



Nevada State Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners

Mailing Address:

4600 Kietzke Ln. O-265
Reno, NV 89502
Phone- (775) 688-1788
Fax-(775) 688-1808
Email:
vetbdinfo@vetboard.nv.gov
Website :
www.nvvetboard.us

F E B R U A R Y 1 4 , 2 0 1 4

Board Members

William Taylor, DVM, ABVP
President
Las Vegas

Ron Sandoval, DVM
Vice-President
Sparks

Scott Bradley, DVM
Las Vegas

Davyd Pelsue, DVM, DACVS
Reno

Kevin Collins, DVM
Las Vegas

Steve Damonte, DVM
Pleasant Valley

Melissa Schalles, LVT
Las Vegas

Sherita Rogers
Public Member
Las Vegas

Board Staff

Debbie Machen
Executive Director

Tracie Estep
Licensing Specialist

Patricia Handal, DVM
Board Inspector

Christina Johnson, LVT
Becky Phlegar, LVT
Compliance Inspectors

Louis Ling
Board Counsel

INSIDE:

Social Media:	2
Standard of Care: When money is an issue	4
Legislative Update	5
New Board Members	6-7
The New Guy: On Being a New Board Member	8
Disciplinary Action	10-14

From the President Bill Taylor, DVM, ABVP

First, I would like to introduce myself as the recently-elected President of the Nevada State Board of Veterinary Examiners. I am Bill Taylor; I have practiced in Las Vegas for 32 years and have been on the Board for 11 years. It is my honor to serve both the public as well as the veterinarians of our state.

In the past year, we have seen quite a change in the Board members. Mrs. Beverly Willard was not reappointed after having served the board for 12 years, and I must say it was a tearful parting at her last meeting. We will certainly miss her. Past President, Dr. Richard Simmonds, also was not reappointed to the Board. For 12 years he has been a source of stability at our Board meetings and appearing before various legislative committees in support of new legislation. He has set the bar high for each Board member and anyone holding office (including me). Happily, Dr. Simmonds will continue to assist us by serving on several committees. Dr. Mark Iodence, after five years on the board, resigned to pursue a radiology residency. Their guidance and support of the veterinary community will be greatly missed.

We have four new Board members. Mrs. Sherita Rogers is our new public member and works as the Program Manager for the Village of Hope Las Vegas. Dr. Kevin Collins, a small animal practitioner in Las Vegas, brings an interest in traditional and nontraditional medicine to the board.

Dr. Davyd Pelsue, a board-certified small animal surgeon from Reno will bring a new perspective to the board. Our newest member holds a brand new position as the

first veterinary technician on the board, Melissa Chesley-Schalles. She is the Veterinary Clinic Manager for the CSN on-campus Veterinary Clinic.

When I was elected to this position, I reflected on the duties of the State Board. Our mission statement states that for "... the protection of the public and their animals ... [the Board] regulates the standards of conduct for the profession ..." This is the primary part of our work as Board members and staff. However, our role encompasses more. We have the opportunity to inform the public what they may expect from their veterinarians, and just as importantly, what they may *not* expect from them.

By way of procedure, the complaint process is as follows: When a member of the public contacts the Board office, Debbie Machen and Tracie Estep first review the state's laws governing veterinary medicine and, in doing so, try to help the owner understand what may have transpired in the care of their pet. If the person chooses to file a complaint, it is filed and assigned to a Board member for investigation.

The Board member or our case investigator will speak with the veterinary professional(s) involved and the owners of the pet. Next, the Board member, investigator and executive director discuss the case and presents a report and recommendation to the Board. The Board discusses the case and either (1) dismisses the complaint or (2) asks the Board to pursue disciplinary action.

I would invite the veterinarians and technicians to attend the review and determination of complaints portion of our Board meeting.

It is an informative and often sobering section of our meetings. I learn quite a lot at each meeting. I think each of you will receive a greater understanding of what the complaint review process entails and how you might improve the medicine and communication in your hospitals.

In addition to hearing these cases, the Board also advises the Nevada Legislature as to the laws and regulations guiding the practice of veterinary medicine. In last year's President's letter, Dr. Simmonds congratulated Debbie Machen and the Board staff on the excellence of their report to the Sunset Subcommittee. Their report set a high bar of excellence and has become the basis on which other board reports are judged. We recently reviewed a survey from the American Association of Veterinary State Boards and I am proud to report that your state Board is very progressive in our legislation and duties performed by the board.

