

Maryland Board of Cosmetologists Meeting

Monday, June 2, 2025

A meeting of the State Board of Cosmetologists was held on Monday, June 2, 2025, at 10:00 a.m. by teleconference.

Board Member Attendees

Ms. Lisa Ennis, *Chairperson*

Ms. Rosalind Hosley, *Cosmetologist Member - **Absent***

Ms. April Kenney, *Cosmetologist Member*

Ms. Kelly Canty, *Consumer Member*

Mr. Maurice Fains, *Cosmetologist Member - **Absent***

Ms. Katrina Lee, *Esthetician Member*

Vacant, School Member

Other Staff Attendees

Ms. Nicole Fletcher, *Executive Director*

Ms. Breona Scott, *Assistant Executive Director*

Ms. Leslie Braxton, *Licensing Supervisor*

Ms. Fatmata Rahman, *Administrative Specialist III*

Mr. Jacob Guy, *Board Administrator - **Absent***

Ms. Ashley Thompson, *Office Secretary - **Absent***

Mr. Kenneth Sigman, *Advice Counsel*

Ms. Renee Robertson, *Continuing Education Coordinator*

Ms. Karina Papavasiliou, *Inspector*

Agenda and Minutes

Quorum Announced, and Meeting Called to Order

A quorum was announced by Chairperson Ms. Lisa Ennis and the meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

Approval of Agenda

Chairperson Ms. Lisa Ennis requested a motion for approval of the June 2, 2025, agenda. Ms. April Kenney made a motion to approve the agenda, seconded by Ms. Kelly Kanty, and the agenda was unanimously approved.

Approval of May 5, 2025, Minutes

Chairperson Ms. Lisa Ennis requested a motion to approve the minutes from the May 5, 2025 meeting. A motion was made by Ms. Katrina Lee to approve the amended minutes which was seconded by Ms. Kelly Canty, and the motion unanimously passed.

New Business

A. RECAP OF MAY 5, 2025, MEETING

Chairperson Ms. Lisa Ennis began by providing a brief overview of the May 5, 2025, meeting. In May the Board discussed HB1547 which will require as a condition for licensure and initial renewal of a license an applicant or a licensee to complete certain training in domestic violence awareness. The meeting also included details about HB 1223 which authorized the Board to facilitate a limited license to provide Eyelash Extension services. For a full breakdown of the details of these discussions, meeting minutes have been posted to the Board of Cosmetologists website.

B. APPRENTICE RESTARTS

Assistant Executive Director Ms. Breona Scott announced each of the potential apprentice restarts who had contacted the Board stating their interest in restarting the program. Upon calling the names of each apprentice, it was determined that neither one was in attendance. No apprentice restarts were able to be approved.

C. PSI EXAM OUTLINES

Executive Director Ms. Nicole Fletcher opened the topic by stating that she was informed of changes coming to PSI's national exam by Shawn Conder, the Account Manager for Maryland at PSI. Mr. Conder reached out to the Board to obtain approval on these changes before they are implemented. Ms. Fletcher shared a document outlining the changes with each Board member and has asked that they review the proposal so they are prepared to reach a decision by the next board meeting. During review of the document, Ms. Katrina Lee pointed out a potential gray area surrounding the theoretical portion of the esthetician exam. Ms. Lee referred specifically to the chemical application and use of eyelash tinting products as items that potentially cross into the scope of practice of a cosmetologist. It was decided that Board members will review the proposal further and make a decision regarding approval during July's meeting.

