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Attendance
The Ohio State Dental Board (Board) met in Room 1932, of The Vern Riffe Center for Government and the Arts, 77 South High Street, 19th Floor, Columbus, Ohio on April 10, 2013, beginning at 1:00 p.m. Board members present were:

Lawrence Kaye, D.D.S., President
Gregory A. McDonald, D.D.S., Vice President
Mary Ellen Wynn, D.D.S., Secretary
Marybeth Shaffer, D.D.S., Vice Secretary
Jacinto W. Beard, D.D.S.
Constance F. Clark, R.D.H.

Ashok Das, D.D.S.
W. Chris Hanners, D.D.S.
James Lawrence
William G. Leffler, D.D.S.
Linda R. Staley, R.D.H.
Douglas W. Wallace, D.D.S.

Clifford Jones, R.D.H. was not in attendance to the meeting.

The following guests were also in attendance: Katherine Bockbrader, Esq. of the Ohio Attorney General’s Office; Keith Kerns, Esq. and Henry Fields, D.D.S. of the Ohio Dental Association (ODA); Mark S. Wenzel, D.D.S. of the ODA Dentists Concerned for Dentists; David D. Goldberg, D.O., Mark Lutz, M.A., L.C.D.C. II, and Marcus D. Sibley of the Ohio Physicians health Program (OPHP); Columbus State Community College Dental Hygiene Students; Lili C. Reitz, Esq., Executive Director, Quentin Holmes, Deputy Director, Kathy Carson, Dental Board Enforcement Officer, Barb Yehnert, Investigator Assistant, Jayne Smith, Licensing Coordinator, and Malynda Franks of the Ohio State Dental Board; and other guests.

Call to Order
Dr. Kaye extended greetings to everyone and noting that there was a quorum present called the meeting to order at approximately 1:06 p.m.

Introduction of Board Members
Dr. Kaye then introduced himself as the Board President, a periodontist from Akron. He took a moment to introduce the rest of the Board members. Dr. Kaye introduced Dr. Greg McDonald, the Board Vice President, a general dentist from Springfield, Dr. Mary Ellen Wynn, the Board Secretary, a general dentist from Cincinnati, Dr. Marybeth Shaffer, the Board’s Vice Secretary, a general dentist from Leetonia, Dr. Jacinto Beard, a general dentist from Gahanna, Dr. Ashok Das, a general dentist from Mason, Dr. Chris Hanners, a general dentist from Chillicothe, Dr. William Leffler, a general dentist from Massillon, Dr. Douglas Wallace, an oral and maxillofacial surgeon from Fairfield, Ms. Constance Clark, a dental hygienist from
Dublin, Ms. Linda Staley, a dental hygienist from Lima and Mr. James Lawrence, the Board’s public member from Akron. Dr. Kaye noted that Mr. Clifford Jones, a dental hygienist from Cincinnati, was not in attendance to the meeting.

Review of Minutes

December 2012
Motion by Dr. Leffler, second by Dr. Beard, to approve the December 5, 2012 Board meeting minutes as presented.

Motion carried unanimously.

February 2013
Motion by Ms. Staley, second by Mr. Lawrence, to approve the February 6, 2013 Board meeting minutes as presented.

Motion carried unanimously.

Enforcement Report

Personal Appearances

Michael S. Lynch
Dr. Lynch began by first thanking the Board for the opportunity to speak with them. He then stated that the purpose of his appearance today was to request an increase to the number of hours he was permitted to practice per week to 34. Dr. Lynch informed the members that he has been working 20 hours per week since January of this year, but with the Board Secretaries approval, he has been working 40 hours per week for the last three (3) weeks.

Discussion followed wherein Dr. Lynch informed the members that he feels he is recovering well, doing well attending at least 5 meetings per week and five (5) caduceus meetings. He stated that he is a sponsor and cosponsor for two (2) other meetings. He then clarified that his license was reinstated in June 2012 but just recently began practicing 20 hours per week in January of this year.

Motion by Dr. Hanners, second by Dr. Shaffer, to increase the number of practice hours per week to thirty-four (34) hours for Michael S. Lynch, D.D.S. and pursuant to the terms of his consent agreement with the Board.

Motion carried unanimously.
Report and Recommendation(s)

In the Matter of Rodney R. Parsell, D.D.S.

Dr. Kaye turned the meeting over to Dr. Shaffer to conduct the Report and Recommendations. Dr. Shaffer then announced that the Board would now consider the Attorney Hearing Examiner’s Report and Recommendation in the matter of Rodney R. Parsell, D.D.S. that was filed by Attorney Hearing Examiner, Paul Stehura, Esq., on December 11, 2012.

Dr. Shaffer then proceeded by asking whether each member of the Board had read the Report and Recommendation in the matter of Rodney R. Parsell, D.D.S.?

Roll call: Dr. Beard – Yes  
Ms. Clark – Yes  
Dr. Das – Yes  
Dr. Hanners – Yes  
Dr. Kaye – Yes  
Mr. Lawrence - Yes  
Dr. Leffler – Yes  
Dr. McDonald – Yes  
Dr. Shaffer – Yes  
Ms. Staley – Yes  
Dr. Wallace – Yes  
Dr. Wynn – Yes

Dr. Shaffer then asked whether each member of the Board had the record, including the transcript available to refer to when necessary when reviewing this matter?

Roll call: Dr. Beard – Yes  
Ms. Clark – Yes  
Dr. Das – Yes  
Dr. Hanners – Yes  
Dr. Kaye – Yes  
Mr. Lawrence - Yes  
Dr. Leffler – Yes  
Dr. McDonald – Yes  
Dr. Shaffer – Yes  
Ms. Staley – Yes  
Dr. Wallace – Yes  
Dr. Wynn – Yes

Dr. Shaffer proceeded by asking if each Board member read any Objections to the Report and Recommendations filed in this case?

Roll call: Dr. Beard – Yes
Dr. Shaffer asked if either Dr. Parsell and/or his attorney were present. Paul Lafayette, Esq., indicated that he was representing Dr. Parsell in this matter and that both were in attendance to the meeting.

Dr. Shaffer then stated that the Board’s minutes would serve as the official record of the proceedings. She stated that Dr. Parsell and his attorney, Mr. Lafayette, have requested the opportunity to address the Board and therefore, Katherine Bockbrader, Esq., the Assistant Attorney General in this matter will be giving the opportunity to respond. She informed the members that Dr. Parsell, Mr. Lafayette, and Ms. Bockbrader should limit their comments to the Hearing Examiners Findings of Fact, Conclusions, and Proposed Order in this matter. She informed them that the Board will only consider the evidence presented during the administrative hearing in this matter and therefore, there would be no questions from the Board members.

Paul Michael Lafayette, Esq.

Paul Lafayette, Esq. began by introducing himself and Dr. Parsell, stating that he had represented Dr. Parsell during the administrative hearing. Mr. Lafayette stated the Board obviously had familiarized itself with the record, the report and recommendations of the hearing examiner, as well as any of the objections. He said that he would not belabor the facts of the case other than regarding restorative treatment, particularly the fillings that were placed by Dr. Parsell on a single patient, Patient #1 on September 17, 2010. He commented that the Hearing Examiner did not find that the Board had provided sufficient evidence to support its burden of proof on Counts 1 and 7. However, Mr. Lafayette said that the counts that are at issue are Counts 3, 4, 5, and 6 which deal with the restorative care and fillings on Patient #1.

Mr. Lafayette said that the purpose of his presentation today was that he believes the Board needs to focus on the timeline of events. He stated that the burden the investigation and potential sanction on the licensee’s license is a very significant and important matter that the Board needs to get right. He said the evidence in this particular case reflected that on September 17, 2010, Dr. Parsell treated this patient and approximately one (1) hour shortly thereafter, the patient went to Montpelier Hospital and was evaluated for pain. He said that on September 20, 2010 Patient #1 returned to Dr. Parsell’s office and complained of pain. He told the members that in the interim, Patient #1 had requested Vicodin for pain after placement of the fillings on Sept. 17, 2010. Mr. Lafayette said that after Dr. Parsell refused to provide her with pain medicine at the time he placed the fillings, she went to Montpelier Hospital Emergency Room (ER) to seek pain medication.
Mr. Lafayette said that on September 20, Patient #1 returned to Dr. Parsell's office, he performed an oral evaluation and everything looked good. He stated that nothing noted in Dr. Parsell’s chart indicates there was a problem. He said that Patient #1 made Dr. Parsell aware that she did go to the ER for an evaluation. Mr. Lafayette explained to the members that on September 20, shortly after Patient #1 left Dr. Parsell’s office, Patient #1 travels to Dr. Pelok’s office in Wasseon, Ohio. He said that Dr. Pelok evaluated the patient and noted no findings or indications for pain. He stated that Dr. Pelok did not find anything wrong with the fillings that were placed by Dr. Parcell, is in agreement with Dr. Parsell’s evaluation and did not see anything in her mouth that was unusual or out of place, or inappropriate or was a basis for her pain. Mr. Lafayette said Dr. Pelok did not even indicate that there was any swelling and this evaluation was performed three (3) days later.

