

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

BEFORE THE STATE OF NEVADA
BOARD OF OPTOMETRY

DENIS HUMPHREYS, O.D.,
Petitioner.

PETITION FOR ADVISORY OPINION
OR DECLARATORY ORDER

8 This Petition for Advisory Opinion or Declaratory Order (“Petition”) is brought by
9 Petitioner, DENIS HUMPHREYS, O.D., Nevada licensed optometrist #141, pursuant to
10 NRS 636.650, requesting clarification of the propriety of optometrists delegating certain
11 data collection and training tasks and administration of certain examinations or
12 measurements to optometric technicians within the optometrist’s practice, under his or
13 her supervision and control.

14
15

I. CURRENT STATUTES

16
17

NRS 636.025 Acts constituting practice in optometry.

18 1. The acts set forth in this section, or any of them, whether done severally,
19 collectively or in combination with other acts that are not set forth in this section
20 constitute practice in optometry within the purview of this chapter:

* * *

21 (c) *The examination of the human eye and its appendages, the measurement of the*
22 *powers or range of human vision, the determination of the accommodative and*
23 *refractive states of the eye or the scope of its function in general, or the diagnosis or*
24 *determination of any visual, muscular, neurological, interpretative or anatomic*
25 *anomalies or deficiencies of the eye or its appendages or visual processes.*

26 (d) *Prescribing, directing the use of or using any optical device in connection with*
27 *ocular exercises, orthoptics or visual training.*

* * *

28 (g) *The topical use of diagnostic pharmaceutical agents to determine any visual,*
muscular, neurological, interpretative or anatomic anomalies or deficiencies of the eye
or its appendages or visual processes.

(h) *Prescribing, directing the use of or using a therapeutic pharmaceutical agent to treat*
an abnormality of the eye or its appendages.

* * *

(j) *The ordering of laboratory tests to assist in the diagnosis of an abnormality of the*
eye or its appendages.

* * *

1
2 **NRS 636.145 Unlawful practice of optometry; penalties.**

- 3 1. A person shall not engage in the practice of optometry in this State unless:
4 (a) The person has obtained a license pursuant to the provisions of this chapter;
5 and
6 (b) Except for the year in which such license was issued, the person holds a current
7 renewal card for the license.

8 * * *

9 **NAC 636.220 Employment of unlicensed persons for certain services.**

10 A licensee shall not employ, either directly or indirectly, an unlicensed person to
11 perform any services for which an optometrist's license is required by law.

12 **II. THE ISSUE**

13 Do the current Nevada optometry laws permit a licensed optometrist to utilize trained
14 optometric technicians to:

- 15 1. perform optometric testing, data collection and measurement,
16 2. direct the use of therapeutic pharmaceutical agents, or
17 3. direct the use of an optical device in connection with ocular exercises, orthoptics
18 or visual training
19 if the licensed optometrist is physically present or available to the patient at the time of
20 these activities?

21 **III. ANALYSIS**

22 I have been a licensed Nevada optometrist since 1974, and have witnessed
23 numerous changes to the optometric statutory and regulatory frameworks in Nevada. I
24 have been and continue to be committed to the ideals of the Board, including
25 maintaining and enhancing the integrity of the optometric profession and the protecting
26 the public.

27 The activities enumerated in NRS 636.025 were adopted by the Nevada Legislature
28 in 1961, well before the technological advances of the 21st century. These advances

1 now allow data collection, measurement, testing and other tasks to safely and
2 accurately be completed. Technicians, with the assistance of technology, can offer
3 valuable and reliable assistance to patients and optometrists, leaving the analysis,
4 diagnosis, prescribing and treatment to the licensee – effectively using optometrists to
5 perform the functions for which their training and expertise are best suited.

6 Currently most, if not nearly all, optometry practitioners assign many such tasks to
7 technicians, and therefore may be acting in violation of the plain language of the statute.
8 We need guidance from the Board about how to keep up with modern practices while
9 operating within the law.

