

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
BUREAU OF PROFESSIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL AFFAIRS

**F I N A L M I N U T E S**

MEETING OF:

**STATE BOARD OF DENTISTRY  
VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE**

TIME: 11:50 A.M.

PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF STATE

September 11, 2020

State Board of Dentistry  
September 11, 2020

BOARD MEMBERS:

K. Kalonji Johnson, Commissioner, Bureau of  
Professional and Occupational Affairs  
R. Ivan Lugo, D.M.D., M.B.A.  
Brice D. Arndt, D.D.S.  
Shawn M. Casey, D.M.D.  
Barbara (Bonnie) L. Fowler, Public Member  
Godfrey Joel Funari, M.S., D.M.D.  
Theresa A. Groody, EFDA  
Alice Hart Hughes, Esquire, Secretary, Public Member  
April Hutcheson, Communications Director, Department  
of Health designee  
Joel S. Jaspan, D.D.S.  
Andrew S. Matta, D.M.D.  
LaJuan M. Mountain, D.M.D.  
Donna L. Murray, R.D.H.  
Amber Sizemore, Esquire, Office of Attorney General  
Jennifer Unis Sullivan, D.M.D., J.D.

BUREAU PERSONNEL:

Jackie Wiest Lutz, Esquire, Board Counsel  
Paul J. Jarabeck, Esquire, Board Prosecution Liaison  
Lisa M. Burns, Board Administrator  
Marc Farrell, Deputy Policy Director, Department of  
State  
Theodore Stauffer, Executive Secretary, Bureau of  
Professional and Occupational Affairs

ALSO PRESENT:

Bruce D. Horn, D.D.S., Director of Dental  
Examinations, Western Regional Examining Board  
Sharon Osborn Popp, Ph.D., Testing Specialist,  
Western Regional Examining Board  
Krunal Patel, D.D.S.

1 \*\*\*

2 State Board of Dentistry

3 September 11, 2020

4 \*\*\*

5 [Pursuant to Section 708(a)(5) of the Sunshine Act,  
6 the Board entered into executive session with Jackie  
7 Wiest Lutz, Esquire, Board Counsel, for the purpose of  
8 conducting quasi-judicial deliberations on a number of  
9 matters currently pending before the Board and to  
10 receive the advice of counsel prior to commencing the  
11 open session.]

12 \*\*\*

13 The regularly scheduled meeting of the State  
14 Board of Dentistry was held on Friday, September 11,  
15 2020. Alice Hart Hughes, Esquire, Secretary, Public  
16 Member, called the meeting to order at 11:50 a.m.

17 R. Ivan Lugo, D.M.D., M.B.A., Chairman, was not  
18 present at the commencement of the meeting.

19 \*\*\*

20 [Jackie Wiest Lutz, Esquire, Board Counsel, reminded  
21 everyone that the Board meeting was being recorded,  
22 and voluntary participation in the meeting constitutes  
23 consent to being recorded.]

24 \*\*\*

25 [Alice Hart Hughes, Esquire, Public Member, Secretary,

1 reported Chairman Lugo was having technical  
2 difficulties and she would be covering for him.

3 Secretary Hughes thanked the Board on behalf of  
4 Dr. Lugo for electing him to serve as Board Chairman.

5 Secretary Hughes reminded everyone to take a  
6 moment to remember what happened 19 years ago and its  
7 impact on the nation.

8 Secretary Hughes welcomed April Hutcheson. Ms.  
9 Hutcheson provided a brief summary of her professional  
10 background.

11 Secretary Hughes noted the removal of item 2 from  
12 the agenda.]

13

\*\*\*

14 Western Regional Examining Board Presentation  
15 [Bruce Horn, D.D.S., Director of Dental Examinations,  
16 Western Regional Examining Board, addressed the 2021  
17 Western Regional Examining Board (WREB) examinations.  
18 He stated WREB continues to offer patient-based  
19 examinations for states that require demonstration of  
20 skill that involves the patient.

21 Dr. Horn commented that other states having  
22 adjustments through COVID-19 to allow for non-patient-  
23 based examinations may continue to accept WREB as  
24 well. He discussed operative assessments and formats,  
25 including patient based and typodont based. He noted

1 periodontal treatment required by most states was also  
2 being offered in two formats in 2021. He noted  
3 traditional initial therapy, diagnosis, acceptance of  
4 a patient, and root planing and scaling had not  
5 changed.

6 Dr. Horn discussed ModuPRO One, which allows  
7 evaluation of whether a candidate would cause any  
8 tissue damage in their skill set by removing calculus  
9 to be utilized for both the hygiene examination and  
10 dental examination and will offer that non-patient-  
11 based component for periodontal treatment as well. He  
12 commented that endodontic and prosthodontic treatment  
13 remains the same as last year.

14 Dr. Horn addressed assessment examination  
15 provided at the Prometric Test Center called  
16 comprehensive treatment planning, which was a  
17 constructive response requiring developing a treatment  
18 plan and answering open-ended questions in an essay  
19 format.

