

The mission of the California State Board of Optometry is to protect the health and safety of California consumers through licensing, registration, education, and regulation of the practice of Optometry and Opticianry.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD
 Mark Morodomi, JD, President
 Glenn Kawaguchi, OD, Vice President
 Debra McIntyre, OD, Secretary
 Cyd Brandvein
 Jeffrey Garcia, OD
 David Turetsky, OD
 Lillian Wang, OD
 Vacant, Public Member
 Vacant, Public Member
 Vacant, Public Member
 Vacant, Licensed Optician Member



APPROVED BOARD MEETING MINUTES
Friday, October 23, 2020

This public meeting was held via WebEx Events.

Members Present	Staff Present
Mark Morodomi, President	Shara Murphy, Executive Officer
Glenn Kawaguchi, Vice President	Cheree Kimball, Assistant Executive Officer
Debra McIntyre, Secretary	Marc Johnson, Policy Analyst
Cyd Brandvein	Natalia Leeper, Licensing Coordinator
Jeffrey Garcia, OD	Rebecca Bon, Legal Counsel
David Turetsky, OD	
Lillian Wang, OD	

Link for the audio of discussion:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M0Vc3m7pTf4&feature=youtu.be>

OPEN SESSION

1. Call to Order / Roll Call and Establishment of a Quorum

Audio of Discussion: [0:05 / 3:52:45](#)

Mr. Morodomi called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. All members were present, and a 7-0 quorum was established.

2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

Audio of Discussion: [1:01 / 3:52:45](#)

There was no public comment.

3. Presentation and Discussion of Executive Officer’s Report

Audio of Discussion: [2:49 / 3:52:45](#)

Ms. Murphy reported that staff is working on developing the Sunset Review Report. A questionnaire was received on October 9th and staff has begun working through the questionnaire with individual staff assignments. President Morodomi and Dr. McIntyre will form a workgroup to assist.

Ms. Murphy provided a summary of staff's efforts throughout the COVID pandemic; as of October 20th, the Board has spent a total of 894 hours on COVID related matters.

There was no public comment.

4. Presentation and Discussion of President's Report

Audio of Discussion: [10:28 / 3:52:45](#)

President Morodomi presented his report and explained that he has been researching how vision care is being provided to minority populations in the U.S. during this pandemic. He discovered that the 2018-2019-year class for California schools of optometry included zero percent of students who identified as African American. In a few years, the optometry schools will not have any graduates that are African American. In response to the recent President's message, Mr. Morodmi was happy to report that he received many responses; not only from California but also from Vermont, Florida, and Texas. He read some of the comments and ideas to members and staff.

Dr. Kawaguchi noted that he and Dr. Turetsky are assigned to the Strategic Planning Committee. He assured that when the final draft is brought before the full Board, the Board (as a whole) will have the opportunity to consider an ad related to this issue. Dr. Turetsky suggested offering a few units of CE credit for cultural diversity – cultural competency courses.

There was no public comment.

5. Election of Board Officers

- A. President
- B. Vice President
- C. Secretary

Audio of Discussion: [25:33 / 3:52:45](#)

David Turetsky moved to continue with Mark Morodomi as President, Glenn Kawaguchi as Vice President, and Debra McIntyre as Secretary for the sake of continuity until the Board can resume elections on a regular basis with nominations beginning in April. Cyd Brandvein seconded. The Board voted unanimously (7-0) and the motion passed.

Member	Aye	No	Abstain	Absent	Recusal
Mr. Morodomi	X				

Dr. Kawaguchi	X				
Dr. McIntyre	X				
Ms. Brandvein	X				
Dr. Garcia	X				
Dr. Turetsky	X				
Dr. Wang	X				

There was no public comment.

6. Petitions for Early Termination of Probation

[Katelyn Nguyen](#), Optometry License # 12503

[Ted Atherton Bailey](#), Optometry License # 6161

Members heard the two petitions for early termination of probation. The Deputy Attorney General (DAG) was Matthew King. The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) was Sean Gavin.

Lunch was taken at 12:45 p.m. Meeting resumed at 1:15 pm.