10 The issue before the Board is whether a licensed optometrist may delegate the tasks
11 italicized in the above laws to an unlicensed technician to use equipment or personal
12 observation skills to collect information and present it to an optometrist in an operational
13 practice. Further, may an optometrist delegate to a technician the explanation and
14 training on the use of a therapeutic pharmaceutical agent or the use of an optical device
15 in connection with ocular exercises, orthoptics or visual training.
16

17 Interpreting the laws broadly, such delegation may be permissible, if the technician
18 acts at the optometrist's direction and under his or her supervision and control. It is
19 important to recognize that a technician, acting alone, is not qualified or able to analyze
20 or interpret the data, diagnose a condition or determine appropriate treatment. But
21 technicians can provide information and training to patients regarding the use of
22 medications, functionality of orthoptics, and other prescribed activities.
23

24 Technicians are simply another tool in the optometrist's toolbox – just as the
25 technology now used in optometric practice can assist optometrists to enhance the
26 quality of their services.

27 //

28 //

1 The Nevada Board of Optometry is encouraged to clarify the laws, report its
2 determination to the profession, and, if necessary, advocate for changes to the Nevada
3 legal framework to allow modern practitioners to practice reasonably within the
4 constraints of the Board's authority.

5 I request that the Board hold an open public hearing on this petition at its earliest
6 opportunity. Thereafter, I request that emergency regulatory changes be put into place
7 and that the matter be brought to the next legislative session to clarify the ability of
8 optometrists to practice efficiently and utilize their resources well.


9
10 DATED this 20th day of December, 2017.

11
12 By _____ /s/ _____
13 Denis Humphreys, O.D., Lic. No. 141
14 Petitioner
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 The Nevada Board of Optometry is encouraged to clarify the laws, report its
2 determination to the profession, and, if necessary, advocate for changes to the Nevada
3 legal framework to allow modern practitioners to practice reasonably within the
4 constraints of the Board's authority.

5 I request that the Board hold an open public hearing on this petition at its earliest
6 opportunity. Thereafter, I request that emergency regulatory changes be put into place
7 and that the matter be brought to the next legislative session to clarify the ability of
8 optometrists to practice efficiently and utilize their resources well.

9
10 DATED this 20th day of December, 2017.

11
12 By  /s/
13 Denis Humphreys, O.D., Lic. No. 141
14 Petitioner

BEFORE THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF OPTOMETRY

CAREN C. JENKINS, ESQ.,
Executive Director of the
Nevada State Board of Optometry,

Complainant,

CASE NO. 18-03

vs.

AMEL YOUSSEF, O.D.

COMPLAINT

Respondent.

The BOARD OF OPTOMETRY OF THE STATE OF NEVADA ("BOARD"), by and through its Executive Director, CAREN C. JENKINS, ESQ. hereby notifies AMEL YOUSSEF, O.D. ("RESPONDENT") of an administrative hearing before the BOARD, which hearing will be held pursuant to Chapters 233B and Chapter 636 of the Nevada Revised Statutes ("NRS") and Chapter 636 of the Nevada Administrative Code ("NAC"). The purpose of the hearing is to consider the allegations stated below and to determine if the RESPONDENT should be subject to an administrative penalty as set forth in NRS 636.295 and NRS 636.420, and the discipline to be imposed if violations are proven.

JURISDICTION

RESPONDENT was at all relevant times mentioned in this Complaint licensed by the Board as an optometrist under License Number 449, and is therefore subject to the jurisdiction of the Board and the provisions of NRS Chapter 636 and NAC Chapter 636.

ALLEGATIONS

1. Respondent is an optometrist duly licensed in the State of Nevada, and has held license #449 since 2002.

2. In mid-2017, the Board received a complaint from a member of the public, alleging that some of Respondent's advertisements failed to state that she is an optometrist or that an individual other than Respondent would perform the LASIK services she advertised. The Complainant, despite his licensure as an optometrist, was not only confused by the advertisements, but was unable to conclusively determine from the advertisements whether Respondent is an optometrist or ophthalmologist, or whether Respondent herself performs LASIK procedures for her patients.

3. NRS 636.380 Right to advertise, provides: A licensee shall be entitled fairly, ethically and truthfully to advertise the practice of optometry.

4. Advertisements for "Vision by Amel", the fictitious business name under which Respondent practices optometry and Respondent registered with the Board in 2015, promote LASIK services which are not truthful, and which fall outside of the permissible practice of optometry. Accordingly, Respondent is not entitled to advertise in this manner.

5. NAC 636.140 Printed advertisements, states: "Any printed advertisement must contain the full name of the optometrist and his professional designation. Any disclaimer in the advertisement must be printed in such a manner as to allow a reasonable person to read and understand it."

