

The Connecticut Board of Examiners for Opticians held a meeting on Wednesday, February 25, 2013 at the Department of Public Health, 410 Capitol Avenue, Third Floor Conference Room, Hartford, CT.

**BOARD MEMBERS**

**PRESENT:**

Linda Conlin, LO, Chairperson  
René"Skip" Rivard, LO  
Donna K. Bojus (Public Member)

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Jeffrey Kardys, Administrative Hearings Specialist/Board Liaison, DPH; Jennifer Filippone, Chief, Practitioner Licensing and Investigation Section; Gary Griffin, Practitioner Investigation Unit, DPH; Alfreda Gaither, Esq., Staff Attorney, Hearing Office, DPH; Janine Cordero, DPH Licensing and Applications Specialist; Deborah Brown, DPH Health Program Assistant; Marianne Horn, J.D., Director of Legal Services, Department of Public Health;

**RECOGNIZED GUESTS:**

Danielle Wilken, M.S., M.T. (ASCP), Assistant VP of Academic Affairs, Goodwin College; Sharon J. Koch, Ed.D., Chair of General Education, Goodwin College, Atty. Aaron S. Bayer, Wiggin and Dana, Counsellors at Law, representing Goodwin College.

Chairperson Linda Conlin called the meeting to order at 9:18 a.m.

I. **Minutes** - December 5, 2012

1. Motion to Waive the Reading of the Minutes. Motion: Bojus, Second, Rivard. Motion Passed.

II. **New Business**

A. Program Approval - Goodwin Technical College - Application to Begin a program in Ophthalmic Science.

1. As previously presented to the Board ( Bd Minutes, 12 September 2012) Goodwin College is proposing a new course in Ophthalmic Science.

Dr.Koch introduced herself as the author of the Ophthalmic Science program proposed by Goodwin College. The college is now seeking approval of the program from the Board which would allow its future graduates to apply for optician licensure.

Discussion followed. Previously listed as its Program Director, Dr. Koch informed the Board that she had recently been promoted and would continue to serve only as the Program consultant. Neither a Program Director nor any optician faculty has been hired. Any equipment necessary to fulfill the goals and objectives of the proposed core curriculum has not been acquired.

Ms. Bojus questioned how the Board could consider approving graduates, when in fact, there currently isn't a program yet in place. She said that the program is currently just a proposal, and until it became operational, with faculty and equipment, she would feel uncomfortable approving the program or its graduates.

Ms. Wilken told the Board that the College is also pursuing programmatic accreditation from a national accrediting agency. She said that they too would not formally accredit the Program until after it has graduated its first class. She stated that it "is pretty routine for how this type of program works."

Attorney Bayer stated that it would be "impossible" to attract students to the program unless it publicized that graduates would be eligible to take the exam. He also stated that it would be very difficult to hire faculty for a program which did not have approval. The college would hesitate funding expenses and equipment if its graduates were not approved.

Ms. Bojus responded that if the program was approved by the State Department of Higher Education, the college would be able to award an academic degree to its graduates which should initially attract students and faculty.

Director Horn interceded that several issues were raised that should be discussed with the Department of Higher Education. Discussion will include representation from the Board. Chairperson Conlin requested additional discussion. Mr. Rivard replied that, at this time, he would remain absent from the discussion.

A motion was made to Table Agenda Item II-A, Program Approval Goodwin Technical College pending further discussion with the Department of Higher Education. Motion: Bojus; Second, Conlin; Abstain: Rivard. Motion passed.

B. Memorandum of Decision - Meeting House Opticians - Petition 2012-1147

1. Motion to Accept: Rivard; Second Bojus. Motion passed unanimously.
2. Ms. Conlin advised all present that additional charges pending against, Jeffrey Fine, the license of record for the above cited MOD, incorrectly cited him for the unlicensed practice of Optometry.