I look forward to the upcoming year as we embrace further changes in veterinary medicine. If you know how the board can better serve the people, veterinary professionals, pets, and livestock of Nevada please don't hesitate to contact the board office, myself, or any board member.



Social Media: Friend or Foe?



Navigating the world of social media doesn't have to be impossible

“Social media can be your marketing ally, or it can be a nidus of discontent.”

We are constantly reminded how important it is to have a strong social media presence. Websites, blogs, Facebook, Twitter, and search engine optimization are vital to maintaining a competitive advantage. When was the last time you picked up a phonebook? Marketing dollars have increasingly moved away from full page color ads in the yellow pages. We now spend our advertising dollars on companies that provide website design, client portals, shopping carts, and reminder implementation by email and text.

Social media can be your marketing ally, or it can be a nidus of discontent. We all know the adage that says a happy client will tell only one person, where as an unhappy client will tell 10 people. These days, one upset client, with the help of social media, can tell thousands of people. A negative review on Yelp or Google will drive potential clients away from your door. I hate to admit it, but when looking for a new place to eat, I will often look to Yelp to assist me in my dining decision. And how should you deal with a negative Yelp review? Multiple publications have reported that up to 25% of those 1- and 2-star ratings can be “fake”.

Many businesses that choose to advertise with Yelp will see their negative reviews drop out of sight. Recently, after negative reviews were posted online about a staff member for an issue unrelated to our hospital, we received a call from a Yelp sales consultant selling their ‘price per click’ plan (coincidence?). I was assured that advertising would help us promote a more positive image and the negative reviews would no longer be a problem.

Here is the official Yelp response: “Is it true that businesses can pay to remove bad reviews?” “Remove”? No. But advertising dollars permit more positive reviews - and your business’ internet banner - to be featured more prominently, including when a search is done for a competitor in your same category-type of business.

Ad dollars don't remove bad reviews. Ad dollars permit more prominent placement of your branding in searches, and shuffle bad reviews further to the back of the queue of your business page (which you can manipulate by using the filtering options). But no reviews are removed, with many of the bad ones done by trolls or people with fewer than 10 friends/reviews are shunted to the filter (which a Yelper - requiring a user login - can still view).

In the past we were advised to ignore negative reviews, because responding could ignite a social media firestorm. Recommendations have changed. So what are tech savvy consultants suggesting?

- Keep your cool: What would you do (or wish to do, if you could have a “do-over”) if this complaint was made in a “face-to-face” situation?

- Respond diplomatically: When you do respond to an online review -- negative or positive -- be civil and professional, and make sure to offer a solution when appropriate. A written response gives you the time to compose, review, and edit your response, in order to present your clinic in the best light possible. Responding publicly is a great route to take when you want to shed more light on a situation, or demonstrate that some action has been

taken to address the reviewer's feedback.

- Be consistent: Actively reading and responding to user reviews can accomplish at least two important things. First, it can provide insight into how your product or service resonates with customers, as well as ideas for ways to improve. Second, it can show users that you care and are engaged.

What does this have to do with the Board of Examiners? It is inevitable that you will get client complaints. Strive to prevent them with thorough and sincere client communication. And once you do receive a complaint, keep your cool and respond diplomatically. Taking these steps may prevent an official complaint being filed with the State Board (and a negative social media review making the rounds on the internet).

Another caution: It is my fear that the disciplinary actions that are published on the State Board website will end up “word for word” or worse yet, creatively paraphrased, in a social media forum. It only takes a few clicks. One more thing to think about, that's for sure.

Every facility should have a policy/procedure in place regarding employees posting information (photos; medical information) to social media sites such as Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram. The Board has received several calls from consumers regarding this type of information being posted on these outlets. Remind your employees that this information is sensitive and confidential. You should have clients direct permission, (in writing is best) to make these postings.

Hospital Inspection Report

Another year has sped by and another rotation of hospital inspections has been completed. An improvement was seen in many areas, such as, controlled drug log accuracy, surgical equipment sterilization and anatomical orientation depiction.