6. Certain advertisements promoting Respondent's practice do not contain either her full name or her professional designation or both. Additionally, Respondent's advertisements rarely contained a disclaimer that would allow a reasonable person to know that Respondent collaborates with a physician who presumably performs the LASIK

procedures Respondent advertises. Such advertisements mislead the reader to suggest that Respondent performs the LASIK procedure herself.

7. NAC 636.145 Symbols for advertising, provides: A licensee may use a symbol for advertising if it is: 1. Displayed with the full name and professional identification of the licensee; and 2. Printed no more prominently than the name and professional identification of the licensee.

8. Respondent's advertising promotes "LASIK," a symbol (an object or word that usually stands for something else) for laser-assisted in situ keratomileusis, without referring to either the licensee's full name or professional identification or designation. Further, LASIK appears more prominently than Respondent's name in some advertising, e.g. Respondent's storefront, if her name appears at all.

9. NRS 636.373 Associations or other business relationships with physicians, applies to Respondent's practice, providing:

1. An optometrist may form an association or other business relationship with a physician to provide their respective services to patients.

2. If such an association or business relationship is formed, the optometrist may:

(c) Advertise and promote the services provided by the association or business consistent with the restrictions on advertising set forth in NRS 636.302.

10. If Respondent has a business relationship with a physician to offer pre- and post-surgical care to the physician's LASIK patients, Respondent is entitled to advertise that affiliation; however, most of Respondent's advertisements for LASIK services do not mention a physician, violating NRS 636.302 (3) - Advertising in any manner that will tend to deceive, defraud or mislead the public.

11. NRS 636.295 outlines the grounds for disciplinary action when they are committed, engaged in, omitted, or being suffered by a licensee, including: 8. false or misleading

representations, by or on behalf of the licensee, with respect to optometric materials or services; 10. unethical or unprofessional conduct in the practice of optometry; and 12. violating any provision of NRS 636 or NAC 636.

12. NRS 636.420 provides that any person found to have violated any provision of NRS 636 or NAC 636 is liable to the Board for an administrative fine of not less than \$100 or more than \$5000.

THEREFORE, PETITIONER PRAYS THE BOARD FIND RESPONDENT COMMITTED:

- A. One or more violations of NRS 636.380 by falsely advertising her provision of LASIK, which falls outside of the permissible practice of optometry;
- B. One or more violations of NRS 636.302 (3) by advertising in any manner that will tend to deceive, defraud or mislead the public.
- C. One or more violations of NAC 636.140 by failing to exhibit her full name and/or professional designation in advertisements, and failing to include a disclaimer that would allow a reasonable person to know that Respondent associates or collaborates with a physician who presumably performs the LASIK procedures Respondent advertises;
- D. One or more violations of NAC 636.145 by using the symbol "LASIK" in advertising optometric services without properly displaying her full name and professional designation; and
- E. One or more violations of NRS 636.373(10) by failing to advertise her affiliation with a physician to perform the LASIK services she advertises.

FURTHER, Respondent should be ordered to pay an administrative fine of between \$100 and \$5000 for each violation found, per NRS 636.420.


Accordingly, for each violation found, the Executive Director recommends imposing:

- A. an administrative penalty of \$2,000, and
- B. a requirement that Respondent complete one Continuing Education hour related to optometric office management, particularly related to advertising for optometrists and business associations with non-optometrists, in addition to the 30 CE hours required before her next license renewal.

FURTHER, the Board should strongly urge Respondent to revise or remove all of her non-conforming advertisements, in addition to those reviewed by this Board, as quickly as is practicable , and to have all future advertisements comply with the requirements of NRS 636.

FINALLY, Respondent should be ordered to reimburse the Board for the out-of-pocket costs of the investigation and hearing of this matter, including its attorney's fees and costs.

Respectfully submitted,



Caren C. Jenkins, Esq.
Executive Director
Nevada State Board of Optometry

1/8/18

Date

BEFORE THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF OPTOMETRY

CAREN C. JENKINS, ESQ.,
Executive Director
of the
Nevada State Board of Optometry,

Complainant,

CASE NO. 18-04

vs.

BELA SVOBODA, O.D.

COMPLAINT

Respondent.

