



CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF
OPTOMETRY

Board Meeting

Monday, December 2, 2013

Department of Consumer Affairs
Sacramento, CA



MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

Alejandro Arredondo, OD, President
Alexander Kim, MBA, Secretary
Cyd Brandvein
Donna Burke
Madhu Chawla, OD
Fred Dubick, OD, MBA, FAAO
Bruce Givner, Esq.
Glenn Kawaguchi, OD
William Kysella, Jr.
Kenneth Lawenda, OD



CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF
OPTOMETRY



QUARTERLY BOARD MEETING AGENDA

Monday, December 2, 2013

9:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

(or until conclusion of business)

Department of Consumer Affairs
SOLID Training Center
1747 N. Market Blvd.
Emerald Room, Suite 184
Sacramento, CA 95834

And via teleconference at

140 C Tower Street
Beaconsfield , Quebec
H9W 6B2

ORDER OF ITEMS SUBJECT TO CHANGE

FULL BOARD OPEN SESSION

1. Call to Order and Establishment of a Quorum
2. Strategic Planning Session
Facilitated by Dennis Zanchi and Shelly Menzel from SOLID Training Solutions

FULL BOARD CLOSED SESSION

3. Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(c)(3), the Board Will Meet in Closed Session for Discussion and Possible Action on Disciplinary Matters

FULL BOARD OPEN SESSION

4. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda
Note: The Board may not discuss or take action on any matter raised during this public comment section, except to decide whether to place the matter on the agenda of a future meeting [Government Code Sections 11125, 11125.7(a)]
5. Suggestions for Future Agenda Items
6. Adjournment

PUBLIC COMMENTS: *Public comments will be taken on agenda items at the time the specific item is raised. Time limitations will be determined by the Chairperson. The Board may take action on any item listed on the agenda, unless listed as informational only. Agenda items may be taken out of order to accommodate speakers and to maintain a quorum.*

NOTICE: *The meeting is accessible to the physically disabled. A person who needs a disability-related accommodation or modification in order to participate in the meeting may make a request by contacting Krista Eklund at (916) 575-7170 or sending a*

written request to that person at the California State Board of Optometry, 2450 Del Paso Road, Suite 105, Sacramento, CA 95834. Providing your request at least five (5) business days before the meeting will help ensure availability of the requested accommodation.

2450 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 575-7170, (916) 575-7292 Fax
www.optometry.ca.gov

To: Board Members

Date: December 2, 2013

From: Alejandro Arredondo O.D.
Board President

Telephone: (916) 575-7170

Subject: **Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order and Establishment of Quorum**

Dr. Alejandro Arredondo, O.D., Board President, will call the meeting to order and call roll to establish a quorum of the Board.

Alejandro Arredondo, O.D., Board President, Professional Member

Alexander Kim, MBA, Board Secretary, Public Member

Donna Burke, Public Member

Madhu Chawla, O.D., Professional Member

Fred Dubick, O.D., MBA, FAAO, Professional Member

Bruce Givner, Esq., Public Member

Glenn Kawaguchi, O.D., Professional Member

William Kysella, Jr., Public Member

Kenneth Lawenda, O.D., Professional Member

Cyd Brandvein, Public Member

2450 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 575-7170, (916) 575-7292 Fax
www.optometry.ca.gov

To: Board Members

Date: December 2, 2013

From: Dennis Zanchi & Shelly Menzel
SOLID Planning Solutions

Telephone: (916) 575-7170

Subject: Agenda Item 2 – Strategic Planning Session

Purpose

The purpose of this Strategic Planning Session is to develop objectives for our upcoming Strategic Plan.

Facilitator Biographies

Shelly Menzel

Shelly Menzel began her California state service and workforce development career in 1992 after graduating from the University of California at Irvine with a Bachelor of Arts degree in English. Since that time, she has created and administered training programs for a variety of state departments including the Student Aid Commission, Office of the Inspector General, Victims of Crime Program, and the Legislative Counsel Bureau. Shelly joined the DCA SOLID team in August 2008. During her time with DCA she has led SOLID's continued training and organizational improvements including the Analyst Certification Training (ACT) program, DCA's eLearning tools, and creation of a comprehensive strategic planning development process. Shelly is an experienced facilitator and strategic planner who has assisted numerous state organizations such as the Bureau of Gambling Control, the Legislative Counsel Bureau, and many DCA Board, Bureaus and Committees with developing comprehensive strategic plans and action strategies.

Dennis Zanchi

Dennis Zanchi joined the SOLID team in 2013. He came most directly from ECMC, a student loan guarantee agency (formerly EdFund). During his time with ECMC and EdFund, Dennis worked with colleges nationwide presenting interactive sessions on a variety of education related topics, including sessions designed to draw out opinions, build consensus, and guide groups to discover new solutions. He helped college administrators build a better framework for understanding student loan default prevention, financial literacy, and student retention. He also develops evaluation measurement methods to quantify the success of various initiatives. Prior to working with colleges, Dennis worked with credit unions nationwide to develop consumer research and marketing plans. He is a graduate of CSU, Sacramento.

Action Requested:

Please review the attached 2013 Environmental Scan. This document includes input from stakeholders, Board staff, and your interviews with DCA's Strategic Planning unit. You will notice the document includes space for you to make notes, add objectives, or make changes to suggested objectives.