### III. Department of Public Health Updates

A. Investigations Update - *Gary Griffin, Practitioner, Investigation Unit, DPH*

1. Mr. Griffin said that two investigations are ongoing. He reported a retail store in Enfield was investigated regarding the sale of non-prescribed (plano) cosmetic contact lens. No pending cases had been resolved since our last meeting.
2. Mr. Rivard questioned the investigation status of ELO Optical, Torrington, CT. The Board minutes of May 10, 2012 state that an Optical Selling Permit had been reinstated to ELO Optical. Those minutes reflect that the ELO Optical permit had been inactive for several years. It was questioned if it had been operating without a valid OSP. Mr. Rivard noted that minutes from the Board meeting on September 12, 2012 also indicate that the investigation was ongoing. Mr. Griffin reported that the investigation is still in progress.

3. Mr. Rivard asked the investigation status pertaining to Wal-Mart Optical and Independent Doctors of Optometry. It was first presented to the Board at its May 10, 2012 meeting and was referred to the DPH for investigation. The Board minutes of September 12, 2012 stated that the investigation was ongoing.

Mr. Griffin reported that the investigation is still ongoing.

B. Examination Update - *Deborah Brown, Health program Assistant*

1. Tentative Dates were selected for the Practical Exam in June. Mr. Rivard will check the availability of the college and report back to the DPH and the Board.
2. After discussion, the Board confirmed that should a licensing candidate demonstrate an inability, by verbal comments or physical demonstration, to safely perform the tested subject matter of the exam, said candidate may be eliminated from any portion of the exam where safety is an issue. Such action may only be undertaken after discussion with the candidate and a decision of the majority of the Board members present.

IV. **Legal Office Business**

- A. No Business

V. **Examination Appeals - *Deborah Brown, Health program Assistant***

1. Two unsuccessful candidates from the November licensing exam appeared before the Board to request a review of their examination results.

VI. **Additional Agenda Items**

- A. Motion to enter Executive Session to review candidate exam scores. Motion: Rivard, Second: Bojus. Motion passed at 10:15 AM.
1. Motion to come out of Executive Session. Motion: Bojus, Second: Rivard. Motion passed at 12:02 PM.
  2. Candidates will be notified of the Review results.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Rivard made a motion, seconded by Ms. Bojus to adjourn the meeting at 12:05 P.M. Motion passed.

Respectfully submitted,



René R. Rivard  
Connecticut Board of Examiners for Opticians

The Connecticut Board of Examiners for Opticians held a meeting on Wednesday, May 8, at the Department of Public Health, 410 Capitol Avenue, Second Floor, Law Library, Hartford, CT.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Linda Conlin, LO, Chairperson  
René"Skip" Rivard, LO  
Donna K. Bojus (Public Member)

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**ALSO PRESENT:** Jeffrey Kardys, Administrative Hearings Specialist/Board Liaison, DPH; Jennifer Filippone, Chief, Practitioner Licensing and Investigation Section; Gary Griffin, Practitioner Investigation Unit, DPH; Alfreda Gaither, Esq., Staff Attorney, Hearing Office, DPH; Deborah Brown, DPH Health Program Assistant

**RECOGNIZED GUESTS:** Raymond P. Dennis, LO, MA, Program Coordinator, Ophthalmic Design & Dispensing Program, Middlesex Community College; Ohan Karagozian, LO.

Chairperson Linda Conlin called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

I. **Minutes -**

A. December 5, 2012

1. Motion to accept Minutes. Motion: Rivard, Second, Bojus. Motion Passed.

B. February 25, 2013

1. Chairperson Conlin read the minutes from the meeting. Motion to accept: Bojus, Second, Rivard. Motion passed.

II. **New Business**

A. Correspondence from Jeffrey Fine.

1. Mr. Fine has requested a payment plan in response to a Memorandum of Decision, Petition No. 2012-1147, Re: Meeting House Opticians, for the amount of \$20,000.

After discussion, the Board requested that Mr. Kardys communicate with Mr. Fine and request a proposal for payment of the fine and present it to the Board at its next meeting.

