

## MINUTES

**BOARD OF VETERINARY MEDICINE  
TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL  
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS  
AND PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
1940 NORTH MONROE STREET, TALLAHASSEE, FL**

**January 7, 2004 @ 11:00 A.M.**

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Dr. O'Neil called the meeting to order at 11:02 a.m.

### **MEMBERS**

Dr. Robert O'Neil  
Dr. Sergio Vega  
Dr. Katherine Horky  
Dr. Joann Helm  
Dr. Kandra Jones  
Ms. Cynthia Lewis  
Ms. Susan Love

### **OTHERS PRESENT**

Jeffrey Jones, Board Counsel  
Drew Winters, Prosecuting Attorney  
Juanita Chastain, Executive Director  
Linda Tinsley, Government Analyst  
Donald Schaefer, FVMA  
Dr. Rubin, FVMA  
Annette Poierer, FVTA  
Debbie Generoux, FVTA  
George Ayrish, Bureau of Education and Testing

### **DISCUSSION**

#### **Correspondence to AAVSB on Technician Certification**

Dr. O'Neil advised the board that there was a letter in the agenda and an updated version had been faxed to each board member to the American Association of Veterinary State Boards concerning two technician certification programs.

Dr. Horky stated that she felt that the test to certify technicians should be a clinical competency test.

Annette Poirier stated that she felt that the board signing the letter goes beyond the scope of what the boards function is and that is to interpret and support the statutes.

Dr. O'Neil advised Ms. Poirier that he felt that in signing the letter the board was interpreting the statutes.

Ms. Poirier stated that the board is making a statement that goes beyond Rule 61G18-16.005, F.A.C. The rule deals specifically with euthanasia, animals and shelters and does not address certification of technicians in Florida.

Dr. Vega stated that Rule 61G18.16.005 (4), F.A.C., states that a certified Veterinary Technician has successfully completed the examinations required by the Florida Veterinary Medical Association's Technician Committee. Dr. Vega stated that the board has grounds to write the letter and the letter is just stating a fact.

Jeffrey Jones advised the board that the purpose of the letter is to articulate the rule change process and to articulate what was concern, by the board, in how the rule was attempted to be changed. He stated that in the second draft there was an attempt to tie it to the definition of a Certified Veterinary Technician issue in paragraph two of the second draft of the letter. Mr. Jones stated that he does not feel the letter goes outside the scope of the board's purview.

Ms. Poirier stated that in June 2002 the FVTA came before the board to ask that their testing requirements be added to Rule 61G18-16.005 (4), F.A.C. She stated that the board voted against changing the rule because if the rule went to committee the rule would be taken out all together. She stated that Mr. Bayo was willing to write a letter as to why the rule was not changed. She stated that Dr. O'Neil asked Mr. Bayo not to get involved in this contest between the two associations.

Ms. Poirier stated that the board was getting involved and the letter was asking the AAVSB to take away the FVTA's testing privileges.

Dr. Vega stated that he feels it hurts the technicians at large to have two different ways of certification. Dr. Vega the FVMA was a better certification because they require two tests.

Dr. O'Neil asked the two consumer members, Ms. Love and Ms. Lewis, if they had any comments.

Ms. Love stated that the second draft is appropriate but had concerns about issuing a certification without the practical exam.

Ms. Lewis stated that she agreed with Ms. Love that the second draft is the letter the board should go with.

Ms. Poirier advised the board that the Florida exam is not a practical exam it is a multiple choice exam. She stated that the FVTA wants technicians to be licensed and the FVMA is against it.

Dr. O'Neil advised Ms. Poirier that the board supports technicians to be licensed but it would require a statute change. He stated that the board could not license them.

Ms. Genereux advised the board that she was the one who came before the board in 2000 to discuss the whole licensure issue. She stated that the FVTA was not given a letter of support for licensure from the board for the legislature and the board denied that request. She stated that she hoped that the second draft is the only letter that would be discussed. Ms. Genereux felt that there were things stated in the letter that were not true.

Donald Schaefer stated that the clinical exam is a clinical exam and very competent.

Dr. O'Neil stated that the definition was put in the rule at the request of both associations.

Debbie Genereux stated that the FVMA was not supportive of language to be put in Chapter 474.

Ms. Genereux stated that the FVTA feels the definition of the rule is being expanded into a broader definition than it is.

Dr. Vega stated that the intention of the change to Rule 61G18-16.005, F.A.C. was to define what a certified veterinary technician is.

Dr. O'Neil stated if he remembers correctly, the FVTA was not opposed to the change at that time.

Ms. Genereux stated that they were not opposed to the change at that time.

Dr. O'Neil asked the FVTA what was wrong with the FVMA exam.

Ms. Genereux stated that the national exam is a two hundred (200) multiple choice test and the FVMA is only fifty (50) questions. She stated the FVTA is trying to follow the national recommendation for standards for a CVT.

Donald Schaefer stated that when this was discussed in 2002 the issue of technicians certifying technicians was not the model wanted in Florida.

Dr. O'Neil stated that the two associations need to get together and work this issue out and put aside differences.