Attachments:

1. 2013 Environmental Scan – California State Board of Optometry Trends

2013 Environmental Scan Optometry Board Trends



Prepared by
SOLID Planning Solutions
Department of Consumer Affairs
November 2013



Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	- 3 -
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	- 4 -
DATA COLLECTION METHOD.....	- 6 -
SURVEY DATA RELIABILITY.....	- 7 -
2010 STRATEGIC PLAN ACCOMPLISHMENTS.....	- 8 -
LICENSING	- 9 -
EXAMINATION.....	- 13 -
LAW AND REGULATION	- 16 -
ENFORCEMENT.....	- 19 -
OUTREACH	- 23 -
ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS.....	- 27 -
MAJOR TRENDS AND CHANGES	- 30 -

Introduction

One of the first steps in developing a strategic plan is to conduct a scan and analysis of the environment in which an organization operates. This analysis allows us to take a look at the factors that can impact the organization's success. This is a summary of the results of the environmental scan recently conducted by SOLID for the Optometry Board of California (Board) from September to October 2013.

The purpose of this environmental scan is to provide a better understanding of stakeholder, Board member, and Board staff thoughts about the Board's performance within the following categories:

- ◆ Licensing
- ◆ Enforcement
- ◆ Examinations
- ◆ Laws and regulations
- ◆ Outreach
- ◆ Organizational effectiveness

This document outlines areas where Board members, staff, and stakeholders are in agreement and disagreement while providing additional insight to assist the Board in developing goals and objectives for the upcoming strategic plan.

Please review this information carefully in preparation for the upcoming strategic planning session. At this planning session we will discuss and evaluate this information as a group to help us identify new strategic objectives the Board will focus on during the 2014 – 2018 strategic plan period.

If you have any questions about this report, please contact Dennis Zanchi with SOLID at (916) 574-8308 or dennis.zanchi@dca.ca.gov.

Summary of Findings

All constituencies (external stakeholders, Board members, and Board staff) recognize the same strengths and challenges facing the Board within the areas of licensing, examinations, and enforcement. Perceptions differ between Board members and stakeholders and Board staff in the areas of law and regulation and outreach. Board staff perceptions differ from other constituencies in the area of organizational effectiveness.

The tables below illustrates external stakeholder, Board member and Board staff perceptions based on the following question asked of each group:

Overall, how would you rate the Board's effectiveness in each of the following areas?

Licensing Effectiveness		
	Excellent or Good	Poor or Very Poor
External Stakeholders	85%	15%
Board Members	100%	--
Board Staff	100%	--

Enforcement Effectiveness		
	<u>Excellent or good</u>	<u>Poor or very poor</u>
External Stakeholders	81%	19%
Board Members	86%	14%
Board Staff	100%	--

Examination Effectiveness		
	<u>Excellent or good</u>	<u>Poor or very poor</u>
External Stakeholders	91%	10%
Board Members	100%	--
Board Staff	100%	--

Outreach Effectiveness		
	<u>Excellent or good</u>	<u>Poor or very poor</u>
External Stakeholders	71%	29%
Board Members	29%	71%
Board Staff	67%	33%

Laws and Regulations Effectiveness		
	<u>Excellent or good</u>	<u>Poor or very poor</u>
External Stakeholders	80%	20%
Board Members	43%	57%
Board Staff	100%	--

Organizational Effectiveness		
	<u>Excellent or good</u>	<u>Poor or very poor</u>
External Stakeholders	82%	18%
Board Members	83%	17%
Board Staff	44%	56%

An additional method to gauge sentiment from the external stakeholder segment is to measure the number of written comments they included on the electronic survey. The table below illustrates the percentage of positive and negative comments written by external stakeholders through the survey. Results show that most overall comments were regarding the licensing functions of the Board with the highest percentage of positive comments regarding the examination process. The Board's functions as they relate to laws and regulations had the highest percentage of negative comments from external stakeholders.

Number of Stakeholder Written Comments by Survey Topic

	Positive		Negative		<u>Total Comments</u>
	<u>Number of Comments</u>	<u>% of Total Comments</u>	<u>Number of Comments</u>	<u>% of Total Comments</u>	
Licensing	58	43%	78	57%	136
Enforcement	24	41%	34	59%	58
Examinations	45	62%	28	38%	73
Laws & Regulations	27	36%	48	64%	75
Outreach	26	50%	26	50%	52
Organizational Effectiveness	14	48%	15	52%	29

Notes

Data Collection Method

Information for this survey was gathered by surveying external stakeholders, Board members and Board staff using the following methods:

- ◆ Interviews conducted with nine members of the Board and the Executive Officer completed during the months of September and October 2013 to assess the challenges and opportunities the Board is currently facing or will face in the upcoming years.
- ◆ A focus group with Board staff on October 3, 2013 to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Board from an internal perspective. Ten Board staff members participated.
- ◆ An online survey sent to 2,500 external Board stakeholders in October 2013 to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Board from an external perspective. Two-hundred-and-eight stakeholders completed the survey. The below table shows how stakeholders identified themselves in the online survey.

