

Materials for Item No. 4

STATE OF NEVADA

JOE LOMBARDO
Governor



DR. KRISTOPHER SANCHEZ
Director

PERRY FAIGIN
NIKKI HAAG
MARCEL F. SCHAEERER
Deputy Directors

ADAM SCHNEIDER
Executive Director

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY
OFFICE OF NEVADA BOARDS, COMMISSIONS AND COUNCILS STANDARDS
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF OPTOMETRY

MINUTES
OF PUBLIC MEETING
April 23, 2026

- 1. Call to Order and statement of purpose to protect public health and safety, and the general welfare of the people of this State.** Live meeting opened at 12:01p.m. and the following was read into the record for NRS 241.020(3)(d)(8) compliance- "Because this meeting is being held using a remote technology system pursuant to NRS 241.023 and does not have a physical location designated for the meeting where members of the general public are permitted to attend and participate, clear and complete instructions for a member of the general public to be able to call in to the meeting to provide public comment is the following- telephone number 669-900-6833, meeting ID 775 883 8367, Passcode 8367."
- 2. Roll Call.** Executive Director Schneider present via Zoom. Board members Mariah Smith, O.D., Jeffrey Austin, O.D., Sally Balecha, and Dan Lyons, O.D. present via Zoom. Quorum established.
- 3. Public Comment.** Public comment was invited with a reminder that no action will be taken at this meeting on any issues presented as public comment and the maximum time is three minutes. No public comment received.
- 4. Action Item. Consideration and approval of March 12, 2026 Regular Board Meeting Minutes.** Director Schneider confirmed all present Board members had an opportunity to review the draft. Dr. Smith moved to accept the proposed Minutes as-is. Dr. Austin seconded. Motion passed 4-0.
- 5. Action Item. Complaint 26-16** Director Schneider stated this Complaint is being presented in a double-blind manner, i.e., the Board is not being told who the complainant is or who the subject licensee is, and the materials associated with this agenda item are redacted to eliminate any identification of party identities.

Director Schneider provided a summary as follows:

No medical records were provided due to lack of relevance to Patient's allegations.

Patient alleges Licensee 1's/Location 1's refusal to see her for an ongoing and/or recurrent bilateral eye infection and being hung-up on my Licensee 1's staff. Licensee 1

prescribed eyedrops but did not resolve the symptoms. Patient's allegations do not make mention of Licensee 1's referral to an OMD, and that Licensee 1 did not take the patient's medical insurance, or the ongoing communications in February 2026 for the issues. Licensee 1 was not in the office at the time of the patient's phone call and when the patient was told to see the OMD and/or was hung-up on the patient felt abandoned leading to the complaint. Licensee 1's narrative contests the patient's allegations, spoke with the staff directly upon receipt of the inquiry letter, and initiated supplemental training regarding location-to-patient communications.

Director Schneider asked does the information presented rise to the level of probable cause for involvement of the Attorney General for investigation into unprofessional conduct of Licensee 1?

Public Member Balecha commented Licensee 1 was not present when the call occurred, the staff told patient to seek immediate care elsewhere given Licensee 1 was unavailable. Patient had history of recurrent eye conditions and to seek specialist care, which suggests Licensee 1 took appropriate steps in the care. She appreciates the Licensee 1 took additional steps with his staff upon receiving the inquiry letter. Dr. Smith agrees, recognizes there is always some he-said-she-said involved, but that Licensee 1's care was appropriate including offering time slots for the patient to be seen. Dr. Austin agrees, noted the communication string was confusing which is dated February 5th compared to the inquiry letter which says March 5th, but nonetheless there is no unprofessional conduct at issue here and this inquiry should be closed. Director Schneider commented he takes the complaint as he receives it, that sometimes the patients are prone to typos or choose not to provide an accurate chronology including here where the licensee had already directed the patient to Ophthalmology. Dr. Lyons agrees with the other Board members' comments.

Dr. Smith moved to close the investigation with no further action. Public Member Balecha seconded. Motion passed 4-0.