20 Dr. Horn expressed a concern regarding the fall  
21 and winter season due to COVID-19 but noted offering  
22 examinations in two patient-based components and also  
23 attending to the needs and requirements at schools for  
24 social distancing.

25 Dr. Jaspan requested an example of the types of

1 cases presented and what is expected regarding the  
2 comprehensive treatment planning section.

3 Dr. Horn explained that there were two adult  
4 cases, including moderate-to-severe periodontal  
5 disease and a case requiring treatment planning that  
6 could involve tooth removal and restoration. He  
7 stated the cases were provided to the candidates in  
8 the form of intraoral photographs, panoramic, or full  
9 mouth X-rays (FMX).

10 Dr. Horn noted the evaluation of medical history,  
11 writing a laboratory prescription, and constructing a  
12 pharmacy prescription is required as well. He  
13 explained that the pediatric case had information  
14 related to space maintenance, eruption, and treatment  
15 planning along with oral hygiene and caries indexing.

16 Dr. Horn stated WREB's committee of content  
17 experts create bullet points of information that  
18 should be included in the answer that the calibrated  
19 examiners use to decide whether the candidate had  
20 answered the question satisfactorily.

21 Dr. Jaspan questioned WREB's experience with the  
22 manikins. Dr. Horn stated WREB provided information  
23 reflecting validity evidence equal to the patient-  
24 based treatment, noting the manikin tooth had been  
25 very similar in terms of outcome with the patient-

1 based operative component offered until COVID. He  
2 mentioned utilizing manikin teeth for the  
3 prosthodontics and endodontics sections for many  
4 years. He commented that their experience had been  
5 good but noted supply issues with examining agencies  
6 due to COVID-19.

7 Chairman Lugo noted not seeing any control groups  
8 in the literature from the two different universities  
9 and questioned whether there was a control group for  
10 each of the two different teeth for comparison.

11 Dr. Horn mentioned providing sufficient testing  
12 samples for the tooth in Utah and in Oklahoma but  
13 stated the only teeth available to be procured from  
14 the manufacturer because of COVID-19 were teeth that  
15 were available in Oklahoma. He stated the other teeth  
16 were not in production and were not available for use.

17 Dr. Horn commented that it was not WREB's desire  
18 to create a control group and compare one to the other  
19 because there was not access to the other. He noted  
20 WREB's desire to test the ability of candidates to  
21 rate criteria on teeth in a simulated environment with  
22 social distancing and other COVID-19 concerns.

23 Chairman Lugo reiterated for the public members  
24 that the Board was looking at all of the different  
25 clinical exams to have more access to the testing

1 agencies to be able to deliberate and understand the  
2 differences in each of the clinical exams offered.

3 Sharon Osborn Popp, Ph.D., Testing Specialist,  
4 Western Regional Examining Board, noted the inability  
5 to have a control group with a patient base as a  
6 comparison due to COVID. She reported being able to  
7 compare them to the candidates from the same  
8 institutions the previous year under another exam,  
9 noting that differences were not specifically  
10 significant from each other.

11 Dr. Osborn Popp explained that the main issue was  
12 to get a sense of which material was working better  
13 and would any be appropriate as a substitute during  
14 COVID-19.

15 Chairman Lugo questioned when the WREB exam would  
16 be given in Pennsylvania. Dr. Horn commented that the  
17 WREB exam had been given at Temple and in Pittsburgh  
18 in the past but was uncertain whether the exam would  
19 be given in Pennsylvania this year.

20 Chairman Lugo thanked Dr. Horn for his insightful  
21 presentation.]

22 \*\*\*

23 Approval of minutes of the July 10, 2020 meeting

24 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

25 Can I have a motion to approve the



1 minutes?

2 DR. ARNDT:

3 So moved.

4 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

5 Thank you Dr. Arndt.

6 MS. GROODY:

7 Second.

8 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

9 Groody, second. Thank you. Any  
10 comments, additions?

11 [The Board discussed corrections to the minutes.]

12 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

13 Any other comments or additions? All in  
14 favor of approving the minutes? Any  
15 opposed? The minutes for the July 10,  
16 2020 meeting have been approved.

17 [The motion carried. Ms. Hutcheson abstained from  
18 voting on the motion.]

19 \*\*\*

20 Report of Prosecutorial Division

21 MS. LUTZ:

22 The first agreement on the agenda that  
23 we discussed was the one at Case No. 16-  
24 46-09238. If there is no question of  
25 the prosecuting attorney, now would be

1 the time to entertain a motion according  
2 to discussions in executive session.