One regulation that seemed particularly challenging for paperless clinics was NAC 638.0629- (5) (6). This regulation states that all prescriptions must have a notation in the medical record stating who filled them and who of the licensed personnel verified the prescription before the prescription was dispensed. For handwritten records this has not been an issue. Many hospitals are simply printing two labels and double initialing the label in the record after it has been checked. For paperless practices it has been more of a challenge. Some systems allow for the prescription label to be modified on a sixth line that does not print on the label or an initial box before the invoice is concluded. Other hospitals have attached a form that pops up with every prescription created that must be completed prior to the prescription release. Others are simply putting a note in for every prescription. Whatever method you choose for your facility the key is consistency and insuring that your staff is clear on your protocol for this particular regulation. This regulation helps ensure that miss-fills or miss-labeling of prescriptions is caught prior to the prescription being dispensed.

We have exciting news this year. We have added a new member to our team in southern Nevada. Becky Phlegar, LVT will be assisting with inspections in Las Vegas. This will allow the board to inspect all facilities more frequently and better assist with compliance. Becky will report her findings to the board office and I will follow-up on her inspections contacting the hospitals and doctor in charge. Becky is very motivated and ready to make 2014 a great year. We can't wait for you to meet her.

A special thank you to the following hospitals for outstanding inspections over the last year:

NO Violations:

Roundhill Animal Hospital Carl Kelly, DVM Incline Village
 Haven Animal Hospital Lisa Mauro, DVM Las Vegas

ONE Violation:

A-Plus Animal Hospital Brad Lingenfelter, DVM Reno
 Northwest Veterinary Hospital Sukhjeet Riar, DVM Reno
 SPCA Clinic Brad Lingenfelter, DVM Reno
 VCA Black Mountain Animal Hospital Randy Winn, DVM Henderson
 Blue Diamond Animal Hospital Maninder Herr, DVM Las Vegas
 Natural Care Institute Nancy Brandt, DVM Las Vegas
 All Creatures Animal Hospital Suzanne Zervantian, DVM Pahrump
 Flamingo Pet Clinic Bryon Kenton, DVM Las Vegas
 Bergin Animal Hospital Mark Grinsell, DVM Elko
 Ruby View Veterinary Clinic John Dinsmore, DVM Elko
 Washoe County Animal Services Euthanasia Technicians Reno

This list is amazing. Thank you for your continued diligence this year and we look forward to another great year. The board office is always happy to answer questions and offer ideas for improving compliance.

Inspections: 12/18/12 through 12/16/13	Violations	% based on total # of violations	Total # of Inspections- 80
Verification of RX by LVT or DVM	40	13%	Northern NV- 27
Surgical equipment appropriately sterilized	32	10.5% (2012- 13.9%)	Southern NV- 40
Inaccurate controlled substance logs	28	9.2% (2012- 12.6%)	Rural NV- 13
All controlled substances double locked	23	7.6% (2012- 4.60%)	
Anatomical orientation appropriately depicted	22	7.3% (2012- 11.0%)	
Expired controlled substances	22	7.3% (2012- 6.97%)	
Incomplete physical exams in medical record	22	7.30%	
Method of monitoring/ historical monitoring	16	5.3% (2012- 4.60%)	
Overnight notification of unattended patients	13	4.30%	
Safe and sanitary surgical suite	11	3.60%	
Total # of violations for the year	303		

	2013	2012
NEW VETERINARIANS LICENSED	80	75
NEW BOARD CERTIFIED VETERINARIAN DIPLOMATES	6	1
ACTIVE VETERINARIANS/DIPLOMATES	888	867
INACTIVE VETERINARIANS/DIPLOMATES	190	185
VETERINARY FACILITIES	207	208
NEW LICENSED VETERINARY TECHNICIANS	63	82
ACTIVE LICENSED VETERINARY TECHNICIANS	605	570
VETERINARY TECHNICIANS-IN-TRAINING	201	134
NEW EUTHANASIA TECHNICIANS	12	16
ACTIVE EUTHANASIA TECHNICIANS	82	87
ANIMAL CHIROPRACTORS	7	7
ANIMAL PHYSICAL THERAPIST	5	5
FORMAL COMPLAINTS FILED	46	57
<i>BOARD MEETINGS - 2014</i>		
JANUARY 30, 2014	RENO	
APRIL 24, 2014	LAS VEGAS	
JULY 31, 2014	RENO	
OCTOBER 30, 2014	LAS VEGAS	