6. Action Item. Complaint 26-17 Director Schneider summarized that Patient presented for monovision contact lens fitting and after a few monovision and multifocal trials, the patient became frustrated and wanted her fee back, which suggests the patient's battle might be with her insurance company to get her benefits reinstated. Licensee 1 documented the fitting in his chart notes. Patient then goes to Licensee 2 where there is a small difference in the glasses prescription. But the main complaint was for the contact lens prescription, and the ironic issue is that Licensee 1 and Licensee 2's spherical equivalent are the same.

Licensee 2's handwritten records were copies of jpegs of pdfs of copies and are very difficult to read and not relevant to the complaint, but Licensee 2 comments that although patient is technically legal to drive without glasses, it was strongly encouraged for the patient to wear spectacles for driving. But there are no written comments about difficulty adapting or about complaints with Licensee 1's prescriptions.

Director Schneider asked does the information presented rise to the level of probable cause for involvement of the Attorney General for investigation into unprofessional conduct of Licensee 1? Public Member Balecha commented that Licensee 1 was very attentive to the patient and this matter should be closed. Dr. Smith agreed, noted the prescriptions were very similar, prescriptions can change on the same patient from morning to night, and that Licensee 1 was within his or her right not to refund the fee when he or she performed the work. Dr. Austin agreed. Dr. Lyons agreed, noting Licensee 1 went above and beyond the average optometrist.

Dr. Smith moved to close the investigation with no further action. Dr. Austin seconded. Motion passed 4-0.

7. Action Item. Complaint 26-19 Director Schneider summarized that Patient presented for a contact lens fitting, trials were ordered but were on back-order. Patient was contacted but did not present in a timely manner within the timeframe that she signed the paperwork about, apparently due to back surgery. Some exceptions were attempted but the prescription was not finalized. Patient alleges violation of the Contact Lens Rule and what she believes to have been a final fit/official prescription.

The EMR formatting looks to be OfficeMate where the information auto-populates. So patient also alleges records keeping violation due to an entry made in 8/2025 for events occurring in 12/2024 once the patient started to complain about the situation of which there is a lengthy email string of the OD's staff and/or the OD himself or herself explaining the contact lens trialing process and that it was never finalized. Then in 3/2026 the OD terminated the relationship.

Director Schneider asked does the information presented rise to the level of probable cause for involvement of the Attorney General for investigation into unprofessional conduct of Licensee 1? And the question is two-fold: 1) is there probable cause for a Contact Lens Rule violation; and 2) is there a probable cause for a records-keeping violation? And there is a series of relevant laws provided in the materials for the Board's review.

Public Member Balecha deferred to the optometrists as to any violation of the Contact Lens Rule but as that there were too many inconsistencies and errors in the charting and should be referred to the Attorney General. Dr. Smith commented about the EMR issues and the licensee's charting was lacking, and needs to be corrected for the future but not to the extent that a formal complaint should be sought. As to the contact lens issue, Licensee 1 never saw the patient with contact lenses on her eyes that year and therefore had justification in advising the patient that no final prescription had occurred requiring the patient to come back. Dr. Austin believes record-keeping is poor, but Addendums are legal so long as accurate which is what occurred here and nothing else rises to level of unprofessional conduct. Dr. Lyons commented he believes contact lens fitting requires teamwork, and the patient did not present for the final fit.

Director Schneider inquired into the Board whether the disposition letter to the licensee should include an admonition or warning that this matter will be considered for future documentation error inquiries. Dr. Smith replied that while the Board's comments can be included in the letter, it does not need to include that kind of warning.

Dr. Smith moved to close the investigation with no further action with a summary of the Board's comments to please do a better job with record keeping for future patients. Dr. Austin seconded. Motion passed 4-0.

