FLORIDA | Board of Optometry

DRAFT MINUTES February 17, 2017

Teleconference Department of Health 4042 Bald Cypress Way Tallahassee, FL 32399-3257



Stuart Kaplan, O.D. *Chair*

Tamara Maule, O.D. *Vice-Chair*

Anthony Spivey, DBA *Executive Director*

General Board Business started: 9:05 a.m.

I. The meeting was called to order by Dr. Kaplan, Chair. Gail Curry called the roll. Those present for all or part of the meeting included the following:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Stuart Kaplan, O.D., Chair Tamara Maule, O.D., Vice Chair Christopher King, O.D. Carl Spear, O.D. Stephen Kepley, O.D. John Griffin

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Lucille Turner

PROSECUTION COUNSEL:

Chris Dierlam, Assistant General Counsel Department of Health, Office of the General Counsel

BOARD COUNSEL:

Lawrence Harris, Assistant Attorney General Office of Attorney General

COURT REPORTER:

For the Record (850) 222-5491

Please note the minutes reflect the actual order agenda items were discussed and may differ from the agenda outline. AUDIO from this meeting can be found online: <u>http://floridasoptometry.gov/</u>

Section II began: 9:05 a.m.

II. MINUTES:

- a. October 14, 2016
 - Dr. King's corrections:
 - Pg. 2, line 4, remove period after case, add the for after it, make V lower case in violation and put a period after (t)
 - Pg. 2, line 5, change the word for to is after word settlement
 - Pg. 2, line 7&8, add \$ before 1,000, remove the period after the word count add the word and after the word count and make the I in If lower case
 - Pg. 2, line 8, add the words He is before the word Asking and change the A in Asking to lower case.
 - Pg. 2, lines 11-14, Visual Eauitie, Visual Aaquitie, visual equities should all be visual acuity, both 2,400s should be 20/400, documented on line 12 should be documenting, Fin Bloom on line 13 should be Feinbloom
 - Pg. 2, line, (type of chart)
 - Pg. 4, line 8; 1 and 2 should be 1 and 3
 - Pg. 4, line 26, 64B13-4.00 should be 64B13-4.001
 - Pg. 4, line 36, add word or after word hardship and delete the word shows.
 - Pg. 5, lines 2-5; delete

Pg. 5, line 22, Delete sentence starting with "Back in February...." And replace with; In February the course was approved based on the primary lecturer having demonstrated competence in Florida law. That course is now seeking approval with a different, less qualified lecturer.

- Pg. 6, line 7, delete and replace with outcome of vote.
- Pg. 6, line 42, delete the word how
- Pg. 7, line 18, add word for after outstanding, change 4004 to 64B13-4.004
- Pg. 7, line 19, remove period after word meeting and remove words "JAPC letter" immediately following the period

STAFF PRESENT:

Anthony Spivey, DBA, Executive Director Gail Curry, Program Operations Administrator Brandi May, Regulatory Supervisor Kelly Woodard, Regulatory Specialist II Nicole Wiley, Regulatory Specialist II

58

- Pg. 7, line 22, change rule to statute, change Diane to Ms. Guillemette.
- Pg. 7, line 23; change Diane to Ms. Guillemette.
- Pg. 7, line 24; change O in Objection to lower case
- Pg. 7, line 30; delete
- Pg. 7, line 45-46; delete sentence starting with "Mr. Griffin asked....."
- Pg. 7, line 49; change Diane to Ms. Guillemette.
- Pg. 8, line 27, Take out Sue and replace with NBEO.

Pg. 8, line 32, delete the word the before Lafitagras and change Lafitagras to lifitegrast, delete words "they are" after the word that and in its place add words optometrists should.

- Pg. 9, line 8; delete period after word reporting and make S in She lower case
 - Pg. 9, line 21, change Terry to Dr. Kerry.