_____ /

The BOARD OF OPTOMETRY OF THE STATE OF NEVADA ("BOARD"), by and through its Executive Director, CAREN C. JENKINS, ESQ. hereby notifies RESPONDENT BELA SVOBODA, O.D. ("RESPONDENT") of an administrative hearing before the BOARD, which hearing will be held pursuant to Chapters 233B and Chapter 636 of the Nevada Revised Statutes ("NRS") and Chapter 636 of the Nevada Administrative Code ("NAC"). The purpose of the hearing is to consider the allegations stated below and to determine if the RESPONDENT should be subject to an administrative penalty as set forth in NRS 636.295 and NRS 636.420, and the discipline to be imposed, if violations of law are proven.

JURISDICTION

RESPONDENT was at all relevant times mentioned in this Complaint licensed by the Board as an optometrist under License Number 314, and is therefore subject to the jurisdiction of the Board and the provisions of NRS Chapter 636 and NAC Chapter 636.

//

ALLEGATIONS

1. Respondent is an optometrist duly licensed in the State of Nevada, and has held license #314 since 1995.

2. In mid-2017, the Board received notification from a member of the public, alleging that Respondent failed to provide a patient with requested medical records, and failed to respond to telephone calls, messages and letters requesting the same.

3. The November 2017 notification also alleged that Respondent's failures to respond were not limited to one one patient, but that several patients had similar experiences.

4. NRS 629.061 requires a health care provider to provide access to his or her health care records within 10 working days of a request.

5. By failing to provide patient records to multiple patients when requested within the statutory timeframe, Respondent violated NRS 629.061.

6. Since the Board received the initial complaint, the Board has received numerous telephone calls from Respondent's patients alleging that they, too, have been unable to reach Respondent to obtain their medical records.

7. Since mid-2017, Respondent's personal circumstances have required him to curtail his practice, but he did not make appropriate arrangements to notify his patients regarding his absence or provide alternate means through which they could access their records.

8. Additionally, Respondent interfered with his patients' ability to request their medical records by either placing extreme restrictions on his office hours or curtailing the ability of his patients to contact him to make records request by: operating his office

for 4 hours per week, failing to retrieve telephone or email messages, failing to respond adequately to messages received or negligently arranging for others to meet the requirements of NRS 629.061 on his behalf. In this manner, Respondent indirectly violated NRS 629.061.

9. After discussing these complaints with the Executive Director in late 2017, Respondent has made some attempts to comply with the laws related to the provision of medical records to patients, but has not successfully done so.

10. NRS 636.295 outlines the grounds constituting sufficient cause for disciplinary action by the Board, including: 6. Gross incompetency; 10. Perpetration of unethical or unprofessional conduct in the practice of optometry; and 11. Violation of any provision of NRS 636 or NAC 636.

11. NRS 636.420 provides that any person found to have violated any provision of NRS 636 is liable to the Board for an administrative fine of not less than \$100 or more than \$5000.

IT IS THEREFORE PRAYED THE BOARD FIND RESPONDENT COMMITTED one or more violations of NRS 636.295 by directly or indirectly failing to comply with the requirement to provide patients with access to their medical records within 10 working days of the request.

FURTHER, Respondent should be ordered to pay an administrative fine between \$100 and \$5000, as follows:

For each violation of NRS 636.295, the Executive Director recommends a penalty of \$500, and required completion of two Continuing Education hours related to

practice management specifically regarding patient access to medical records in addition to the standard CE hours required before his next license renewal.

FINALLY, Respondent should be ordered to reimburse the Board for the out-of-pocket costs of the investigation and hearing of this matter, including its attorney's fees and costs.



Caren C. Jenkins, Esq.
Executive Director
Nevada State Board of Optometry

Date 1/8/18

BEFORE THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF OPTOMETRY

CAREN C. JENKINS, ESQ.,
Executive Director
of the
Nevada State Board of Optometry,

Complainant,

CASE NO. 18-07

vs.

MARK OHRINER, O.D.

COMPLAINT

Respondent.