8. Executive Director report re R074-25. Director Schneider updated the Board he attended the workshop, provided the Board's comments to it in advance of the workshop per the Board's vote on 3/12/2026, and plans to attend the Notice of Intent to Act on Regulation meeting on 5/11/2026 and will advise the Board at the May 2026 meeting. It is noted that seemingly none of the Board's comments were incorporated into any changes of the proposed regulation, and other Boards are taking issue with that lack of incorporation as well. Director Schneider asked the Board for any comments to state at the Notice of Intent hearing. Dr. Austin wanted to know why B&I is not factoring in the Boards' comments.

9. **Executive Director report re ARBO 2026 Annual Meeting- Phoenix AZ, June 13-14, 2026.** Director Schneider advised the membership about the ARBO 2026 Annual Meeting in P Phoenix, AZ to be held on June 13-14, 2026, that ARBO has encouraged membership attendance in light of it occurring in the Southwest, and that he will attend the optional Friday as well as be a panel speaker.

10. **For Board Discussion and Possible Action.** Director Schneider inquired into proposed items for future Board meetings. None received.

11. **Public Comment.** Public comment was invited with a reminder that no action will be taken at this meeting on any issues presented as public comment and the maximum time is three minutes. None received.

12. **Action Item. Adjournment.** President Smith moved to adjourn. Dr. Austin seconded. Motion passed 4-0. Adjournment occurred at 12:25p.m.

7 persons attended virtually, inclusive of four Board members and Executive Director. No role call conducted or sign-in sheets provided.

* * * * *

FY 2025-2026 Regular meeting schedule

Thursday 4/23/2026 12:00p.m. (pst) Reg. Bd. Meeting- phone or Zoom
Thursday 5/28/2026 12:00p.m. (pst) Reg. Bd. Meeting- phone or Zoom
Thursday 6/25/2026 12:00p.m. (pst) Reg. Bd. Meeting- phone or Zoom

* * * * *

FY 2026-2027 Regular meeting schedule

Thursday 8/6/2026 12:00p.m. (pst) Reg. Bd. Meeting- phone or Zoom
Thursday 10/1/2026 12:00p.m. (pst) Reg. Bd. Meeting- phone or Zoom
Thursday 11/5/2026 12:00p.m. (pst) Reg. Bd. Meeting- phone or Zoom
Thursday 12/10/2026 12:00p.m. (pst) Reg. Bd. Meeting- phone or Zoom

These minutes were considered and approved by majority vote of the Nevada State Board of Optometry at its meeting on May 28, 2026.

Adam Schneider, Executive Director

Materials for Item No. 6

STATE OF NEVADA

JOE LOMBARDO
Governor



DR. KRISTOPHER SANCHEZ
Director

PERRY FAIGIN
NIKKI HAAG
MARCEL F. SCHAEERER
Deputy Directors

ADAM SCHNEIDER
Executive Director

**DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY
OFFICE OF NEVADA BOARDS, COMMISSIONS AND COUNCILS STANDARDS
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF OPTOMETRY**

[Licensee 1]
[Licensee 1 email address]
via email only

Re: NSBO Complaint# 26-20

Dear Licensee:

This office has received information that you and/or your optometry practice may be in violation of Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) Chapter 636 and Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) Chapter 636. It is alleged:

In January 1992, you entered into an employment contract as an “employee” with employer-entity [OMD 1 Ltd.] (herein “OMD 1 Ltd.”) to be its practice administrator for the ophthalmology practice of the employer-entity, and in which the contract states does not concern the practice of optometry.

In April 1995, OMD 1 Ltd. registered with the County Clerk the fictitious name of [Fictitious 1] (herein “Fictitious 1”). In the 1990s, Fictitious 1 operated as a co-management center and an optometric residency program affiliated with a college of optometry.

In May 2000, a deputy attorney general recommended you register Fictitious 1 with this Board as a fictitious name. Accordingly in June 2000, you submitted an Application for Certificate of Registration of Assumed/Fictitious Name for Fictitious 1 inclusive of documentation that as of April 1995 it is owned by OMD 1 Ltd. and that it “is conducting a practice of medicine.”