Mr. John Griffin's corrections:

- Pg. 2, line 1, Council needs to be changes to Counsel.
- Pg. 2, line 19, change ensured to ensued.
- Pg. 2, line 19; reference to rule 64B13-3.008 there needs to be a dash.
- Pg. 2, line 24, take out Dr. Spear was recused.
- Use Dr., Mr., Ms., or Mrs. Should be used instead of first names.
- Pg. 2, line 30, counsel is misspelled.

Pg. 2, line 39, payable should be inserted so it should read, settlement agreement includes a fine of \$4,250.00 payable. Bates pg. 5, line 3 -- add "violations" after "keeping"

Bates pg. 5, line 22 -- the sentence should reflect that I asked the prosecutor to describe the process followed by the

Department in referring an administrative complaint to the Division of Administrative Hearings (DOAH) for a hearing Bates pg. 5, line 47 -- delete "endorsement"

- Bates pg. 6, line 38 -- substitute "Dr. Spear" for "Carl Spears"
- Bates pg. 7, line 25 -- substitute "board rule" for "statute"
- Bates pg. 7, line 25 -- the correct reference is "64B13-5.002 (7)"
- Bates pg. 8, line 4 -- substitute "met" for "meant"
- Bates pg. 9, line 41 -- substitute "DOAH" for "DOA"

Bates pg. 9, lines 45-46 -- the sentence should reflect that I was asking whether the subjects being raised by Board Counsel should be more properly discussed by the Board in a litigation shade meeting

Bates pg. 9, line 47 -- substitute "DOAH" for "DOA"

Bates pg. 10, line 29 -- substitute "Register" for "Registry"

Action: Motion to table the minutes until the next meeting was made by Mr. Griffin. Seconded by Dr. King. Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried.

Section II concluded: 9:26 a.m. Section III began: 9:26 a.m.

III. PETITIONS:

- a. Variance/Waiver:
 - i. Yaitza E. Matos-Cruz, O.D..

Petitioner was present and was not represented by counsel.

Dr. Matos-Cruz submitted a Petition for Variance/Waiver from Rule 64B13-4.001, F.A.C., along with an application for licensure. The petition was filed on February 8, 2017. The petition requested that the board allow Dr. Matos-Cruz to use the NBEO examination that she took in 2008 to meet the requirement for licensure. She is an active licensee in another state and has been since 2008. This decision would be contingent on the 14-day notice to run with no written comments received. If written comments are received, then it would have to come back to the next board meeting for a final decision.

Dr. Matos-Cruz explained that she took the boards in 2008 which is out of the 7-year requirement. It will be hard for her to take the boards again. She is moving to Florida in the summer and would like the board to grant her a variance/waiver of the 7-year requirement.

Discussion: Dr. King brought to the attention of the board that looking at her examination results she failed Part II in 2007 and passed it in 2008. Also, failed the TMOD section on that passing attempt in 2008. She would also need a Variance/Waiver for the passing of the TMOD. Dr. Matos-Cruz practical's were less than the 75% required for licensure. She has passed parts of Part II but at different times. She would need to pass all parts of Part II at the same time. She would also need a Variance/Waiver for that portion of the rule as well. She hasn't asked for these additional Variance/Waiver. Mr. Harris stated that the only Variance/Waiver on today's agenda is for only the 7-year Variance/Waiver. There was some discussion whether Dr. Matos-Cruz has taken the Florida Board exam. Dr. Matos-Cruz replied that she has not taken the Florida exam. Mr. Harris explained to Dr. Matos-Cruz that she could choose to withdraw her application and Petition for Variance/Waiver and reapply at a later date or she can leave the application open and file for additional Variance/Waiver for the other rules. Go forward today, withdraw today or table action today in order to give you time to file additional Variance/Waivers for the next meeting. Dr. Matos-Cruz would like to waive her 90 days and table her Petition to give her time to file additional Variance/Waivers for the next Board meeting.