3 DR. ARNDT:

4 I move to adopt the Consent Agreement  
5 for Case No. 16-46-09238 regarding  
6 Christopher George Bereznak, D.M.D.

7 MS. LUTZ:

8 There is another case number associated  
9 with that Consent Agreement, which is  
10 Case No. 17-46-09129.

11 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

12 Call the question.

13

14 Dr. Arndt, aye; Dr. Casey, aye; Ms.  
15 Fowler, aye; Dr. Funari, aye; Ms.  
16 Groody, aye; Ms. Hughes, recuse; Ms.  
17 Hutcheson, aye; Dr. Jaspán, aye; Dr.  
18 Matta, recuse; Ms. Murray, aye; Ms.  
19 Sizemore, aye; and Dr. Sullivan, aye.

20 [The motion carried. Ms. Hughes and Dr. Matta recused  
21 themselves from deliberations and voting on the  
22 motion. The name of the Respondent is Christopher  
23 George Bereznak, D.M.D.]

24

\*\*\*

25 DR. CASEY:

1 I move to reject the Consent Agreement  
2 in File No. 17-46-05440 as too lenient.

3 MS. HUGHES:

4 Second.

5 [The Board discussed the motion.]

6 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

7 Dr. Arndt, aye; Dr. Casey, aye; Ms.  
8 Fowler, aye; Dr. Funari, nay; Ms.  
9 Groody, aye; Ms. Hughes, nay; Ms.  
10 Hutcheson, aye; Dr. Jaspan, aye; Dr.  
11 Matta, nay; Ms. Murray, aye; Ms.  
12 Sizemore, aye; and Dr. Sullivan, nay;  
13 Dr. Mountain, aye.

14 [The motion carried. Dr. Funari, Ms. Hughes, Dr.  
15 Matta, and Dr. Sullivan opposed the motion.]

16 \*\*\*

17 MS. FOWLER:

18 I move to reject the Consent Agreement  
19 in Case No. 17-46-014182 as too lenient.

20 MS. GROODY:

21 Second.

22 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

23

24 Call the question.

25

1 Dr. Arndt, aye; Dr. Casey, aye; Ms.  
2 Fowler, aye; Dr. Funari, aye; Ms.  
3 Groody, aye; Ms. Hughes, aye; Dr. Matta,  
4 aye; Dr. Mountain, aye; Ms. Murray, aye;  
5 Dr. Jaspan, aye; and Dr. Sullivan, aye;  
6 Ms. Hutcheson, aye.

7 [The motion carried unanimously.]

8 \*\*\*

9 DR. FUNARI:

10 I move to accept the Consent Agreement  
11 for Case No. 19-46-016044.

12 MS. GROODY:

13 Second.

14 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

15 Call the question.

16

17 Dr. Arndt, aye; Dr. Casey, aye; Ms.  
18 Fowler, aye; Dr. Funari, aye; Ms.  
19 Groody, aye; Ms. Hughes, aye; Ms.  
20 Hutcheson, aye; Dr. Matta, aye; Dr.  
21 Mountain, aye; Ms. Murray, aye; Ms.  
22 Sizemore, aye; and Dr. Sullivan, aye;  
23 Dr. Jaspan.

24 [The motion carried unanimously. The Respondent's  
25 name is Jackie Singer, EFDA.]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

\*\*\*

MS. GROODY:

I move to accept the Consent Agreement  
for Case No. 20-46-001325.

MS. HUGHES:

Second.

CHAIRMAN LUGO:

Call the question.

Dr. Arndt, aye; Dr. Casey, aye; Ms.  
Fowler, aye; Dr. Funari, aye; Ms.  
Groody, aye; Ms. Hughes, aye; Ms.  
Hutcheson, aye; Dr. Jaspán, aye; Dr.  
Matta, aye; Dr. Mountain, aye; Ms.  
Murray, aye; Ms. Sizemore, aye; and Dr.  
Sullivan, aye.

[The motion carried unanimously. The Respondent's  
name is Linda Barbara Edelson-Slocum, D.M.D.]

\*\*\*

MS. HUGHES:

I move to accept the Consent Agreement  
at Case No. 18-46-000314.

MS. GROODY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN LUGO:

1 Call the question.

2

3 Dr. Arndt, aye; Dr. Casey, aye; Ms.  
4 Fowler, aye; Dr. Funari, aye; Ms.  
5 Groody, aye; Ms. Hughes, aye; Ms.  
6 Hutcheson, aye; Dr. Jaspan, aye; Dr.  
7 Matta, aye; Dr. Mountain, aye; Ms.  
8 Murray, aye; Ms. Sizemore, aye; and Dr.  
9 Sullivan, aye.

10 [The motion carried unanimously. The Respondent's  
11 name is Mohammed Iqbal Bhuiyan, D.D.S.]

12

\*\*\*

13 Report of Board Counsel - Status of Regulations

14 [Jackie Wiest Lutz, Esquire, Board Counsel, provided a  
15 status of regulations report that was last updated on  
16 August 27, 2020, for the Board's review.