Continuing on, Mr. Lafayette informed the Board that on September 22, Patient #1 appeared to Dr. Shepard’s office, but we do not have any records from Dr. Shepard because Dr. Shepard did not actually treat Patient #1. He stated it was their understanding that Patient #1 went into Dr. Shepard’s office and that Dr. Shepard never ended up offering any treatment since Patient #1 was seeking pain medication and also sought to criticize Dr. Parcell. Mr. Lafayette stated that on September 28, Patient #1 showed up to Dr. Cochran’s office, a local competitor of Dr. Parcell, and at that time the intraoral photographs are taken. He commented that these are the principal and exclusive evidence in this case that the Board investigation and findings are based upon. He said that Dr. Cochran indicated that Dr. Parcell improperly placed and deviated from the standard of care in the placement of fillings. Mr. Lafayette said that those photographs are the evidence in this case.

Mr. Lafayette continued, stating that the Board is aware that photographs are not diagnostic, but more critically, the Board’s decision must be made based on reliable, probative and substantial evidence. He commented that the most reliable evidence in any particular case is going to be the evidence closest to the act. He reiterated that Dr. Parsell treated this patient on September 17 and again evaluated the patient on September 20 and did not see anything. He informed the members that Dr. Pelok also saw this patient three (3) days after Dr. Parsell’s initial treatment and saw nothing that deviated from the standard of care. He stated that it was not until September 28 when the patient was at Dr. Cochran’s office eight (8) days later, eleven (11) days after initial treatment, that Dr. Cochran’s intraoral photographs indicate that there is something wrong with the fillings.

Mr. Lafayette informed the members that during the hearing, Dr. Parcell could not specifically identify that those intraoral photographs were actually the teeth in question in question, nor at issue in this particular patient. However, he stated that Dr. Parsell acknowledged that if those were the restorations that he placed, then yes, there was a deviation from the standard of care.

Mr. Lafayette commented that the issue here is what happened between September 20 and September 28, 2010. He stated that there is no evidence, none in the record, to show what happened between those two (2) dates. He said the only thing we do know is that three (3) days after Dr. Parsell provided this treatment, on September 20, Dr. Pelok saw this patient and there were no problems. He stated that Dr. Pelok did not visualize any problems with any of her fillings and he would have noted that in her chart if he did. Therefore, Mr. Lafayette stated that the evaluations performed by Dr. Parsell and Dr. Pelok are the most
reliable, probative and substantial evidence in this case, and reliance should not be placed on Dr. Cochran’s record. He said that the gist of their argument, their objections and their principle concern was that the most reliable, probative, substantial evidence was not relied upon. He stated that in order to reach the conclusions that the Hearing Examiner came to, the Hearing Examiner had to disregard Dr. Pelok’s findings.

Another concerning issue in this case, Mr. Lafayette said, was Dr. Cochran’s records themselves. He stated that the records provided to the Board in response to the Boards original investigative subpoena and the records that he subpoenaed on behalf of Dr. Parsell in March of 2012, did not match the records that Dr. Cochran provided at his video deposition in the summer of 2012. He stated that while it appears that there is not any real substantive difference in the charts, there is no doubt that they are not the same chart. Mr. Lafayette indicated that at the tops of the original and the subpoenaed charts there are different terms/words used. Additionally, he indicated that there were differences in the handwritten notations in the margins and around the box at the top of the charts, specifically the handwriting was inside the box on the original chart and the handwriting continued outside the box on the subpoenaed copies provided by Dr. Cochran. Mr. Lafayette pointed out that on the last page of the original chart, it is indicated that Patient #1 had scheduled an appointment for January 5, 2011 but had called and left a message to cancel the appointment. He indicated that on both copies of the subpoenaed charts, which were subpoenaed in late 2011 and 2012, this entry did not exist where it should have been on the chart.

Continuing on, Mr. Lafayette stated that the most important fact about the additional notation in the original chart is that there is also a notation that the patient had moved to Kentucky. He stated that they had subpoenaed for testimony of Patient #1 due to the dire concerns they had about what transpired between September 20th and September 28th, 2013 in addition to the credibility of the patient. He stated that the issued subpoena had gone to Patient #1’s last known address but had been returned unserved and therefore, they went to great lengths in an attempt to locate the patient in Ohio. He stated that it would have been beneficial for them to have known that the patient had moved to Kentucky, as was indicated in the original chart from Dr. Cochran. Mr. Lafayette noted that Dr. Cochran acknowledged in his video deposition that the charts were different but did not offer any explanation as to why. He also noted that in the copies of the chart that were provided pursuant to their subpoena it appeared as if someone wrote over or tried to trace over the original writing on the chart whereas the original does not appear to have been altered.

An additional issue, Mr. Lafayette stated, was the conduct of the investigation itself. He stated that he would have expected that the Board would investigate all the facts in wanting to determine what happened. However, he stated that the records of Dr. Parsell and Dr. Cochran were the only records that were subpoenaed by the Board. He stated that references to Dr. Shepard, Dr. Pelok, and Montpelier Hospital are all made within the charts but records from these three (3) were never subpoenaed. Mr. Lafayette commented that as an independent body conducting investigations that will affect the livelihood of a licensee to practice their profession; those licensees might have a jaded opinion of the “system” if it appears that you are single-minded toward charging the licensee when obtaining evidence. He then directed the Board members to Exhibit G of their exhibits, which was a portion of an e-mail correspondence dated August 17, 2012 from Deputy Director Quentin Holmes advising Dental Board Enforcement Officer Kathy Carson to “hang’em high” in reference to Dr. Parsell. Mr. Lafayette commented that this was inappropriate.
and that it raised questions as to the conduct and/or focus of the investigation and at the very least raises grave concerns about the process.

Concluding, Mr. Lafayette stated that from a fundamentally legal standpoint the timeframes are his main concern. He stated that the person with the most probative, reliable evidence in this case was Dr. Pelok, who had indicated that there was nothing wrong. For this reason alone, Mr. Lafayette stated, the Hearing Examiners Report and Recommendations should be rejected and overruled. He then turned the floor over to Dr. Parsell.

Rodney R. Parsell, D.D.S.

Dr. Parsell began by thanking the Board members for the opportunity to speak with them. He informed them that on September 17, 2010 he first saw Patient #1 and her two (2) children who were scheduled for 3:00 p.m. appointments until the end of the day. He said that Patient #1 had scheduled appointments to get her and her children’s many fillings done at the same time. Dr. Parsell informed the members that all three (3) of the patients presented with very dirty mouths, poor oral hygiene, and numerous complaints of pain. He stated that their prophysis were done and panorex x-rays were completed prior to any treatment planning. He stated that their decay which was their chief complaint.

Dr. Parsell stated that Patient #1 was treated first and that she had indicated that she was unable to get her fillings done for a long time because no-one would accept her Medicaid insurance and she lived over 50 miles away. He informed the Board that Patient #1 had checked “Yes” to many diseases such as kidney disease, frequently tired, cancer, arthritis, stomach ulcers, easily winded, and hay fever. Additionally, he stated that she reported migraines, pain to hot and cold in every tooth, facial trauma to which she could not remember, TMJ clenching, and it hurt to chew in both of her jaws yet she had no soreness or any muscle mastications. He stated that upon questioning the patient, she responded that she was not taking any prescriptions, had not been to any doctor as an adult, she was 29 years old, and was uncertain if she even had any of those illnesses but just wanted to have her fillings done. Dr. Parsell informed the members that Patient #1 was instructed to follow-up with a physician. Dr. Parsell said that Patient #1 was numbed up, was instructed to hold up her hand if she wanted him to stop and had 12 fillings done over the next 90 minutes. He stated that she was told that most likely her teeth would be sensitive to cold, not to eat for at least three (3) hours and to call if previous sensitivity lasted for more than two (2) days.

Continuing on, Dr. Parsell stated that treatment for Patient #1’s son required five (5) fillings and an extraction for an abscessed baby tooth. He stated that Patient #1’s daughter presented with no problems and no pain. Dr. Parsell informed the Board that over all they had taken three (3) hours with Patient #1 and her children. He informed the members that at the end of their appointments, Patient #1 was pleased that they had all received treatment and then asked for Vicodin for herself for pain. He stated that he told her that Vicodin was not usually warranted after fillings but to call him if her pain truly persisted or lasted longer than two (2) days. He stated that Patient #1 became very upset and told him that she would “just get it from the ER then”.

~ 7 ~
On September 20, 2010, Dr. Parsell stated that Patient #1 showed up in his office without calling and unannounced. He stated that while in the waiting room Patient #1 demanded Vicodin and did not want to be seen. He stated that he came out into the waiting room and explained to Patient #1 that he would first need to do an exam. He said that he took a look at all 12 of Patient #1’s fillings, noted in the chart that all fillings were filled, occlusion was good, and no sensitivity. He stated that he again informed the patient to call if the sensitivity did not subside within two (2) days. Dr. Parsell stated that Patient #1 then reported to him that she had already received Vicodin from the Emergency Room.