7. Update, Discussion, and Possible Action on Presentation by DCA's Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) on the National Board of Examiners in Optometry Linkage Study

Audio of Discussion: [2:21:14 / 3:52:45](#)

Dr. Tracy Montez, Chief of Division of Programs & Policy Review for the Department of Consumer Affairs, provided an update from the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES's) review of the linkage study between the Board Optometry Occupational Analysis and the National Board of Examiners in Optometry testing series. She explained that her goal is to ensure that the Board remains in compliance with B&P Code Section 139. Licensing examinations are used to make pass/fail decisions about individuals in terms of competency. They are referred to as "high stake exams" because consumer and patient health and safety issues are related to these decisions. Dr. Montez explained the psychometric review of the NBEO examination series which consists of components and are used whenever analysis of an exam is performed, which is about every five years. She detailed the process to determine exam validity and to determine an exam's suitability as a competency exam. OPES has determined that the NBEO series meets professional guidelines in testing standards.

President Morodomi asked if an applicant may be allowed to practice temporarily (during the COVID crisis) and take the exam afterward; Dr. Montez replied that the intent of the exam is to ensure that the applicants can practice at entry-level standards. Therefore, the OPES has concerns with temporary licenses that work around examinations and competency standards. She concurred that ideally, the NBEO should consider having additional testing sites. President Morodomi questioned if supervision by a licensed optometrist would alleviate concerns; Dr. Montez responded that it could potentially work, but must fall within the Board's regulations. Dr. Wang asked if regulation was changed to allow the Board to offer alternative test measures would OPES be involved; Dr. Montez noted she would request to be involved in

any language change to ensure that it is not only legally sound but psychometrically sound as well.

There was no public comment.

8. Update, Discussion, and Possible Action on Recent National Board of Examiners in Optometry Part III Blueprint and Task Force Report

Audio of Discussion: [2:37:02 / 3:52:45](#)

Dr. Jill Bryant, NBEO Executive Director began the update and discussion, noting her appreciation for the opportunity to work with OPES. She stated that the report has been shared with the Board of Directors' and she is certain that there will be a discussion during a future meeting.

[Dr. Brianne Hobbs](#), NBEO Director of Examination Innovation, reported on the historical progress that has been made on the exams, and where the NBEO is currently at with regards to the development of the exam. She explained that the current Part III Clinical Skills Exam will be replaced when NBEO launches the new Part III exam. The new exam is quite different in format and emphasis from the current exam. The new exam will be called "Patient Encounters and Performance Skills (PEPS). The new exam will focus heavily on clinical thinking, synthesis, analysis, and decision making, rather than physically performing the skills. Therefore, patient encounters will form the bulk of the new exam and there will be some evaluation of the candidate's ability to perform specific essential skills as well.

In the Summer of 2019, the NBEO launched the stakeholder survey to determine which skills stakeholders considered most essential for testing. The Task Force consisted of 12 very diverse members of the optometric community to obtain diverse opinions and ensure that all aspects of optometry would be represented. She noted the new exam model was released in the Spring of 2020 and consists of 12 stations (10 standardized patient encounter stations plus 2 skills stations). The blueprint (PEPS) was released during the summer of 2020 and it specifies the components of the exam. All candidates will receive the same mix of patients. The five skills tests consist of Tonometry, Gonioscopy, Biomicroscopy, BIO, and Dilated Biomicroscopy. Dr. Hobbs announced that currently two committees have been formed to work on furthering the development of the exam.

[Dr. Brooke Houck](#) (NBEO Director of Psychometrics and Research), spoke on NBEO's process of test development that the organization has used. The validity of the exam is the most important part of test development. Validity refers to the degree to which evidence and theory support the interpretations of test scores for proposed uses of tests. Designing the test is the next step; it is a structured process to determine and document a test's defining characteristics. Analysis of the domains is performed. This is a review conducted to define and document, knowledge and skills that are relevant to the test. Development of the blueprint is a response to three questions: 1) how many test items/tasks should be devoted to each content area? 2) what item format is most appropriate? 3) how many items should be developed for each cognitive complexity level? Afterward, the development and review of the exam content are performed. The result is a bank of items/tasks that aligns with the blueprint

and the intended interpretations and uses of test scores. Currently, with PEPS they are in the pre-test and analyze phase. After all pilot testing and pre-testing of items are completed the committees and councils work with the exam directors to assemble the items or tasks into one or more test forms. If an appropriate cut score does not exist, a panel of experts reviews the test to establish performance standards for a minimally qualified candidate (MQC) to pass. The performance standards are translated into one cut score for the test. Once a test is developed and put into operational use, it requires ongoing care and attention to improve upon or, at a minimum, maintain valid evidence.