17 Ms. Lutz noted fee regulations were moving  
18 forward.

19 Ms. Lutz was retyping the Annex to the General  
20 Revisions regarding the child abuse reporting  
21 regulation adopted by the Board due to track changes  
22 throughout the document and will provide the revised  
23 regulation at the next meeting.

24 Ms. Lutz addressed Act 41 annex and exposure  
25 draft comments received from the Pennsylvania Dental

1 Association. She provided a summary of Board  
2 requirements for an applicant to be issued a license  
3 by endorsement under Act 41.

4 Ms. Lutz noted the Pennsylvania Dental  
5 Association (PDA) was in agreement with the proposals  
6 of the Board proposed thus far. PDA suggested the  
7 continuing education requirements be a separate  
8 provision required of all applicants and allowing  
9 applicants the option of prior experience or an  
10 examination as part of the pathway to obtaining a  
11 provisional license.

12 Ms. Lutz stated PDA also recommended keeping  
13 either or in terms of experience or passing a board-  
14 approved skills examination but recommended requiring  
15 every applicant for licensure under Act 41 to have the  
16 continuing education during the 24 months preceding  
17 the date of the application.

18 Ms. Lutz explained that the Board was being asked  
19 to consider granting a provisional license to allow  
20 those who do not have the required hours of continuing  
21 education to obtain those hours during the period of  
22 time that they hold their provisional license.

23 Ms. Lutz reviewed the Board's current proposal,  
24 including experience or continuing education or  
25 achieving a passing score in a Board-approved skills

1 exam, while recognizing the purpose of Act 41 is to  
2 facilitate pathways to licensure for individuals from  
3 out of state or military families, et cetera, who  
4 otherwise would have a difficult time becoming  
5 licensed in Pennsylvania.

6 Ms. Lutz questioned whether the Board desired to  
7 require an individual with experience also have to  
8 take the required hours of CE before being granted a  
9 license under Act 41. She noted the need for review  
10 through the regulatory review process and the Policy  
11 Office. She believed the push was to facilitate the  
12 pathway for licensure for other individuals who met  
13 the competency requirement or verified licensure from  
14 another jurisdiction whose requirements for licensure  
15 are substantially similar to those of the Board.

16 Ms. Hughes stated her interpretation of PDA's  
17 letter was that 2 years of active practicing during  
18 the last 5 and passing of an exam were equivalent and  
19 could qualify someone to practice in the Commonwealth  
20 of Pennsylvania. She commented, if the only metric  
21 the applicant under Act 41 is the continuing  
22 education, then that approval would be provisional and  
23 would require an additional component during the  
24 provisional period to establish their level of  
25 competency.



1 Ms. Hughes stated continuing education was not  
2 enough to establish an individual is clinically  
3 competent to practice in the Commonwealth, noting the  
4 importance of the Board's responsibility to protect  
5 the residents of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

6 Dr. Funari agreed with PDA, noting the importance  
7 of meeting both the skills and knowledge component.  
8 He suggested active practice to qualify for 2 of the  
9 preceding 5 years should be a minimum of 1000 hours a  
10 year, which is basically a half-time practice at 20  
11 hours a week for 50 weeks.

12 Ms. Lutz stated the Board had proposed experience  
13 2 of the last 5 years or documentation of completion  
14 of continuing education or achieved a passing score in  
15 a Board-approved skills exam to receive a license by  
16 endorsement under Act 41.

17 It was noted that the Board had not come to  
18 consensus other than to put the draft forward at the  
19 last meeting in the hopes of receiving guidance from  
20 stakeholders as to whether or not continuing education  
21 alone demonstrates competency in clinical skills. Ms.  
22 Lutz stated the crux of the issue was whether or not  
23 Board members believed that continuing education alone  
24 demonstrated clinical competency. She noted a person  
25 with a license from another jurisdiction reflects the

1 knowledge. She questioned whether the three criteria  
2 demonstrated clinical skills.

3 Ms. Hutcheson commented that the intention of the  
4 legislation was to create as many pathways for out-of-  
5 state dentists to be able to practice in Pennsylvania.  
6 She noted that those who have satisfied their  
7 continuing education requirement and without a  
8 complaint against them can renew their licenses,  
9 stating there was nothing to prove an individual was  
10 effective in the scope of dentistry unless there was  
11 an action to demonstrate otherwise.

12 Chairman Lugo stated an individual could be  
13 licensed but not taken the clinical exam. He noted an  
14 individual could receive a license in New York with a  
15 residency program and one year postgraduate, but  
16 unlike a Pennsylvania dentist, the individual has  
17 taken a clinical exam in addition to the National  
18 Board of Dental Examination Part I and Part II, which  
19 now will become the Integrated National Board of  
20 Dental Examination.

21 Chairman Lugo noted Pennsylvania requires the  
22 Integrated National Board of Dental Examination but  
23 also requires a clinical competency examination, where  
24 New York does not.