Continuing on, Dr. Parsell stated that not one of the fillings that he had seen that day looked anything like the photographs that he had been presented by the Board. He stated that Patient #1 never called him back, nor had the patient ever followed up with his calls. On September 23, 2010, Dr. Parsell stated that Dr. Shepard’s office, in Montpelier some 50 miles away, called his office and informed him that Patient #1 had walked into his office the day before on September 22nd, refused to be examined and informed Dr. Shepard that on September 20th the patient had gone to Dr. Pelok’s office in Wasseon prior to coming to his (Dr. Parsell) office in Napoleon immediately following. Dr. Parsell stated that Dr. Shepard informed him that Patient #1 had said that neither one of us (Dr. Parsell and Dr. Pelok) had given her pain medication after getting twelve (12) fillings done and that she wanted assistance in filing a complaint against Dr. Parsell for not giving her Vicodin. He stated that Dr. Shepard had informed her that he could not give her pain medicine without an exam and so she left.

Dr. Parsell stated that he again attempted to contact Patient #1 and was still unable to reach her. He said that he then contacted Dr. Pelok who reported that one (1) hour prior to walking into his office on September 20th, Dr. Pelok had examined Patient #1 thoroughly and found no problems with the fillings or that she was symptomatic in any of her teeth. He stated that Dr. Pelok reported that all the fillings looked good; absolutely no signs of decay, and therefore, Dr. Pelok rendered no treatment. He stated that Dr. Pelok informed him that since Patient #1 was so completely enraged, Dr. Pelok gave her Erythromycin and thirty (30) Vicodin extra strength. Dr. Parsell stated that Dr. Pelok did not know that Patient #1 had gotten Vicodin from the Montpelier Hospital Emergency Room three (3) days prior.

Dr. Parsell informed the members that Patient #1 lived in Pioneer, Ohio on the Michigan border, approximately 50 miles from him. He stated that the patient made trips to Montpelier and Dr. Shepard on separate days near the Indiana border on two (2) different days for pain medicine, that the patient then proceeded to see Dr. Pelok in Wasseon, almost 35 miles away from her home and received more pain medicine and then came to see him again in the same day. Dr. Parsell stated that Patient #1 traveled 50 miles again to see Dr. Cochran and got more Vicodin within at same week. He commented that there are about 50 other dentists that are closer than 50 miles to Patient #1 and he does not know how many other dentists Patient #1 may have seen between September 23rd and September 28th.

Concluding, Dr. Parsell said that he accomplished a lot for Patient #1 and her two (2) children in their one and only visit to his office. He stated that their examinations were problem-focused on the decay which was Patient #1’s chief complaint, that three (3) days after placement both he and Dr. Pelok thoroughly examined all of Patient #1’s fillings and found no cause for pain and no remaining decay. He informed the Board that Patient #1 never returned to either of their offices after September 20th and never returned either his or Dr.
Pelok’s phone calls. He stated that he now sits before the Board some two and one half (2 ½) years later with tens of thousands of dollars lost and numerous lost days of work, all because he helped a person in need and when he did not provide narcotics, she obtained them from at least three (3) other sources including a local competitor, Dr. George Cochran, who took the intraoral pictures and filed the complaint for the patient. Dr. Parsell commented that Dr. Cochran’s intraoral pictures, wherein he cannot recognize as his own work and whose chart has been found to be altered at the time of deposition is the basis for all of this before the Board. Therefore, he asked that the Board acknowledge that there is simply no basis for this.

Katherine Bockbrader, Esq, Assistant Attorney General

Ms. Bockbrader began by stating that she wished to address the allegations that the Respondent had made regarding the discrepancies in the timeline of Dr. Cochran’s charts. She stated that it is shown in Respondent’s Exhibit G, which is a copy of the Board’s investigative file and of which we are required to provide upon request, that the Board opened its investigation in 2010 and requested copies of Dr. Cochran’s records and was provided them in 2010. She stated this is why a 2011 entry did not appear in the records which were provided to the Board in 2010, because they were provided before the entry in 2011 was made. Ms. Bockbrader stated that the Respondent subpoenaed an original record and attended Dr. Cochran’s deposition wherein Dr. Cochran brought the original chart and records, and he was freely able to review it at that time. She stated that it was at the video deposition of Dr. Cochran when the 2011 entries appeared, in the updated records. Ms. Bockbrader encouraged the Board members to closely review and compare State’s Exhibit K, which is a copy of the updated record, and State’s Exhibit 5, which was the original copy received pursuant to the Board’s subpoena in 2010. She stated that it appears that someone traced over the handwriting entries in State’s Exhibit 5. She stated that Dr. Cochran testified that he has a very old copier which makes very bad copies and a lot of things do not show up. She stated that it was apparent that the copies were not very dark and someone traced over the copies to make it darker and that Dr. Cochran testified that a staff member had made the copies and most likely traced over the handwriting to make it clearer. Ms. Bockbrader pointed out that there was nothing of significance that is different between the two (2) exhibits. She stated that perhaps if one of the records had stated “decay” and the other did not, the record would become suspicious, however, that was not the case, and Counsel’s allegations that the entries were altered should be rejected.

As to Patient #1’s relocation to Kentucky and the entry in Dr. Cochran’s records as to that affect, Ms. Bockbrader stated again that the exhibits had been obtained prior to the entry being made in 2011. She stated that Dr. Cochran did not know of the Respondent’s request to subpoena Patient #1, nor was it his or the Board’s responsibility to locate Patient #1 for the Respondent. She stated that Counsel could have contacted Dr. Cochran himself to obtain the patient’s correct address. Or, she stated that once Counsel became aware of her change in address during the video deposition of Dr. Cochran, he could have located her as he had more than two months to locate her, and there was no evidence to that affect.

Continuing on, Ms. Bockbrader stated that Dr. Cochran’s intraoral photographs were not the exclusive evidence in this case as Counsel suggested. She stated that evidence was also obtained within Dr. Cochran’s dental records wherein he clearly documented the decay he witnessed and found upon examination of Patient #1. She stated that, based on Dr. Parsell’s testimony wherein he speculated that the intraoral photographs taken by Dr. Cochran were altered or forged, the Board would have to speculate that Dr.
Cochran would have had to remove good fillings, replace them with bad fillings, somehow make decay reappear, take the intraoral photographs, and then replace the bad fillings again with good ones. Ms. Bockbrader informed the Board that the intraoral photographs were not used exclusively in this matter. She stated that Dr. Cochran’s records indicate he retreated Patient #1 over the course of several weeks. Dr. Cochran’s records indicated that he had provided pain medication on the first visit only, and she returned several times until everything was corrected and she felt confident that the fillings were done right. Ms. Bockbrader indicated that these findings were also the Board’s expert’s opinion, which was based on not only the intraoral photographs, but on Dr. Cochran’s documented examination and diagnosis, which was testified to under oath.

Ms. Bockbrader stated that Dr. Cochran testified that he personally found decay under and around the fillings place by Dr. Parsell, that he not only visualized the decay but felt it clinically with a probe. She stated that Dr. Cochran also testified to diagnosing an open margin, and to the uneven, rough and grainy nature of the fillings.

Continuing on, Ms. Bockbrader stipulated that there was other evidence of poor work provided by the intraoral photographs beside the issue of decay. She stated that the photographs show poor workmanship, along with Dr. Parsell’s own testimony that he completed a prophy and twelve (12) fillings, many of which were multi-surface performed without a dental hygienist and in an appointment that only lasted approximately one and a half (1 ½) hours. She stated that this is insufficient time to meet the standard of care and that it was apparent that Dr. Parsell rushed through the appointment for this Medicaid patient. She stated that the poor work is also consistent with Patient #1’s symptoms and that contrary to the Respondent’s arguments that Patient #1 went “straight” to the emergency room to obtain pain medicine, the hospital records indicated that it was approximately 11:00 p.m. when Patient #1 sought medical treatment for pain.

Continuing on, Ms. Bockbrader stated Dr. Parsell’s version of his conversations with Dr. Pelok are inconsistent with Dr. Pelok’s records and testimony in that Dr. Pelok testified that he did not remember seeing any problems with the fillings but admitted that he did not perform a thorough examination as it was a limited emergency appointment. Additionally, Ms. Bockbrader noted that Dr. Pelok prescribed antibiotics and Vicodin and referred her back to Dr. Parsell which is indicative of problems.

Ms. Bockbrader stated that although the Respondent portrays Patient #1 as a “drug-seeker”, she did not behave like one in that she told both Dr. Parsell and Dr. Pelok that she had received Vicodin from the emergency room, an action that “drug-seekers” typically try to hide. She stated that Respondent attempts to make this case about withholding drugs to a drug-seeking patient when in fact the case is about poor dental work which was below the standard of care.

Concluding, Ms. Bockbrader stated that regardless of whether Patient #1 was a Medicaid patient or a drug seeking patient, Dr. Parsell was required to provide a minimum level of competency in her dental care. Unfortunately, Ms. Bockbrader stated that it was apparent that Dr. Parsell apparently rushed through and performed substandard work and therefore, the Board should find him in violation of the standard of care as found in the Hearing Examiners Report and Recommendations. She stated that at a minimum Dr. Parsell should receive an Order from the Board requiring significant remediation education in diagnosis and
treatment planning, dental restorations, and ethics. Additionally, she stated that there should be a suspension of Dr. Parsell’s license to practice due to the nature of the violations, if the Board feels it is appropriate.