Referring to her comments from our meeting of February 27, 2013, Chairperson Conlin, again remarked that pending civil charges against Mr. Fine allege the unlicensed practice of Optometry and that charges should be corrected to the unlicensed practice of Opticianry. The court docket indicates two previous postponements also citing the inaccurate charges. Discussion followed with concerns that charges might be dismissed based on a legal technicality of terminology. Attorney Gaither will contact the State's Attorney's office in an attempt to correct the charges.

### III. Old Business

#### A. Program Approval - Goodwin Technical College

1. Jennifer Filippone reported that she had contacted the State Department of Higher Education. A meeting will be set up with the Commissioner of Higher Education and a representative of the Board of Examiners to discuss procedures.
2. Ms. Conlin recognized Professor Dennis who discussed the history of approval for the optician's program at Middlesex Community College. He stated that the Program was not pre-approved at its inception by the Board of Examiners to allow it graduates to apply for the State licensing exam until it had graduated its first class. He was not allowed to advise opticianry students during the first two years of its operation that they would be eligible to apply for the State exam. After the program was approved by the Commission on Opticianry Accreditation, the Board of Examiners for Opticians, allowed graduates to apply for the optician examination.

Discussion followed regarding approval of new degree granting programs which lead to licensing of a profession by the State. Further discussion included that although CGS Sec. 20-146 provides that successful completion of an educational program approved by the Board may be substituted for apprenticeship, there is no criteria in place for such approval.

Future agenda items may include criteria for programmatic approval of educational programs to be approved by the Board.

Ms. Bojus reaffirmed her concerns that a request has been made to approve a program which is essentially only a business plan. She does not feel approval can be granted until after a program is in operation and cannot be based on a conceptual plan.

Discussion also followed that an academic program not located within a State facility, such as Middlesex, might require an Optical Selling Permit to conduct a campus optical clinic.

Discussion also followed regarding criteria for candidates who apply for licensure who apply from out-of-state programs. Currently, graduates of COA accredited programs are allowed to apply.

### IV. Department of Public Health Updates

#### A. Investigations Update - *Gary Griffin, Practitioner, Investigation Unit, DPH*

1. Mr. Griffin said that two investigations are in process. No pending cases had been resolved since our last meeting.
2. Mr. Rivard once again questioned the investigation status of ELO Optical, Torrington, CT. The Board minutes of May 10, 2012 state that an Optical Selling Permit had been reinstated to ELO Optical. Those minutes reflect that the ELO Optical permit had been inactive for several years. It was questioned if it had been operating without a valid OSP. Mr. Rivard noted that minutes from the Board meeting on September 12, 2012 and February 27, 2013 also indicate that the investigation was ongoing. Mr. Griffin reported that the investigation is still in progress.

3. Mr. Rivard asked if the investigation pertaining to Walmart Optical and Independent Doctors of Optometry was still ongoing. The request for investigation was first presented to the Board at its May 10, 2012 meeting and was referred to the DPH for investigation. The status of the ongoing investigation was referenced in Board minutes of September 12, 2012 and February 27, 2013. Mr. Griffin reported that the investigation is still ongoing.

B. Examination Update - *Deborah Brown, Health program Assistant*

1. Ms. Brown reported eighteen candidates are scheduled for the Contact Lens examination on June 6. Twenty-four candidates are scheduled for the Eyewear exam on June 13 and 15 candidates for State Law. Fourteen candidates are first time takers. There are 10 retakes for Eyewear; 4 retakes for Contact Lenses.
2. Sufficient supplies have been ordered for the exam. Proctors have been selected. Mr. Rivard will supply names of proctors to Ms. Brown.