_____ /

The BOARD OF OPTOMETRY OF THE STATE OF NEVADA ("BOARD"), by and through its Executive Director, CAREN C. JENKINS, ESQ. hereby notifies RESPONDENT MARK OHRINER, O.D. ("RESPONDENT") of an administrative hearing before the BOARD, which hearing will be held pursuant to Chapters 233B and Chapter 636 of the Nevada Revised Statutes ("NRS") and Chapter 636 of the Nevada Administrative Code ("NAC"). The purpose of the hearing is to consider the allegations stated below and to determine if the RESPONDENT should be subject to an administrative penalty as set forth in NRS 636.295 and NRS 636.420, and the discipline to be imposed, if violations of law are proven.

JURISDICTION

RESPONDENT was at all relevant times mentioned in this Complaint licensed by the Board as an optometrist under License Number, and is therefore subject to the jurisdiction of the Board and the provisions of NRS Chapter 636 and NAC Chapter 636.

//

ALLEGATIONS

1. Respondent is an optometrist duly licensed in the State of Nevada, and has held license #249 since 1988.

2. In November 2017, the Board received a notification from the Nevada State Board of Pharmacy, alleging that, earlier in 2017, Respondent was authorized to write prescriptions for controlled substances, and did so without establishing a Prescription Monitoring Program (PMP) account and reviewing patient records before prescribing controlled substances.

3. The November 2017 notification also alleged that Respondent exceeded the authority provided by his Therapeutic Pharmaceutical Agent certificate issued by the Board of Optometry.

4. Prior to writing the alleged prescriptions, the Respondent had obtained a Therapeutic Pharmaceutical Agent certificate, a federal Controlled Substance Number and a Drug Enforcement Agency Number, and therefore was authorized to issue prescriptions for certain optometric controlled substances.

5. NRS 453.164(6) requires individuals authorized to issue prescriptions for controlled substances to register for an account with the PMP and access the PMP database at least once every 6 months to review information related to their prescribing history, notify the PMP of any incorrect information, and verify to the Pharmacy Board that they have accessed the PMP database as required.

6. By failing to establish a PMP account and perform the requirements of the statute, Respondent violated NRS 453.164(6).

7. On or about February 2, 2017, Respondent prescribed 100 doses of Hydrocodone-Chlorphen ER solution (a 10-day supply) to a patient, which exceeds the 72-hour (3-day) prescribing limit in NRS 636.2882.

8. On or about October 18, 2017, Respondent issued a prescription to a patient for a 20 pills (a 5-day supply) of Hydrocodone-Acetaminophen, which exceeds the 72-hour (3-day or 18 pill) limit in NRS 636.2882.

9. Respondent already had issued the same patient Hydrocodone-Acetaminophen on July 6, 2017 and August 8, 2017. Respondent issued all three prescriptions without first consulting the PMP to review the patient's records, in violation of NRS 639.23507.

10. On or about August 31, 2017, Respondent prescribed 16 Tramadol (a 4-day supply) to a patient, a drug which is beyond the authority provided by a Therapeutic Pharmaceutical Agent certificate as defined in NRS 636.024.

11. NRS 636.295 outlines the grounds constituting sufficient cause for disciplinary action by the Board, including: 6. Gross incompetency; 10. Perpetration of unethical or unprofessional conduct in the practice of optometry; and 11. Violation of any provision of NRS 636 or NAC 636.

12. NRS 636.420 provides that any person found to have violated any provision of NRS 636 is liable to the Board for an administrative fine of not less than \$100 or more than \$5000.

//

///

IT IS THEREFORE PRAYED THE BOARD FIND RESPONDENT COMMITTED:

A. One violation of NRS 636.295 by issuing a prescription for a controlled substance outside of the authority provided in his TPA certificate, constituting gross incompetency and unprofessional conduct;

B. Two violations of NRS 636.2882 by prescribing more than a 72 hour supply of Hydrocodone to patients on two occasions;

C. One violation of NRS 453.164(6) by failing to establish an account with the Nevada PMP, checking his account at least once every 6 months; and

D. Three violations of NRS 639.23507 by failing to consult with the PMP before issuing a prescription for any controlled substance, reviewing the patient's records, and following the related requirements of the PMP.

FURTHER, Respondent should be ordered to pay an administrative fine between \$100 and \$5000, as follows:


A. For each violation of NRS 636.295, the Executive Director recommends a penalty of \$2,000, and required completion of two Continuing Education hours related to addiction and substance abuse in addition to the 30 CE hours required before his next license renewal.

B. For each violation of NRS 636.2882, the Executive Director recommends a penalty of \$2,000, and required completion of two TPA-related Continuing Education hours in addition to the 30 CE hours required before his next license renewal.