**Quasi Judicial Deliberations**

**Motion by Dr. McDonald, second by Dr. Beard, to recess for the purpose of conducting quasi-judicial deliberations in the disciplinary matter of Rodney R. Parsell, DDS, pursuant to R. C. Chapter 119, and to reconvene in open session following deliberations.**

**Roll call vote:**
- Dr. Beard - Yes
- Ms. Clark - Yes
- Dr. Das – Yes
- Dr. Hanners. - Yes
- Dr. Kaye – Yes
- Mr. Lawrence – Yes
- Dr. Leffler - Yes
- Dr. McDonald - Yes
- Dr. Shaffer – Yes
- Ms. Staley - Yes
- Dr. Wallace - Yes
- Dr. Wynn – Yes

Motion carried unanimously.

**Open Session**

The Board resumed open session at approximately 2:55 p.m.

Dr. Shaffer stated, “Let the record reflect that Dr. Bill Leffler and I were the Secretaries in these matters, were not present during executive session, and did not participate in deliberations in this matter. Therefore, we will abstain from final vote.”

**Decision in the Matter of Rodney R. Parsell, D.D.S.**

**Motion by Dr. Wynn, Second by Dr. Das, to accept the Findings of Fact of the Hearing Examiner with respect to the counts in the matter of Rodney R. Parsell, D.D.S.**

**Roll call vote:**
- Dr. Beard - No
- Ms. Clark - Yes
- Dr. Das – Yes
- Dr. Hanners. - No
- Dr. Kaye – Yes
- Mr. Lawrence – Yes
- Dr. Leffler - Abstain
- Dr. McDonald - Yes
- Dr. Shaffer – Abstain
- Ms. Staley - Absent
- Dr. Wallace - Yes
Dr. Wynn – Yes

Motion carried.

Motion by Dr. Wynn, Second by Dr. McDonald, to modify the Hearing Examiner with respect to the counts in the matter of Rodney R. Parsell, D.D.S.

It is hereby ORDERED that:

1. The licensure of DR. PARSELL to practice dentistry in the state of Ohio is SUSPENDED for a period of fourteen (14) consecutive days.
2. Once REINSTATED, DR. PARSELL’s license to practice dentistry shall be subject to the following terms and conditions for a period of three (3) years:
   a. DR. PARSELL shall obtain seven (7) hours of continuing education in diagnosis and treatment planning, and fourteen (14) hours of continuing education in restorative dentistry, approved in advance by the Board Secretary. DR. PARSELL shall notify the Board of successful completion of these hours within 180 days of the effective date of this order. These hours shall be in addition to the forty (40) hours of continuing education necessary for renewal.
   b. DR. PARSELL shall fully cooperate with the Board investigators in future inspections and evaluations in accordance with law. Further, upon the Board’s request, DR. PARSELL shall make any and all of his patient records available for inspection and review. At the Board’s discretion, such records may be reviewed by a consultant to the Board.
   c. DR. PARSELL shall submit to the Board, on a quarterly basis, a written report indicating his compliance with all probationary terms and conditions.
   d. DR. PARSELL shall appear before the Board or its designee as requested by the Board.
   e. DR. PARSELL shall obey all federal, state and local laws and rules governing the practice of dentistry in Ohio.
3. DR. PARSELL’s failure to comply with all terms of this Order may result in additional disciplinary proceedings against his dental license.
4. Upon successful completion of the terms of this ORDER, DR. PARSELL’s license and permits shall be fully RESTORED.

Discussion followed wherein Dr. Kaye stated that the Hearing Examiners Recommended Order stipulated that the remediation education shall be completed by Dr. Parsell within the fourteen (14) consecutive days of suspension. He stated that the Board was granting up to 180 days in which to complete the requirement.

Roll call vote:
- Dr. Beard - No
- Ms. Clark - Yes
- Dr. Das – Yes
- Dr. Hanners. - No
- Dr. Kaye – Yes
- Mr. Lawrence – Yes
- Dr. Leffler - No
- Dr. McDonald - Yes
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Dr. Shaffer – Abstain
Ms. Staley - Abstain
Dr. Wallace - Yes
Dr. Wynn – Yes

Motion carried.

Mr. Lawrence then left for the duration of the meeting.

In the Matter of Roy L. Heaton, D.D.S.
Dr. Shaffer then announced that the Board would now consider the Attorney Hearing Examiner’s Report and Recommendation in the matter of Roy L. Heaton, D.D.S. that was filed by Attorney Hearing Examiner, Sharon W. Murphy, R.N., Esq., on January 29, 2013.

Dr. Shaffer then proceeded by asking whether each member of the Board had read the Report and Recommendation in the matter of Roy L. Heaton, D.D.S.?

Roll call: Dr. Beard – Yes
Ms. Clark – Yes
Dr. Das – Yes
Dr. Hanners – Yes
Dr. Kaye – Yes
Dr. Leffler – Yes
Dr. McDonald – Yes
Dr. Shaffer – Yes
Ms. Staley – Yes
Dr. Wallace – Yes
Dr. Wynn – Yes

Dr. Shaffer then asked whether each member of the Board had the record, including the transcript available to refer to when necessary when reviewing this matter?

Roll call: Dr. Beard – Yes
Ms. Clark – Yes
Dr. Das – Yes
Dr. Hanners – Yes
Dr. Kaye – Yes
Dr. Leffler – Yes
Dr. McDonald – Yes
Dr. Shaffer – Yes
Ms. Staley – Yes
Dr. Wallace – Yes
Dr. Wynn – Yes
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Dr. Shaffer asked if either Dr. Heaton and/or his attorney were present. There being no response she then stated that there was no court reporter present and the Board’s minutes would serve as the official record of the proceedings.

**Quasi Judicial Deliberations**

*Motion by Dr. McDonald, second by Dr. Hanners, to recess for the purpose of conducting quasi-judicial deliberations in the disciplinary matter of Roy L. Heaton, DDS, pursuant to R. C. Chapter 119, and to reconvene in open session following deliberations.*

**Roll call vote:**
- Dr. Beard - Yes
- Ms. Clark - Yes
- Dr. Das - Yes
- Dr. Hanners - Yes
- Dr. Kaye - Yes
- Mr. Lawrence - Yes
- Dr. Leffler - Yes
- Dr. McDonald - Yes
- Dr. Shaffer - Yes
- Ms. Staley - Yes
- Dr. Wallace - Yes
- Dr. Wynn - Yes

Motion carried unanimously.

**Open Session**

The Board resumed open session at approximately 3:31 p.m.

Dr. Shaffer stated, “Let the record reflect that Dr. Mary Ellen Wynn and I were the Secretaries in these matters, were not present during executive session, and did not participate in deliberations in this matter. Therefore, we will abstain from final vote.”

**Decision in the Matter of Roy L. Heaton, D.D.S.**

*Motion by Dr. Wallace, Second by Dr. Beard, to accept the Findings of Fact of the Hearing Examiner with respect to the counts in the matter of Roy L. Heaton, D.D.S.*

**Roll call vote:**
- Dr. Beard - Yes
- Ms. Clark - Yes
- Dr. Das - Yes
- Dr. Hanners - Yes
- Dr. Kaye - Yes
- Mr. Lawrence - Yes
- Dr. Leffler - Yes
- Dr. McDonald - Yes
- Dr. Shaffer - Yes
- Ms. Staley - Abstain
- Dr. Wallace - Yes
- Dr. Wynn - Abstain
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Motion carried.

Motion by Dr. Wallace, Second by Dr. McDonald, to modify the Hearing Examiner with respect to the counts in the matter of Roy L. Heaton, D.D.S.

It is hereby ORDERED that:

1. The licensure of DR. HEATON to practice dentistry in the state of Ohio is SUSPENDED for a period of at least thirty (30) consecutive days.

2. The Board shall NOT consider REINSTATEMENT of DR. HEATON’s license to practice dentistry unless and until all of the following requirements are met:
   a. DR. HEATON shall appear before the Board.
   b. DR. HEATON shall submit an application for reinstatement, accompanied by the appropriate fees.
   c. DR. HEATON shall provide acceptable documentation of successful completion of continuing education approved in advance by the Board Secretary, as follows:
      i. Seven (7) hours in Ethics
      ii. Seven (7) hours in Infection Control
      iii. Seven (7) hours in Record Keeping
   d. These twenty-one (21) hour of continuing education shall be in addition to the forty (40) hours of continuing education necessary for renewal.