Standard of Care Complications: When Money is an Issue by Bill Taylor, DVM



In these sometimes financially difficult times, we as veterinarians and technicians face difficult decisions regarding the medical care for our patients and clients with monetary difficulties on a daily basis. When the decision is made to treat a pet and work with the owner financially, we cannot fall below the standard of care for medical or surgical treatment. The Board has had several cases in which the veterinarian trying to do the “right thing” – trying to save a patient’s life by absorbing some of the cost for the treatment – has cut corners and his or her care fell below the standard of care. The Board, in reviewing such cases, must evaluate them based upon whether the standard of care was maintained for this pet’s treatment. We would like to take into account the financial issues; however, we cannot disregard the baseline requirement of standard of care.

The following is a hypothetical case demonstrating this challenge. A veterinarian is brought an emaciated dog presented for dystocia. The owners have little money. The veterinarian, at the urging of his staff, elects treatment at the hospital’s expense. Radiographs are made, blood work evaluated, and treatment

with fluids, calcium, glucose, and warming of the dog are initiated. The pet is stabilized, taken to surgery, and appropriate post-operative care is given. This meets the standard of care. If this pet was taken to surgery without appropriate pre-operative diagnostics and stabilization and post-operative care, even though still much at the hospital’s expense, the standard of care would not be met and the veterinarian would be found guilty of negligence.

There are established protocols that, although they are not what we would prefer to do, do provide acceptable treatment and meet the standard of care. An example is the outpatient care of a parvo case. Subcutaneous fluids, Convenia, Cerenia, and home nursing care are acceptable treatment options. Unfortunately, we may be left having to recommend euthanasia as the only viable action in many cases. This is an excerpt from a recent board decision that demonstrates the Board’s position on this important issue:

“While the Board acknowledges that the Licensee was constrained by the financial capabilities of the pet’s owners, the Board has con-

sistently held that the standard of care always applies even where financial issues are involved in the care of the animal. Once a veterinarian has undertaken care of an animal, the veterinarian must deliver the standard of care regardless of financial considerations or must suggest other humane courses if the financial considerations prevent the delivery of the standard of care.”

The Board is proud of the state’s many veterinarians who daily make difficult decisions based upon financial considerations, and we are prouder still of those veterinarians who undertake care of an animal at some cost to the veterinarians. Please just assure that the quality of care remains consistent regardless of whether the owner can afford it or whether the veterinarian is helping to absorb some of the financial hardship.