Dr. Wang asked when the new test will be implemented? Dr. Houck replied that she does not expect the new PEPS exam to be implemented before August of 2022.

Dr. Kawaguchi asked what groups were involved in determining that sweeping changes needed to be made to Part III and what the process was like; Dr. Hobbs responded that there was some sentiment within the optometric community to move away from whether the candidate can perform a task, over to critical thinking about the task because ultimately the greatest threat to patient protection is not so much gathering the data as much as it is the actual decision making surrounding it. Dr. Bryant added that NBEO heard received a lot of feedback from stakeholder groups; namely the ARBO and the Association of Schools and Colleges of Optometry (ASCO) about the current Part III exam. A deep analysis was conducted and ultimately the decision was made that the NBEO needed to work towards a restructuring of Part III. Feedback from the stakeholder survey provided information about what potential elements could be removed from the exam and what elements needed to be added to the exam.

Ms. Brandvein noted that the content is terrific, but her question is how are we going to make testing readily available; Dr. Hobbs responded, stating that the NBEO's testing center in Charlotte has been open since mid-May, and over a thousand candidates have taken their exam in Charlotte. According to the percentages, only around 20 California candidates have yet to schedule their exam. Regarding having one testing location, she argued that California is not an outlier in this. The osteopathic medical candidates travel either to Philadelphia or Chicago for their performance exam. Also, podiatry students travel to Philadelphia for their performance exam.

[Dr. Bill Rafferty](#), OD, Executive Director, North Carolina State Board of Optometry provided details on the Task Force approach and validity. The process was comprised of three meetings and the NBEO considered exam validity, reliability, security and candidate and test giver safety as being highly critical and needing to be maintained. Dr. Rafferty assured that the task force spent considerable time looking at the feasibility, and the cost of opening a temporary or permanent testing center on the West coast. Having a second testing center on the West coast would raise fees for all students. The NBEO considers the point of a second testing center as valid. Dr. Hobbs added that the NBEO does hear, understand and care about the requests for a temporary testing center on the West coast and it continues to be a point of ongoing discussions. Recommendations from the task force to pursue a temporary means are being taken seriously.

Public Comment:

- Dr. Patrick O’Neil, OD, President of the American Regulatory Boards of Optometry (ARBO). He noted the important differences between optometry schools and regulatory examinations and why they must remain separate and distinct entities for reasons of validity, defensibility, and conflicts of interest.
- Lisa Fennell, Executive Director of ARBO. She noted that there is a big push for mobility and portability at this time, and having a license in one state that does not allow you to receive a license in any other state seems like a huge barrier to mobility and portability. Additionally, Ms. Fennell explained that ARBO is here to address any concerns and answer any questions; this is ARBO’s purpose.
- Dr. John Flanagan, Dean, Berkeley School of Optometry. Dr. Flanagan clarified that schools are not in any way attempting to move away from the national board examinations: In fact, the deans have spoken very strongly of the need for national examinations and their support for these exams. He noted that what they do want is emergency planning so students can have access to licensure once they have graduated. Mr. Flanagan argued that the national board has been unable to provide emergency planning and alternative routes; therefore, the state Board is where we must attempt to accomplish this task. ARBO does not have regulatory authority; it is the state boards that have regulatory authority.

9. Future Agenda Items

Audio of Discussion: [3:49:11 / 3:52:45](#)

Ms. Brandvein suggested that staff begin the process with OPES of pulling the public documents relative to the process of testing requirements and the study that Ms. Montez referred to for a future meeting.

CLOSED SESSION

The Board went into closed session at 3:00 p.m.

10. Adjournment

Upon conclusion of closed session, the meeting adjourned.