

**BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY**  
Professional and Vocational Licensing Division  
Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs  
State of Hawaii

MINUTES OF MEETING

The agenda for this meeting was filed with the Office of the Lieutenant Governor, as required by § 92-7(b), Hawaii Revised Statutes (“HRS”).

Date: May 7, 2021

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Place: Virtual Videoconference Meeting – Zoom Webinar  
(use link below)  
<https://dcca-hawaii-gov.zoom.us/j/93285269393>

Present: Sherry Sutherland-Choy Psy.D., Chair  
Marty Oliphant, Vice Chair  
Jill Oliveira Gray, Ph.D., Member  
Don Pedro, Psy.D., Member  
James Spira, Member, Ph.D., Member  
Christopher Fernandez Executive Officer (“EO”)  
Susan A. Reyes, Secretary  
Daniel Jacob, Esq. Deputy Attorney General (“DAG”)  
Stephanie Karger, Office Assistant (Technical Support)  
Christine Dela Cruz, Office Assistant (Technical Support)  
Keaweamahionalani Hurst, Secretary

Excused: None.

Guests: Dr. Kevan Kamisato  
Risé Doi, EO

Call to Order: Chair Sutherland-Choy provided information to the public on how to participate if they wanted to provide testimony. They were also informed that testimonies will be limited to five minutes.

Chair Sutherland-Choy confirmed by roll call that she, Vice Chair Oliphant, Drs. Pedro, Oliveira Gray and Spira were present. With roll call complete Chair Sutherland-Choy brought the meeting to order at 1:47 p.m.

Chair Sutherland-Choy requested to correct the agenda as follows:

- Under Examination Waiver it should read as:

2) Christina Wafer

Chair Sutherland-Choy asked if there was any public person who wished to provide oral testimony on the agenda item; there were none.

Review and  
Approval of:  
Meeting Minutes:

Chair Sutherland-Choy asked if there were any changes to the meeting minutes for April 9, 2021, to which Dr. Oliveira Gray stated yes and noted the following:

- Page 3, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph, last sentence should read as follows: "There is a claim that there are issues with the EPPP2. The assertion is that it has not gone through appropriate validations."
- Page 6, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, should read as follows: "Dr. Oliveira Gray asked if the process can typically take this long."

It was motioned by Dr. Pedro, seconded by Dr. Oliveira Gray, and by roll call vote, members present voted unanimously to approve the minutes for April 9, 2021 with the corrections.

Executive Officer's  
Report:

a. Record of Candidates Examined: For the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology ("EPPP")

EO Fernandez reported that there were no exams taken since the Board's last meeting.

b. EPPP Examination and Facilitation Updates

EO Fernandez said that we have been receiving a lot of requests for support from people who are approved to take the exam regarding exam facilitation and registry. He spoke to the Exam Branch Director to coordinate speaking with ASPPB on the process. The following are the steps after the Board approves someone for examination:

- The EO will send a memo to file or signature of approval for the applicant to take the exam and it is forwarded the day of the meeting or the week after to the licensing clerk.
- The licensing clerk will send an "X1" notice, which means that they have been approved and explain how to contact the Exam Branch ("XB") so that XB can set-up a "Workflow" or approval of a new registration to attempt the EPPP in Certemy.
- The EPPP scores will be in the Certemy system within 48 hours from completing the exam.

In other examination news The EPPP Part 2 skills exam is wrapping up its Beta Phase on May 31, 2021. Early adopter jurisdictions with approved exam takers who need to take the Part 2, will need to assign a Workflow. (Since Hawaii is not an adopter of the Part 2, this is not applicable).

Lastly, there were issues with registering people with the EPPP and the EPPP practice exams. Effective on April 23, 2021, candidates can register for the practice exam using a specific link.

Chair Sutherland-Choy asked if Pearson View, who facilitates the exam, has more slots available than what is online.