FURTHER, Respondent should have the following equitable remedies imposed for his violations of NRS 453.164 and NRS 639.23507:

Suspension of Respondent's TPA certificate and ability to prescribe any therapeutic agent for 6 months, and thereafter until the PMP represents to the Executive Director in writing that Respondent has registered for a PMP account and completed PMP staff-provided, one-on-one training regarding the PMP's functionality and how to access and report the information required under the relevant law.

FINALLY, Respondent should be ordered to reimburse the Board for the out-of-pocket costs of the investigation and hearing of this matter, including its attorney's fees and costs.



Caren C. Jenkins, Esq.
Executive Director
Nevada State Board of Optometry

Date 1/8/18

Application Endorsement Form : Entry # 1313

Name

none

Social Security Number

Current Address

United States

[Map It](#)

Permanent Mailing Address, including postal code if different from current address listed above

United States

[Map It](#)

Identify Preferred Mailing Address

Current

Identify each maiden name, surname, or any other names or aliases you have been known by or used, and identify the reason for your name change.

Place of birth (City, County, State, other jurisdiction, Country)

Date of Birth

Telephone Numbers

E-Mail Address

Are you a citizen of the United States?

Yes

Do you intend to seek entry into the United States for the purpose of performing labor as a healthcare worker, other than an optometrist?

No

Have you ever served in the Military?

No

Military Occupation Specialty/Specialties?

none

Application Endorsement Form : Entry # 1313

Has your spouse ever served in the Military?

No

Military Occupation Specialty/Specialties?

none

1. Name of Last Secondary School Attended

Location of Last Secondary School Attended

Year of Graduation

Name of College/University

Dates of Attendance

From - To

05/1980 to 12/1980

From - To

01/1981 to 05/1981

From - To

08/1981 to 05/1983

From - To

08/1983 to 05/1987

Graduated

No

No

No

Yes

Degree/Major

Application Endorsement Form : Entry # 1313

Optometrist

Jurisdiction

Arizona

Colorado

Washington State

Puerto Rico

License Number

Date of Issuance

05/31/2004

03/16/2015

01/04/2001

12/09/1987

Status

active

active

inactive

inactive

1. Have you ever had an application for any professional license refused or denied by any licensing authority?

No

2. Have you ever been refused or denied the privilege of taking an examination required for any professional licensure?

No

3. Have you ever voluntarily surrendered your optometry license?

Application Endorsement Form : Entry # 1313

No

4. Have you ever allowed your optometry license to lapse, or had a limited license issued by any optometric authority?

No

5. Have you ever voluntarily surrendered any other professional license?

No

6. Have you ever allowed any other professional license to lapse, or had a limited license issued by any other licensing authority?

No

7. Have you ever been the subject of disciplinary action with regard to your optometry license?

No

8. Has your optometry license ever been revoked?

No

9. Have you ever had any other professional license revoked?

No

10. Have you ever been the subject of disciplinary action by any licensing agency with regard to any other professional license?

No

11. To your knowledge, have any unresolved or pending complaints been filed against you with any optometric licensing authority?

No

12. Have you ever had a registration issued by a controlled substance authority revoked, suspended, surrendered, limited, or restricted?

No

13. Have you ever voluntarily surrendered a registration issued by a controlled substance authority?

No

14. Has your application for accreditation by the DEA ever been denied?

No

15. Has the DEA ever disciplined your certification, or have you ever voluntarily surrendered it, allowed it to lapse, or had a limited certificate issued by the DEA:

No

16. Is there any disciplinary action pending against you by any licensing jurisdiction, drug enforcement agency, or any state drug enforcement authority?

No

17. Have you been charged with or convicted (including a nolo contendere plea or guilty plea) of a felony (or criminal offense in any state or federal court (other than minor traffic violations) whether or not sentence was imposed or suspended?

No

18. Have you ever been pardoned from a felony (or criminal) conviction?

No

19. Have you ever had a record expunged from a felony (or criminal) conviction?

Application Endorsement Form : Entry # 1313

No

20. Have you ever been charged with or convicted (including a nolo contendere plea or guilty plea) of a violation of any federal or state drug law(s) or rule(s) whether or not sentence was imposed or suspended?