Action: Motion to accept the request to table the Petition for Variance/Waiver until the May Board meeting was made by Mr. Griffin. Seconded by Dr. Kepley. Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

Section III concluded: 9:43 a.m. Section IV began: 9:43 a.m.

IV. APPLICATIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW:

a. Dr. Larry Snyder, O.D.

Petitioner was present and was not represented by counsel.

Dr. Snyder's application is for an upgrade to Certified Optometrist, which was received by the board office on November 28, 2016. Dr. Snyder submitted a Petition for Variance/Waiver from Rule 64B13-10.001(2), F.A.C., which was filed on October, 06, 2016. Dr. Snyder is licensed in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and has worked as a licensed optometrist since 1974.

Dr. Snyder explained his examination and work experience. He wants to be licensed as a Therapeutic Optometrist.

Discussion: Dr. Kepley asked Dr. Snyder what the current licensure is in Virginia as it relates to Therapeutic Pharmaceuticals. Had to pass a 100 plus hour course from Pennsylvania School of Optometry, Pass of the State of Virginia exam and take 20 hours of continuing educating that are Pharmaceutical related every year. The Board asked if he has been compliant with the requirements for the Florida license. To which he answered yes. Dr. King has some concerns if Dr. Snyder meets the requirements for rule 64B13.10.001(2), F.A.C. Dr. King would like to know if Dr. Snyder can prove he has had 1 year of supervised experience in deferential diagnosis of eye diseases and disorders then he believes the board can approve the certification. Dr. Griffin commented that there is also a requirement in rule 64B13.4.001(3), F.A.C. that requires Dr. Snyder to pass part II of the NEBO examination. This also includes the TMOD. This would also require a Variance/Waiver.

Action: Motion to grant the Petition for Waiver or Variance of rule 64B13-10.001finding that Dr. Snyder has achieved the underlying purpose of the statute by other means and based on his particular facts and circumstances application of the rule would violate principles of fairness. Require proof of passing the TMOD to meet the requirements of rule 64B13.4.001(3), F.A.C. for licensure was made by Dr. King. Second by Dr. Maule.

Discussion: Dr. King wants to note that since Dr. Snyder has been licensed in the State of Florida since 1974 he needs to be recognized also. Dr. Griffin wants the order to reference that Dr. Snyder was unable to secure documentation from the Virginia licensing board relative to the examination he took.

Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

b. Dr. William Monaco, O.D.

Petitioner was present and was not represented by counsel.

Dr. Monaco is before the Board for a reconsideration of the denial of his application.

Discussion: Dr. Monaco gave a description of his work experience. Mr. Harris explained that Dr. Monaco only had 21 days from the Final order to request a reconsideration or a hearing. This is a final order that should not be disturbed. Dr. Monaco has the right to make a new application and file a new Petition for Variance or Waiver. Dr. King stated 463.006, F.S., that requires the applicant show proof of the examination results and the 110 hours course work. Mr. Harris said the burden of proof lays with Dr. Monaco.

Action: Motion to deny the request for reconsideration was made by Dr. King. Seconded by Dr. Kepley. Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried.

Dr. Akram Masood, O.D.

Petitioner was not present and was not represented by counsel.

Dr. Masood is seeking variance/waiver from the following:

64B13-4001 (2) An applicant for licensure must achieve a passing score on all four parts of the licensure examination. For Part III, an applicant must receive an overall' passing score on the CSE. as well as the rewired score of 75 percent (75%) or better on each of the three (3) individually identified skills, on the same test attempt. Dr. Masood scored a 74.625 on the examination and would like the Board to consider rounding up the score to 75%.

Discussion: Dr. King explained that when the exam was turned over to the National level there were rules in place for the 75%. There might be some minor variance in the grading. He doesn't believe that it is unfair to round it up.