In January 2024, according to the Secretary of State business registry:

- 1) you formed [Licensee 1 Ltd.] (herein “Licensee 1 Ltd.”); and
- 2) you and [OMD 1] (herein “OMD 1”) formed [Fictitious 1 LCC] (herein Fictitious 1 LLC) inclusive of you being its registered agent. Fictitious 1 LCC is a business held out to the public as Fictitious 1, and which offers optometric services, advertises itself as such on the internet, and whose name is the domain of your email address registered with the Board.

In September 2005, the Board acknowledged you are a principal of Fictitious 1 LCC and that the business arrangement was compliant with NRS 636 as it existed at that time. Examples of relevant laws at that time include:

- 1) NRS 636.300(2) (unprofessional conduct includes “Accepting employment, directly or indirectly, from a person not licensed to practice optometry in this State to assist the person in such practice or enabling the person to engage therein . . .”) (1961); and
- 2) NRS 636.301(2) (unprofessional conduct includes “Division of fees or any understanding or arrangement which is designed or tends to impair, influence or affect the independent judgment or practice of the optometrist with any person who is not an optometrist . . .”) (1985)

For any license renewal from 2004 to 2024, you never advised the Board about your ownership of Fictitious 1 LLC or practicing as Fictitious 1 when the license renewal application specifically asks if any jurisdiction issued you any business license to offer optometric services. Instead you listed for such renewal application Licensee 1 Ltd.

In 2019-2020, all licensees were advised of changes in the law including those which prohibit a non-licensee from owning an optometry practice and that licensees cannot serve as employees or independent contractors of a non-licensee.

In February 2026, for the first time since 2004, in your license renewal application you **swore under oath and under penalty of perjury** that you are a 20% owner of Fictitious 1 and that OMD 1 is an 80% owner.

OMD 1, the owner of OMD 1 Ltd., while a member of the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners licensed under NRS 630 is not a member of the Nevada State Board of Optometry licensed under NRS 636.

Pursuant to NRS 636.305(3), in order to determine whether or not there has been a violation of NRS/NAC 636, please provide a written response. Your reply to director@nvoptometry.org is due on or by the close of business **May 20, 2026**. **Failure to responsively address each of the above listed allegations and the below listed laws could result in a determination that you agree with the above listed allegations and that you violated the below listed laws.**

Please include any further information you believe would be useful for the Board to make a determination in this matter, including but not limited to any explanatory statement from [OMD 1] or your lawyers who helped establish any of the above-referenced entities or made any adjustments to those business structures upon the laws changing in 2019-2020.

If presented to the Board, this matter will be presented in a double-blind manner, i.e., the identity of yourself and the above-described entities and ophthalmologist will not be disclosed so as to allow an objective review of the allegations and response. Therefore in your response, refer to **yourself as “Licensee 1,” [Fictitious 1] as “Fictitious 1,” [Fictitious 1 LLC] as “Fictitious 1 LLC,” [OMD 1] as “OMD 1,” and [Licensee 1 Ltd.] as “Licensee 1 Ltd.” and do NOT place your response on your company letterhead.**

The Nevada State Board of Optometry investigates all information received concerning possible violations of NRS/NAC 636 and based upon the entries stated in your renewal application, you may be in violation of such laws since 2019-2020:

R066-19(34)(2)(b) (“A licensee shall not: . . . serve as an employee or independent contractor of any person who is not licensed to practice optometry.”); and

NRS 636.350(1)(a) (“A person shall not own all or any portion of an optometry practice under an assumed or fictitious name unless the person holds an active license to practice optometry in this State.”).

Note as the above statute in 2019 “own all or any portion of an optometry practice” replaced now-eliminated “practice optometry” and in 2023 “A person” replaced now-eliminated “An optometrist.” Thus taking your attestations in your license renewal application as true, the ownership structure of Fictitious 1 and Fictitious 1 LLC may be in violation of NRS 636. Had OMD 1’s 80% ownership in Fictitious 1 or Fictitious 1 LLC were disclosed anytime after 2019, this necessarily would have resulted in the Board initiating an investigation into Fictitious 1, its structure, and any potential profit-sharing with the OMD or OMD 1 Ltd. in light of the new changes in the law.

