instruction in a state board-approved continuing competence program currently it is 60 minutes which does not allow for questions and answers, as continuing competence experts recommend.

- Suggested Continuing Competency Providers (revised) Presumptive Providers

I. Providers such as 501c6 and 3 professional. educational, and trade associations pertaining to funeral service as approved by the board (refer to subsection 9) as well as educational institutions! reciprocal state funeral licensing boards, and branches of Virginia government, such as OCME and Health Department and other areas related to funeral service and public health and safety, shall have presumptive approval as accredited providers

a. Presumptive Approval (or Accredited Providers)

Once an organization is approved as an accredited provider under this status, the continuing education programs presented by that organization are presumptively approved for credit and no Individual course applications must be made to the Board for approval. The Board may revoke the accreditation of an assumptive provider for failure to satisfy, the Rules in this Section (include the disciplinary policy — written complaint. review. etc.)

VMA:

- Course approval 30 days prior to its presentation
- Applications should include: plan of objectives/outline, credentials of speaker, date, time, location, and quantity of ceus, one page in length, standard and uniform, signed by the provider's designated spokesperson
- Certificates of completion with in 10 days after the presentation
- Grandfather clause should be completed for exemption of ceu requirements for licensees with 45 plus years of licensure. (A practice in other states)

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business, the committee adjourned at 3:56 p.m.

---

Billie Watson Hughes, Chair

---

---

Elizabeth Young, Executive Director

---