

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
BUREAU OF PROFESSIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL AFFAIRS

F I N A L M I N U T E S

MEETING OF:

**STATE BOARD OF OPTOMETRY
REGULATORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

TIME: 11:06 A.M.

Held at
PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF STATE
2525 North 7th Street
CoPA HUB, Eaton Conference Room
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110

as well as

VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS

Thursday, February 1, 2024

State Board of Optometry
Regulatory Committee Meeting
February 1, 2024

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

BOARD MEMBERS:

Luanne K. Chubb, O.D., F.A.A.O., Chairperson
John A. Godfrey, O.D. Vice Chairperson
Arion R. Claggett, Acting Commissioner, Bureau of
Professional and Occupational Affairs
Denise T. Wilcox, O.D., Ph.D., F.A.A.O., Secretary
Rebecca Zehring, Office of Attorney General, Consumer
Protection
Jeffrey B. Becker, O.D.
Perry C. Umlauf, O.D. - Absent
Marc Berson, O.D.

BUREAU PERSONNEL:

Jacqueline A. Wolfgang, Esquire, Regulatory Counsel
Paul J. Jarabeck, Esquire, Senior Board Prosecutor
Gregory S. Liero, Esquire, Board Prosecution Liaison
Shakeena Chappelle, Board Administrator
Brian ???, Extern, Department of State

ALSO PRESENT:

Jake Newman
Jennifer Keeler, Executive Director, Pennsylvania
Optometric Association,
Victoria Lantz

1 ***

2 State Board of Optometry
3 Regulatory Committee Meeting
4 February 1, 2024

5 ***

6 A State Board of Optometry Regulatory Committee
7 Meeting was held on Thursday, February 1, 2024.
8 Luanne K. Chubb, O.D., F.A.A.O., Chairperson, called
9 the meeting to order at 11:06 a.m.

10 ***

11 Roll Call of Board Members/Introduction of Attendees
12 [Shakeena L. Chappelle, Board Administrator, provided
13 a roll call of Board members and an introduction of
14 attendees.

15 Arion R. Claggett, Acting Commissioner, Bureau of
16 Professional and Occupational Affairs, was not
17 present at the commencement of the Regulatory
18 Committee Meeting.]

19 ***

20 Regulatory Board Counsel - 16A-5217 - General
21 Revisions

22 [Jacqueline A. Wolfgang, Esquire, Regulatory Counsel,
23 noted prior Board discussion regarding continuing
24 education regulations and presented amendments to
25 asynchronous education, synchronous education,

1 terminology, and the definition of distance
2 education.

3 Ms. Wolfgang stated the Board also requested that
4 she rewrite some of the continuing education sections
5 concerning the percentage of required education in
6 terms of synchronous, asynchronous, and the other
7 types of education that are permissible.

8 Ms. Wolfgang noted the child abuse regulations
9 were published on January 27, and she would
10 incorporate those changes into the annex by either
11 the next Board meeting or regulatory meeting.

12 Ms. Wolfgang referred to Excel sheets showing a
13 comparison of Pennsylvania CE boards and state-by-
14 state comparison for the Board's information so they
15 can decide whether to change the percentage in the
16 regulations.

17 Ms. Wolfgang addressed the annex, noting the
18 definition of distance education is the same as last
19 time. She stated the Board's regulations used the
20 term "instruction" but proposed using the term
21 "courses" in the definition of distance education to
22 make terminology consistent.

23 Ms. Wolfgang noted the definition of synchronous
24 distance education was the same one discussed last
25 time and has not changed. She asked whether Board

1 members wanted her to proceed, and Board members
2 wanted her to proceed.

3 Ms. Wolfgang suggested correcting § 23.84(e),
4 noting it referenced § 23.81 but should have
5 referenced § 23.86(a), and Board members agreed.

6 Ms. Wolfgang referred to § 23.86 and agreed with
7 the Board that there are too many cross-references in
8 this section. She noted the need for further
9 discussion regarding her rewrite and proposal to
10 change everything or stay with the Board's current
11 version.

12 Ms. Wolfgang referred to Act 116 of 2020 and
13 asked whether the Board wanted to consider adding
14 carryover CE. She explained that the reason the
15 Board may not have considered Act 116 at that time
16 is, because the Board was in the middle of drafting
17 its general revisions, which included revising its
18 continuing education regulations.