V. **Office of Licensure Regulation and Compliance**

- A. No Business

VI. **Additional Agenda Items**

1. Having no other agenda items, Chairperson Conlin asked the guests if they wished to address the Board.
  - a. Professor Dennis announced that he is the appointed liaison between the Connecticut Opticians Association and the Board of Examiners. He addressed both his concerns and those of the COA regarding the ordering and dispensing of prescription eyewear by unlicensed online retailers located in and doing business within the State of Connecticut. Lively discussion followed regarding the online sales of eyewear, contact lenses and other (non-optical) prescription goods.
  - b. Professor Dennis asked for confirmation that should the optician of record, as listed on an Optical Selling Permit, disassociates from the establishment, a new Optical Selling Permit must be applied for. He also questioned whether any additional opticians who may be listed as employees on the permit, and remain in the employ of the establishment, would eliminate the need to reapply for a permit. The Board and Ms. Filippone agreed that when the optician of record disassociates from the practice, the permit is terminated. A new optical selling permit must be applied for, regardless if additional opticians remain. Only one optician, the optician of record, is personally responsible for all acts and omissions, by himself or others, pertaining to the optician's law. [Department of Public Health Regulations: Sec. 20-141-12 Optical Selling Permits; Sec. 20-141-18 Disassociation of Licensed Optician from Establishment; Sec. 20-141-20. Licensed Optician Responsible for all Establishments for which he is granted an Optical License Permit.]

**ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Bojus made a motion, seconded by Mr. Rivard to adjourn the meeting at 10:40 P.M. Motion passed.

Respectfully submitted,

René R. Rivard  
Connecticut Board of Examiners for Opticians

The Connecticut Board of Examiners for Opticians held a meeting on Tuesday, September 10, at the Department of Public Health, 410 Capitol Avenue, Third Floor, Conference Room C, Hartford, CT.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** René "Skip" Rivard, LO, Chairperson  
Linda Conlin, LO  
Donna K. Bojus (Public Member)

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**ALSO PRESENT:** Jeffrey Kardys, Administrative Hearings Specialist/Board Liaison, DPH; Jennifer Filippone, Chief, Practitioner Licensing and Investigation Section; Gary Griffin, Practitioner Investigation Unit, DPH; Alfreda Gaither, Esq., Staff Attorney, Hearing Office, DPH; Janine Cordero, DPH Licensing and Applications Specialist; Deborah Brown, DPH Health Program Assistant; Daniel Shapiro, Esq., AAG, Office of the Attorney General

**RECOGNIZED GUESTS:** Sharon J. Koch, Ed.D, Department Chair for General Education and Associate Professor, Goodwin College; Attys. Aaron S. Bayer and Daniel Wiggins, representing Goodwin College;

Chairperson René Rivard called the meeting to order at 9:22 a.m.

Mr. Rivard thanked Ms. Conlin for her years of dedication as Immediate Past Chairperson and a current member and of the Board of Examiners.

I. **Minutes** -

A. May 8, 2013

1. Motion to accept Minutes. Motion: Conlin, Second, Bojus. Motion Passed.

II. **Department of Health Updates**

A. Investigations Update - *Gary Griffin, Practitioner, Investigation Unit, DPH*

1. One investigation is open involving an eyeglass complaint. It has been sent to an optician consultant for technical review.
2. The ELO case, first reported in the minutes of May 12, 2012, is ready to go to the Legal Department for a Consent Order.
3. Mr. Griffin reported that the Walmart Optical case, also first reported in May 2012, might be ready for presentation at the next meeting of the Board. He explained that investigators are visiting other Walmart stores to take statements from staff.

B. Examination Update - *Deborah Brown, Health Program Assistant*

1. June 2013 exam: There were 14 Contact Lens exam participants: 8 passed, 6 failed. One person did not show. For Eyewear: 20 candidates, 5 passed and 15 failed. Five candidates were granted licenses.
2. Tentative dates were set for the Fall Exam: Tuesday, November 12<sup>th</sup> for Contact Lenses and November 18<sup>th</sup> for Eyewear. The deadline for applications has passed. The actual number of registered candidates will be provided soon.

III. **New Business**

A. License Reinstatement Application Review - *Janine Cordero, DPH Licensing and Applications Specialist; substituting for Frank Manna, Department of Public Health.*

1. The Board received an application for reinstatement from Linda Doll. Her license was originally issued on June 21, 2000 and lapsed on March 31, 2012. There have been no disciplinary actions, and she holds no license in any other state. Ms. Doll's last day of clinical practice was on March 2, 2008. Since then, she was working in completely different field. Ms. Cordero stated that Ms. Doll did not complete any Continuing Education Credits, but proof is not typically required for reinstatement.