3. Once REINSTATED, DR. HEATON’s license to practice dentistry shall be subject to the following terms and conditions for a period of three (3) years:
   a. DR. HEATON shall provide to the Board, by the 5th of each month, documentation from an independent testing agency that is acceptable to the Board, demonstrating that the heat sterilizing device in his office is tested for proper function on a weekly basis by means of a biological monitoring system that indicates microorganism kill and that immediate remedial action was taken in any biological spore test was positive.
   b. DR. HEATON shall fully cooperate with the Board investigators in future inspections and evaluations in accordance with law. Further, upon the Board’s request, DR. HEATON shall make any and all of his infection control records available for inspection and review. At the Board’s discretion, such records may be reviewed by a consultant to the Board.
   c. DR. HEATON shall submit to the Board, on a quarterly basis, a written report indicating his compliance with all probationary terms and conditions.
4. DR. HEATON shall obey all federal, state and local laws and rules governing the practice of dentistry in Ohio.

5. DR. HEATON's failure to comply with all terms of this Order may result in additional disciplinary proceedings against his dental license.

Upon successful completion of the terms of this ORDER, DR. HEATON's license and permits shall be fully RESTORED.

This ORDER shall take effect thirty (30) days from the date of mailing of this ORDER.

Roll call vote:  Dr. Beard - Yes
Ms. Clark - Yes
Dr. Das - Yes
Dr. Hanners - Yes
Dr. Kaye - Yes
Mr. Lawrence - Yes
Dr. Leffler - Yes
Dr. McDonald - Yes
Dr. Shaffer - Yes
Ms. Staley - Abstain
Dr. Wallace - Yes
Dr. Wynn - Abstain

Motion carried.

Review of Motion(s)

Case Number 12-77-0080
Ms. Reitz explained that the Board had approved and issued a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing (Notice) where there were two (2) counts violations of the Dental Practice Act. The first count involved the failure to have a certain radiograph as part of the patient file and the second count was failure to report an adverse occurrence. The radiograph has since been produced which renders the first count moot. The Supervisory Investigative Panel (SIP) is now recommending that the Notice be rescinded and the licensee be issued a Warning Letter.

Motion by Dr. McDonald, second by Dr. Hanners, to rescind the notice of opportunity for hearing issued to the licensee in Case No. 12-77-0080.

Motion carried unanimously.

Review of Proposed Voluntary Retirement(s)
The Board reviewed one (1) proposed voluntary retirement. The name of the individual/licensee was not included in the document reviewed by the Board. The name of the individual/licensee has been added to the minutes for public notice purposes.
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Deidre N. McFann, R.D.H.
Motion by Dr. Wallace, second by Dr. McDonald, to approve the proposed voluntary retirement for Deidre N. McFann, R.D.H., license number 31-011999, case number 12-40-0065.

Motion carried unanimously.

Review of Proposed Consent Agreement(s)
The Board reviewed five (5) proposed consent agreements. The names of the individuals/licensees were not included in the documents reviewed by the Board. The names of the individuals/licensees have been added to the minutes for public notice purposes.

Disciplinary

Jessica E. Fraley, Dental Assistant
Motion by Dr. Beard, second by Ms. Staley, to approve the proposed agreement for Jessica E. Fraley, dental assistant radiographer, certificate number 51-024657, case number 12-30-0342.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mark Kriwinski, D.D.S.
Motion by Ms. Staley, second by Dr. Beard, to approve the proposed agreement for Mark Kriwinski, D.D.S., license number 30-016440, case number 12-18-0300.

Motion carried unanimously.

Fred S. Glick, D.D.S.
Motion by Dr. McDonald, second by Ms. Staley, to approve the proposed agreement for Fred S. Glick, D.D.S., license number 30-017346, case numbers; 12-18-0374, 12-18-0028, 12-18-0102.

Motion carried unanimously.

Eric L. Thompson, Dental Assistant
Motion by Dr. McDonald, second by Ms. Clark, to approve the proposed agreement for Eric L. Thompson, dental assistant radiographer, certificate number 51-016513, case number 13-08-0085.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mack A. Wright, D.D.S.
Motion by Dr. Hanners, second by Ms. Clark, to approve the proposed agreement for Mack A. Wright, D.D.S., license number, 30-020302, case number 09-11-0079.

Motion carried unanimously.

Notice(s) of Opportunity for Hearing
The Board reviewed three (3) proposed notices of opportunity for hearing and one (1) Amended Notice of Opportunity for Hearing. The names of the individuals/licensees were not included in the documents
reviewed by the Board. The names of the individuals/licensees have been added to the minutes for public notice purposes.

G. Thomas Noakes, DDS

Motion by Dr. McDonald, second by Ms. Staley, to approve the proposed notice of opportunity for hearing and forward it to G. Thomas Noakes, DDS, license number 30-020366, case number 11-78-0403.

Motion carried unanimously.

Linda E. Ritchey, Dental Assistant

Motion by Dr. McDonald, second by Dr. Das, to approve the proposed notice of opportunity for hearing and forward it to Linda E. Ritchey, certificate number 51-000440, case number 12-87-0239.

Motion carried unanimously.

Amy G. Robinson, R.D.H.

Motion by Dr. Wallace, second by Dr. Wynn, to approve the proposed notice of opportunity for hearing and forward it to Amy G. Robinson, R.D.H., license number 31-009558, case number 07-25-0421.

Motion carried unanimously.

C. Jed Kesler, D.D.S.

Motion by Dr. McDonald, second by Dr. Wallace, to approve the proposed amended notice of opportunity for hearing and forward it to C. Jed Kesler, D.D.S., license number 30-019011, case number 11-25-0417 and 11-25-0243.

Discussion followed wherein Ms. Reitz explained that two (2) counts in the original Notice of Opportunity for Hearing had been removed from this amended version due to the counts being problematic.

Motion carried unanimously.

Review of Proposed Orders to Assessment

The Board reviewed two (2) proposed Orders to Assessment. The names of the individuals/licensees were not included in the documents reviewed by the Board. Further, the names have not been disclosed thereafter because these letters are part of ongoing investigation, confidential under Ohio Revised Code 4715.03(D).

Ms. Reitz explained that the Board has the authority under Ohio Revised Code 4715.30(A)(10) to take action based on “Inability to practice under accepted standards of the profession because of physical or mental disability, dependence on alcohol or other drugs, or excessive use of alcohol or other drugs.” She stated that the two (2) letters before them sets forth the Board’s concerns and reasons, and by the authority given the Board under Section 4715.30(D) this letter is ordering the licensee to an examination at a Board-approved treatment provider. She stated that these appointments have already been scheduled and that it is a seventy-two hour patient assessment at the Board’s expense. Ms. Reitz explained that failure of the
licensee to appear could be grounds for summary suspension and/or they may subject the licensee to further action based on failure to cooperate with the Board in an ongoing investigation.

Case Numbers 11-25-0243 and 11-25-0417

Motion by Dr. Beard, second by Dr. Wynn, to approve the proposed order to assessment and issue it to the licensee in case number 11-25-0243 and 11-25-0417.

Discussion followed wherein Ms. Reitz clarified questions from the members regarding possible disciplinary sanctions, fees/costs involved to the Board, etc.

Motion carried unanimously.

Case Number 12-25-0241

Motion by Dr. Beard, second by Dr. McDonald, to approve the proposed order to assessment and issue it to the licensee in case number 12-25-0241.

Motion carried unanimously.

Enforcement Update

Deputy Director Quentin Holmes began his report by informing the Board that there are six (6) cases pending hearings, all of which have been assigned. He stated that there is one (1) case listed that is pending the hearing officer’s report and recommendation and two (2) report and recommendations that were considered today. Mr. Holmes indicated that there are currently forty-one (41) licensees under suspension. He informed the Board members that there are twelve (12) pending QUIP cases and eight (8) active cases in QUIP. Additionally, Mr. Holmes stated that the Board currently has three hundred and thirty-one (331) active cases and informed the Board that fifty-nine (59) cases have been investigated and reviewed by the Board Secretaries and are recommended to be closed. He informed the members that the Board Enforcement Officers and Investigator Assistant, Barb Palmucci, have performed seventy-five (75) infection control evaluations. Mr. Holmes stated that there are currently sixty-nine (69) licensees on probation.

Due to the requirement in Chapter 4715.03(D) of the Ohio Revised Code, that "The board shall not dismiss any complaint or terminate any investigation except by a majority vote of its members,..." Mr. Holmes reviewed the cases to be closed with the Board.

The following cases are to be closed:

12-50-0267 Standard Of Care-Warning 12-25-0405 Standard/Aband/Misrep
13-37-0006 Standard/Infection 12-76-0161 Infection Control
12-25-0397 Standard Of Care 12-48-0307 Standard Of Care
12-18-0248 Standard Of Care-Warning 12-25-0413 Misrepresentation
12-25-0183 Drugs 12-78-0229 Misrepresentation
12-78-0303 Standard Of Care 12-48-0173 Standard Of Care
12-71-0162 Standard/Abandament-Warning 12-25-0094 Unlicensed Practice
12-25-0195 Standard Of Care 12-50-0332 Standard Of Care
12-18-0407 Standard Of Care 12-76-0382 Standard Of Care
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Prior to the vote to close the above listed cases, Dr. Kaye inquired as to whether any of the Board members had any personal knowledge that the cases that were being voted on today involve either themselves or a personal friend.