19 Ms. Wolfgang stated the proposed regulations were
20 published in March 2019, and the Board had two years
21 to finalize those regulations. She noted the
22 regulations had the definition of contact lenses,
23 which was important for the Board to get through and
24 did not want to pull this regulation. She reported
25 that it went through and was published as final in

1 May 2021.

2 Ms. Wolfgang read the law, where the boards are
3 authorized to provide for carryover of any continuing
4 education credits in excess of the number required
5 for biennial renewal. She noted the carryover shall
6 be valid for one biennial renewal term only as used
7 in this paragraph, and the term continuing education
8 includes any term similar in nature used by a
9 licensing board or commission.

10 Ms. Wolfgang stated it is the Board's authority
11 to provide for continuing education and would have to
12 include that in the regulation in order to implement
13 it. She asked Board members whether they wanted to
14 provide for carryover and asked for the parameters of
15 the carryover.

16 Dr. Godfrey asked how other boards have been
17 dealing with this issue.

18 Ms. Wolfgang was not certain whether any boards
19 have specifically promulgated regulations on this but
20 noted that many boards have carryover already
21 provided for in their regulations. She offered to
22 provide that information after review of the other
23 boards.

24 Dr. Berson asked whether it had been an issue for
25 their Board.

1 Chairperson Chubb explained that the Board does
2 not have a high number of credits over the course of
3 two years compared to other states, noting
4 information does change relatively quickly. She
5 commented that for the number of continuing education
6 that they want for the number of glaucoma credits and
7 therapeutics and the rate that medical information
8 changes, she would not be inclined to say that they
9 have a carryover.

10 Chairperson Chubb noted being licensed in New
11 Jersey, and they require 50 hours but do allow a
12 certain number of carryover credits.

13 Dr. Godfrey commented that it would make the
14 process more complicated, and there would be more
15 questions for Ms. Chappelle.

16 Chairperson Chubb stated the Board currently does
17 consider extenuating circumstances, where they have
18 had people with extreme health issues who physically
19 could not meet their credits and could take those
20 online. She reported having only three people
21 applying for exceptions during her time on the Board.

22 Dr. Wilcox mentioned that she would say no
23 because it is not impossible for someone to get 30
24 credits in front of their computer.

25 Ms. Wolfgang noted it sounds like the Board does

1 not want to include it. She mentioned that the
2 legislature thought it was important to provide that
3 statutory authority to boards but is up to the Board
4 to decide.

5 Ms. Wolfgang addressed § 23.86(a) under
6 terminology, noting they use acceptable courses. She
7 referred to their definition of continuing education
8 program and asked whether there was a difference
9 between program and course. She explained that the
10 definition of a continuing education program is a
11 group, self-study, correspondence, or other program.

12 Ms. Wolfgang informed Board members of
13 inconsistencies in terminology and asked whether they
14 were talking about courses for the continuing
15 education program. She suggested Board discussion
16 concerning program terminology compared to a course.
17 She requested verification as to whether program and
18 course are interchangeable.

19 Ms. Chappelle informed Board members that using
20 those words interchangeably has become an issue for
21 another board just by adding them into the system,
22 because it will issue a provider number, a program
23 number, and a course number, where they have to
24 explain that there is no program necessarily, and it
25 would just be a course. She reported that it does

1 cause confusion when they are interchanged, and Ms.
2 Wolfgang is trying to make it consistent throughout
3 the regulation.

4 Acting Commissioner Claggett believed the Board
5 decided to change it from program to course, and
6 Board members agreed.

7 Dr. Wilcox commented that she would like to see
8 all of it rewritten rather than getting rid of the
9 word "program," because the word "program" appears
10 several times.

11 Ms. Wolfgang agreed but did not want to rewrite
12 that without talking with the Board and offered to
13 rewrite that section.

14 Ms. Wolfgang asked whether they are also looking
15 at the standards under § 23.84 when a provider wants
16 to get approval for just one course.

17 Ms. Chapelle offered to look into that and get
18 back with her.

19 Ms. Wolfgang believed that is where they are
20 using the word sort of interchangeably and where they
21 are using it to cover both courses and what they
22 refer to as programs.

23 Dr. Becker discussed reviewing CEs submitted by
24 providers over the past year or two and referred to 1
25 through 14 under § 23.84, noting reviewing each one to

1 make sure they are valid. He discussed providing
2 approval following validation, and the course is
3 appropriate for optometrists.

4 Ms. Wolfgang believed that the provision applies
5 to one single course or could apply to multiple
6 courses within one program and is why she suggested
7 reviewing and updating the terminology for
8 consistency.