This letter is not to be construed as a determination as to whether or not there has been a violation of such laws until a thorough investigation is completed. As a licensee subject to an investigation, you are required by law to timely provide the requested information. This correspondence is sent pursuant to NRS 636.305(2) and NRS 636.310(3), and any accompanying subpoena is sent pursuant to NRS 636.141 and NRS 629.061(1)(g).

Respectfully,
/s/ Adam Schneider
Adam Schneider, Esq.
Executive Director

In 1991 I approached the Nevada State Board of Optometry with the concept of forming an Optometric Referral Center to work in conjunction with the optometric community to facilitate collaborative care of optometric patients in need of ophthalmic surgery or secondary care not provided in an optometric practice. While the State Board liked the concept, and appreciated that I was seeking Board help in establishing the model, they informed me that the current law would not allow me to practice in the capacity of working with an ophthalmologist. I had multiple appearances at the State Board of Optometry meeting to determine if there was a solution that would allow the formation of the collaborative care model. The State Board determined that if I was to create an extended clinical facility, and an optometric residency, a State optometric license could be issued to the affiliate institution to allow me to teach and practice under the license. It took time to establish a residency program through Pacific University College of Optometry and recruit a resident. During that time period, in January of 1992, I agreed with the State Board not to see patients in the referral center and act as the Administrator. I proceeded to establish the residency program and awaited the final approval and license as an extended clinical facility of Pacific University College of Optometry where I would be the residency director. I graduated from University of Nevada with a degree in business and financial management, so I was well equipped to be practice administrator and have continued to be administrator for 34 years.

The fictitious name filed in 1995 was a change of DBA from (original fictitious name) to (fictitious 1 LLC). The medical practice was then and always has been (OMD 1). (OMD 1 LLC Ltd) is wholly owned by (OMD 1) and I have never had an ownership in the medical entity.

In 2003 we sought experienced medical legal counsel (Kelly Testolin, since deceased) and his firm Holland-Hart, to advise us if there was a way to form a legal Nevada entity in compliance with both medical and optometric laws where I could have ownership. The legal entity recommended and formed by Kelly Testolin and the law firm, was a structure where an LLC was formed as an asset holding company owning all assets. The holding company would conduct the business aspects, and all professional services were to be conducted by a medical practice of (OMD 1), completely owned by (OMD1) and (licensee 1 Ltd), owned completely by myself. The medical corporation hired and compensated all ophthalmologists and my optometric practice would hire and compensate all optometrists. My legal entity was formed on January 2 of 2004 and has always been 100% owned by myself and never by (OMD1). This has allowed me 100% autonomy. (Attached document from Nevada Secretary of State)

In September of 2005, the board acknowledged that I was a principal in the (fictitious 1 LLC) holding corporation. (Attached correspondence). I had submitted all personal tax returns,

all business tax returns as an owner, any agreements as well as co-management agreements and any documents showing my ownership. This led to the determination that the agreement and the ownership was in compliance with NRS 636. I continued to renew my license with my practice (licensee 1 LLC) Ltd on the recommendation of the State Board.

We continued to operate an optometric residency program and extended clinical facility even though, Executive Director, Judy Kennedy had informed me that each resident must apply for a Nevada Optometric License. The residents and myself would no longer be operating under the license of Pacific University College of Optometry. When Caren Jenkins assumed the role of executive director of the Nevada State Board of Optometry she informed me that there was no need to continue to pay for the extended clinical facility license as I was an owner of the holding corporation and a licensee. Since the residents were applying for their own Nevada license before starting the residency program they also did not to work under the license of the extended clinical facility.