Old Business

A. REGISTERED APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM

Executive Director Ms. Nicole Fletcher first introduced Mr. Jessee Skittrall, who is an Apprenticeship Ambassador at the Department of Labor National Office. Mr. Skittrall stated that he will be covering two things, what is the structure of a Registered Apprenticeship Program, and reasons why the Board should consider implementing such a program. The Registered Apprenticeship Program would pull the administrative weight off of the State Board of Cosmetologists. All relevant information regarding employment agreements, credit tracking, and record keeping would be stored and accessible to the necessary agencies, and would allow for some level of reciprocity between states. Such a program could also satisfy a need for structuring the program and creating more accountability from sponsors. Mr. Skittrall then spoke to the issue of potential sponsor liability for unpaid wages. He noted that, while the current language in the Maryland cosmetology statute provides that there is no requirement that an apprentice be paid, under applicable wage and hour laws, apprentices must be paid if they perform work that benefits the salon.

Mr. Skittrall then spoke to the added structure created by a Registered Apprenticeship Program. A salon would be required to submit their "standards" for their apprenticeship program,

which would go to an approval committee. The standards would dictate how the program would be run, including items such as payment progression, how would the apprentice be disciplined, an approved curriculum, etc. The committee would then review the standards and determine if the salon had the capability to manage such a program and if so, the salon would be issued a license to facilitate apprenticeships. This differs from the current structure, where apprentices are sponsored by individuals whose qualifications are determined by their license status. With a Registered Apprenticeship Program the State Board still may implement regulations that determine how compliance is regulated. Mr. Skittrall went on to discuss some of the financial benefits for an establishment participating in the program. In-demand occupations have access to workforce development funds, employer tax credits, and a 50% reimbursement rate for incumbent workers through Maryland Business Works. Additionally, after completion of the program, the apprentice receives a certificate of completion, which is eligible for reciprocity in any state. Ms. Katrina Lee then asked about classroom hours and the payment requirements surrounding that. In response, Mr. Skittrall stated that in most cases these hours are seen as an investment in education and will not be paid. Ms. Lee also asked about the timeline for an establishment to be approved under a Registered Apprenticeship Program. Mr. Skittrall replied that this can vary greatly depending on the salons ability to develop and submit their standards. Additionally, Chairperson Ms. Lisa Ennis asked about charging apprentices for the theoretical education portion of training. Mr. Skittrall replied that this could be possible with a written agreement prior to any facilitation of training, however, the goal is to provide training at little to no cost for aspiring apprentices.

Executive Director Nicole Fletcher then polled Board members informally regarding their interest in implementing such a program. Consumer Member Ms. Kelly Canty was the lone Board member to speak up against doing so. Ms. Canty offered that the added structure to the program could serve as a barrier to apprentices who wish to complete the program in conjunction with working another job or any other responsibilities that could interfere. Ms. Canty also was not in favor of putting the responsibility on the salon opposed to the one-on-one connection that currently exists between apprentice and sponsor. Lastly, Ms. Canty opposed the requirement for classroom hours. In response to Ms. Canty's concerns, Mr. Skittrall clarified that when he mentions "classroom hours requirement" these do not necessarily have to be formal classroom training sessions, he was referring to theoretical training that may be facilitated. Executive Director Ms. Nicole Fletcher also replied stating she still receives many inquiries from apprentices and sponsors about the inability to pass examinations and the need for added structure in the apprentice program.

B. PROPOSED ESTHETIC REGULATIONS VOTE

Advice Counsel Kenneth Sigman headed this portion of the meeting, beginning by summarizing the "one size fits all" rule surrounding chemical peels. The intended goal of this rule was to prevent estheticians from performing medical services. However, based on the feedback

received, it was determined that the rule would actually prevent licensed estheticians from performing services that they should be able to provide. Rather than specifying maximum concentration, the revised proposal provides that chemical peels must not penetrate beyond the epidermis. Similarly, in regards to microneedling, the proposed regulations were revised to increase the maximum length of needles from 0.5 mm to 1 mm and specify that microneedles must be “used in a manner that does not penetrate the skin beyond the epidermis.” Mr. Sigman added that this is a good balance because it allows estheticians the flexibility to provide services within their scope of practice, and also allows the Board grounds for enforcement whether it be through complaints, or observing needles longer than 1 mm. Advice Counsel Mr. Kenneth Sigman then asked for a motion to approve the proposed amendments to esthetic regulations. Ms. Katrina Lee then made a motion to approve the proposed amendments, seconded by Ms. Kelly Canty, and then unanimously approved.