25 Ms. Lutz addressed the first prong of the

1 licensure by endorsement, where the Board must be  
2 satisfied that the applicant has a current license  
3 from another jurisdiction whose standards are  
4 substantially equivalent, which would fall under  
5 substantial equivalence rather than the determination  
6 of competency, noting the "or" for a passing score in  
7 a Board-approved skills examination. She noted the  
8 skills examination was being covered through the  
9 competency prong of the analysis.

10 Ms. Lutz commented that the Board could require a  
11 passing score on a Board-approved skills examination  
12 if another state does not require a skills examination  
13 and the individual has not been practicing for at  
14 least 2 of the last 5 years and not completed the  
15 continuing education.

16 Chairman Lugo recommended moving the discussion  
17 to committee to bring a pathway to the Board to  
18 consider.

19 Chairman Lugo thanked Board Counsel for the  
20 regulation status report, noting the need for  
21 committee work and close review of outstanding issues.

22 Chairman Lugo noted the Board was reviewing the  
23 clinical competency exams and testing areas, keeping  
24 the people in Pennsylvania safe.

25 Ms. Lutz referred to Act 53 of 2020 for the

1 Board's review and a PowerPoint explanation to further  
2 understand the act. She defined Act 53 of 2020 as the  
3 framework for a board's consideration of criminal  
4 convictions in application cases and disciplinary  
5 proceedings after December 27, 2020.

6 Ms. Lutz explained the Act requires the Board to  
7 create a list of criminal offenses that directly  
8 relate to the profession. She noted developing a list  
9 with the prosecution liaison to be considered by the  
10 Board, which would be given to Commissioner Johnson to  
11 share with stakeholders and the Board.

12 Ms. Lutz addressed rebuttable presumption, where  
13 applicants for licensure or licensees, who had been  
14 convicted of a criminal offense on the list of  
15 offenses determined to directly relate to the  
16 profession under Act 53, would pose a substantial risk  
17 to the health and safety of patients or clients or the  
18 public or a substantial risk of further criminal  
19 convictions. She noted the Board would be required to  
20 conduct an individual assessment to determine if the  
21 license should be granted.

22 Ms. Lutz commented that there was no rebuttable  
23 presumption if the criminal offense was not on the  
24 list, and the Board would have to conduct an  
25 individual assessment to determine if licensure would

1 pose a substantial risk.

2 Ms. Lutz stated that sexual offenses would be a  
3 permanent bar toward licensure. She noted an  
4 individual convicted of a crime of violence may be  
5 granted a license if at least 3 years has elapsed  
6 since release from incarceration or at least 3 years  
7 had elapsed since imposition of sentence, if  
8 sentencing was other than incarceration and the  
9 individual remained conviction-free during that 3-year  
10 period.

11 Ms. Lutz informed the Board that Act 53 pertains  
12 to the Board's consideration of criminal convictions  
13 in application cases and disciplinary cases after  
14 December 27, 2020, and Commissioner Johnson will be  
15 scheduling meetings with all of the boards to review  
16 this list of offenses. Ms. Lutz requested everyone  
17 read and become familiar with Act 53.

18 Ms. Hughes referred to the PowerPoint that  
19 mentions 3113(a)(1), where the Board shall follow the  
20 procedures in that section and, second point, where  
21 the Board shall not consider good moral character;  
22 crimes of moral turpitude; or ethical or dishonest  
23 practice when granting licenses, certificates, or  
24 registrations; or when determining discipline. She  
25 questioned whether those were no longer a part of the

1 licensing and discipline process. Ms. Lutz explained  
2 that past criminal offenses that impacted whether or  
3 not someone has the requisite moral character to  
4 become licensed would now be considered and analyzed  
5 under Act 53 based upon criminal offenses on the list.  
6 She noted the requirement of an individualized  
7 assessment if there is a rebuttable presumption that  
8 licensure would pose a substantial risk to the health  
9 and safety of the public.

10 Ms. Hughes expressed a concern with good moral  
11 character no longer being an element of being licensed  
12 or disciplined. Ms. Lutz explained that many of the  
13 offenses on the list would be considered crimes  
14 involving moral turpitude. She stated the Board would  
15 be covered, but moral turpitude alone was not going to  
16 be able to be used to deny licensure or discipline an  
17 individual.

18 Chairman Lugo questioned whether it would be  
19 possible to begin to work on this process and review  
20 the list in committee before the November meeting and  
21 before the Commissioner had given additional  
22 information concerning the Act.

23 Commissioner Johnson offered to distribute the  
24 document through a shared platform in either an  
25 OneDrive document or Microsoft Teams platform, so the

1 committee will be able to elicit their feedback in a  
2 shared format. He will provide the list to Ms.  
3 Hughes.]

4 \*\*\*

5 Motion to Enter Default and Deem Facts Admitted

6 DR. MATTA:

7 In the matter of Dawn Marie Mita, EFDA,  
8 File No. 17-46-02614, I'd like to motion  
9 to grant the deem facts admitted and  
10 direct counsel to prepare an  
11 Adjudication and Order consistent with  
12 discussion in executive session.