Mr. Rivard asked if CECs since 2008 might be requested. Ms. Cordero replied that only 3 years of credits must be maintained. She explained that Ms. Doll did not have any documents to confirm any continuing education. Mr. Rivard stated that there have been significant technical changes in the profession since 2008.

Ms. Conlin noted that Ms. Doll's license renewal application since 2011 required that she attest to annual continuing education. Ms. Doll's renewal applications were not presented to the Board, but could be made available if requested. Asked if she had attended CEC classes, Ms. Doll replied that she planned on attending classes in October.

For the record, Mr. Rivard stated that he was familiar with Ms. Doll, who was his former student at Middlesex Community College. Citing significant changes in the profession during the last five years, he opened discussion questioning if anyone who had been unlicensed for five years and without CECs, be required to retake the licensing exam. Mr. Rivard asked Ms. Doll if her ABO and NCLE were current, to which she replied she was unsure. (Documented CECS are required to renew.) Ms. Doll stated that she "is pretty sure" she had gone to classes, but had no documentation to prove that she took the classes.

Discussion continued regarding retaking the State licensing examinations. Mr. Rivard noted that the State licensing exam content had not changed significantly in the proceeding four years. Ms. Filippone added that the exam was geared to minimum competencies.

Obviously disappointed with the Board's discussion, Ms. Doll abruptly left the meeting.

Ms. Filippone offered that a stipulated agreement or a restricted license, as determined by the Board, could be granted. Such an agreement could include direct supervised practice, including contact lenses. After much discussion, the Board agreed that a restricted license not be issued.

Ms. Conlin stated that it was reasonable for the Board to request documented CEC's affirmed since Ms. Doll's 2011 license renewal application and if provided, suggested a stipulated agreement. Consensus was reached to allow a stipulated agreement that would require 1000 hours of (optician) supervised hours, 500 hours for eyewear and 500 hours for contact lenses, or in lieu of 500 contact lens hours, 500 supervised eyewear hours and retaking the NCLE examination. Should Ms. Doll agree to retake both the ABO and NCLE exams, their successful completion would void the 1000 hours of supervised training.

B. Petition for Declaratory Ruling - Goodwin College - *Daniel Shapiro, AAG, Office of the Attorney General*

To avoid any potential conflict of interest, Chairman Rivard recused himself from the discussion and turned the meeting over to Ms. Conlin.

1. Goodwin College has requested a Declaratory Ruling pursuant to CGS § 4-176 and 20-146(a) concerning the process and standards for approval by the Board of Examiners of a proposed **opticians program under CGS § 20-146(a)**.
2. AAG Shapiro provided suggested options to the Board for a Conditional approval of the program based on programmatic accreditation and a final review by the Board.

Attorney Bayer concurs with the suggestion, citing that the college wants to move forward with the program but cannot proceed without approval from the Office of Higher Education and whatever would generate approval from the Board of Examiners.

Lengthy discussion followed regarding the process and approvals by both the Office of Higher Education and the Commission on Opticianry Accreditation, which grants programmatic accreditation.

Ms. Conlin stated that out-of-state applications from students who have graduated from an accredited program are permitted to take the licensing exam. She suggested that the same process be applied providing the program has OHE approval and COA accreditation.

Speaking for the Department of Public Health, Ms. Filippone, stated that the DPH would agree to the conditional agreement. OHE process has to approve the program before Goodwin can get accreditation, and OHE needs the approval from this Board to move forward. If this Board conditionally approves the program, it will still come back to Board for review at the end of two years, when the program has graduated is first class. At that time, the Board will decide if students can sit for the licensing exam. She recommended that the Board agree to the conditional agreement.

Discussions continued during which it was made clear that until final approval from the Board, Goodwin College cannot advertise that students can sit for the exam.