C. LEGISLATIVE UPDATES

i. HB1547 DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS TRAINING

Executive Director Ms. Nicole Fletcher started by reminding everyone that the bill was amended to be effective beginning January 1, 2026 and is a one time requirement for new licensees and current licensees. Ms. Fletcher added that she has been communicating with some established domestic violence training providers that are interested in becoming an approved provider in Maryland. These programs are currently being evaluated, and Ms. Fletcher stated that she expects four to five providers to be approved, and the administrative team is currently working on a portal for the upload of completion certificates, and updates can be expected on the Board’s website in the coming months.

ii. HB1223 EYELASH EXTENSIONS

Executive Director Ms. Nicole Fletcher provided an update on the newly passed limited eyelash extension license, stating that the regulatory committee will continue to work to draft regulations so that they can be posted to the register by the August 8, 2025 due date. In order to do so, they will need to be finalized before the next board meeting in July so that Board members can vote on the proposal. In addition to regulations, details are still being ironed out in regards to testing and curriculum.

D. CURRICULUM APPROVAL

Executive Director Ms. Nicole Fletcher stated that there were no new curriculums approved since the last board meeting in May.

E. INSPECTION SUMMARY

Licensing Supervisor Ms. Leslie Braxton provided the Inspection Summary for today's meeting. The data was collected from May 1, 2025 - May 28, 2025.

27	New shop applications received
6	New shops pending inspections - to be assigned
2	Complaints received
2	Complaints - open / to be assigned
0	Complaints - inspections completed
103	Inspections conducted
52	Inspections passed
31	Inspections failed
1	Failed - new shop inspections
2	Failed - late renewal inspections
0	Failed - complaint
6	Failed - per board inspections
22	Failed - routine inspections
18	Closed at time of inspection
2	Permanently Closed

Public Comment

Denise Haddaway - Ms. Haddaway spoke in reference to the previously discussed PSI Exam changes. Ms. Haddaway was looking for a timeline for approval for the proposed changes as the drafted letter was dated for March 2025. Executive Director Ms. Nicole Fletcher clarified that she received the document two weeks prior to the Board meeting, and she believes that March 2025 was included by mistake.

Sid Saab - Mr. Saab representing the Maryland Esthetician Alliance asked for clarification that the continued practice of lash artistry is permitted while the proposed regulations are awaiting final approval and publication, to which Executive Director Ms. Nicole Fletcher confirmed that indeed it is. Mr. Saab went on to express his gratitude towards Board members and the administrative team for working with the Esthetician Alliance and considering their feedback and altering regulations as such.

Dionne Blackledge - Ms. Blackledge first asked about the possibility of the Board expanding to include an Eyelash Technician seat to represent the newly licensed discipline. Executive Director Ms. Nicole Fletcher responded that this is not something that has been discussed and that it could be something to be considered by the Board. Ms. Blackledge then asked if the Board would take framework for the facilitation of the new Limited Eyelash Technician license from states where such licensure already exists. Executive Director Ms. Nicole Fletcher responded that a foundation is already in place, and the Board would take points from neighboring states and not be starting from scratch.

Crystal Thomas - Ms. Thomas asked if the document outlining potential changes to the PSI examination had been made available to the public. Executive Director Ms. Nicole Fletcher stated that for now the potential changes are a discussion point, and should they gain approval during July's meeting then those changes will be published. It was then clarified for Ms. Thomas that the way which different portions of the exam are weighted is one of the potential changes.

Adjournment

Chairperson Ms. Lisa Ennis requested a motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:17 A.M. Ms. Kelly Canty made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. April Kenney, and then was unanimously approved.

APPROVED BY: _____ on July 7, 2025.