Legislative Update 2013



AB 20	Revises provisions governing agriculture. AN ACT relating to agriculture; deleting provisions which authorize the Director of the State Department of Agriculture to remove certain persons from office with the approval of the State Board of Agriculture; revising the classification and qualifications of certain persons appointed by the Director; expanding the purposes for which expenditures from the Livestock Inspection Account and for the Program for the Control of Pests and Plant Diseases may be made; requiring an inspector of the Department to notify an agricultural enforcement officer of certain findings made by the inspector concerning the actual legal owner of an animal; revising the circumstances under which a person may possess the carcass of a bovine animal; revising provisions governing certain farm products other than livestock, livestock products or poultry; revising the circumstances under which a person must obtain a license to engage in pest control; repealing provisions governing the Agricultural Loan Mediation Program and slaughtering cattle without a formal inspection; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.	Passed
AB72	Revises provisions relating to the Nevada State Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners. Section 1 of this bill increases the membership of the Board to eight members, adding one member who must be a Nevada resident who is a veterinary technician and who has been lawfully engaged in practice as a veterinary technician in this State for at least 5 years next preceding the date of his or her appointment.	Passed
AB110	AN ACT relating to crimes; providing that a dog may not be determined to be dangerous or vicious based solely on its breed; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.	Passed
AB408	Revises provisions governing business impact statements prepared by state agencies and governing bodies of local governments. (BDR 18-416) AN ACT relating to business impact statements; revising provisions governing the small business impact statements prepared by state agencies when proposing regulations; requiring a copy of those statements to be submitted to the Legislative Commission; authorizing the Legislative Commission to reject a regulation if the statement is not prepared properly.	Passed
SB72	Makes various changes concerning cruelty to animals. (BDR 50-114) AN ACT relating to cruelty to animals; prohibiting a person from intentionally engaging in horse tripping for sport, entertainment, competition or practice or from knowingly organizing, sponsoring, promoting, overseeing or receiving money for the admission of any person to a charreada or rodeo that includes horse tripping; providing a penalty; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.	Passed
SB73	Revises provisions relating to cruelty to animals. (BDR 50-55) AN ACT relating to animals; deleting certain provisions which make a report of an act of cruelty against an animal confidential; revising the prohibition against willfully releasing data or information concerning the report so that the prohibition only applies to data or information concerning the identity of the person who makes the report.	Passed
SB21	Prohibits certain licensing agencies from renewing licenses, certifications, registrations, permits or other authorizations that grant a person the authority to engage in certain professions or occupations in this State if: (1) the person owes a debt to a state agency which has been assigned to the State Controller for collection; or (2) the person has not provided to those licensing agencies certain information relating to state business licenses.	
SB83	AN ACT relating to cruelty to animals; increasing the penalties for certain offenses related to the use of an animal or a bird for baiting or fighting; prohibiting a person from manufacturing, owning or possessing a gaff, spur or other sharp implement designed for attachment to a cock or other bird with the intent that it be used in fighting another cock or other bird under certain circumstances; providing penalties.	Passed
SB371	Prohibits a person from intentionally feeding any big game mammal under certain circumstances. (BDR 45-838)	Passed
AB71	AN ACT relating to crimes; revising provisions governing the basis and procedure for determining whether a dog is dangerous or vicious; providing a penalty; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.	Failed
AB250	AN ACT relating to civil liability; providing immunity from civil liability to certain persons for injuries or death resulting from certain risks inherent in equine activities; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.	Failed
SB245	AN ACT relating to animals; authorizing a board of county commissioners to adopt an ordinance regulating the importation, possession, sale, transfer or breeding of captive wild animals; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.	Failed
BDR250	Revised provisions governing euthanization of animals.	Failed

For the final enrolled version of the Bill go to: <http://leg.state.nv.us/Session/27th2013Special/Reports/>

Davyd Pelsue, DVM, MS, DACVS-SA



Dr. Davyd Pelsue grew up in Maine and Vermont, attending the University of Vermont and graduating as a Vermont Scholar. He attended veterinary school at Iowa State University College of Veterinary Medicine in Ames, Iowa graduating in 1997. While in veterinary school he received a Merck Scholarship to study the ability of nutritional supplements to promote cartilage growth for the treatment of osteoarthritis in dogs.

He began his surgical training with a small animal internship at Colorado State University and continued at CSU in a three-year small animal surgical residency program. During his residency, Dr. Pelsue pursued a Masters of Science Degree in clinical sciences with research emphasis on sternal bone healing following sternotomy and changes in gastric blood flow in an experimental model of gastric dilatation-volvulus. He has presented these findings both in literature and national seminars. Dr. Pelsue is board certified in small animal surgery.

He enjoys all aspects of surgery from preoperative diagnostics through postoperative care and rehabilitation. His primary clinical interests are in orthopaedic surgery, arthroscopy, and neurosurgery.

Melissa Chesley-Schalles, LVT



Hello there everyone please let me introduce myself! My name is Melissa Chesley-Schalles and I am the first Licensed Veterinary Technician (LVT) member to be appointed to the Nevada Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners. I am a native to Las Vegas; having attending Rex Bell Elementary, Brinley Junior High and Cimarron-Memorial High School. Upon graduation from high school I attended Colorado State University in Fort Collins, Colorado and obtained my Bachelor's degree in Animal Science. I returned to Las Vegas upon receiving my degree and gained my first employment with a small animal veterinarian in a two doctor practice. I actually worked with the first licensed LVT in Nevada!

After taking a brief intermission from Veterinary medicine to work in Human Resources, I became an LVT at Rainbow Animal Hospital and loved being a member of their team for over 3 years, which is where Dr. Dennis Olsen found me. Since January of 2005 I have been part of the College of Southern Nevada's (CSN) Veterinary Technology Program in one capacity or another. Currently I am the Veterinary Clinic Manager for the CSN on-campus Veterinary Clinic as well as a surgical and anesthetic nurse for Dr. Dennis Olsen, DACVS. While employed at CSN I went back to school and obtained my Master's degree in Educational Leadership and Workforce Education.