13 MS. GROODY:

14 Second.

15 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

16 Call the question.

17

18 Dr. Arndt, aye; Dr. Casey, aye; Ms.  
19 Fowler, aye; Dr. Funari, aye; Ms.  
20 Groody, aye; Ms. Hughes, aye; Ms.  
21 Hutcheson, aye; Dr. Jaspán, aye; Dr.  
22 Matta, aye; Dr. Mountain, aye; Ms.  
23 Murray, aye; Ms. Sizemore, aye; and Dr.  
24 Sullivan, aye.

25 [The motion carried unanimously.]

1 \*\*\*

2 Final Adjudication and Order

3 MS. HUTCHESON:

4 I move that the Board adopt the final  
5 Adjudication and Order as presented by  
6 Board counsel in the case of Avijit  
7 Goel, D.D.S., Case No. 20-46-001306.

8 MS. GROODY:

9 Second.

10 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

11 Call the question.

12  
13 Dr. Arndt, aye; Dr. Casey, aye; Ms.  
14 Fowler, aye; Dr. Funari, aye; Ms.  
15 Groody, aye; Ms. Hughes, aye; Ms.  
16 Hutcheson, aye; Dr. Jaspán, aye; Dr.  
17 Matta, aye; Dr. Mountain, aye; Ms.  
18 Murray, aye; Ms. Sizemore, aye; and Dr.  
19 Sullivan, aye.

20 [The motion carried unanimously.]

21 \*\*\*

22 DR. JASPAN:

23 I believe it is appropriate to entertain  
24 a motion at this time to adopt the final  
25 Adjudication and Order prepared by Board



1 counsel in the matter involving Daniel  
2 Perry Schecter, D.M.D., Case No. 19-46-  
3 013369 and direct Board counsel to issue  
4 the Adjudication and Order on the party.

5 MS. GROODY:

6 Second.

7 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

8 Call the question.

9

10 Dr. Arndt, aye; Dr. Casey, aye; Ms.  
11 Fowler, aye; Dr. Funari, aye; Ms.  
12 Groody, aye; Ms. Hughes, aye; Ms.  
13 Hutcheson, aye; Dr. Jaspan, aye; Dr.  
14 Matta, aye; Dr. Mountain, aye; Ms.  
15 Murray, aye; Ms. Sizemore, aye; and Dr.  
16 Sullivan, aye.

17 [The motion carried unanimously.]

18 \*\*\*

19 Miscellaneous

20 MS. MURRAY:

21 I make a motion to deny the request for  
22 reconsideration of Case No. 18-46-  
23 005332, Jamshid K. Assadinia, D.D.S.

24 MS. GROODY:

25 Second.

1 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

2 Call the question.

3

4 Dr. Arndt, aye; Dr. Casey, aye; Ms.  
5 Fowler, aye; Dr. Funari, aye; Ms.  
6 Groody, aye; Ms. Hughes, aye; Ms.  
7 Hutcheson, aye; Dr. Jaspán, aye; Dr.  
8 Matta, aye; Dr. Mountain, aye; Ms.  
9 Murray, aye; Ms. Sizemore, aye; and Dr.  
10 Sullivan, aye.

11 [The motion carried unanimously.]

12

\*\*\*

13 DR. MOUNTAIN:

14 I move that the Board adopt the hearing  
15 examiner's proposed Adjudication and  
16 Order and direct Board counsel to  
17 prepare the final order in the Case of  
18 Alfred George Khallouf, D.D.S., File  
19 Nos. 19-46-016830 & 19-46-001504.

20 DR. FUNARI:

21 Second.

22 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

23 Call the question.

24

25 Dr. Arndt, aye; Dr. Casey, aye; Ms.

1 Fowler, aye; Dr. Funari, aye; Ms.  
2 Groody, aye; Ms. Hughes, recuse; Ms.  
3 Hutcheson, aye; Dr. Jaspán, aye; Dr.  
4 Matta, recuse; Dr. Mountain, aye; Ms.  
5 Murray, aye; Ms. Sizemore, recuse; Dr.  
6 Sullivan, aye.

7 [The motion carried. Ms. Hughes, Dr. Matta, and Ms.  
8 Sizemore recused themselves from deliberation and  
9 voting on the motion.]

10 \*\*\*

11 MS. SIZEMORE:

12 I move that the Board deny the request  
13 of John Kim, D.M.D., File No. 19-46-  
14 005260, seeking to waive the remaining  
15 payments due.

16 MS. GROODY:

17 Second.

18 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

19 Call the question.

20

21 Dr. Arndt, aye; Dr. Casey, aye; Ms.  
22 Fowler, aye; Dr. Funari, aye; Ms.  
23 Groody, aye; Ms. Hughes, aye; Ms.  
24 Hutcheson, aye; Dr. Jaspán, aye; Dr.  
25 Matta, aye; Dr. Mountain, aye; Ms.