Action: Motion to approve the Petition for Variance/Waiver finding that Dr. Masood has met the underlying purpose of the statute by other means and the principles of fairness would be violated by requiring him to have a 75% rather than having the 74.625 on that one that one skill and by grant the Petition for Variance/Waiver the application would be approved for licensure was made by Dr. King. Seconded by Mr. Griffin.

Discussion: Dr. Spear believes that the 75% is 75% not 74.625. This would be unfair to all other past applicants. Dr. Kepley concurs with Dr. Spear. Dr. Spear wanted to know at what point does this stop? Dr. Griffin is in favor of granting the petition given the fact that Dr. Masood addressed the Board previously and was told to go back and take the exam again. He did as the Board requested and is now back before the board.

Vote: 4 yeas / 2 opposed; Dr. Spear and Dr. Kepley, motion carried.

Dr. Lorraine Snead

Petitioner was present and was not represented by counsel.

Dr. Snead has submitted a petition for a variance and waiver for Rule 64B13-4.001(1).

Dr. Snead addressed the Board to explain her experience and hardship.

Discussion: Dr. King asked Mr. Harris if being that the Board just approved a similar request this doesn't set a precedent for future requests? Mr. Harris explained that the petitioner has to demonstrate the rule to their particular facts and circumstances.

Action: Motion to grant the Petition for Variance/Waiver finding Dr. Snead has demonstrated that she has achieved purpose of the underlying statue by other means and she is minimally competent to practice Optometry with skill and safety. The findings to this rule found that the facts and circumstances would violate principles of fairness or would constitute undue hardship that would affect her differently than other applicants were made by Mr. Griffin. Seconded by Dr. King.

Discussion: Dr. Spear believes this one is different than the last petition due to the hardships presented by Dr. Snead. She has gone back and taken all parts of the exam.

Action: Motion to grant the Petition for Variance/Waiver finding Dr. Snead has demonstrated that she has achieved purpose of the underlying statue by other means and she is minimally competent to practice Optometry with skill and safety. Application of the rule to this particular facts and circumstances would violate principles of fairness given

that she has $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 % difference of her score and the required score and she attempted to comply with the board's rules to demonstrate her entitlement and eligibility for licensure. This would be unfair to make her go back and take 1 part of the exam based on the totality of the circumstances was made by Mr. Griffin. Seconded by Dr. King.

Discussion: Dr. Spear commented that he can support the hardship case but he cannot support it on the fairness as a 74.5% is not a 75%. Fairness must support all people. Dr. Kepley concurs with Dr. Spear.

Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried.

Action: Motion to approve the application subject to complying with all other rules and eligibility requirements for licensure was made by Mr. Griffin. Second by Dr. Maule. **Vote:** 6 yeas/ 0 opposed; motion carried.

Mr. Griffin wants to be sure that when the order is written he wants it to reflect that board's decision in the last 2 petitions were based in part on the fact that both petitioners passed all subjective portions of the exam in accordance within the 7 year prescribed by the rule and was less than $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1%.

Section IV concluded: 11:10 a.m. Section V began: 11:10 a.m.

V. RATIFICATION LIST:

a. Licensure:

i. Optometrist 5282 - 5309

Action: Motion to accept all licenses based on meeting all requirements for licensure was made by Dr. Keply. Seconded by Dr. King. Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

ii. Optometry Faculty Certification 0

Section V concluded: 11:12 a.m. Section VI began: 11:12 a.m.

IV. PROSECUTION REPORT:

Report was given by Mr. Dierlam.

Total Cases open/active in PSU:20Cases in Emergency Action Unit:1Cases under legal review:13Cases with probable cause recommendation:2Total cases where PC has been found:1

Total number of cases older that one year: 11

Section VI concluded: 11:14 a.m. Section VII began: 11:14 a.m.

VII. CHAIR/VICE CHAIR REPORT:

Dr. Kaplan nor Dr. Maule have anything to report at this time.

Section VI concluded: 11:14 a.m. Section III resumed: 11:14 a.m.

VIII. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

a. Annual Board Elections

Moved to the end of the meeting.