Stakeholders Breakdown	Number	% of Total
Professional licensee	193	93%
School or college	6	3%
Professional optometric association	5	2%
Consumer/member of the public/representative of the public	2	1%
Retired optometrist	1	<1%
TOTAL:	208	

Survey Data Reliability

Based on 208 external stakeholders who responded to the electronic survey, we can be 95% confident their opinions represent all California optometrists plus or minus seven percent. For example, 85% of stakeholders rated the Board’s overall licensing effectiveness as good or excellent. Based on our response rate, we can be 95% confident between 78% and 92% of stakeholders would rate the Board’s effectiveness the same way.¹

To help improve data integrity, the online survey did not provide a neutral option when asking about overall effectiveness. Instead, stakeholders completing the survey chose between a positive choice (excellent or good) or a negative choice (poor or very poor). This allows the Board to better understand whether stakeholders have a positive or negative view of the Board in various areas.

Notes

¹ Source: University of Connecticut sample size calculator www.gifted.uconn.edu/siegle/research/samples/samplecalculator.htm

2010 Strategic Plan Accomplishments

The California Board of Optometry accomplished the following 14 goals since the adoption of the previous 2010 strategic plan.

1. Implemented a more streamlined certification process for the treatment of glaucoma which increased access to care for consumers.
2. Established a retired license status and a volunteer retired license status; giving retired optometrists a designation they can be proud of, save them money, and eliminate the risk of going into a delinquent status.
3. Implemented Uniform Standards Related to Substance Abuse as directed by the legislature to better protect consumers from substance abusing licensees.
4. Established requirements for the practice of optometry at nursing homes. These much needed requirements clarified the law, and set minimum standards for this new, non-traditional optometric practice setting.
5. Started using social media to reach more licensees and consumers through its Facebook and Twitter pages.
6. Participated in the accreditation of Western University of Health Sciences, College of Optometry. Now there are three schools/colleges of optometry in California.
7. Successfully participated in the Sunset Review Process and extended the Board's Sunset date to January 1, 2018.
8. Successfully implemented computer based testing with PSI for the California Law and Regulation Examination.
9. Successfully performed ongoing exam development and validation workshops for California Law and Regulation Examination and extended the Board's subject matter expert pool from 20 doctors to 60.
10. Successfully re-designed the website and leveraged it as a source of education and outreach.
11. Successfully updated and revised the Board's Administrative Procedures Manual
12. Successfully implemented an online customer service survey.
13. Successfully updated the Board's law book.

Licensing

The Board of Optometry provides applicants and licensees a method for obtaining and maintaining licensure registration, business licenses, and certifications required to practice optometry in California.

Licensing refers to the initial application submission process for obtaining a license from the board, as well as the renewal process. Licensing includes processing times, processing backlogs, responsiveness of Board staff to initial and renewal applicant inquiries. Inquiries may include information from the Board about the licensing process and licensing requirements, and eligibility criteria for licensure.

External stakeholders, Board members, and Board staff were all asked to rate the Board's overall effectiveness in the area of licensing. As the table shows below, all groups are in close agreement: The Board rates excellent or good in effective licensing.

Licensing Effectiveness			
<u>Rating</u>	<u>External Stakeholders</u>	<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Board Staff</u>
Excellent	23%	57%	11%
Good	62%	43%	89%
Poor	12%	---	---
Very poor	4%	---	---
Total	100%	100%	100%

Licensing Strengths

Stakeholders, Board members and Board staff universally agree the initial licensing process is efficient and the Board staff is accessible and knowledgeable. The comments below characterize the effectiveness of the Board’s licensing strengths. Of the 208 stakeholder survey responses, six percent included a written comment about the efficiency of renewing a license.

Comments Regarding Licensing Strengths		
Stakeholders	Board Members	Board Staff
<p>Convenient and straight forward.</p> <p>The Board does keep track of the situation regarding its duties in a manner that is commendable, particularly given the number of licensees, and limited resources. Replies to e-mail inquiries have been surprisingly fast.</p> <p>Seems fair and reasonable in licensing optometrists.</p> <p>Our State Board is very strong taking care of our ongoing problems. We need to keep it as strong as it is and was for many years. We have many enemies from within AND without that have to be dealt with.</p> <p>Helpful and knowledgeable staff. Generally quick turnaround on license issues.</p> <p>Good communication with the profession.</p> <p>Customer service is friendly, knowledgeable, knows how the Board runs.</p>	<p>Two weeks (from national exam and transcripts) to provide initial licensee their license.</p> <p>The Board trying really hard to do it in a timely fashion, making sure they meet requirements in order to be an optometrist.</p> <p>Board staff does outreach to eligible optometrists to get them licensed.</p> <p>Staff is able to respond in a timely manner.</p> <p>Timeliness of processing, turnaround times are good. New licenses are pretty efficient and completed in a timely manner contentious staff.</p>	<p>There is a lot of staff knowledge and historical experience in the Licensing unit. Licensing staff are open and friendly to the licensees.</p> <p>Licensing staff are accessible to callers.</p> <p>Staff in the licensing unit is collaborative with one another and reliable. The Licensing unit has good teamwork and respect for one another.</p>

Licensing Challenges

While initial licensing is viewed as efficient, the renewal process is viewed as slow as shown by the comments below.