EO Fernandez responded that he is unsure how Pearson's web-based scheduling system functions, and he will need to reach out to them with the support of XB to ask how they are scheduling dates. Certemy, ASPPB and Pearson View have been in direct communication with XB stated that there are facilitations available that are sooner than the Fall according to them. But this does not seem to be what approved test takers are reporting. On a case by case basis, he will try to find out how the applicants are getting the later dates and connect them with the proper people to see if they can take the exam sooner.

Dr. Spira asked if we do adopt EPPP Part 2, how is it being done currently in places that have both, for example:

- (1) Is Part 2 independent of Part 1?
- (2) If a test taker fails Part 1 but passes Part 2, is this possible?
- (3) Will they have to retake one part and not the other part, how does this work.

EO Fernandez stated that in the Board's conversations a couple of years ago when a representative from ASPPB came to talk to the Board about it, the Board was informed of a few things: (1) the exams were separate; (2) the exams were not adopted in California because of the extra costs; (3) That typically the practical exam (part 2) is taken after passing part 1.

Chair Sutherland-Choy agreed saying that her understanding is that you would need to take Part 1 before you can take Part 2.

Dr. Pedro asked about the complications that applicants have been experiencing in HI.

EO Fernandez explained that there are multiple reasons that have contributed to delays with approval for examination and licensure. For example, due to the Licensing Branch's recent transition from one database/application processing system. Staff are still in training while processing applications and this is understandable

since the old system was so outdated. Another continuing issue causing delays is COVID distancing. However, despite these two main complications, there have still been applicants not really seeing a delay, because their applications had no initial deficiencies. But this still does not account for the delay of examinations being experienced after someone sets up their registry in Certemy.

Dr Pedro said that he and other members of the board had heard concerns from State Employed psychologists regarding their licensing status and the expiration date of their employment if they do not become licensed. He wanted to know if EO Fernandez heard anything about this. If so, should the Board consider what it should do in a situation like this?

EO Fernandez said that the issue regarding delays are experienced typically by exam candidates who are awaiting the opportunity to take the exam, which is out of the Board's control. It's a facilitation and scheduling issue.

Dr. Oliveira Gray said that it underscores how much longer everything is taking with both phases of going through the application process.

EO Fernandez said that he works on a case-by-case basis with any applicant who is approved to take the exam who is going to run into an issue with their two-year employment agreement deadline to take the exam.

Dr. Oliveira Gray asked if we have a FAQ's section on our PVL website for psychologists.

EO Fernandez said yes, we do. He stated that he is working on updating information on the website due to all of the difficulties that have been occurring the past year. The updates would include explanation of delays caused by the issues just discussed including social distancing standards at the PVL caused by the COVID-19 response. He said that infrastructurally-speaking, he is trying to get a handle on these issues by providing applicants with as much information as possible.

Dr. Oliveira Gray said that he could also disseminate information to HPA who can get information out to its members.

EO Fernandez said that he would reach out to them.

Dr. Spira said that the state of California regularly sends out BOP announcements that he finds very helpful and wanted to know if we send out updates to all our psychologists.

EO Fernandez said that this is something that PVL does not do; instead it relies on its Boards' and Programs' web pages. When he gets specific inquiries, if it is appropriate, he refers them to the web page which is available to anyone. The only notices that applicants receive by mail are the renewal notices that go out bi-annually. Since the Board does not collect email addresses, there are no listings that go out by mass email either.

Dr. Oliveira Gray said the Board has to figure out how to get notices or announcements out. She suggested putting a message out through the HPA List Server to alert members that there is new information that has been added to the Board of Psychology web page.

EO Fernandez said this is something that he can do. Once the announcements have been prepared and uploaded to the web page, he can contact HPA to let them know and they can disseminate it.

EO Fernandez said that as far as the delays on applications and the complications due to COVID and the database change, and in order to expedite examinations and other applicants as well, he developed an internal tracking system for him to keep track of applications. This requires reaching out to the licensing clerk for current statuses. What he is hoping to avoid are situations where applicants have been getting deficiency notices that he is not aware of and have not received any response that people have submitted the deficiency months ago.