Ms. Genereux stated that the letter is not appropriate and the intention of the letter is to make their contract with the AAVSB go away.

Dr. Helm asked Mr. Jones if there was one approved system for the technicians to be certified in Florida.

Mr. Jones stated that was his understanding in the original draft of the letter from the FVMA.

Dr. Helm stated that when the FVTA went out on their own they circumvented Florida. She stated that they are governed by Florida first.

**MOTION:** Dr. Horky made a motion to approve the second draft of the letter with a change to the last paragraph from administered to which are recognized by various state boards.

**SECOND:** Dr. Jones seconded the motion.

Dr. O'Neil asked for a roll call with all board members voting yes.

### **Rule 61G18-12.002 (2) – Examination and Reexamination Fees**

Ms. Chastain advised the board that the testing fee of nineteen dollars and fifty cents (\$19.50) paid to the vendor needed to be changed to reflect the new fee of thirteen dollars and fifty cents (\$13.50).

Mr. Jones stated that he felt the exact dollar amount should be changed to reflect what the exact dollar amount is now.

After discussion by the board the following motion was made.

**MOTION:** Dr. Vega made a motion to direct board counsel to draft language for Rule 61G18-12.002 (2), F.A.C. Examination and Reexamination Fees.

**SECOND:** Dr. Jones seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

### **Continuing Education –Expiry Date for Providers**

Dr. O’Neil advised the board that providers needed to have an expiration date.

Ms. Chastain stated that this issue was discussed at the December 2, 2003 meeting and Chapter 455, F.S. states that you cannot go beyond four years.

**MOTION:** Dr. Helm made a motion to direct board counsel to amend the continuing education rule to have providers renew every four (4) years.

**SECOND:** Ms. Lewis seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

### **Continuing Education – Application Fee for Providers of Continuing Education**

Ms. Chastain advised the board that at the December 2, 2003 board meeting the board had asked how much the continuing education section was costing the board per year. She stated that she checked with the Bureau of Education and Testing and Mr. Ayrish provided a figure of thirty five hundred dollars (\$3500.00) per year. Ms. Chastain informed the board that there were seventy five (75) providers. She stated that some boards charge the providers but they do not charge for courses.

Mr. Ayrish advised the board that the board does have statutory authority to charge the provider.

Mr. Schaefer commented that and individual can no longer submit a course on a course by course basis for approval, the individual must become a provider. He commented that if the individual agrees to provide the courses based on the guidelines outlined in the rule and the board will recognize the applicant as a provider. Dr. Schaefer stated that eighty percent of the providers are small associations or the courses are being provided by companies at the request of associations, and they are not for profit. Mr. Schaefer stated that this licensing period the board was fortunate that the Governor waived the licensing fee. He stated that now the full renewal fee will be re-instated. Mr. Schaefer stated that based on the previous history of the licensing fees that over the next two (2) to four (4) year period that money will be in the budget. He stated that more than thirty five hundred dollars (\$3500.00) a year in new revenue to cover the cost of the continuing education unit would be generated by the renewal fee. He stated

that the FVMA is working on making everyone a provider he feels it should be left alone and the board should not charge to be a provider.

After discussion by the board the following motion was made.

**MOTION:** Dr. Helm made a motion to table the issue until the June 2004 meeting.

**SECOND:** Dr. Jones seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

## **RATIFICATION OF APPLICATIONS**

### **Exam Candidates**

**MOTION:** Dr. Helm made a motion to ratify Dr. O'Neils actions on the following exam candidates.

**SECOND:** Dr. Jones seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

*Dr. O'Neil approved and ratified by conference call on December 24, 2003*

### **Senior Candidates**

Sandy Accime, Kelly Bakas, Terah M. Browning, Janas Gray, Natalie H. Hall, Clark D. McCullough, Jennifer Ann Matysczak, Maria I. Torres

### **AVMA Graduates**

Rachel E. Abrams, Donna Clifton, Robert M. cook, Alex Emerson, John Patrick Garrity, Joni R. Goldstein, Stephanie Jacks, Misha Mitchell, Jeffrey David Ohm, Emily Pinnell, Richard Rocconi

### **Foreign Graduates**

Patrick A. Abernathy, Chivonne Ali, Geoffrey Bailey, Donna Marie Brinck, Eduardo Castellanos, Eduardo Diaz, Gregory Fleming, Anthony Roger Greenland, Sreenivas R. Kanaganti, Boaz G. Mann, Gabriel Manu, Mohan Ramanathan

### **Endorsement**

Kim H. Braeutigam, Joann Cork, Michele Dumas, Gabrielle Falk, Fred Faragalla, Kristi Fox-Jackson, Jay Hemenway, Victoria Jordan, Henry Lester, Margarest Ohlinger, David Kelly Price, Stephen P. Romero, Yvette Vinton, Marie Yakubik

**NEW BUSINESS**

No new business

**OLD BUSINESS**

Ms. Chastain advised the board that the newsletter would be sent out as soon as it was approved by the Department's communications office.

The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.