Comments Regarding Licensing Challenges		
Stakeholders	Board Members	Board Staff
<p>6-8 weeks for processing a license is archaic and presents issues.</p> <p>Always very slow at license renewal turnaround.</p> <p>The optometrist business owner cannot commence practice, which incurs a substantial debt waiting for forms to process.</p> <p>When an OD (Doctor of Optometry) is opening a branch office he is forced to wait and not open his practice for an average of 2 months while the OD waits for the Board license. That requires 2 months of lease payment with close doors.</p> <p>I would like to be able to register online.</p> <p>Confusing form.</p> <p>It is a very difficult process to renew one's license. I heard of several doctors' checks getting lost in the mail and then those doctors not being able to practice because they were told that it would take at least 4 weeks to process their paperwork. This is the biggest dissatisfier among all the Optometrists I talk to. Why cannot the ODs pay online with a credit card? This would get rid of the hassle of having to keep checking that one's application was received.</p>	<p>Problematic renewals.</p> <p>Licensees do not update board with new address.</p> <p>Potential for expanded scope of practice (see laws & regulations).</p> <p>Board should send out renewal licensing requests earlier.</p> <p>Licensees have commented that board sends them out at last second.</p> <p>Upcoming retirements of key staff.</p>	<p>Slow licensing cycle times.</p> <p>Incomplete applications.</p> <p>Inaccuracy of ATS (Applicant Tracking System) data.</p> <p>CLRE (California Law and Regulation exam) not always imported after completion.</p> <p>Transcripts are sometimes incomplete.</p>

Suggested Licensing Objectives

1. Increase efficiency of application process for all licenses and certifications issued.
 - a. Review forms, indicate areas that can be simplified, and implement new forms.
 - b. Work with school registrars to get complete transcripts for optometrist license application.
 - c. Include colored inserts with notices in license renewals, etc. explaining the most frequent application errors.
 - d. Discussion with OPES (Office of Professional Examination Services) and PSI to improve timelines of data transmission to Optometry Board for optometrist license application process.
2. Document Board procedures for initial and renewal optometrist licensing process, and issuance of certifications (TPA, TPG, TLG, etc.) and business licenses (SOL, BOL, FNP).
 - a. Identify efficiencies to streamline processing timelines.
3. Improve data reliability.
 - a. Clean up inaccurate data before BreEZe implementation.
4. Promote the launch of BreEZe and provide updates to inform optometrists the board is moving in this direction.

The above suggestions were obtained from Board stakeholders during the environmental scan. Please review and consider these actions as possible objectives for the upcoming strategic plan. Use the space below to capture notes and/or questions for discussion at the strategic planning session.

Examination

The Board works to provide a fair, valid and legally defensible licensing exam (California Law and Regulation Examination) and exam process to ensure that only qualified and competent individuals are licensed to provide optometric services in the State of California.

The Examination function is the validity of the exam used by the Board to test qualifications, exam development process, occupational analysis process, the ability of schools to prepare students for the exam, and continuing education requirements. As the table shows below, all groups are in close agreement. The Board rates excellent or good in effective examinations.

Examination Effectiveness			
<u>Rating</u>	<u>External Stakeholders</u>	<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Board Staff</u>
Excellent	32%	71%	33%
Good	59%	29%	67%
Poor	9%	---	---
Very poor	1%	---	---
Total	100%	100%	14%

Examination Strengths

Across all groups, it is agreed the Board offers a fair and efficient exam. There is agreement on using the national exam and using the California Law and Regulation Exam. Contributing to the overall effectiveness of the exam is the board’s strong relationship with OPES and great subject matter experts. Of the 78 comments provided by external stakeholders, this category had the highest percentage of positive comments.

Comments Regarding Examination Strengths		
Stakeholders	Board Members	Board Staff
<p>The law exam is very fair and is an appropriate length.</p> <p>Many test locations, instant grading and feedback.</p> <p>I feel the Board does an adequate job during the exam to only pass qualified and competent individuals.</p> <p>Examination material that is tested is very limited however, the Board makes sure that applicants think and understand what issues they must deal with to pass the exam. If an applicant does pass the exam he/she will have a good knowledge of the law.</p> <p>Exam appears to test clinical relevance of law.</p> <p>Online Law Exam has made process much more efficient.</p>	<p>There is a state law & ethics exam which has gone through rigorous reconstruction.</p> <p>No one has done it as rigorous and fair as we have.</p> <p>National board test is perfectly fine.</p> <p>Went to computer testing three years ago and everyone loves it. Happy with national exam.</p> <p>Law test is comprehensive. Test is not too stringent or lax.</p> <p>No issues with CE requirements.</p>	<p>Strong exam and strong relationship with OPES.</p> <p>United/work well with licensing.</p> <p>Great subject matter experts.</p> <p>Transparent.</p>

Examination Challenges

Although 28 stakeholders provided comments in the survey, the comments were varied and did not contain a consistent message. During the staff focus group, the staff did not identify current challenges with the examination or examination process. A few challenges were identified during Board member interviews, however, the Board member comments focused more on the strengths than the challenges.

Examination challenges identified by Board members:

- ◆ Would like to see more levels of licensure.
- ◆ Everyone should be licensed at the highest level.
- ◆ Multi-level licensure –Ultimately the Board needs to go to one license level.
- ◆ One challenge might be confirming people are doing continuing education, although that would require looking at each license which can't work because of staffing.
- ◆ We need better reciprocity policies.

Although there were few challenges, Board members and staff acknowledged if the scope of practice is expanded it could impact the examination process.

Suggested Examination Objectives

- ◆ Perform occupational analysis to prepare for possible scope of practice expansion.
- ◆ Determine Board member concerns over requiring more levels of licensure or a single level of licensure.

The above objectives are suggested based on the Environmental Scan results. However, it is the Board's responsibility to develop and approve final objectives for the strategic plan. Please review the objectives above, make changes, or note additional objectives below.