Roll call:  
Dr. Beard – No  
Ms. Clark – No  
Dr. Das – No  
Dr. Hanners - No  
Dr. Kaye – No  
Dr. Leffler - No  
Dr. McDonald - No  
Dr. Shaffer – No  
Ms. Staley – No  
Dr. Wallace – No  
Dr. Wynn – No

Dr. Kaye then called for a motion to close the cases.

**Motion by Dr. Mr. Jones, second by Dr. Beard, to close the above fifty-nine (59) cases.**

Roll call vote:  
Dr. Beard – Yes  
Ms. Clark – Yes
Dr. Das - Yes
Dr. Hanners - Yes
Dr. Kaye – Yes
Dr. Leffler – Yes
Dr. McDonald - Yes
Dr. Shaffer – Yes
Ms. Staley – Yes
Dr. Wallace – Yes
Dr. Wynn - Yes

Motion carried unanimously.

Review of License/Certification/Registration/Permit Application(s)

License/Certification/Registration Report (Approved by the Executive Office)
Jayne Smith, Licensure Coordinator, had prepared a report of the licenses, certificates, and registrations issued since the previous Board meeting.

Dentist(s)
Motion by Dr. McDonald, second by Dr. Wallace, to approve the licensure report for the following dental licenses issued by a regional board examination:

Alok Ahlawat
Reed Attisha
Sean M. Bannan
Bradley P. Boeke
Doyoung Choi
Meghan D. Condit
Patrick J. Condit
Joseph A. Dagher
April R. Davis
Rachel E. Doan
Kendra L. Hunter
Nicholas M. Kerns
Christopher M. King
Damian J. Lee
Aaron F. Lerg
Keith L. Little
Andrew J. Mesaros

Tasha E. Metzger
Ahmad A. Millwala
Noelle M. Peters
Tuyen T. Pham
Vikas Puri
Gerardo P. Romeo
Jonathan H. Ross
Ellen Ross
Harsh M. Shah
Peter M. Spalding
Kevin C. Stephens
Sasi K. Sunkara
Ronald R. Tilgner
Gary J. Trilli
Frank D. Tuzzio, III
Freddie E. Wilkes, Jr.
Kevin M. Woody

Motion carried unanimously.
Dental Hygienist(s)

Motion by Dr. Wallace, second by Ms. Clark, to approve the licensure report for the following dental hygiene licenses issued by a regional board examination:

Bridget N. Allred
Elizabeth M. Ardire
Alissa H. Brewer
Montana A. Dodge
George A. Fields
Jordan A. Flowers
Brianne M. Gerschutz
HyeGyeong Kang
Christa D. Libertini
Marcie N. Mulling
Susan C. Noll
Lisa R. Ramsey
Lynnette M. Tavenner
Amanda J. Travis
Christine R. Umbenhower
Alicia A. White

Motion carried unanimously.

Dental Assistant Radiographer(s)

Motion by Dr. Wallace, second by Dr. McDonald, to approve the licensure report for the following dental assistant radiographer certificates issued by: acceptable certification or licensure in another state, certification by the Dental Assisting National Board (DANB) or the Ohio Commission on Dental Assistant Certification (OCDAC), or successful completion of the Board-approved radiography course:

Kayla Adams
Taylor Adams
Danielle Akers
Ashley Alexander
Lisa Ammons
Teri Anderson
Lindsey Applegate
Ashley Aramouni
Alesha Arnold
Brittany Arpajian-Zaleski
Christina Ausenbaugh
Tiffany Bahmer
Autumn Baker
Camellia Baker
Samantha Barrometti
Chelsea Bates
Samantha Bauer
Korie Baugh
Shawn Baum
Odessa Beam
Ashley Becker
Mallory Beckman
Stacy Bevis
Caylee Billenstein
Michelle Bittenbender
Tiffany Blaine
Stephanie Blake
Sarah Blazer
Felecia Bodary
Casie Boerner
Jessica Bogdanski
Marian Bonner
Devin Booher
Max Bowes
Michaela Bowman
Gretchen Burbridge
Julie Burns
Diana Burrows
Ashley Burton
Renee Bussey
Lisa Butcher
Momna Butt
Jeniffer P Caicedo Perez
Courtney Caldwell
Teresa Caldwell
Heidi Card
Muriel Carpenter
Evangelina Carr
Rachelle Carr
Kathryn Carrick
Cierra Carter
Morgan Casto
Eva Chhith
Rylan Childs
Monica Christian
Carla Christopher
Brittany Church
Amber Clagg
Jill Clifford
Cathy Coates
Paulzlina Collins
Mikala Combs
Juan Concha-Perez
Colleen Connolly
Samantha Cooper
Macie Copic
Casey Cornett
Cynthia Cornwell
Deanna Covelli
Andrew Cox
Kristin Cozart
Katelyn Cummings
Erica Cunningham
Esther Curran
Daleann Dampman
Candace Daugherty
Ladawn Davidson
Natalie Davidson
Nicolette Davis
Bogdan Denisyuk
Ashley Dixon
Dana Dixon
Nicole Dixon
Scarlett Dodd
Cynthia Donahue
Lauren Drehs
Kristie Duff
Lauren Durnbaugh
Jami Dutcher
Allison Dwelly
Jordan Eberhardt
Diane Eller
Amy Engeldinger
Sheana England
Kara Fair
Sharon Fairclough
Heather Fasnacht
Kimberley Faught
Mallory Federle
Maryann Fixel
Courtney Fountain
Anna Fox
Heather Fox
Leah Fullwiler
Sarah Gadd
Zainab Gbaya
Mallory Gentry
Sabrina Gierke
Chelsea Gilmore
Dawn Gluth
Debra Goldammer
Brandi Goostree
Alexus Gorby
Jordan Gotcher
Christina Gray
Sheila Gray
Jacqueline Gregg
Jayne Gregory
Allison Grooms
Jonelle Grosjean
Justine Hamel
Lisa Harden
Courtney Hay
Darlene Hilty
Rachel Hinkle
Dana Hirschbuehler
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Cara Mostoller
Laiken Mourer
Mikayla Mourer
Erika Mullins
Cynthia Munshower
Rachel Myers
Kari Nickell
Laura Niess
Bethany Nugent
Kelly Ohler
Ritta Oraha
Kaycee O'steen
Aracelis Otero
Jenna Overbeck
Haleigh Owens
Bethany Papp
Cindy Parent
Cheyanne Parish
Pousada Pasith
Dominique Penn
Shaylee Pennywitt
Alysa Perez
July Perez-Lopez
Jacqueline Perkowski
Cassandra Peters
Angela Peterson
Karin Pfaff
Delrani Phagoo
Jaclyn Pierce
Nicole Pinzarroni
Heidi Plensdorf
Alanna Polkow
Jessica Pooley
Tiffany Price
Ashley Prince
Kaitlynn Rahmoeller
Yohali Ramirez
Jennifer Rapier
Emilee Ratti
Kayla Rhome
Nina Rich
Kendre Richards
Ashley Riesenbeck
Emily Riggs
Deana Rimes
Andrea Rivera
Azucena Rivera
Amanda Roberts
Megan Roberts
Shelly Roberts
Jassmin Robinson
Sarah Rocklin
Megan Rodgers
Cheyanne Rokicki
Marlenia Rollison
Mandy Romans
Maria Ruh
Andrea Ryba
Christina Rye
Sarah Rysz
Amal Salah
Samantha Samsal
Brittany Saunders
Breanna Sawyer
Amber Saylor
Maxx Schaffer
Kimberly Schmitz
Kilie Schneider
Samantha Schneider
Kayla Schumacher
Megan Schwankhaus
Breanna Scully
Chelsie Sechrist
Tiffany Sexton
Andrea Shackelford
Brooklyn Shaffer
Latoya Shepherd
Chelsey Shields
Jamirra Shotwell
Payton Shuff
Samantha Shultz
Sara Shuttic
Liege Simons
Erika Singletery
Danielle Sisco                        Kara Vankannel
Karen Smith                          Rachel Varner
Mary Katherine Stall                 Joanna Vela
Kayla Stanton                        William Viney II
Melissa Stasny                       Rachel Walton
Donna Steele                         Megan Wamsley
Shawanda Steele                      Kaylie Warnock
Heather Stein                        Carol Watson
Christine Stimson                    Brandy Weaver
Carolyn Stowe                        Rebeka Weaver
Jane Stratton                        Rebecca Welch
Jenna Sturm                          Jessica Wesley
Loren Svede                          Mackenzie Wheeler
Angie Swingle                       Emma White
Amanda Szyskowski                    Lori Whitener
Asia Tabler                          Brianne Whitman
Kachara Talbert                     Tanya Williams
Monica Talbert                      Ariadna Williamson
Whitney Taulbee                      Caitlin Williamson
Keasa Taylor                        Angela Wilson
Natalya Teregulova                   Curtis Wilson
Teresa Thompson                      Tenita Wilson
Nikki Tilton                         Aime Winans
Toni Topoleski                       Lori Wohl-Siedel
Jeffrey Torres                       Miranda Young
Alexa Traikoff                      Christina Yount
Kaitlyn Tucker                       Adrianne Yruegas
Eunice Vado                          Serina Ziroulo
Danielle Vail                        Carrie Zizert
Allison Vanderwier

Motion carried unanimously.