Applications:

Chair Sutherland-Choy asked if there was any public person who wished to provide oral testimony on the agenda item; there was a raised hand from Dr. Kevan Kamisato.

After being reminded he would have 5 minutes to provide testimony by Chair Sutherland-Choy, Dr. Kamisato informed the board of his situation. He explained that he submitted his application in July 2020. He received a deficiency notice from the licensing clerk and by the time he rectified the deficiency, three months had passed. He did not hear anything from the clerk so, when he got around to it, he submitted a new application in December 2020 because he was under the impression his last application had expired. Since then, the system (database) was changed. The second application was lost, and he was not notified until March 2021 about his application status.

He said he has submitted another application, but he is coming up on the two-year expiration date of his State Employment. He said that two other colleagues have been terminated from their positions with the State, specifically with the State Hospital because they had not obtained licensure by their expiration dates. He was wondering if he could be approved after he submitted a third application. He does have the receipt

for the second application he submitted to PVL which there is no record of in the system.

Dr. Pedro said that the State Government positions requiring licensure by a later date have a strict two-year limit and this concerns him with Dr. Kamisato's application. His understanding is that not being able to get an application approved in a timely fashion creates a situation that employees could be terminated, not because they have not tried to get licensed in the time frame, but because of the unforeseen issues stated earlier in the meeting. He contemplated whether the Governor could add language to the proclamation to help with this.

Dr. Kamisato said that this has been a big worry for him. Luckily, he has managed to work things out with his department, that even if his licensure is not in by the two-year deadline, they will be able to shuffle things around, but he will have to stop providing clinical psychologist services at that time.

EO Fernandez said that he was sorry to hear about the difficulties Dr. Kamisato is experiencing with his application and would support him in any way he could.

To address this agenda subject, EO Fernandez first addressed the application issues and reported to the Board that the database is showing Dr. Kamisato's application file as incomplete. EO Fernandez asked if he had submitted the documents to correct the deficiency through the web portal.

Dr. Kamisato said he did. The deficiency was the affidavit from his postdoctoral supervisor describing his summary of duties. He said he had gotten the affidavit signed last Fall (2020), but the portal had locked him out of uploading further documents. At that time, he decided to resubmit his application so he could include the new document in a new packet. This is the one that he alleges is missing since December 2020. He said he has records of submitting three applications. He said he has tried contacting anyone he was directed to contact but was not able to get through to anyone except to the executive officer. His biggest concern, at the moment, is to get his application approved.

EO Fernandez asked Dr. Kamisato to send a copy of the letter from his supervisor to the Board's email which he could get to the licensing clerk to help complete Dr. Kamisato's application.

Dr. Kamisato said he would do this asap.

EO Fernandez said that he will see if he can talk to the licensing clerk today and will try to get a response back to Dr. Kamisato by the end of the business day.

EO Fernandez then addressed Dr. Pedro's concerns and question of whether something could be done with regard to those who are employed by the state affected by these types of issues. He reminded the members that they had discussed something similar at a previous meeting, specifically that it is beneficial that time-constrained state workers try and make sure that they have submitted an application a year before their employment expiration date, to prevent delays. This is obviously unnecessary but would help applicants. As far as the emergency proclamation and changes, he is not sure if the Board would be involved in this or if another department would handle it. He will need to check on this.

Dr. Oliveira Gray asked Dr. Kamisato how long it was between when he first applied in July 2020 and received the deficiency notice and that it was rectified.

Dr. Kamisato responded that he was not sure about the time line, but he said it took a couple of months to get the letter from his supervisor because they were busy at the time. It was October or November when he went back online but he was not able to upload documents, it just said "deficiency". This was on the old portal, it may have been a period of four months.