Law and Regulation

The Board works to establish and maintain fair and just laws and regulations that provide for the protection of consumer health and safety and reflect current and emerging, efficient and cost-effective practices.

Laws and regulations include the Board’s practice act as well as the clarifying regulations along with pending legislation that may affect the profession.

Law and Regulation Effectiveness			
<u>Rating</u>	<u>External Stakeholders</u>	<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Board Staff</u>
Excellent	26%	29%	
Good	54%	14%	100%
Poor	17%	57%	---
Very poor	3%	---	---
Total	100%	100%	100%

Law & Regulation Strengths

The Board’s strengths in the area of law and regulation center on Board staff being knowledgeable about regulations and processes. External stakeholder’s strength comments focused on the ease of acquiring information.

Comments Regarding Law and Regulation Strengths		
Stakeholders	Board Members	Board Staff
<p>Legal and regulatory information is easily obtained on the internet site for the board, and is available to all who need to review or familiarize themselves with it.</p> <p>Keeps ODs informed with emails.</p> <p>Historically, a very proactive board in developing legislative strategy and proponent of change.</p>	<p>The Board and Board staff are very good with regulations and processes.</p> <p>Board of Optometry regulates our own doctors pretty well.</p>	<p>Staff knowledge and experience.</p> <p>Teamwork, respect and board “personality”.</p> <p>Professional, accessible and collaborative staff.</p>

Law & Regulation Challenges

For all segments, the primary concerns are 1) the challenge of keeping up with (or understanding) the laws and regulations and 2) the loss of Board knowledge as staff retires or leaves the Board.

Comments Regarding Law and Regulation Challenges		
Stakeholders	Board Members	Board Staff
<p>With the expanding scope of optometry, it's getting harder to keep track of the varying levels of certification.</p> <p>Board of Optometry is not fully and properly enforcing the sale of colored contact lenses. There are many illegal vendors of colored contact lenses.</p> <p>The Board should work on banning the sale of contact lenses on the Internet.</p> <p>The main challenge is getting the information to the professionals. I still have no idea whether I am allowed to do certain things, and don't even know where to find the information.</p>	<p>Potential problem if one or two staff move on because of their knowledge.</p> <p>If SB 492 passes, it will change regulation. Biggest challenge will be to update training which will be in regulations.</p> <p>There has been legislation about expanding of scope of practice - legislation the staff just doesn't have the resources to address.</p> <p>TPA - therapeutic pharmaceutical agents need to be revisited and rewritten. Schools are no longer giving TPA certification course.</p> <p>In some optician practices optician gives medical advice but shouldn't.</p> <p>Some of us are not attorneys or optometrists so the nuances of the laws and regulations are difficult to navigate.</p> <p>Would like the board to have more input into what an optician does.</p> <p>The Practice Act is overly complicated. The Board needs to simply the practice act.</p> <p>The scope was last expanded 5-6 years ago and it was out of date as soon as it was signed.</p> <p>May need to address new procedures.</p> <p>Outside influencers have an extreme amount of influence on the board.</p>	<p>Laws & regulations still unclear.</p> <p>Lack of staff.</p> <p>No succession plan for when experience staff retire.</p> <p>Need to share more information among staff members.</p> <p>Lack of Board member participation and understanding.</p> <p>Expanded scope of expansion legislation will cause need for staffing increase.</p>

Suggested Law & Regulation Objectives

- ◆ Monitor passage of SB492 and/or legislation affecting the scope of practice of optometry.
- ◆ Identify Board functions impacted by pending legislation and develop a timeline to manage the functions impacted.
- ◆ Work to clarify current laws and regulations to increase understanding among all stakeholders via the legislative and regulatory process.
- ◆ Without interpreting the law, develop educational materials to educate licensees and interested stakeholders.
- ◆ Conduct a work load evaluation to support Budget Change Proposal (BCP) to address current and future workload needs as they relate to legislation and regulation activities.
- ◆ Prepare procedures manual to document Board staff knowledge for use in training new hires that may replace existing staff due to retirement or new staff due to expansion of optometric scope of practice.
- ◆ Schedule committee meetings, staff meetings and develop a repository of information to ensure easy sharing of information among all staff and Board members.

The above objectives are suggested based on the Environmental Scan results. However, it is the Board's responsibility to develop and approve final objectives for the strategic plan. Please review the objectives above, make changes, or note additional objectives below.

Enforcement

The Board protects the health and safety of consumers of optometric services through the active enforcement of the laws and regulations governing the safe practice of Optometry in California.

Enforcement includes complaint intake, internal investigations, licensee disciplinary actions, the hearing process, investigation cycle times, and the enforcement knowledge of Board staff. Enforcement also includes the Board’s relationships with the Attorney General’s office and with Office of Administrative Hearings, as well as proactive Board activities that mitigate the need for enforcement.

Enforcement Effectiveness			
<u>Rating</u>	<u>External Stakeholders</u>	<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Board Staff</u>
Excellent	21%	29%	
Good	60%	57%	100%
Poor	15%	14%	---
Very poor	4%	---	---
Total	100%	100%	100%

Enforcement Strengths

The key strengths across each segment include the Board’s interest in protecting the public and educating licensees.