**Motion:** To grant conditional approval of the Opticians program at Goodwin College pending approval from the OHE, graduation of an optician class, and National programmatic accreditation (currently the Commission on Opticianry). Once the conditions are met, Goodwin College must again petition the Board for its final approval of the program.. At that point, Atty. Bayer withdrew his petition for declaratory ruling. **Motion-Conlin; Second-Bojus. In Favor: Conlin; Abstention: Bojus. Motion Passed.**

IV. **Office of Licensure And Compliance (listed in error as agenda Item V )**

- A. No Business

V. **Additional Agenda Items**

- A. Mr. Rivard opened discussion regarding the vagueness of CGS § 20-146(a) which requires that the Board “approve” any two-year educational program before allowing its graduates to sit for the licensing exam. He suggests the Board consider regulations to make clear approval requirements for Optician education programs. He referred to similar regulations in place for nursing programs.

He is also concerned that apprentice optician training requirements, included in the C.G.S. and DPH regulations, are also vague and lack structure. He referred to the unlimited length of time anyone may remain as an apprentice. He recommends the structure and education requirements for apprenticeship also be clearly defined by regulation.

**Motion:** To add to the agenda: Discussion Regarding Regulation Promulgation for Academic Standards and Training. *Motion-Bojus; Second-Conlin. Motion passed unanimously.*

Discussion followed.

**Motion:** To draft a letter to the Commissioner requesting a meeting with the Board to discuss and consider making Regulations to address Optician education and training requirements. **Motion-Bojus; Second-Conlin. Motion passed unanimously**

- B. Chairman Rivard requests a motion to add to the agenda discussion pertaining to license reinstatement without proof of mandatory continuing education credits.

**Motion-Conlin; Second-Bojus. Motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Rivard discussed several license reinstatements in which the petitioners allegedly fraudulently verified completion of CECs on prior license renewal applications. He asked if the DPH can request verification for three prior years of CECs before reinstatement. Discussion followed. Ms. Filippone informed the Board that the only way to require proof is to amend current regulations. By consensus, the Board agreed to add a request to review current regulations for CEC verification and license reinstatement to the previously agreed upon letter to the Commissioner.

- C. Chairman Rivard recognized members of the audience and answered questions regarding investigations, the examination process and exemptions to Chapter 381.

VI. **Examination Appeals - Deborah Brown, Health Program Assistant.**

- A. Six candidates have appealed their exam results from June 2013. Mr. Rivard allowed an appellant an opportunity to address the Board.

VII. **Examination Review - Eyewear**

- A. **Motion:** To enter Executive Session at 11:20 AM to review examination results. **Motion-Bojus; Second-Conlin. Motion passed unanimously.**

The Board came out of Executive Session at 12:27 PM

1. **Motion:** to come out of Executive Session at 12:27 PM. **Motion-Bojus; Second-Conlin. Motion passed unanimously.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Bojus made a motion, seconded by Ms. Conlin to adjourn the meeting at 12:28 P.M. Motion passed.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna K. Bojus  
Connecticut Board of Examiners for Opticians

The following minutes are draft minutes which are subject to revision and have not yet been adopted by the board.

The Connecticut Board of Examiners for Opticians held a meeting on Tuesday, December 10, 2013, at the Department of Public Health, 410 Capitol Avenue, Third Floor, Conference Room C, Hartford, CT.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** René "Skip" Rivard, LO, Chairperson  
Linda Conlin, LO  
Donna K. Bojus (Public Member)

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**ALSO PRESENT:** Jeffrey Kardys, Administrative Hearings Specialist/Board Liaison, DPH; Gary Griffin, Practitioner Investigation Unit, DPH; Alfreda Gaither, Esq., Staff Attorney, Hearing Office, DPH; Janine Cordero, DPH Licensing and Applications Specialist; Deborah Brown, DPH Health Program Assistant.

Chairperson René Rivard called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.