Limited Resident’s

Motion by Dr. Wallace, second by Dr. McDonald, to approve the licensure report for the following limited Resident’s licenses:

Ammar K. Al-Mahdi                      Scott J. Hudepohl
Fadia S. Bazina                        Kellee A. Miller
Eslam Megahid Ali Eldawlatly          Neetha Santosh
Nicole W. Hood                         Ioannis Tsolakis
Sean M. Horan
Motion carried unanimously.

**Limited Continuing Education**

Motion by Dr. McDonald, second by Dr. Wallace, to approve the licensure report for the following limited continuing education license:

Robert B. Mabry

Motion carried unanimously.

**Limited Teaching**

Motion by Dr. Wallace, second by Dr. McDonald, to approve the licensure report for the following limited teaching license:

Toru Deguchi

Motion carried unanimously.

**Coronal Polishing**

Motion by Dr. Beard, second by Dr. Wynn, to approve the licensure report for the following coronal polishing certificates issued by: certification by the Dental Assisting National Board (DANB) or the Ohio Commission on Dental Assistant Certification (OCDAC) and completion of the requirements necessary to obtain certification:

Rebekha M. Boehmer
Liana T. Bryant
Kaysee L. DeLong
Asia A. Dingess
Kathleen K. Fisher
Yvonne L. Ford
Ginger L. Gibson
Susan M. Hilliard
Heather M. Jones
Samantha Jones
Nancy J. Lyons
Shannon N. McDaniel
Sarah O. Mohammad

Allyson E. Ortlepp
Amanda L. Pozenel
James M. Raver
Christina N. Reece
Lesa G. Rutherford
Sallie M. Springfield
Lindsay M. Stechschulte
Danielle M. Strecker-Simos
Alicia M. Taylor
Dana J. Watson
Chelsea K. Williams
Heather A. Ziccardi

Motion carried unanimously.

**Expanded Function Dental Auxiliary**

Motion by Dr. Beard, second by Dr. Das, to approve the licensure report for the following expanded function dental auxiliary registrations issued by: certification by the Dental Assisting National Board (DANB) or the Ohio Commission on Dental Assistant Certification (OCDAC) and completion of the requirements necessary to obtain registration:
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Motion carried unanimously.

License/Certification/Registration/Permit Application(s)

Motion by Ms. Clark, second by Dr. Wynn, that the following applicants have met the requirements necessary to obtain permits to practice under the oral health access supervision program:

Oral Health Access Supervision Permit(s)

**Dentist(s)**
- Dr. Gary P. Brunk – Lima
- Dr. Norman E. Facter – Solon
- Dr. Gregory A. Hart – Port Clinton
- Dr. David S. Kilgore – Leetonia
- Dr. James E. Metz – Columbus
- Dr. Edward F. Norton – Huron
- Dr. Larry D. Rowland – Miamisburg
- Dr. Matthew J. Skurich – Youngstown

**Dental Hygienist(s)**
- Marla L. Bluedorn – Warren
- Susan W. Breitsch – Chagrin Falls
- Karen A. Clemente – Struthers
- Darlene R. Theodus – Sagamore Hills

Motion carried unanimously.

Reinstatement Application(s)

Motion by Dr. McDonald, second by Dr. Beard, to approve the following reinstatement application for licensure in Ohio:

**Dentist(s)**
- Henry L. Young, Jr., D.D.S.

**Dental Hygienist(s)**
- Patricia H. Beruk, RDH
- Diane T. Steinmetz, RDH

Motion carried unanimously.
Anesthesia Committee Report

Provisional Conscious Sedation Privilege(s)
Dr. Wallace stated that the following individual has applied for a conscious sedation permit. He explained that the Anesthesia Committee has reviewed the application and the applicant is recommended to receive provisional privileges:

Dr. Michael D. Carpenter - Intravenous

Provisional Anesthesia Privilege(s)
Dr. Wallace stated that the following individual has applied for an anesthesia permit. He explained that the Anesthesia Committee has reviewed the application and the applicant is recommended to receive provisional privileges:

Dr. Robert W. Lucas - Cincinnati

Conscious Sedation Permit(s)
Dr. Wallace stated that the following individuals have applied for conscious sedation permits. He explained that the Anesthesia Committee has reviewed the applications, evaluations have been conducted, and the applicants are recommended to receive conscious sedation permits.

Dr. Kendell T. Buxton - Marietta - Intravenous
Dr. Rick L. Chapman – Worthington – Intravenous
Stephen J. Clark – Dayton - Intravenous
Dr. Kenyon Glor - Wellington – Intravenous
Dr. Donald A. Rehl – Marietta – Intravenous
Jenna Shevlin – Xenia - Intravenous

Anesthesia Permit(s)
Dr. Wallace stated that the following individuals have applied for anesthesia permits. He explained that the Anesthesia Committee has reviewed the applications, evaluations have been conducted, and the applicants are recommended to receive anesthesia permits.

Dr. Hooman Adamous – Mt. Vernon
Dr. Chris McDaniel - Fairfield
Dr. Rishad Shaikh – Cleveland
Joshua T. Smith – Tipp City
Dr. Nathan M. Smith - Boardman

Dr. Wallace made the motion from the Anesthesia Committee to accept the report and approve the above applicants to receive privileges and permits.

Motion carried unanimously.
Education Committee Report

Ms. Clark stated that as the new Chair for the Education Committee she wanted to first thank her predecessor, Linda Staley, R.D.H., for all her hard work for the committee in the past and to let her know that she would do her utmost to continue in her footsteps. She commented that being the new chair, she had lots of questions to bring to the committee. She stated that the Committee had discussed that there were three (3) types of education and the committee’s role regarding them. The three (3) types of education are:

- Initial education ~ that which is defined and offered through accredited entities with specific curriculums leading to a specific knowledge or skillset
- Continuing education ~ which holds a “looser” definition in that we approve “sponsors” or “providers” and have guidelines set forth in the rules but relying on the sponsors to ensure appropriate content; and
- Remedial or Remediation education ~ which holds no set curriculum but is stipulated by the Boards Secretaries in formal orders of the Board and by the QUIP Coordinator and Panel for specific skills/knowledge deficiencies for QUIP participants.

Ms. Clark stated that these considerations opened the discussion on specific curriculum requirements for the “Board approved Ethics Courses” for the dental assistant radiographer. She stated that the Committee went around with this discussion mainly because many of them have received inquiries from sponsors wanting to provide this course and asking what the Board is specifically looking for in an ethics curriculum for dental assistants who failed to renew their certificates in a timely manner. Ms. Clark informed the members that Dr. Beard had supplied her with two (2) informative documents that she will be using to develop some recommended guidelines for curriculum content that can be shared with potential course providers.

The Committee’s final topic of discussion Ms. Clark stated, involves EFDA curriculums. She said that recently the Board became aware of a new EFDA program, and at first, there was some confusion as to approval status of this program; whether the Commission on Dental Testing or the Board issued approval. She stated that while there is no process set forth in the Dental Practice Act for approval of EFDA programs, the Education Committee would like to be proactive in reviewing new EFDA curriculums and by “new” she meant those that are not currently listed as approved. She informed the Board that the Committee would like to pursue drafting internal policy/guidelines/or processes whereby the Board requests information from the “unapproved” program to determine its compliance with the specific curriculum guidelines set forth in the Dental Practice Act and make recommendations to the director of the new program as to whether the course would be ultimately acceptable to the Board for EFDA Registrations. She stated that the Committee intends to work on these documents to provide to the Board in the near future.

Concluding, Ms. Clark stated that the Committee also reviewed Biennial Sponsor applications, Sponsor Renewal Applications, and Dental Assistant Radiographer Initial Training Course Applications submitted since the last meeting. She stated that the following organizations listed have submitted all the appropriate documentation, meet all the requirements set forth in the Dental Practice Act and Board Guidelines and are recommended for approval by the Education Committee:
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Biennial Sponsor Application(s)
Dental Education Adventures
Eastside Dental Study Club
Marc T. Fried, D.D.S.
Brian N. Hockenberger, D.D.S.
Andre K. Mickel, D.D.S., M.S.D.
Ohio Association of Community Health Centers
Southwest Endodontics and Periodontics

Biennial Sponsor Renewal Application(s)
Stephen P. Burke, D.D.S., M.S.
Greater Columbus ITI Study Group
James I. Matia, D.D.S., M.S.D., Inc.

Dental Assistant Radiographer Initial Training Course Application(s)
Delaware Area Career Center - “Adult Education/Dental Assisting: 7 Hour Radiology Course”
Eastern Ohio Area Health Education Center - “Dental Radiography: A 7-Hour Program”

Ms. Clark made the motion from the Education Committee to accept the report and approve the above applications.

Motion carried unanimously.

Law and Rules Review Committee Report
Dr. Leffler informed the Board members that the Law and Rules Review Committee met earlier that morning to conclude its Sunshine Rule Review of the rules in Chapters 4715-12 and 4715-13 regarding radiographers and advertising scheduled for this past year. He said the Committee also took their first look at the rules up for review this year.