Comments Regarding Enforcement Strengths		
Stakeholders	Board Members	Board Staff
<p>When there are offenses, the Board seems to address them as best they can.</p> <p>Consistent.</p> <p>Good communication and web access.</p> <p>When there are offenses, the Board seems to address them as best they can.</p>	<p>Strengths are most of the Board members are interested in benefiting the public. The staff is definitely committed to benefiting the public. Applying laws fairly, protecting people.</p> <p>Enforcement part is really, really good.</p> <p>Process is pretty seamless.</p> <p>Board does a good job being objective with individual doctor hearings.</p> <p>We do a good job of listening & hearing what they have to say, understanding allegations, and negotiating decisions & next steps.</p>	<p>Friendly enforcement staff who educate violators.</p> <p>Experienced and knowledgeable staff.</p> <p>Staff works well with all other units (licensing, etc.)</p> <p>Strong enforcement. We have good staff that really learn the law.</p> <p>Working to change negative perception of enforcement through education.</p>

Enforcement Challenges

Working cases more quickly, cleaning up erroneous data before BreZE implementation and the need to modernize discipline standards were identified as enforcement challenges.

Comments Regarding Enforcement Challenges		
Stakeholders	Board Members	Board Staff
<p>The Board should provide information and interpretation of state law to any optometrist. Education is the best prevention. The primary objective of the Board should be prevention. Protect consumers by educating Optometrist. No need to enforce and prosecute. When O.D. is educated laws are not broken.</p> <p>The Board needs more officers to cover all of these offenses.</p>	<p>If enforcement issue, it's hard for professional member to be unbiased.</p> <p>Making sure we are public focused.</p> <p>Could work on discipline cases more quickly but the discipline process is good.</p> <p>The Board needs to update ALJs (Administrative Law Judges) to current practice.</p> <p>Board needs to clean up/ modernize discipline standards for ALJ.</p> <p>The Board is taking way too long to process complaints.</p> <p>The Board should have the resources to go out and do proactive enforcement.</p> <p>Enforcement cycle times are too long.</p>	<p>Talk about each case on weekly basis to keep everyone informed.</p> <p>Keeping up with cases.</p> <p>Accuracy of data in CAS (Consumer Affairs System) and ATS. Need to clean up before BreZE implementation.</p> <p>Could use one more analyst.</p> <p>Need to develop procedure manuals/document processes.</p> <p>Long cycle times that do not meet performance measures.</p>

Suggested Enforcement Objectives

- ◆ Document internal Board processes in a procedure manual.
- ◆ Clean data/verify accuracy of data before BreEZe implementation.
- ◆ Submit Budget Change Proposal for an additional analyst.
- ◆ Review how pending legislation will impact enforcement.
- ◆ Create inspection authority in order to enforce laws such as sign posting and infection guidelines that require inspection of practices.

The above objectives are suggested based on the Environmental Scan results. However, it is the Board’s responsibility to develop and approve final objectives for the strategic plan. Please review the objectives above, make changes, or note additional objectives below.

Outreach

The Board proactively educates, informs and engages consumers, licensees, students and other stakeholders on the practice of optometry and the laws and regulations which govern it.

Outreach refers to the Board’s ability to communicate with consumers, licensees, and other stakeholders. Seventy-one percent of stakeholders and 67% of Board staff feel the Board is good or excellent in the area of outreach to consumers. However, 71% of Board members and 33% of staff feel the Board does a poor or very poor job at educating consumers. This discrepancy is shown in the table below.

Outreach Effectiveness			
<u>Rating</u>	<u>External Stakeholders</u>	<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Board Staff</u>
Excellent	20%	---	---
Good	51%	29%	67%
Poor	27%	71%	22%
Very poor	2%	---	11%
Total	100%	100%	---

Outreach Strengths

Each segment below agrees the electronic methods of communication are effective.

Comments Regarding Outreach Strengths		
Stakeholders	Board Members	Board Staff
Electronic newsletters are an easy to access form of information.	The board has done a much better job in outreach.	Good website
Email notifications are timely & useful.	Outreach is not optimal but it is improving.	Staff visits to colleges
When there are changes in regs or requirements the board is good about communicating them.	Staff is truly interested in public protection.	Newsletter/ Facebook/ Emails
Our Board seems to go to all of the schools in California which is excellent.	Outreach to schools is really good.	Public brochures
Our Board seems to go to all of the schools in California which is excellent.	Good website.	
The website, and regular e-mail communications have led me to sense that education and outreach is more robust than when I was first licensed.		

Outreach Challenges

The significant challenges identified include the public not being aware of the optometry profession and the additional need for public outreach in general.

Comments Regarding Outreach Challenges		
Stakeholders	Board Members	Board Staff
<p>A lot of patients are not aware the role of optometrists, and they are confused among ophthalmologist, optometrists and opticians. Many patients do not know what optometrists in California are capable and allowed to do.</p> <p>Does the board actually conduct any education to optometry or the public other than website and e-newsletters?</p>	<p>The Board needs a fulltime public relations person on staff, or one position that could be shared with another board.</p> <p>Would like to see proactive elements of what we do.</p> <p>Adding more diversity to the optometry field.</p> <p>Information for the public could be better.</p> <p>Board should have more presence in schools/communities.</p> <p>Improve timeliness of newsletters to licensees.</p> <p>General public doesn't know we even have an optometry board.</p> <p>People need to see the face of the board members.</p> <p>We don't do an adequate job of using email. Need to get optometry/stakeholders okay to use.</p> <p>Help consumer understand importance of routine eye care, the whole concept of preventative care.</p>	<p>More education to licensees about completing license renewal forms correctly and fingerprint requirements.</p> <p>Lack of travel funds preventing Board from attending consumer health fairs.</p> <p>Consumer notice law flyers not in optometrists' offices.</p> <p>Licensees don't read or understand information we provide.</p>