Federation of Associations of Regulatory Boards
 This information was given to the Board Members for their review.
 This shows how the Board information is being handled to work with other Boards across the country.

c. Anti-Trust Issues

Dr. Spivey gave an update on the Anti-Trust issue.

- **d.** Letter to Honorable Rick Scott dated April 18, 2016 For the Board Members information only.
- e. Letter to Honorable Rick Scott dates December 6, 2016 For the Board Members information only.

Section VIII concluded: 11:17 a.m. Section IX began: 11:17 a.m.

IX. BOARD COUNSEL REPORT:

a. Rules Report – February 2017

Mr. Harris presented the rules to the Board and explained all rules are now effective and the only rule still needing some attention is 64B13-4.001.

Mr. Harris explained the difference between Quasi-Judicial and Quasi Legislative.

Quasi-Judicial is the board acting as a judge to determine the rights of a particular party. There are discipline cases, approval of licensure, applications, declaratory statements and continuing education. Anything that allows you to act like a judge.

Quasi Legislative is the board acting like a legislator. Rulemaking. you are considering facts that are not in the case as long as you make it part of the record. You can talk to individuals to gather information. This must become part of the record.

b. OFARR Identified Rules for Repeal

- i. 64B13-2.009, F.A.C.
- ii. 64B13-2.017, F.A.C.
- iii. 64B13-3.001, F.A.C.
- iv. 64B13-3.005, F.A.C.
- v. 64B13-3.006, F.A.C.
- vi. 64B13-3.012, F.A.C.
- vii. 64B13-3.015, F.A.C.
- viii. 64B13-4.003, F.A.C.
- ix. 64B13-4.005, F.A.C.
- x. 64B13-4.007, F.A.C.
- xi. 64B13-4.009, F.A.C.
- xii. 64B13-6.003, F.A.C.
- xiii. 64B13-7.007, F.A.C.
- xiv. 64B13-7.008, F.A.C.
- xv. 64B13-16.001, F.A.C.
- xvi. 64B13-16.003, F.A.C.
- xvii. 64B13-16.004, F.A.C.

64B13-4.009

This rule is incorrect as it refers to 64B13-6-003 which has been repealed.

Suggested language is located in the agenda materials.

64B13-6.001 Fees 64B13-6.003 Fees

Dispensing Practitioner Registration

The rules need to be updated to reflect the fee. The language for the application fee and the renewal fee need to be cleaned up. Mr. Harris's suggested language is viewable in the agenda documents. It needs to be in the language in the rule also.

Action: Motion to move forward with rule making for the recommended corrections to rule 64B13-4.009 was made by Mr. Griffin. Second by Mr. Kepley.

Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried.

Mr. Harris asked if the proposed Rule amendment would have an adverse impact on the small business or be likely to directly or indirectly increase regulatory cost to any industry including Government in excess of \$200,000 in the aggregate in Florida within 1 year of after the implementation of the rule?

Action: Motion to move that the approved revisions to the rules would not require preparation of a SERC by Dr. Spear. Second by Dr. Kepley.

Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

Mr. Harris asked the board will the language, as proposed, increase cost in access if \$1,000,000 within 5 years of implementation?

Action: Motion to move that the approved revisions to the rules would not require preparation of a SERC by Dr. Spear. Second by Dr. Kepley.

Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

64B13-5.002(3)(a) 6

Criteria for Approval of Continuing Education.

There is some question about the language regarding the exam being mailed and the monitoring of the exam. The provider giving the course should be giving the exam right after the course is completed. That should be enough monitoring. Dr. Maule asked if the word monitored need to be defined? Also, is emailed included as mail? With the new technology we are in a new age and the exams are monitored enough. This needs to be made more clear for this day and age. New language should include that the test would be given right after the course is completed.