**I. Minutes -**

- A. September 15, 2013
1. Motion to amend minutes from meeting of September 15, 2014. Motion: Conlin, Second, Bojus. Motion Passed
  2. Motion to accept amended minutes from meeting of September 15, 2014. Motion: Conlin, Second, Bojus. Motion Passed

**II. Department of Health Updates**

- A. Investigations Update - *Gary Griffin, Practitioner, Investigation Unit, DPH*
1. No active investigations. Two cases are pending before the Office of License Regulation and Compliance.
  2. The DPH continues to investigate and stop the sale of "plano" cosmetic soft lenses in beauty salons and convenience stores. The latest investigation was at a beauty salon in New London.
- B. Examination Update- *Janine Cordero, DPH Licensing and Applications Specialist; Deborah Brown, Health Program Assistant*
1. Contact Lens: Nine registered candidates. One did not attend. Five failed. Three passed
  2. Eyewear: Sixteen candidates. One did not attend. Seven failed. Eight passed
    - a. Results will be mailed to the candidates within the week. It is anticipated that six new licenses will be issued.
  3. Discussion followed regarding repeated exam failures. Opticians are the only regulated profession within the DPH which allows an apprenticeship for training.
  4. A review of exam score points and scoring sheets was tabled for a future meeting. Ms. Cordero will check to determine if exam score sheets might be emailed to the Board for review before a future meeting.

### III. **Old Business**

#### A. Goodwin College - Application for Ophthalmic Science Program

1. A letter from Jennifer Filipone, Section Chief, Practitioner Licensing and Investigations, dated October 17, 2013, acknowledged the conditional approval, granted by the Board at its meeting on Sept. 10, 2013, to an application by Goodwin College to offer a program in Ophthalmic Science. In summary, the letter references that after approval by the Connecticut Office of Higher Education (OHE) and accreditation by the Commission on Opticianry Accreditation (COA), the application shall be returned to the Board for final approval.
2. An advertisement from Goodwin College was distributed stating that, "Students will be prepared to sit for [the] both the American Board of Opticianry's (ABO) and the National Contact Lens Examination (NCLE). Once passed, students will be eligible to take the state exam to be an optician in Connecticut."

The minutes from the Board meeting of September 10, 2013 document, ". . . it was made clear that until final approval from the Board, Goodwin College cannot advertise that students can sit for the exam." In attendance were: Sharon J. Koch, Ed.D, Department Chair for General Education and Associate Professor, Goodwin College; Attys. Aaron S. Bayer and Daniel Wiggins, representing Goodwin College.

It was the unanimous consensus of the Board that the advertising for the program was misleading and in violation of its conditional approval.

Chairperson Rivard requested that a letter be sent to Goodwin College advising it correct its misleading advertising and announcements.

Discussion followed regarding CGS 20-146 [Licensed Opticians; Examinations. Licensure without Examination] as it pertains to "completion of a two year educational program approved by the board...."

### IV. **Office of Licensure Regulation And Compliance.** *No report*

### V. **Additional Agenda Items**

- A. Meeting with the Commissioner. It was agreed that Chairman Rivard will request a meeting with the Commissioner to discuss, 1) Education and training requirements for opticians, 2) the approval requirements for an academic education program for opticians and 3) current regulations for continuing education credit verification and license reinstatement.
- B. Apprenticeship Training. Mr Rivard presented talking points for discussion and consensus.
  1. Supervising optician currently not responsible for poor testing performance of apprentices
    - a. The optician supervisor should be required to maintain detailed annual training evaluation reports at the completion of each apprentice renewal (annual) period.
    - b. Should an apprentice fail to establish competence in licensing examinations for reasons attributable to the failure of the supervisor to properly train and instruct such apprentice, the Board, upon notice and affording an opportunity to be heard, may exclude an individual from acting as a supervisor. Limit the number of apprentices registered to a supervisor at no more than four. The ratio of apprentices to opticians during store hours shall not exceed the number set, ie: 4:1.

2. Apprenticeship Identification to the public. Chairman Rivard acknowledged apprentice opticians are often misidentified as licensed.
  - a. Each apprentice shall wear an identification tag, which shall be clearly visible to the patient at all times. The tag shall bear the first name or initial, the full second name, and on a separate line, be clearly labeled "Apprentice Optician". The letters on the tag shall be in type not smaller than ¼ inch
  - b. Recognizing that apprentice training is geared to providing a terminal career goal, consider limiting years of apprentice training before mandatory testing for licensing. This would prevent a "career" optician apprentice.
  