Suggested Outreach Objectives

- ◆ Research use of free public service announcements to expand outreach to consumers.
- ◆ Include inserts with renewal notices and other mailings addressing most common questions for licensees.
- ◆ Create a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) to expand outreach program to allow Board representation at consumer health fairs.
- ◆ Define clear goals for online media for consumer and licensees.
- ◆ Send consumer notice to optometrists with information about the requirement to make consumer protection information available to clients.
- ◆ Outreach to administrators at public schools and clinic administrators who have optometrists come in and do eye exams about the Board and how to file complaints.
- ◆ Work with the DCA Publications Design and Editing unit to create a “Your State Board for New Optometrists” kit that informs new licensees about the Board.

The above objectives are suggested based on the Environmental Scan results. However, it is the Board’s responsibility to develop and approve final objectives for the strategic plan. Please review the objectives above, make changes, or note additional objectives below.

Organizational Effectiveness

The Board works to develop and maintain an efficient and effective team of professional and public leaders and staff with sufficient resources to improve the Board’s provision of programs and services.

Organizational effectiveness includes the administrative management of the Board, staffing levels, fiscal resources, organizational structure, and customer service. Stakeholders and Board members have positive comments and perspectives of the Board’s organizational effectiveness. However, the majority of Board staff rated organizational effectiveness as poor or very poor.

Organizational Effectiveness			
<u>Rating</u>	<u>External Stakeholders</u>	<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Board Staff</u>
Excellent	23%	33%	---
Good	58%	50%	44%
Poor	15%	17%	44%
Very poor	4%	---	11%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Organizational Effectiveness Strengths

The strengths of the staff include their knowledge, professionalism, and team work approach.

Comments Regarding Organizational Effectiveness Strengths		
Stakeholders	Board Members	Board Staff
Great job as far as I have experienced. Those associated with the board are very professional. Staff seems knowledgeable on the rare occasion I have initiated questions about licensure.	Very polite, very courteous staff. Staff is organized. Never had more than a 24 hour delay for an email – usually much sooner. Staffs ability to flex and multi task and support each other with expertise where appropriate.	Collaborative. Basic knowledge of other areas (cross trained in basic areas).

Organizational Effectiveness Challenges

Challenges include customer service issues, the need to establish staff training, and provide Board member training.

Comments Regarding Organizational Effectiveness Challenges		
Stakeholders	Board Members	Board Staff
<p>It appears that there have been a few times recently that the Board membership is not at full capacity.</p> <p>Renewal response and confirmation seems a bit slow.</p>	<p>There are some staff quality issues but overall the board is head & shoulders above where it's been but it's definitely not perfect.</p> <p>Customer service is an ongoing issue. Phone system is terrible – rolls to voicemail, not consumer friendly.</p> <p>Need procedures to handle intake issues.</p> <p>Staffing levels are low. Unfilled positions.</p>	<p>Improve staff reliability/effort.</p> <p>Personal issues affecting work duties.</p> <p>Job specific training needs to be established.</p> <p>Revamp Board specific orientation for new Board members.</p>

Suggested Organizational Effectiveness Objectives

- ◆ Hold regular staff meetings and provide minutes for future reference and/or for those who miss the meeting to assist with information sharing.
- ◆ More professional development for staff using the Individual Development Plan (IDP) process.
- ◆ Implement Board member specific orientation training in addition to DCA Board Member Orientation Training (BMOT).

The above objectives are suggested based on the Environmental Scan results. However, it is the Board's responsibility to develop and approve final objectives for the strategic plan. Please review the objectives above, make changes, or note additional objectives below.

Major Trends and Changes

There are many factors that may impact the future direction of the optometry profession. These trends and/or changes could be opportunities the Board may want to capitalize on or threats that the Board may want to mitigate.

External stakeholders, Board members and Board staff were asked to prioritize the areas to indicate where the Board should focus for upcoming strategic plan. The chart below shows the percent of each group rating the category a high or highest priority.

Category	External Stakeholders	Board Members	Staff
Law and regulation	82%	100%	100%
Health care ACA	77%	78%	89%
Education	73%	89%	100%
Professional methods	66%	89%	67%
Technology	59%	89%	44%
Economy	44%	33%	44%

Law and Regulations Trends and Changes

External stakeholders, Board members, and Board staff all believe the Board should focus on law and regulation. This is consistent with findings within the law and regulation section. The second highest number of comments received by stakeholders was on the challenges within the law and regulation category. Eighty percent of stakeholders and 100% of Board staff feel the Board is effective in law and regulation. However, 43% of Board members feel this way. It is possible external stakeholders and Board staff feel the board is effective with current laws and regulations. All Board members mentioned the upcoming changes included in Senate Bill 492 which could expand optometrist's scope of practice as having a significant impact on the Board.

Suggested Law & Regulation Objectives

1. Monitor passage of SB492 and/or legislation affecting the scope of practice of optometry.
2. Identify Board functions impacted by pending legislation and develop a timeline to manage the functions impacted.