1 Murray, aye; Ms. Sizemore, aye; and Dr.  
2 Sullivan, aye.

3 [The motion carried unanimously.]

4 \*\*\*

5 Review of Applications

6 \*\*\*

7 DR. SULLIVAN:

8 I move to accept the applications under  
9 Act 41 of Helmy Mostafa, dentist; Jacy  
10 Stauffer, dentist.

11 DR. FUNARI:

12 Second.

13 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

14 Call the question.

15

16 Dr. Arndt, aye; Dr. Casey, aye; Ms.  
17 Fowler, aye; Dr. Funari, aye; Ms.  
18 Groody, aye; Ms. Hughes, aye; Ms.  
19 Hutcheson, aye; Dr. Jaspán, aye; Dr.  
20 Matta, aye; Dr. Mountain, aye; Ms.  
21 Murray, aye; Ms. Sizemore, aye; and Dr.  
22 Sullivan, aye.

23 [The motion carried unanimously.]

24 \*\*\*

25 DR. ARNDT:

1 I make a motion to accept the  
2 application approved under Act 41 for  
3 licensure of Pamela Ann DeFord, dental  
4 hygienist.

5 MS. GROODY:

6 Second.

7 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

8 Call the question.

9

10 Dr. Arndt, aye; Dr. Casey, aye; Ms.  
11 Fowler, aye; Dr. Funari, aye; Ms.  
12 Groody, aye; Ms. Hughes, aye; Ms.  
13 Hutcheson, aye; Dr. Jaspán, aye; Dr.  
14 Matta, aye; Dr. Mountain, aye; Ms.  
15 Murray, aye; Ms. Sizemore, aye; and Dr.  
16 Sullivan, aye.

17 [The motion carried unanimously.]

18 \*\*\*

19 DR. CASEY:

20 I make a motion to deny the application  
21 of Sehar Hayan, dental hygiene local  
22 anesthesia.

23 MS. GROODY:

24 Second.

25 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

1 Call the question.

2

3 Dr. Arndt, aye; Dr. Casey, aye; Ms.  
4 Fowler, aye; Dr. Funari, aye; Ms.  
5 Groody, aye; Ms. Hughes, aye; Ms.  
6 Hutcheson, aye; Dr. Jaspan, aye; Dr.  
7 Matta, aye; Dr. Mountain, aye; Ms.  
8 Murray, aye; Ms. Sizemore, aye; and Dr.  
9 Sullivan, aye.

10 [The motion carried unanimously.]

11

\*\*\*

12 MS. FOWLER:

13 I note that the application of Kasandra  
14 L. Vazquez, EFDA, is being tabled for  
15 consideration pending receipt of  
16 additional information.

17 MS. GROODY:

18 Second.

19 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

20 Call the question.

21

22 Dr. Arndt, aye; Dr. Casey, aye; Ms.  
23 Fowler, aye; Dr. Funari, aye; Ms.  
24 Groody, aye; Ms. Hughes, aye; Ms.  
25 Hutcheson, aye; Dr. Jaspan, aye; Dr.

1                   Matta, aye; Dr. Mountain, aye; Ms.  
2                   Murray, aye; Ms. Sizemore, aye; and Dr.  
3                   Sullivan, aye.

4 [The motion carried unanimously.]

5   \*\*\*

6 [K. Kalonji Johnson, Commissioner, Bureau of  
7 Professional and Occupational Affairs, exited the  
8 meeting at 1:40 p.m.]

9   \*\*\*

10 Report of Board Chair

11 [R. Ivan Lugo, D.M.D., M.B.A., Chairman, addressed  
12 pending issues over the last 10 years requiring the  
13 Board's attention. He discussed committee composition  
14 and will be reaching out to members. He mentioned  
15 accreditation and licensing, disciplinary, probable  
16 cause, and scope of practice committees.

17           Chairman Lugo addressed Board communications,  
18 commenting on Ms. Fowler's excellent job, but the  
19 current situation demanded the Board reflect on its  
20 communications with the stakeholders and the public on  
21 the Board's actions and available venues. He  
22 requested to be advised of areas where the members  
23 would like to participate to help with their  
24 assignment to the correct committee.

25           Chairman Lugo thanked the Board for their vote of

1 confidence. He expressed his honor to work with such  
2 a competitive staff, noting Ms. Burns as a prize  
3 asset. He was hopeful the Board would be able to  
4 deliver to the Commissioner and Board Counsel.]

5 \*\*\*

6 Report of Commissioner

7 [Lisa M. Burns, Board Administrator, reported  
8 Commissioner Johnson had to exit the meeting to attend  
9 another meeting. Ms. Burns welcomed Ms. Hutcheson to  
10 the Board on Commissioner Johnson's behalf.]