After the 2019 change to NRS 636, executive director Caren Jenkins (not Judy Kennedy as I originally thought and submitted to you) and I discussed the change to the NRS 636 and she told me that I would not be affected in any manner since the board had determined I was not an employee of an ophthalmologist or an ophthalmology practice. I made no assumptions about whether or not the new law affected me; I contacted the State Board and asked the question directly and was given the answer that I was not affected by the law changes.

My 2026 renewal application was submitted by a well-intended employee who typically filled out credentialing forms. She took it upon herself, without my knowledge to fill out and submit the renewal form. Since there is **no log-in** necessary to access the Nevada State Optometric Board website or a **two factor authentication**, it allowed submission of the form without my knowledge. My first knowledge of this came when I received the enquiry from you on February 11th. Unknowingly, the employee incorrectly submitted the holding company information rather than my (licensee 1 LLC) information as I had been submitting since 2004, (again at the advice of the Nevada State Board to use my professional LLC in 2004). The holding corporation is a legal entity formed to hold assets owned 20% by me and 80% by (OMD 1). It was a mistake relative to what I had submitted in the past, and was absolutely incorrect as (OMD1) owns no interest in my optometric practice. The co-ownership of the holding company doesn't mean that (OMD 1) owns any interest in an optometric practice, nor does it mean that I own any part of a medical practice. Both of those scenarios would be a violation of medical and optometric laws. With the incorrect information of the renewal application, I see exactly where the confusion originated. The

Nevada State Board of Optometry has been aware of the holding company, (Fictious 1 LLC) and the joint ownership since it was formed. In 2005 the State Board requested from all optometrists working with ophthalmologists a comprehensive list of tax and legal documents. This then generated another letter (attached) designating the entity as compliant with NRS 636. The 2019 law clarifies that a non-optometrist cannot own any part of an optometric practice. Our legal counsel who formed the entity in 2004, had interpreted what was then clarified in 2019 and took the necessary steps in the holding corporation and formation of my additional professional corporation to prevent a violation of the medical or optometric law. Over the years we have maintained those guardrails to ensure compliance.

I apologize for the confusion created by the incorrect submission of my renewal application by my employee. I had no knowledge of the submission which the employee was able to submit without my knowing. I mentioned to you previously, I have always been fully transparent with the Nevada Board of Optometry and never sought to be deceptive during the past 34 years.

Additionally I apologize for the lack of back up documentation as the majority of my files were destroyed by a sewer back up that soaked the stored documents making them unreadable and they were disposed of as hazardous waste.

Respectfully,

Licensee 1

Relevant Law

NAC 636.210 as amended by R101-24(14)

4. An optometrist who employs another optometrist or a technician, assistant or any other employee on a temporary or permanent basis may be subject to disciplinary action for any violation of this chapter or chapter 636 of NRS, including, without limitation, for unprofessional conduct, by the optometrist, technician, assistant or other employee that he or she employs which takes place during the performance of services pursuant to such employment.

5. An optometrist has the ultimate responsibility for:

(a) The conduct, treatment, acts and omissions of an employee of the optometrist when the employee is acting within the scope of his or her employment;

Materials for Item No. 7

The Board has not taken a formal stance on AI scribes, nor are there any statutory or regulatory prohibitions at this time. Ultimately, the doctor is still responsible for all documentation, billing, and coding related to a patient chart. The doctor is also responsible to ensure all information is kept HIPAA compliant and patient data is not used as feedback to AI. If a patient complaint occurs the OD must be able to prove that no PHI was improperly disclosed, and that AI did not persuade the OD to make a final diagnosis or final treatment plan in deviation from the standard of care.

Materials for Item No. 9

Proposed regulation by Dept. of Taxation within R085-26 (**proposed language bolded**):

NAC 372.320:

1. Oculists and optometrists are the consumers of ophthalmic materials including eyeglasses, frames and lenses used or furnished in the performance of their professional services in the diagnosis, treatment or correction of conditions of the human eye. The tax applies to the sale of the materials to oculists and optometrists.
2. The tax applies to the entire charge made by a dispensing optician for eyeglasses and related products furnished in filling a prescription ~~+~~, ***whether or not the dispensing optician is licensed pursuant to chapter 637 of NRS.***

See also NRS 372.055(3) (“A licensed optometrist . . . shall not be considered a retailer within the provisions of this chapter, with respect to the ophthalmic materials used or furnished by him in the performance of his professional services in the diagnosis, treatment or correction of conditions of the human eye, including the adaptation of lenses or frames for the aid thereof.”)