3. Work to clarify current laws and regulations to increase understanding among all stakeholders via the legislative and regulatory process.
4. Without interpreting the law, develop educational materials to educate licensees and interested stakeholders.
5. Conduct a work load evaluation to support Budget Change Proposal (BCP) to address current and future workload needs as they relate to legislation and regulation activities.
6. Prepare procedure manual to document Board staff knowledge for use in training new hires that may replace existing staff due to retirement or new staff due to expansion of optometric scope of practice.
7. Schedule committee meetings, staff meetings and develop a repository of information to ensure easy sharing of information among all staff and Board members.

Outreach Trends and Changes

A second priority when setting goals could be outreach. While the majority (71% of stakeholders and 67% of Board staff) feels the Board is effective at reaching out to consumers and licensees, this is the lowest majority in any of the Board functional areas. Also, 29% of Board members feel the Board's outreach efforts are effective. Because the scores from all groups are not very high, the Board may want to include outreach as a priority in its strategic plan.

The board may want to also consider using technology to improve outreach efforts and promote new online license renewal via BreEZe.

Suggested Outreach Objectives

1. Research use of free public service announcements to expand outreach to consumers.
2. Include inserts with renewal notices and other mailings addressing most common questions for licensees.
3. Create a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) to expand outreach program to allow Board representation at consumer health fairs.
4. Define clear goals for online media for consumer and licensees.
5. Send consumer notice to optometrists with information about the requirement to make consumer protection information available to clients.
6. Outreach to administrators at public schools and clinic administrators who have optometrists come in and do eye exams about the Board and how to file complaints.

7. Work with the DCA Publications Design and Editing unit to create a “Your State Board for New Optometrists” kit that informs new licensees about the Board.

Organizational Effectiveness Trends and Changes

Board members and staff each addressed the concern that knowledgeable staff may be retiring soon and the need to documenting procedures. The board may want to consider developing goals that would allow Board staff to capitalize on strengths of knowledge and collaboration while mitigating the risk that could occur with the loss of long-time, knowledgeable staff members.

Suggested Organizational Effectiveness Objectives

1. Hold regular staff meetings and provide minutes for future reference and/or for those who miss the meeting to assist with information sharing.
2. More professional development for staff using the Individual Development Plan (IDP) process.
3. Implement Board member specific orientation training in addition to DCA Board Member Orientation Training (BMOT).

Licensing and Enforcement Trends and Changes

Pending legislation could cause a substantial increase in workload if the scope of Optometry expands. By addressing the needs identified in laws & regulations and organizational effectiveness sooner, the Board can put itself in a position to better prepare for the increased workload if it happens.

Suggested Licensing Objectives

1. Increase efficiency of application process for all licenses and certifications issued.
 - a. Review forms, indicate areas that can be simplified, and implement new forms.
 - b. Work with school registrars to get complete transcripts for optometrist license application.
 - c. Include colored inserts with notices in license renewals, etc. explaining the most frequent application errors.
 - d. Discussion with OPES (Office of Professional Examination Services) and PSI to improve timelines of data transmission to Optometry Board for optometrist license application process.

2. Document Board procedures for initial and renewal optometrist licensing process, and issuance of certifications (TPA, TPG, TLG, etc.) and business licenses (SOL, BOL, FNP).
 - a. Identify efficiencies to streamline processing timelines.
3. Improve data reliability.
 - a. Clean up inaccurate data before BreEZe implementation.
4. Promote the launch of BreEZe and provide updates to inform optometrists the board is moving in this direction.

Suggested Enforcement Objectives

1. Document internal Board processes in a procedure manual.
2. Clean data/verify accuracy of data before BreEZe implementation.
3. Submit Budget Change Proposal for an additional analyst.
4. Review how pending legislation will impact enforcement.
5. Create inspection authority in order to enforce laws such as sign posting and infection guidelines that require inspection of practices.

Examination Trends and Changes

This area was agreed upon by external stakeholders, Board members, and Board staff as the most effective area within the Board. Stakeholders and Board staff did not identify areas in need of improvement. However, some Board members cited multi levels vs. single level of licensure and reciprocity as possible opportunities to consider. With the possible passage of SB 492, the Examinations area may require goals and objectives to address changes related to SB 492.

Suggested Examination Objectives

1. Perform occupational analysis to prepare for possible scope of practice expansion
2. Determine Board member concerns over requiring more levels of licensure or a single level of licensure

2450 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 575-7170, (916) 575-7292 Fax
www.optometry.ca.gov

To: Board Members

Date: December 2, 2013

From: Alejandro Arredondo O.D.
Board President

Telephone: (916) 575-7170

Subject: **Agenda Item 3 – Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda**

The Board may not discuss or take action on any matter raised during this public comment section, except to decide whether to place the matter on the agenda of a future meeting [Government Code Sections 11125, 11125.7(a)].

2450 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 575-7170, (916) 575-7292 Fax
www.optometry.ca.gov

To: Board Members

Date: December 2, 2013

From: Alejandro Arredondo O.D.
Board President

Telephone: (916) 575-7170

Subject: **Agenda Item 4 – Suggestions for Future Agenda Items**

Members of the Board and the public may suggest items for staff research and discussion at future meetings.

2450 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 575-7170, (916) 575-7292 Fax
www.optometry.ca.gov

To: Board Members

Date: December 2, 2013

From: Alejandro Arredondo O.D.
Board President

Telephone: (916) 575-7170

Subject: Agenda Item 5 – Adjournment