11 \*\*\*

12 Report of Board Administrator

13 [Lisa M. Burns, Board Administrator, thanked Chairman  
14 Lugo for his kind words.]

15 \*\*\*

16 Scope of Practice Committee

17 [Andrew S. Matta, D.M.D., requested guidelines on  
18 setting up a meeting and whether a detailed agenda  
19 must still be approved for a committee meeting. He  
20 mentioned that there are topics regarding scope of  
21 practice that would be beneficial to review and  
22 discuss.

23 Ms. Burns informed Dr. Matta to follow the same  
24 procedure as before and to provide her with  
25 information on the committee's agenda, along with



1 details of the subjects contained in that meeting.]

2

\*\*\*

3 Probable Cause Screening Committee

4 [Alice Hart Hughes, Esquire, Secretary, Public Member,  
5 reported the committee reviewed two matters presented  
6 by prosecution.]

7

\*\*\*

8 Expanded Function Dental Assistant Committee

9 [Theresa A. Groody, EFDA, noted the EFDA Committee  
10 reviewed one EFDA program.

11 Ms. Groody mentioned not noting information  
12 concerning the EFDA clinical exam in the regulation  
13 status report. Ms. Lutz explained that the matter  
14 would be included in the Annex she was drafting and  
15 should be on the next meeting agenda.]

16

\*\*\*

17 For the Board's Information/Discussion

18 [Lisa M. Burns, Board Administrator, noted the  
19 Pennsylvania Sunshine Act and Recusal Guidelines for  
20 the Board's review.

21 She also noted Pathways to Dental Licensure  
22 Qualification and the American Board of Dental  
23 Examiners (ADEX) information for the Board's review.

24 Ms. Murray addressed her attendance at the  
25 Commission on Dental Competency Assessments (CDCA)

1 webinar. She encouraged Board members to review the  
2 attached documents concerning Pathways to Dental  
3 Licensure Qualification and ADEX examination. She  
4 noted the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
5 (CDC) website has a PowerPoint recording of the  
6 webinar in September.

7 Ms. Murray mentioned discussion at the webinar  
8 concerning patient-based and non-patient-based  
9 examinations that were taking place through ADEX. She  
10 commented that the focus was on the dental portion,  
11 and there will be a webinar being presented for dental  
12 hygiene as data was being gathered from Dental Hygiene  
13 Manikin Examinations that had been delivered by the  
14 CDCA.

15 Ms. Murray mentioned the importance of examining  
16 updates, studies, and product developments for  
17 patient-based exams and non-patient-based exams for  
18 dental and dental hygiene as a means to further  
19 protect the public from incomplete dental treatment,  
20 delayed treatment, and health risks associated with  
21 the COVID-19 pandemic and the preservation of personal  
22 protective equipment (PPE) and those CompeDont exams  
23 and the dental hygiene manikin exams that were  
24 available within other states.]

25

\*\*\*

1 [Godfrey Joel Funari, D.M.D., noted a question from  
2 Dr. Krunal Patel, who wanted to know when a public  
3 comment period would be scheduled on the agenda.

4 Chairman Lugo stated virtual etiquette will  
5 include time on the agenda for public comment once it  
6 is decided how to incorporate the virtual public and  
7 their participation in deliberating.

8 Ms. Burns recommended everyone submit questions  
9 in writing to the Board through the Board email  
10 resource account to be addressed either through the  
11 Board office or on the Board's next agenda.

12 Chairman Lugo reassured those who wished to  
13 contribute that a mechanism will be put in place for  
14 their participation in the meetings going forward and  
15 thanked everyone for their time.]

16 \*\*\*

17 Adjournment

18 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

19 I am looking for a motion to adjourn.

20 MS. HUTCHESON:

21 I motion to adjourn.

22 DR. CASEY:

23 Second.

24 CHAIRMAN LUGO:

25 The meeting is adjourned. Thank you all

1 for your time.

2 [The motion carried unanimously.]

3 \*\*\*

4 [There being no further business, the State Board of  
5 Dentistry Meeting adjourned at 1:58 p.m.]

6 \*\*\*

7

8 CERTIFICATE

9

10 I hereby certify that the foregoing summary  
11 minutes of the State Board of Dentistry meeting, was  
12 reduced to writing by me or under my supervision, and  
13 that the minutes accurately summarize the substance of  
14 the State Board of Dentistry meeting.

15

16

17



18

Evan Bingaman,

19

Minute Clerk

20

Sargent's Court Reporting

21

Service, Inc.

22

23

24

25

26

STATE BOARD OF DENTISTRY  
REFERENCE INDEX

September 11, 2020

## TIME

## AGENDA

11:50	Official Call to Order
11:53	Appointment - Western Regional Examining Board Presentation
12:15	Approval of Minutes
12:17	Report of Prosecutorial Division
12:37	Report of Board Counsel
1:41	Report of Board Chairman
1:46	Report of Committees
1:51	For the Board's Information/Discussion
1:58	Adjournment