Dr. Leffler made the motion from the Law and Rules Review Committee to accept the report and approve the following rules to be initial filed as “amended” and “no change” with the Joint Committee on Agency Rule Review (JCARR), the Legislative Service Commission (LSC), the Secretary of State (SOS) and with the Ohio Department of Development (DOD) Office of Small Business.

4715-12-01 Permissible practices of a dental assistant radiographer; supervision required; certificate to be displayed.
4715-12-02 Application for certificate; requirements; exceptions.
4715-12-03 Certificate renewal.
4715-12-04 Accreditation of education programs; application; fee; suspension; revocation.
4715-12-05 Continuing education requirements.
4715-13-01 Public announcements, publicity, advertising and solicitation.
4715-13-02 Name under which practice may be conducted.
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4715-13-03 False, fraudulent, or misleading statements.
4715-13-04 Statements tending to deceive or mislead the public.
4715-13-05 Advertising specialty services.

Motion carried unanimously.

Ad Hoc Board Operations Report
Dr. McDonald reported that an ad hoc workgroup had been formed to work on such things as updates to the Office Manual. He stated that he, along with Drs. Shaffer, Das, Wallace comprise the workgroup which will report to the Ad Hoc Operations Committee.

Treatment Center Approval
The following organization/entity has applied for approval to be a Treatment Provider for the Board:

The Farley Center at Williamsburg Place – Williamsburg, Virginia

Motion by Dr. McDonald, second by Dr. Hanners, to approve the treatment center application.

Motion carried unanimously.

Supervisory Investigative Panel Report
Dr. Wynn attested that, as Secretary, she had spent in excess of ten (10) hours per week attending to Board business. Dr. Shaffer, as Vice Secretary, attested that she had spent in excess of ten (10) hours per week attending to Board business.

Motion by Dr. McDonald, second by Ms. Clark, to approve the Supervisory Investigative Panel report.

Motion carried unanimously.

Office Expense Report
Motion by Dr. Wallace, second by Dr. Hanners, to approve the expense report and approve payment of the January and February, 2013 Board bills.

Motion carried unanimously.

Executive Director’s Report
Financial Disclosure Statements
Ms. Reitz began her report by reminding the Board members that if they have not completed their Financial Disclosure statements online or if they needed assistance they could contact Mr. Holmes to get them completed on time. She reminded the members that the statements were due by May 15, 2013.
Staff Changes
Ms. Reitz informed the members that Dental Board Enforcement Officer Gail Noble resigned the previous week. She has taken a position with a halfway house in the Chillicothe area. She stated that Dental Board Enforcement Officer Harry Pasku will be retiring May 31, and Dental Board Enforcement Officer Larry Powell, who was on disability and will be returning on Monday, will be retiring around the first of August. Therefore, she said that the executive office will be hiring personnel to replace those positions.

American Association of Dental Administrators (AADA)/American Association of Dental Boards (AADB) Meetings
Ms. Reitz informed the members that the next meeting of the American Association of Dental Administrators (AADA) and American Association of Dental Boards (AADB) would be held in mid-April. She stated that the majority of the topics to be discussed involve continued competency and relevant issues. She informed the Board that she was asked by the AADB to be on the Program Committee along with several other individuals across the United States. Unfortunately, she stated that their first conference call was when I while she was away on spring break. However, Ms. Reitz indicated that she would be speaking with them soon to discuss topics for the next meeting. She stated that some suggestions are: corporate dentistry, anesthesia, sleep dentistry, specialty licensing. She stated that she is also Co-chair of the Attorney Roundtable of the AADB and will present at their mid-year meeting also.

Presentations
Ms. Reitz informed the Board that she had presented to the dental hygienists at the Ohio Dental Hygienists’ Association, ODHA Day at the Statehouse. Additionally, she spoke two (2) days later to the Keely Dental Society and that next Monday, April 15, she would be speaking to Lorain County Community College. She stated that she would also be presenting on June 18 to the 2nd year dental students at Case Western Reserve University.

Ethics and Open Meetings Act Training
Continuing on, Ms. Reitz commented that once new Board member appointees have been determined, she would schedule the Boards ethics and open meetings training.

New Phones and New E-License System
Ms. Reitz informed the members that as an agency of the state the Board executive office will be getting a new phone system and a new E-licensing system. She indicated that she had been attending vendor meetings, along with Licensing Coordinator Jayne Smith, and the vendors seem to be pretty excited about it. Ms. Reitz commented that these were more changes that all the employees will need to adjust along with the new phones. She commented that these are unplanned expenses that the Board will incur.

Correspondence – Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services
Ms. Reitz distributed a copy of a request for support from the Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services (ODADAS). She stated that the Board, as well as the State Medical Board of Ohio, Ohio Board of Nursing, and the Ohio State Board of Pharmacy, along with the other regulatory boards had received ODADAS letter. She stated that ODADAS is requesting that a letter of support be submitted by April 12, 2013, for their Request for Applications (RFA) for Fiscal year 2013 Cooperative Agreements for
Screening, Brief Intervention and Referral to Treatment (SBIRT) be submitted to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT).

Budget Update
Ms. Reitz informed the members that she had testified on the Board’s budget to the House of Representatives on February 20, 2013. She stated that she had just received an e-mail that they were scheduling testimony for the Senate.

Draft Opiate Regulatory Statement
Ms. Reitz distributed a copy of her memorandum Opioid Prescribing along with the Draft Regulatory Statement regarding Chronic Pain Trigger Point: 80 Morphine Equivalent Dosage (MED), which she had e-mailed to the members previously. She stated that, as she informed them in the memorandum, she had been representing the Dental Board, along with other regulatory board representatives, on the Governor’s Reforming Prescribing Practices Committee (Committee). She stated that they have been in meetings “to develop responsible prescribing guidelines for Ohio’s clinicians”. She explained that the memorandum informed the members that the Boards, via a letter from Director Kantor-Burman of the Ohio Department of Aging and Director Wymyslo of the Ohio Department of Health, were being asked to identify “where provider education is needed to achieve appropriate pain management, and where rules are needed to assess provider performance.” Ms. Reitz stated that rather than each regulatory board establishing administrative rules, they were being asked to develop and adopt a Regulatory Statement regarding using 80 MED as a specific point for patient reassessment when prescribing opioids. She stated that at the last Subcommittee meeting, the Directors informed them that the Committee would meet again in April, and the plan is to issue the Regulatory Statement, educate prescribers, and establish an effective date of July 1, 2013. She informed the Board members that the Subcommittee was asking the regulatory boards to approve the Regulatory Statement by mid-May for final approval at the projected “roll-out” date. Ms. Reitz concluded by stating that she has been working with the State Medical Board of Ohio and the Ohio Board of Nursing on the Draft Regulatory Statement, for their initial review, with a final draft to be considered at the May meeting for their approval.

Dr. Wallace suggested that he could assist Ms. Reitz in addressing some issues in the draft for preparation for final consideration.

Anything for the Good of the Board

Farewell to Linda Staley, R.D.H.
Dr. Kaye stated:

“On behalf of the Ohio State Dental Board, I want to take this opportunity to recognize you and your tenure as a Board member for the past 8 years.

Ms. Staley was appointed to the Board in 2005. In her years on the Board, Ms. Staley has served as a member of the Law and Rules, Scope of Practice and Policy Committees. She also chaired the Board’s
Education Committee, and spent many hours ensuring that schools, educational providers, and licensees were all on the same page when it came to educational requirements for specific additional functions, or continuing education for maintaining a license.

Ms. Staley is a member of AADB, and an active member and examiner for the North East Regional Board of Dental Examiners.

Ms. Staley’s opinions and communications with the Board on issues affecting the profession of dental hygiene and the profession of dentistry as a whole were open and honest, heartfelt and beneficial to the Board in considering a variety of matters over the years.

Ms. Staley has served the Board, the profession and the public in a professional manner, and her commitment to the Board has brought credit upon herself, the Ohio State Dental Board, and the citizens of the state of Ohio.

We thank you for everything you have done in your years as a member of the Board, and wish you nothing but the best in all of your future travels.........I mean, endeavors.”

Dr. Kaye then presented Ms. Staley with a plaque and asked everyone to join him in a warm round of applause.

Executive Session

Motion by Dr. Wynn, second by Dr. McDonald, to move the Board into executive session pursuant to Ohio Revised Code Section 121.22(G)(3) to confer with counsel on matters that are the subject of pending or imminent court action, pursuant to Ohio Revised Code Section 121.22 (G)(1) to consider the appointment, employment, dismissal, discipline, promotion, demotion, or compensation of a public employee.

Roll call vote. Motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Kaye requested Ms. Reitz and Ms. Bockbrader to attend the Executive Session.

Dr. Kaye then informed the meeting attendees that that the Board would be adjourning the meeting immediately following the Executive Session and there would be no further Board business.

Open Session

The Board resumed open session at approximately 5:07 p.m.
Adjourn
Dr. Kaye adjourned the meeting at 5:10 p.m. He reminded the Board members that their next meeting would be May 15, 2013.

Lawrence Kaye, D.D.S.
President

Mary Ellen Wynn, D.D.S.
Secretary