9 Ms. Wolfgang informed Board members that she
10 would make the changes and bring it back to the
11 committee to make sure everyone's in agreement.

12 Ms. Wolfgang noted the Board asked her to confirm
13 whether § 23.86(6) included the Accreditation Council
14 for Continuing Medical Education (ACCME) and
15 continuing medical education (CME) credits, but it
16 does not. She suggested the additional highlighted
17 language be included, and Board members agreed.

18 Ms. Wolfgang referred to Dr. Becker's suggestion
19 to add the Neuro-Optometric Rehabilitation
20 Association to § 23.86.

21 Ms. Wolfgang noted the association is not
22 currently an approved provider and referred to
23 subsection (b), noting that they would have to go
24 through steps under (b) if they wanted to consider
25 this entity as a preapproved provider. She mentioned

1 that the Board should understand the program and
2 standards utilizing their due diligence before a
3 provider is preapproved.

4 Ms. Wolfgang also mentioned that some thought
5 should be given to whether they should be a
6 preapproved provider if it is not a provider
7 providing multiple courses and is heavily used.

8 Dr. Becker commented that there are about 500-600
9 members in the United States that belong to the
10 Neuro-Optometric Rehabilitation Association (NORA),
11 and they provide the Council on Optometric
12 Practitioner Education (COPE)-approved courses. He
13 noted they fall under the College of Optometrists in
14 Vision Development (COVD) and Optometric Extension
15 Program Foundation (OEP) but are a separate
16 organization. He mentioned that he submitted many of
17 his credits under NORA for rehabilitation.

18 Dr. Becker mentioned that some of the courses are
19 not COPE approved because they are provided by an
20 ophthalmologist who does not go through COPE and
21 talks about brain lesions and how it affects ocular
22 motor control. He stated it may not be COPE
23 approved, but NORA has approved it and is why he
24 mentioned Neuro-Optometric Rehabilitation Association
25 should be in there.

1 Chairperson Chubb asked whether any process was
2 used to select providers when the other ones were
3 added under sources of continuing education.

4 Dr. Wilcox believed they had been traditionally
5 in the old regulations and were just carried over.
6 She noted examining each one to make sure that they
7 were valid but did not include Neuro-Optometric
8 Rehabilitation Association. She mentioned that the
9 Neuro-Optometric Rehabilitation Association was new
10 and therefore was not included.

11 Dr. Godfrey asked whether they have their own
12 standards for credits for NORA.

13 Dr. Becker explained that NORA has a meeting
14 in different parts of the country every year, giving
15 21 credits over three days in areas relevant to their
16 profession for those in that mode of treatment. He
17 mentioned having to take traditional CME for
18 therapeutics and glaucoma but does not take any
19 contact lens courses because he does not fit contact
20 lenses.

21 Dr. Becker explained that he and many other
22 optometrists go to NORA to receive education. He
23 believed it needs to be included because they are
24 accredited and have a lot of COPE credits. He
25 mentioned that out of 21 credits on a weekend, there

1 may be 4 that are not because they are not a doctor
2 of optometry (OD) and may be a functional
3 neurologist, ophthalmologists, or a neuro-
4 ophthalmologist, where they do not get COPE approval
5 but are great courses.

6 Chairperson Chubb requested more information
7 about the organization at the next board meeting, and
8 Dr. Becker offered to provide the information.

9 Ms. Wolfgang suggested Dr. Becker review
10 standards for providers under § 23.85 for the types
11 of things the Board needs to consider when deciding
12 whether they should be a preapproved provider.

13 Ms. Wolfgang also recommended having the
14 organization do a presentation because of it will be
15 a permanent decision, along with all of their courses
16 being preapproved. She believed it to also be good
17 for the Board to put that in their preamble to be
18 able to show what the Board did to ensure that the
19 standards of NORA are consistent with the Board's
20 standards.

21 Dr. Wilcox explained that COPE-approved providers
22 are already accepted but would have to be on the list
23 of approved providers if they are not COPE approved.

24 Chairperson Chubb further explained that an
25 organization they have approved may not have a COPE

1 approval, but if they are given at the academy or
2 under the Pennsylvania Optometric Association (POA),
3 they do not require COPE approval because they are
4 already a vetted continuing education provider.

5 Ms. Wolfgang suggested Dr. Becker provide the
6 information to Board Counsel to facilitate contact
7 with NORA instead of Dr. Becker because he would be a
8 voting member to determine whether they are a
9 preapproved provider.