3. Chairman Rivard presented optician apprenticeship standards from other States.
  - a. Current Connecticut apprentice statutes and DPH Regulation were discussed.
  
4. Failure to successfully complete examination process.
  - a. When an unsuccessful candidate for licensure fails to complete licensure within 2 years of passing any part of the examination, the applicant will be required to retake the examination in total part.
  
5. Education and training requirements for apprentice opticians..
  - a. The optician supervisor should provide appropriate training for the apprentice, and at each renewal period, verify when each task of that training was successfully completed.
  - b. Current apprenticeship training is neither structured nor documented in detail. Verification and apprentice renewal forms are somewhat vague in content areas. Mr. Rivard recommended that the supervising optician be responsible to provide apprentice instruction and training verification in the following areas:
    - (1) Neutralizing and Producing Lenses (1000 Hrs)
    - (2) Mounting Ophthalmic Lenses to Supporting Materials (725 Hrs)
    - (3) Layout and Mark-up for Bench and Edging (725 Hrs)
    - (4) Fitting and Adjusting Final Eyewear to the Ultimate Wearer (1000 hrs)
    - (5) Repairing Optical Frames or Mountings and Supplying Repair Parts (150 Hrs)
    - (6) Measuring Interpupillary Distance and Multifocal Seg Heights (500 Hrs)
    - (7) Obtaining Visual Acuity by use of a Snellen-type Chart (50 Hrs)
    - (8) Keratometry and Interpreting Corneal Curvatures (800 hrs)
    - (9) Design and Fitting of Hard and Soft Contact Lenses (1000 Hrs)
    - (10) Neutralizing Contact Lenses (200 Hrs)
    - (11) Dispensing and Evaluating Contact Lenses (1000 Hrs)
    - (12) Biomicroscopy (1000 Hrs)
    - (13) Statutes and Regulations Pertaining to Opticianry (50 Hrs)
    - (14) Total Apprentice Training Hours (8000 Hours)
  - c. Mr. Rivard suggested that standardized Goals and Desired Learning Outcomes be developed for the 14 points and with documented records proving successful compliance and completion in each content area.
  - d. Although if unsuccessful in performing the above tasks, there is currently no statutory language that would prevent an apprentice from applying for licensure.
  
- C. Consensus was reached. Conceptually, to make apprenticeship academically sound, all points were deemed appropriate for review and possible action by Regulation or Statutory change. They will be discussed in a meeting with the Commissioner.

- D. The Chair recognized Ohan Karagozian, a member of the public, who addressed his concerns of lack of license supervision and structure for some optician apprentices. He also suggested that many optical establishments do not have the equipment necessary to complete all the referenced tasks.
- E. Ms. Brown confirmed that should an apprentice be employed by an establishment that does not have the necessary equipment, a limited apprenticeship is granted. It does not preclude a "limited" apprentice from applying for a licensure at the end of an 8,000 hour (limited) apprenticeship.
- F. Previous concerns of the Board regarding lapsed license reinstatement were addressed.
  - 1. Applicants for reinstatement who have not been in "active" practice for longer than six months are referred to the Board for reinstatement
  - 2. Proof of continuing education credits are not routinely requested by the DPH when a lapsed licensee applies for reinstatement.
  - 3. Citing similar policies from the Connecticut Medical Examining Board, Connecticut State Dental Commission and the Board of Examiners for Physical Therapists, it is the opinion of the Board that verification of CEC's for the previous three year period be documented and continuing education credits be made current for year of reinstatement.
- G. Meeting dates were set FY 2014
  - a. February 18
  - b. Tuesday, May 6
  - c. Monday, September 15
  - d. Monday, December 8

**VI. Examination Appeals**

- A. None

**ADJOURNMENT**

Hearing no other business, Ms. Conlin made a motion, seconded by Ms. Bojus to adjourn the meeting at 11:12 P.M. Motion passed.

Respectfully submitted,



René R. Rivard  
Connecticut Board of Examiners for Opticians