EO Fernandez said he just wants to make sure that his application is completed so that he can move forward with licensure. But for history's sake, last summer the Board, along with other Boards and Programs, began to accept online applications and he believes the system only allows for a single opportunity to submit application documents. If there is a deficiency, the licensing clerk sends a deficiency notice to the address on the application. If the person moves and licensing branch was not notified, it would not go out to the right address. He said that this may not be what happened to him, but it is a common issue. The deficiency letter provides the instructions and address where to send the application to. Once the application documents requested are received, the time for licensing branch to process the application is typically 15-20 business days. But EO Fernandez informed the Board that clerks are covering multiple boards and programs and during this current time processing times have increased. He suggested that people contact the Board to ask for updates. This way they are not waiting for the clerk who may have them on his to-do list but may be so inundated with other boards' or programs' applications that the applicant does not hear an update for some time. This will help the clerk and hopefully in the end, help the licensee and then also the patients that they are seeing and caring for.

Dr. Pedro asked Dr. Kamisato what would be helpful or beneficial to him to be added to the website.

Dr. Kamisato said what would be helpful is a highly visible phone number for the Board, and in the FAQ's section, add information about attending meetings as an applicant.

EO Fernandez noted Dr. Kamisato's suggestions. He went on to explain that today he is drafting general responses for those requesting application updates. He created several responses for certain situations. The first response would be for applicants who have submitted their application in the last week for example and have not seen any updates on their "MyPVL" account. It asks the applicant to allow up to 15-20 business days for processing and updates to their account to be made. He noted that included in this time frame would be the sending of any deficiency notices by the Licensing Clerk, which would likely lengthen the time. The second response is for those who have reached 15-20 business days and have not gotten an update. The response informs the applicant that he is forwarding their inquiry to the Licensing Clerk and to give them up to 5-10 business days to respond. The third response is where he would step in, and it asks the applicant to allow up to 5-10 business days to provide them a response. Although this still prolongs the application process, he informed the Board that he needs to give the licensing branch time to handle what they need to handle. He also wished to remind the Board that these issues represent a small minority of applications. The majority of applications are being processed within the number of days specified. It is unfortunate that people that have deadlines are having to go through these stressors. He is doing as much as he can within his purview to try to remedy as many issues as possible, as quickly as possible, and is trying to keep the Board updated often. He thanked the Board for referring him to HPA for help and, also thanked Dr. Kamisato for his patience in this matter.

Chair Sutherland-Choy thanked Dr. Kamisato for coming today and informing the Board on what is happening with his application and told him that it will be attended to it as soon as possible.

Executive Session: Chair Sutherland-Choy announced that the Board will go into executive session at 2:37 p.m. to consider and evaluate personal information relating to individuals applying for professional or vocational licenses in accordance with HRS §92-5(a)(1), and to consult with the Board's attorney on questions and issues pertaining to the Board's powers, duties, immunities and liabilities in accordance with HRS §92-5(a)(4).

Dr. Spira motioned to go into executive session, which was seconded by Chair Oliphant, and unanimously carried by roll call vote.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 2:49 p.m., it was moved by Vice Chair Oliphant, seconded by Dr. Spira, and unanimously carried by roll call vote to return to open session.



Applications:

a. Board Review

Examination

1) Kimberley Cook

Upon a motion by Dr. Spira, seconded by Dr. Oliveira Gray, the Board voted unanimously by roll call vote to approve the application of Dr. Cook, pursuant to HRS §465-7.

Examination Waiver

2) Christina Wafer

Upon a motion by Dr. Spira, seconded by Vice Chair Oliphant, the Board voted unanimously by roll call vote to conditionally approve the application of Dr. Wafer upon receipt of signed affidavit from her supervisor for both her internship and postdoctoral verification experience confirming that all of the supervision agreement requirements related to the field of psychology were completed in the date ranges found on the internship and postdoctoral experience verification forms.

b. Ratification(s)

Examination Waver

1) Caroline Acra

National Register

2) Kenli Urruty

Upon a motion by Dr. Oliveira Gray, seconded by Dr. Pedro, the Board voted unanimously by roll call vote to ratify the list applications pursuant to HRS §465-7.