No

21. Are you being treated or have you, in the last 5 years, been treated for drug or alcohol addiction or participated in a rehabilitation program?

No

1. Name of Business/Institution

Address/Phone Number of Business/Institution

Dates of Employment

07/21/2006

10/27/2017

Job Title

Optometrist

Name of Supervisor

Description of Duties Performed

Primary care Optometrist.. Still working at

2. Name of Business/Institution

Address/Phone Number of Business/Institution

Dates of Employment

12/12/1987

06/30/2006

Job Title

Optometrist

Name of Supervisor

Reason for termination/resignation

Description of Duties Performed

Application Endorsement Form : Entry # 1313

General Optometry

1. I currently have obligation for child support

No

2. I am currently obligated by Court Order for the payment of child support

No

3. I am obligated to pay child support, and have had arrearages on my obligation

No

4. Currently there is an arrearage on my child support obligation

No

5. I am currently repaying a child support arrearage pursuant to an agreement with the District Attorney or other public enforcement agency, and my ongoing monthly payment is current

No

Name

Date

10/26/2017

State Of

Arizona

County Of

Maricopa

I,

3. I am currently licensed to practice optometry in the State of

Arizona

under license number

which was originally issued on

5/5/2004

- By submitting this information and checking this box, I affirm that each document is complete and correct and that all information contained in this submission is true under the pains and penalties of perjury and the requirements of NRS Chapter 636 and NAC Chapter 636 and Nevada law generally. I also acknowledge that if I have directed or authorized a person to complete or submit this information on my behalf, I, the optometrist licensed by the Nevada Board of Optometry, am fully responsible for the content of the submission.

Name

Application Endorsement Form : Entry # 1313

Date

10/26/2017

Credit Card

- I have read all questions, answers and statements and know the contents thereof. I hereby certify, under penalty of perjury, that the information furnished on this application are true, accurate and correct.

Order

| Product | Qty | Unit Price | Price |
|-----------------------------|-----|--------------|-----------------|
| Application/Examination fee | 1 | \$225.00 | \$225.00 |
| Processing Fee (3.5%) | 1 | \$7.88 | \$7.88 |
| | | Total | \$232.88 |

Date: 11/22/2017

SSN: xxx-xx

OE Number

PRE - 1987 CONTENT OUTLINES

| EXAM DATE | PARTS | | | SECTIONS | Th Optics | Vis Sci I | Ocular Anatomy | Oph Optics | Vis Sci II | Th & Prac of Opt | Ocular Pathology | Pub Hlth ... Juris | Ocular Pharm | SPECIAL | TMOD | PART |
|-----------|-------|-----|-----|----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------|------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------|------|------|
| | I | IIA | IIB | | | | | | | | | | | | | III |
| 1985 Apr | 227F | | | | 55 | 52 | 41 | | | | | | | | | |
| 1986 Apr | 253F | | | | 54 | 66 | 53 | | | | | | | | | |

2000 - 2009 CONTENT OUTLINES

| EXAM DATE | PARTS | | | SECTIONS | Human Biology | Ocular/Visual Biology | Th/Op/Ph Optics | Psychology | Systemic Conditions | Ocular Dis/Trauma | Refract... Conditions | Percept Conditions | Public Health | Legal/Ethical | Clinical Skills | Pat Assmt & Mgmt | SPECIAL | TMOD | ACMO |
|-----------|-------|----|-----|----------|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------|------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|---------|------|------|
| | I | II | III | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2003 Apr | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 75P | |

A 'P' or 'F' after a score indicated Pass or Fail.

Section scores are reported on a different scale than Part scores. Therefore, the sum of section scaled scores is not likely to equal a Part scaled score. Scores for Clinical Skills/VRICS (CSK, VRICS & CSK/V) before 1993 are identified separately. For 1993 to 1999, these were included as Section scores of Part III, which consisted of Clinical Skills, VRICS, and Patient Management. In 2000, the VRICS and Patient Management sections were replaced with the Patient Assessment and Management (PAM) section.

The Legal and Ethical Issues (Legal/Ethical) Section of Part II was known as Clinicolegal Issues prior to 1998.

Please note that while a pass/fail decision has been made by the National Board based on the Part scores only (except TMOD, CSK/V, and ACMO), each State Board will make a licensure decision based on its own rules and regulations regarding use of all scores reported.