Mr. Harris suggested that he goes back and looks at the language to come up with some draft language and submit it to Dr. Kaplan to be approved to be put on the next agenda. Dr. Spear is suggesting that maybe a rule language change isn't necessary and possibly putting verbiage on CEBrokers website and CE providers for clarification.

Mr. Harris will have more information and verbiage for the next meeting.

64B13-3.001(5)

Will be tabled until the FTC has made a final ruling.

c. Review of Application

d. JAPC Letter

e. Anti-Trust Dental North Carolina Board Presentation

f. FTC Staff Guidance: Active Supervision

g. Rule Reduction Project

Mr. Griffin asked Mr. Harris to give an update on the pending litigation. Mr. Harris explained he is working on a pre-hearing statement to the hearing officer. The intent is to move the factual stipulation and the hearing exhibits into the record by stipulation and not have the in-person hearing. At that time draft the proposed final orders. The parties have requested until

March 10th to get all the documentary and exhibits into the record and submit our proposed final orders into the hearing officer.

Section IX concluded: 11:52 a.m. Section X Resumed: 11:52 a.m.

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

- a. Budget Dr. Kepley: Nothing to report at this time.
- **b.** Continuing Education Dr. Maule: Nothing to report at this time.
- **c.** Complaints, Investigations, and Enforcement Dr. Kaplan: Nothing to report at this time.
- **d. Disciplinary Compliance Dr. Kaplan:** Nothing to report at this time.
- e. Examination Dr. King: Nothing to report at this time.

f. FOA – Dr. Kaplan:

Attended the RBB meeting. He gave a Board report and gave information on the lifitegrast to remind people in the future when new medications come out as of right now you have to follow the rules.

- **g.** Healthiest Weight Dr. King: Nothing to report at this time.
- h. Legislative Dr. Kaplan: Nothing to report at this time.
- i. **Probable Cause Dr. Spear** Nothing to add at this time.
- **j. Probationary Dr. Kaplan** Nothing to report at this time.
- k. Rules Dr. Kaplan: Rules have also been reviewed. Nothing to add at this time.

I. Unlicensed Activity – Dr. Maule:

There was an entire county of OD that were told they could write Xiidra prior to when they were actually allowed to write the prescription. Mr. Harris asked that there no further discussion on this at this time on this matter in case this was to show up on a probable cause panel.

Section X concluded: 11:54 a.m. Section XI began: 11:54 a.m.

XI. OLD BUSINESS:

Dr. King, at the last meeting, was charged to work with Ms. Guillemette to come up with a new format for disciplinary rules. There was a conference call and Ms. Guillemette said the rules were fine the way they were. There was no change to the rule format.

Section XI concluded: 11:55 a.m. Section XII began: 11:55 a.m.

XII. NEW BUSINESS

a. 2018 meeting dates

March 9, 2018 (Orlando) June 1, 2018 (Telephone Conference Call) September 28, 2018 (Orlando) November 16, 2018 (Telephone Conference Call)

Section XII concluded: 11:57 a.m. Section XIII began: 11:57 a.m.

XIII. 2016 CHAIR/VICE CHAIR ELECTIONS

Action: Motion to nominate Dr. Kaplan for Chair was by Dr. Maule. No other nominations. Dr. Kaplan accepts the Chair. Dr. Spear closed the nominations. Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried.

Action: Motion to nominate Dr. Maule for Vice Chair was by Dr. Kaplan. Dr. Maule moved to Dr. Spear. Second by Dr. King. Dr. Spear accepts the Vice Chair. No other nominations. Dr. Spear closed the nominations. Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried.

Section XIII concluded: 11:59 p.m. Section XIV began: 11:59 p.m.

XIV. NEXT MEETING DATE

a. May 19, 2017 - Orlando

Section XIV concluded: 12:01 p.m.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Spear wanted to thank Mr. Harris for all his hard work he does for the Board.

Action: Motion the adjourn the board meeting was made by Dr. Spear. Second by Dr. Maule

The meeting was adjourned at 12.02 p.m.