Supervision,  
COVID-19, and  
Telehealth:

Chair Sutherland-Choy asked if there was any public person who wished to provide oral testimony on the agenda item; there was none.

The Board to continue discussion on the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and the use of telehealth modalities on the supervision of psychological assistants, interns, and postdoctoral fellows, by licensed Psychologists.

To recap the Board's discussion thus far, Chair Sutherland-Choy said that she has been receiving inquiries from different supervisors on whether or not they need permission from the Board of Psychology to supervise students, interns and postdoc via telehealth since those clinicians had to go to telehealth during the COVID pandemic.

To help ground the discussion, EO Fernandez cited Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR) §16-98-4 regarding the direction of an individual which states the following:

Only a licensed psychologist in the State shall be considered eligible to direct the services of an individual, and only if the licensed psychologist meets the following requirements;

- (1) Prior to the individual interacting with others, the person seeking to direct an individual:
  - (A) Shall inform the board in writing as to when the direction shall begin; and
  - (B) Shall notify the board in writing of the person's own name, address, license number, state in granted and area of specialization, as well as the name and address of the person to be directed. The notification shall also contain the following statement: "I, \_\_\_\_\_, hereby attest that \_\_\_\_\_ is being directed by me pursuant to section 465-3(2), HRS, As defined by section 16-98-2.";
- (2) The person directing an individual shall also inform the board in writing as to when the direction is terminated;
- (3) Is responsible for the direct and continuing administrative and professional direction of the person being directed;
- (4) Is vested with administrative control over the functioning of the person being directed in order to maintain ultimate responsibility for the welfare of every client;
- (5) Has sufficient knowledge of the all clients in order to plan effective service delivery procedures. The progress of the work shall be monitored through such means as will ensure that full legal and professional responsibility can be accepted by the supervisor for all services rendered. Supervisors shall also be available for emergency consultation and intervention;
- (6) Works in the same physical setting as the person being directed, unless other arrangements are approved by the board;

- (7) Informs patients of the status of the person being directed, and provides specific information as to the qualifications and functions of the person being directed;
- (8) Establishes and maintains a level of supervisory contact consistent with established professional standards, and be fully accountable in the event that professional, ethical, or legal issues are raised;
- (9) Does not permit the person being directed to engage in any psychological practice which cannot be performed competently by the supervisor; and
- (10) Is not in the employ of the person being directed.

EO Fernandez also included that the HRS citation in the rules refers to chapter 465 section 3, the exemptions, specifically:

- (2) Any person who performs any, or any combination of the professional services in accordance with rules adopted by the board; provided that the person may use the term “psychological assistant”, but shall not identify the person’s self as a psychologist or imply that the person his licensed to practice psychology

EO Fernandez said that this was discussed a while back by a previous Board and it determined that HAR §16-98-4 referred to those people who are not in an internship program or a postdoctoral program. Instead it refers to those people that are employed as psychological assistants. With this understanding, these rules would only pertain to those situations. This would mean, for example, that HAR §16-98-4(6), where the supervisor works in the same physical setting as the person being directed unless other arrangements are approved by the Board does not pertain to interns and fellows. But to clarify he asked the Board if interns and fellows are called psychological assistants.

Dr. Oliveira Gray said no, they are called psychology interns or postdoctoral fellows.

Chair Sutherland-Choy said that psychological assistant would be someone who works for a psychologist, who is employed by a psychologist, doing psychometric testing, but none are interns or postdocs.

EO Fernandez said that the rules in question, according to the previous Board, only refer to psychological assistants, not interns or postdoc fellows.

Dr. Oliveira Gray said that training programs had to go to online to allow training to continue without it all coming to a complete halt. Supervision necessarily had to use telehealth too and the APA approved this due to the pandemic situation.

EO Fernandez asked if internships are outside of the school setting.