Nevada Optometry State Law Exam

Name:

OE Tracker:

Exam Results

Total # of questions on exam: 100
 Total # answered correctly: 79
 Total # answered incorrectly: 21
 Percentage Score: 79%
 Date Started: 10/27/2017
 Date Completed: 10/27/2017

Exam results per question:

Correct = ✓ | Incorrect = ✗

| | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Question 1: ✓ | Question 2: ✓ | Question 3: ✗ | Question 4: ✓ | Question 5: ✓ |
| Question 6: ✓ | Question 7: ✗ | Question 8: ✓ | Question 9: ✓ | Question 10: ✓ |
| Question 11: ✓ | Question 12: ✓ | Question 13: ✓ | Question 14: ✓ | Question 15: ✗ |
| Question 16: ✓ | Question 17: ✓ | Question 18: ✓ | Question 19: ✓ | Question 20: ✓ |
| Question 21: ✓ | Question 22: ✓ | Question 23: ✗ | Question 24: ✓ | Question 25: ✓ |
| Question 26: ✓ | Question 27: ✗ | Question 28: ✓ | Question 29: ✓ | Question 30: ✗ |
| Question 31: ✗ | Question 32: ✓ | Question 33: ✓ | Question 34: ✓ | Question 35: ✗ |
| Question 36: ✓ | Question 37: ✓ | Question 38: ✓ | Question 39: ✓ | Question 40: ✓ |
| Question 41: ✓ | Question 42: ✗ | Question 43: ✓ | Question 44: ✗ | Question 45: ✓ |
| Question 46: ✓ | Question 47: ✓ | Question 48: ✓ | Question 49: ✗ | Question 50: ✓ |
| Question 51: ✓ | Question 52: ✓ | Question 53: ✓ | Question 54: ✓ | Question 55: ✓ |
| Question 56: ✓ | Question 57: ✗ | Question 58: ✓ | Question 59: ✓ | Question 60: ✓ |
| Question 61: ✗ | Question 62: ✓ | Question 63: ✗ | Question 64: ✗ | Question 65: ✓ |
| Question 66: ✓ | Question 67: ✓ | Question 68: ✓ | Question 69: ✓ | Question 70: ✓ |
| Question 71: ✓ | Question 72: ✗ | Question 73: ✓ | Question 74: ✗ | Question 75: ✓ |
| Question 76: ✓ | Question 77: ✗ | Question 78: ✗ | Question 79: ✓ | Question 80: ✓ |
| Question 81: ✓ | Question 82: ✓ | Question 83: ✓ | Question 84: ✓ | Question 85: ✓ |
| Question 86: ✓ | Question 87: ✓ | Question 88: ✓ | Question 89: ✓ | Question 90: ✓ |
| Question 91: ✓ | Question 92: ✗ | Question 93: ✓ | Question 94: ✗ | Question 95: ✓ |
| Question 96: ✓ | Question 97: ✓ | Question 98: ✓ | Question 99: ✓ | Question 100: ✓ |

Douglas A. Ducey
Governor

John Chrisagis, O.D.
President

Marla Husz, O.D.
Vice President



Arizona State Board of Optometry
1400 West Washington, Suite 230
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Margaret Whelan
Executive Director

Telephone (602) 542-3095 - Fax (602) 542-3093

License Verification

Print Date February 3, 2017

Doctor:

License:

| | | | |
|----------------------|--------|------------------|-----------|
| Number: | | Issue Date: | 5/5/2004 |
| Status: | Active | Expiration Date: | 8/26/2017 |
| Disciplinary Action: | No | | |

Certificate(s) of Special Qualification:


| | | | |
|-------------|--------|-------------|----------|
| DPA Number: | N/A | Issue Date: | N/A |
| TPA Number: | N/A | Issue Date: | N/A |
| PA Number: | P0681A | Issue Date: | 5/5/2004 |

Optometry School:

Name: Illinois College of Optometry
Year Graduated 1987

Completed By:

Paula Hollins
Licensing Administrator
(602) 542-8164

Signature: 

Date: 2/3/17

State Seal:





Certificate of Completion

has successfully completed requirements for

Adult CPR/AED Online - valid 2 Years

conducted by
American Red Cross

Date Completed: **08/04/2017**

Instructors:



Certificate ID: 10GYEN

To verify, scan code or visit:
redcross.org/confirm