10 Ms. Wolfgang suggested updating some of their
11 language instead of saying on a form supplied by the
12 Board to instead use language "in the manner and
13 format prescribed by the board" because it is more
14 general and covers the electronic aspect of their
15 application process, and Board members agreed.

16 Ms. Wolfgang referred to subsection (e),
17 document attendance within 60 days of attending the
18 program. She asked whether that still happens with
19 respect to the continuing education credit awarded
20 retroactively for programs to include lectures in
21 college and university courses.

22 Chairperson Chubb commented that she is not
23 familiar with anyone using subsection (e) and did not
24 believe it was relevant to optometry for continuing
25 education.

1 Dr. Wilcox believed the original intent was if
2 someone takes a course at a university or a college
3 and then applies for approval after they took the
4 course that they would receive CE for that and did
5 not see anything the matter with that.

6 Dr. Wilcox noted the Pennsylvania College of
7 Optometry (PCO) has courses that can be taken when
8 someone goes to their rounds, where someone went to a
9 rounds course and did not apply for continuing
10 education until after it was over.

11 Chairperson Chubb stated those are formal
12 processes automatically granted in their grand rounds
13 course.

14 Chairperson Chubb stated she read it as taking a
15 lecture and asking the college to approve a lecture,
16 whether it be anatomy or ocular disease, not as
17 continuing education, but as a student taking that,
18 because she is not aware of colleges offering that
19 anymore if someone is not a student or enrolled
20 there.

21 Dr. Wilcox noted that she did not see any reason
22 to delete it. She believed there are situations
23 where someone would attend a program or a continuing
24 education course and then realize they can get
25 continuing education for this and apply for CE and

1 put it in their CE document.

2 Dr. Becker commented that he did not see any harm
3 in keeping it.

4 Acting Commissioner Claggett commented that he
5 did not think it should be in there.

6 Chairperson Chubb believed it to be relevant when
7 it was written because it was common for colleges to
8 say someone could take a select course here or there.

9 Ms. Zehring leaned toward removal.

10 Dr. Wilcox wanted more research on other boards.

11 Acting Commissioner Claggett stated the Board is
12 good with removing it.

13 Ms. Wolfgang commented that all of subsection (e)
14 could be removed.

15 Ms. Wolfgang referred to (f), noting prior Board
16 discussion of whether it should be removed. She
17 noted it to be attendance of clinical conferences,
18 clinical rounds, or training under a preceptor.

19 Dr. Wilcox believed it to be important for folks
20 to attend rounds or train through a preceptor and
21 receive continuing education for that effort.

22 Chairperson Chubb asked whether someone would
23 view that as dual, where someone is training to
24 achieve a different license but now want CE for that
25 as well. She noted the Board would leave this matter

1 open for discussion and would be revisited at a later
2 time.

3 Ms. Wolfgang stated new graduates do not have to
4 take CE the first two years when they are licensed
5 and suggested the Board think that through in the
6 duplicative discussion. She asked whether someone
7 getting a license or some sort of additional
8 certification to increase their knowledge in
9 optometry would be analogous to what the Board does
10 for a new licensee. The Board decided to keep it in
11 for now.

12 Ms. Wolfgang suggested adding an application
13 process to it and proposed the highlighted language,
14 and Board members agreed.

15 Ms. Wolfgang addressed (g), noting she tweaked
16 the language to be consistent with the asynchronous/
17 synchronous education program language. She referred
18 to "proper credit being given for such program is
19 dependent upon the licensee proving to the
20 satisfaction of the Board that the program meets the
21 provisions of subsection (a) and (b)."

22 Ms. Wolfgang referred to courses approved under §
23 23.84 or § 23.86(d) and asked whether they are missing
24 something. She noted they are talking about
25 providers, but as they discussed before, courses

1 and/or programs are approved under § 23.84.

2 Chairperson Chubb commented that she would assume
3 that if they are taking an online course that it has
4 to be by one of the providers that are preapproved.
5 She noted that she does not know of anyone who has
6 taken an online course and then proved to the
7 satisfaction of the Board that they took an online
8 course from the providers of (a) and (b), noting she
9 is not sure of the intent of why that was originally
10 in there. She asked whether they would have to state
11 online courses, where the journal courses must be
12 given by the preapproved providers.

13 Chairperson Chubb noted it seems like it would
14 read that courses are given for individual study,
15 including correspondence, taped programs,
16 asynchronous distance programs at the rate of one
17 credit hour for every 50 minutes, which are courses
18 that are approved under § 23.84. She asked whether
19 they could just make it clean and say it has to be
20 one of their preapproved providers.