Dr. Spira said, most often, yes. But even if it is in a school setting, it could be considered an independent clinic. Internship is a requirement by the program and is typically off-site.

EO Fernandez asked if any of the board members had reports of any quality change because of telehealth supervision.

Chair Sutherland-Choy said yes. Some of their interns were not pleased with the fact that they cannot be in the emergency rooms as frequently. This has been an issue where they felt that they didn't get as much experience in certain settings and in certain primary care clinics as well. But, in terms of supervision from the supervisor, she feels that they have been very satisfied with this.

Dr. Oliveira Gray said that when she was with I Ola Lahui, and this would be on the patient satisfaction side, as far as the telehealth provision, which included supervisor's coming in to sessions to meet them and talk with them about how things were going, informally, there were no criticisms of the telehealth. She said that Dr. Spira has been dealing with research on telehealth for some time in terms of delivery of care.

Dr. Spira said that the research that he is familiar with is regarding patient outcomes and satisfaction not supervision, so he cannot speak to that. Although, if he was to speculate, he believes that telehealth supervision would be pretty good.

Dr. Oliveira Gray said that trainees were very grateful that they could continue their training through telehealth supervision and practice.

Dr. Spira said that his only concern is the safety mechanism that when a patient is on-site and the student is on-site, but the supervisor may be off-site. And, also if the patient is off-site and the supervisor is at a third location, there has to be, he would hope, a safety mechanism put into place to maintain the safety of all parties. It needs to be thought through anytime you do telehealth. If this is in place, he feels that it should be fine.

Chair Sutherland-Choy suggested that moving forward, the Board should not require supervisors who are supervising via telehealth to get special permission during the pandemic.

Dr. Oliveira Gray said that she agreed.

DAG Jacob asked if the rule requires it, because the Board just cannot decide to throw a rule to the wayside because of practical COVID concerns. If the rule requires it, the Board needs to address it.

Dr. Oliveira Gray said this is why the Board needs to clarify this with EO Fernandez. Because her understanding is that there is a requirement that if you are supervising, that you alert the Board on which intern or postdoc trainees are under your supervision. She thought it applied to interns and postdocs and not just psychological assistants.

Chair Sutherland-Choy said that the Board will not take a position on the subject at this time since there is no formal inquiry or request about this.

Emergency  
Proclamation  
Regarding  
COVID-19:

The Board may discuss the language of the Governor's Emergency Proclamations as it relates to the practice of psychology.

Chair Sutherland-Choy said that the Board did not add any additional language or make any modifications or changes to the Governor's Emergency Proclamations so believed there was nothing to discuss.

Administrative  
Updates:

- a. The Board to continue discussion of application forms, requirements, and review procedures.

Dr. Oliveira Gray said that the biggest issue with what Dr. Kamisato was eluding to earlier, was not knowing where to locate a phone number to call to follow-up. Is there a way for the EO to be notified sooner.

EO Fernandez said possibly, because once he becomes aware of what is happening, things tend to move more quickly for the applicant.

Dr. Oliveira Gray asked that once the application is received, is it immediately entered into the system for him to see.

EO Fernandez said application information should be added to the system within 15-20 business days. Before the pandemic, there were no problems. In the summer or fall PVL started the online submission. If there were other documents that needed to be submitted to correct a deficiency then they were mailed in. This is where the application gets delayed because the clerk is waiting for the documents to come in, and only knows what they receive from the mail room. This is where a lot of the issues occur.

Dr. Oliveira Gray asked if the fact people can submit online improve the process.

EO Fernandez said that it does and it does not. The good thing is that once the licensing branch receives all the documents

necessary for licensure, the clerk will notify him that the PDF copy of the file is ready for his review and it is placed into a specific folder for him to retrieve. It's quick. The negative side is that once the application is submitted through the portal, no changes can be made to that submission. The documents submitted to correct a deficiency are usually hard copies and can take some time getting to the clerk; or worse never make it to them.

Dr. Oliveira Gray asked if the applicant is given a time frame or deadline to submit the deficient document in by.