Materials for Item No. 10



Association of Regulatory Boards of Optometry, Inc.

Association of Regulatory Boards of Optometry

3440 Toringdon Way
Suite 205 PMB #20533
Charlotte, NC 28277

Tel: (704) 970-2710
Fax: (888) 703-4848
Email: arbo@arbo.org

To: ARBO Member Boards
From: Lisa Fennell, Chief Executive Officer
Date: May 6, 2026
Re: ARBO Quarterly Update

Happy spring everyone! I hope your weather is getting warm and the flowers are starting to bloom. I'm pleased to share ARBO's second quarter 2026 update. Please add this to the agenda for your next Board meeting and share it with your Board members.

ARBO's 2026 Annual Meeting for Optometry Regulators:

- ARBO's annual meeting is just over a month away. The meeting is taking place June 13-14, 2026, in Phoenix, Arizona.
- More information and registration is available on ARBO's website: <https://www.arbo.org/meetings/2026>
- We are having some optional breakout sessions on Friday, June 12, 2026:
 - The National Board of Examiners in Optometry (NBEO) workshop will be from 3:30-5:30 pm.
 - The Member Board Executive breakout meeting with dinner will take place from 5:30-8:00 pm.
 - There is no charge for the Friday sessions, but you must register to attend.
- Travel stipends are still available for Boards that have limited travel allowances. Information is posted on ARBO's website: <https://www.arbo.org/meetings/2026>
- Please contact Lisa Fennell with any questions at LFennell@arbo.org.

QR Codes for Non-COPE Courses for Use with the OE TRACKER Mobile App:

- CE providers now have the ability to generate *OE TRACKER* QR codes for courses held at Non-COPE events to track attendance of the courses using the *OE TRACKER* mobile app.
- This will be especially useful for State/Provincial mandated or Board approved courses.
- Use of the *OE TRACKER* mobile app allows optometrists' attendance of a CE course to be instantly recorded in *OE TRACKER*. There is no delay in reporting of the credits which benefits optometrists, CE providers, and licensing Boards.
- More information can be found in the attached flyer.




ARBO Member Regulatory Webinars:

- If you missed the last Regulatory Happy Hour with Dale Atkinson that discussed Surrender of License, the webinar recording can be found in the member section of our website.
- Other past Regulatory Happy Hours are also posted there. Past topics have included: best practices for Board minutes, Administrative Sanctions and Board Authority, Regulatory Board Audits, and the NBEO Part III PEPS and Laser & Surgical Procedures Exams.

WHAT'S NEW?

QR Codes can now be created for Non-COPE courses for use with the *OE TRACKER* mobile app.

BENEFITS

-  Learners receive immediate verification of attendance
-  Reduced administrative workload
-  Ideal for state-mandated or required courses

HOW TO CREATE A NON-COPE EVENT QR CODE

1. Log in to your COPE administrator account at www.arbo.org > If you don't have an account you can sign up for one at no charge <https://www.arbo.org/orgs>
2. Select "Create a Non-COPE QR Code for use with the OE TRACKER mobile app"
3. Choose whether the Non-COPE course will be presented at a COPE Event or not
4. Enter the required course information
5. Your courses and QR codes will be stored in your account and can be accessed anytime.

COST \$

CE Providers pay \$20 per non-COPE Course QR Code

FOR LEARNERS

Optometrists download the OE TRACKER mobile app and scan the QR Code at the conclusion of the course presentation to receive CE credit.

If you have questions or need assistance, our team is here to help!

Brittany Howard – ARBO Senior Program Specialist

Email: bhoward@arbo.org **Phone:** 704-970-2765