21 Ms. Wolfgang stated they have a mechanism to
22 allow for approval of courses and did not believe it
23 should be different for online. She suggested adding
24 the reference to § 23.84.

25 Ms. Wolfgang noted prior Board discussion

1 concerning 50% for asynchronous and asked whether the
2 Board wanted to increase that or leave it the same.

3 Chairperson Chubb noted her prior comment was not
4 to increase the asynchronous but was whether or not
5 they wanted to keep it at 50% for the asynchronous.
6 She noted other members seemed to be in favor of just
7 leaving it the same at this point.

8 Ms. Wolfgang addressed (h), noting they talked
9 last time about the online component, including a
10 monitoring system or knowledge check. She informed
11 Board members that no boards have any type of
12 monitoring requirements other than child abuse
13 training and is only a knowledge check that is
14 required.

15 Dr. Wilcox stated she looked at dentistry under
16 their renewal guide, where it does say a live webinar
17 continuing education course is considered a lecture
18 but only applies to courses that are conducted as
19 live real-time sessions. She noted they must be
20 fully interactive courses that allow attendees to
21 communicate and ask questions with the presenter and
22 other attendees.

23 Dr. Becker commented that most online courses do
24 not require testing, and if they are going to say
25 that they have to have some kind of form that they

1 actually passed the course, they are not going to be
2 able to do live synchronous.

3 Chairperson Chubb noted that there are states
4 that do require tests, where Florida and Illinois
5 require continuing education with exams and courses
6 given.

7 Dr. Becker stated not all of them do that, and
8 some are mostly for therapeutics and injection.

9 Chairperson Chubb stated COPE requires active
10 interaction for any live CE and leave it to the
11 discretion of the provider to monitor that. She did
12 not believe it needed to be addressed in their
13 regulations.

14 Ms. Wolfgang reported revising subsection (h) to
15 clarify the application process. She asked whether
16 they currently require documentation of attendance
17 within 60 days of attending a program service as a
18 teacher, preceptor, lecturer, or speaker.

19 Chairperson Chubb noted she never applied for CE
20 when she wrote and published an article. She
21 mentioned that she would leave it in but remove
22 written materials and would not give it double
23 because they have to have written materials anyway.

24 Ms. Wolfgang noted the regulation requires that
25 after attendance they have to send the Board

1 documentation of attendance. She was not sure
2 whether the Board was requiring or receiving that
3 information or requiring that information.

4 Dr. Wilcox commented that if they taught a course
5 or published something that they probably do not
6 submit that within 60 days to the Board.

7 Ms. Wolfgang suggested they put the application
8 process in there and remove that requirement for
9 documentation of attendance, and Board members
10 agreed.

11 Ms. Chappelle explained that if someone wants to
12 get an individual course or publication, there is an
13 application, and is what they submit. She noted
14 there are supporting documents that they have to
15 submit along with it, but the application is
16 essentially the proof of the course. She noted that
17 the application says it has to be completed at least
18 60 days prior.

19 Dr. Wilcox commented that someone would not know
20 60 days prior that their article would even be
21 published.

22 Ms. Chappelle stated there are separate
23 applications for other boards, where there is an
24 application if an individual wanted a course approved
25 and a separate application if they have a

1 publication. She noted those applications list the
2 regulations, so if they are getting rid of or
3 changing anything, she does not see that a regulation
4 is even stated on the application.

5 Ms. Chappelle offered to provide examples from
6 the State Board of Chiropractic and State Board of
7 Examiners in Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology.
8 She noted optometrists have a provider application, a
9 course application, and the individual request.

10 Ms. Chappelle mentioned that State Board of
11 Examiners in Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology
12 have an application that is separate when an
13 individual wants an individual course or when an
14 individual is applying to have their publication
15 article or lecture approved because they are
16 different.

17 Ms. Wolfgang stated subsection (h) does not
18 require an application and is what she was
19 suggesting, where they would require an application
20 instead of what the Board currently has in the
21 regulation, which is no application, but document
22 their attendance within 60 days of attending the
23 program, which would include writing the article.

24 Ms. Wolfgang suggested developing some kind of a
25 form. She noted she would be removing "and document

1 attendance within 60 days of attending the program."

2 Ms. Wolfgang again referred to subsection (h),
3 where a licensee may complete up to 25% of the
4 required continuing education in accordance with the
5 subsection, an additional 25% or many of the required
6 CE in sources, subsections (e), (f), and (g). She
7 noted having a rewrite but discussed changes if the
8 Board decided to keep this.