Chair Sutherland-Choy also asked when the applicant is uploading their application, if they get some sort of alert that their application is deficient and they need to submit them before it can be uploaded. Is it like ordering something online and if you don't put the credit card in, you cannot complete the order? Is their a mechanism that is done all at once so that there is not something hanging out there and then find out three months later.

EO Fernandez said that the system is very rudimentary so, basically no. He said that a notification on the webpage could be useful and he can include it in the application section, and hopefully before applicants submit their application, they will be able to read that. This will help the applicant know that the clerk will then have 15-20 business days. Within this time, they will see some kind of confirmation that it has been received. There are multiple factors for delays, but the major thing that can be helpful, at this point, is making an announcement that is specific for those people who are submitting applications. It can inform the applicants of what to look for, the time frames that they should expect, and if outside those time frames, who they can contact, which would be him, to keep it going and to track these applications. Once he approves applications, they go into "X1" (approval to take exam) or "L1" (approval to be licensed). In most instances, when he sends a memo to file, which is the approval of the application to the clerk, he requests the clerk to let him know when he moves the applicant into the next phase. This is when he adds this date to his spreadsheet.

Dr. Pedro said that the Board and PVL has to be accountable and asked what it can do differently saying it sounds like there are a lot of steps. He said we still don't know why Dr. Kamisato had to submit his application three times and he should be reimbursed for two of them.

Dr. Oliveira Gray said that EO Fernandez will disseminate the announcement about the 15-20 business day window, and at this time if applicants do not receive confirmation, that they need to contact EO Fernandez.

Dr. Spira said that the only way the spreadsheet will work is if there is one spreadsheet that is shared by all parties, and every time someone touches anything it has to be entered. This way it will have a record of what and when things are received.

Dr. Pedro believes that the shared folder should show the name of whoever entered the information.

Chair Sutherland-Choy said that maybe we need a web designer or and IT person to help with this.

EO Fernandez said that the functionality of the new database system Ho'ala is doing what members are saying. It's the disjunction between the Board, which he is the administrative assistant to, and the licensing branch. If he is able to do daily reports, he can pull all the "A1" and "A3" that are getting logged in, it gives him a little bit more information about when they have movement. The major thing that he has to address is the mailing of the hard copy documents. Because if someone is "A3" and they sent it months ago, the only way he and the clerk knows, is if it is in their physical in-tray or somewhere else locatable. This is something that he is still working on. He will continue to keep the Board posted on this. He also said that there is no email for the licensing branch and it is difficult to get through by telephone and most of the time calls get pushed through to the Boards or Programs and not where they need to go, to the licensing clerk.

Dr. Pedro said if PVL were to make everything digital, where it is uploaded and the applicant can track it themselves, it would eliminate the number of calls to the office.

EO Fernandez said he will need to ask to confirm but he thinks that "MyPVL" does give the date and what has been done.

Dr. Spira said it sounds to him that if documents are supposed to be scanned in, then the trouble is that the mail room and other people are not logging it in. When they get something in the inbox, they should immediately enter it into the database so that it can be tracked, so there is no question on where it is. It may be an extra step and take another minute, but it will resolve a lot of these issues.

- b. The Board will begin planning and preparing for rule revisions for Hawaii Administrative Rules § 16-98.

Chair Sutherland-Choy is deferring this until the next meeting.

Next Meeting: September 3, 2021  
1:30 a.m.  
Virtual Videoconference Meeting -- Zoom Webinar

Adjournment: There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned  
by Vice Chair Oliphant at 3:36 p.m.

Reviewed and approved by:

Taken and recorded by:

/s/ Christopher Fernandez  
Christopher Fernandez  
Executive Officer

/s/ Susan A. Reyes  
Susan A. Reyes  
Secretary

CF:sar

6/7/21

[ ] Minutes approved as is.  
[X] Minutes approved with changes; see minutes of \_\_\_\_\_.