9 Ms. Wolfgang suggested taking out the sentence
10 because the Board keeps reminding people that this is
11 their percentage requirements, where it is just a
12 summary of the percentage requirements that is
13 already stated, and Board members agreed.

14 Ms. Wolfgang addressed (i) paragraph 5, noting
15 prior Board discussion concerning deleting the
16 section about auditing courses.

17 Chairperson Chubb stated she is still in favor of
18 deleting that section, noting auditing courses was
19 commonly done before but continuing education is
20 typically not done that way anymore, and Board
21 members agreed.

22 Ms. Wolfgang noted paragraph 5 correlates with
23 (e) and should be deleted, and Board members agreed.

24 Ms. Wolfgang addressed § 23.86, reporting of
25 continuing education credit hours, noting Board

1 practice and bureau policy with respect to renewal is
2 not consistent with this section. She stated the
3 Board does require information regarding attendance
4 for biennial renewal and under § 23.82(b), licensees
5 certify completion of CE, so the certifying language
6 is redundant for renewals.

7 Ms. Wolfgang asked whether they should be more
8 specific and indicate that this applies to applicants
9 seeking reactivation. She mentioned the section
10 currently talks about applicants for a license and
11 believed it applies to reactivation.

12 Ms. Wolfgang stated the Board does not require
13 documentation dates of CE or continuing education
14 hours claimed and just have the certification. She
15 noted the Board does not require the information on
16 renewal forms but have to deal with this section for
17 reactivation and audits. She stated it is cross-
18 referenced and suggested they leave that there and
19 all the information for reactivation and remove the
20 renewal piece.

21 Ms. Wolfgang addressed the rewrite, noting she is
22 proposing § 23.86(a) go under § 23.86, where § 23.86
23 would then only go (a) through (d), delete (e)
24 through (i) in § 23.86 and substitute, where the
25 content would be covered in this § 23 86. She asked

1 whether Board members wanted to continue to work on
2 what they have or reinvent it.

3 Ms. Wolfgang further explained that the Board
4 discussed how complicated their CE regs are and asked
5 her to simplify them. She referred to the
6 highlighted version of the annex and the sources of
7 continuing education. She explained that § 23.86
8 would remain the same, where they would keep 23.86(a),
9 § 23.86(b), (c), and (d). She noted they would delete
10 (e) through (i) from § 23.86.

11 Ms. Wolfgang explained that the content would
12 then fall under the rewrite at § 23.86(a), which is
13 acceptable methods and content of continuing
14 education. She mentioned that it separates the
15 providers from acceptable methods and content. Board
16 members requested the opportunity to review the
17 finished version before voting. She offered to
18 update the highlighted version and the rewrite for
19 the next committee meeting.

20 Board members thanked Ms. Wolfgang for all of her
21 hard work.

22 Chairperson Chubb informed Ms. Wolfgang that she
23 would like the next Regulatory Committee Meeting to
24 include discussions concerning what a second office
25 or second license means and updating it from

1 previously being known as having two separate
2 physical buildings versus the current practices. She
3 offered to provide information to Ms. Wolfgang.

4 Ms. Wolfgang asked whether the Board members
5 wanted a regulatory meeting before May, and Board
6 members agreed to have the meeting in May following
7 the regular Board meeting because that worked best
8 for all of their schedules

9 Dr. Wilcox also would like to discuss renewal
10 documents to make it clear for people getting
11 continuing education.

12 Acting Commissioner Claggett noted that issue
13 could be placed on the agenda for discussion at the
14 next meeting.]

15 ***

16 Adjournment

17 DR. GODFREY:

18 I move to adjourn.

19 DR. BERSON:

20 Second.

21 ***

22 [There being no further business, the State Board of
23 Optometry Regulatory Committee Meeting adjourned at
24 12:37 p.m.]

25 ***

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing summary minutes of the State Board of Optometry Regulatory Committee Meeting, was reduced to writing by me or under my supervision, and that the minutes accurately summarize the substance of the State Board of Optometry Regulatory Committee Meeting.



Victoria Lantz,

Minute Clerk

Sargent's Court Reporting
Service, Inc.

STATE BOARD OF OPTOMETRY
REGULATORY COMMITTEE MEETING
REFERENCE INDEX

February 1, 2024

TIME	AGENDA
11:06	Official Call to Order
11:06	Roll Call/Introduction of Attendees
11:08	Regulatory Board Counsel
12:37	Adjournment

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50