In 2000, I married my high school sweetheart, David, who is a proud Sergeant First Class in the Nevada Army National Guard's 77th Sustainment Brigade. I am a very proud military wife having supported my husband and his units during their deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan. In 2006 we adopted our beautiful daughter, Gabriella and could not ask for anything more to make our lives complete. We currently live in Las Vegas with my father Kim, our four horses (Purebred Arabian Geldings, WN Pegasus [31 years old], WN Star Trek [his full brother age 27] and BST Tafyr as well as our miniature horse Knee High Scooter Pie), our two dogs (a Great Dane, Andi and a Border Collie/Healer, Cavalry), our Catalina McCaw (Maggie), and a variety of Koi and Goldfish.

Sherita Rogers



Sherita Rogers was born and raised in Las Vegas, Nevada. She is the youngest of 6 children. Straight out of high school she moved to Reno where she attended the University of Nevada, Reno and obtained a Bachelors Degree in Criminal Justice with a minor in Spanish, and a Masters Degree in Human Development and Family Studies. She has an extensive background in working with at risk youth and families and is currently the Program Manager for the Village of Hope Las Vegas, a non-profit organization that provides after school programming and case management services to needy children and families associated with Whitney Elementary School and The Children's Cabinet.

Sherita loves giving back to her community and believes that her passion for youth and genuine love for people is a gift from God. Her work and volunteerism has helped her to discover her true purpose in life-- encouraging people to succeed despite their adversities. Sherita also loves cooking and baking, arts and crafts, music, dancing, doing anything outdoors, and spending time with family. She is a member of Destiny Christian Center where she met her wonderful husband Christopher. They are new proud parents to one son, Calen Rogers and have 1 dog, a feisty Chiuweenie named Ruby.

Kevin H. Collins, DVM

I feel honored to have been appointed to the Nevada State Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners and I hope I will serve the Board and the community well. I was born and raised in Port Jefferson, N.Y.. My mother told me that I wanted to be a veterinarian since the age of five. She also said she was afraid to tell me that some of those creatures I attempted to heal had passed when I was a younger.

When I was 19 years old a drunk driver hit me head on while I was riding my motorcycle to work. I spent 3 days in a coma, with a fractured wrist, arm, collar-bone and shoulder blade. I also dislocated my right hip and severely damaged my right knee. I was informed at that time that I might not be able to walk and function normally after the accident. I didn't like that statement and became determined to prove that doctor wrong.

I was in a lot of pain and against medical advice I worked out harder than ever which ended in a full recovery 1.5 years later. After a short stay in Los Angeles I decided to join the United States Army where my medical training began in 1984 as a combat medic. I served during Desert Storm with the 410th Evacuation Hospital when my reserve unit was activated. I had completed my undergraduate study at Kansas State University at that time and after spending nine months in Iraq and Kuwait I returned home and was able to attend Kansas State University School of Veterinary of Medicine and graduated in 1995.

I became a Nevada resident immediately after graduation while working as an Associate Veterinarian I was fortunate to meet Dr. Ronald Sandoval who was not only a wonderful employer but also a great mentor. I had decided to buy a veterinary practice that didn't work out and was fortunate that Dr. Ronald Sandoval had a position for me once again. I wasn't happy with my departure after the attempt to purchase the veterinary practice and decided to start K. Collins Inc. working throughout Nevada as a relief veterinarian.

I am currently a Small Animal Associate Veterinarian at Island Pet Hospital and provide mobile veterinary services thru my practice Integrated Veterinary Services. I am a true believer in Traditional Chinese Medicine and am currently working to learn the art of Acupuncture and Herbal therapy. I would like to say that I am not anti Western Medicine since I have healed many of my patients thru out the years with this style of practice. My goal as a veterinarian is an attempt to heal all of my patients and I will do everything in my power to promote health and well being for all animals and the people that care for them.



The New Guy: Being a New Board Member



“Emotions can run high when dealing with loved ones and it is important that we provide the highest standard of care available.”

I, Dr. Kevin H. Collins, am writing this as the rookie joining the Nevada State Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners. I attended my first meeting and would like to say how considerate and helpful all of the board members were in guiding me with the procedures and structure of the meeting.

I have suffered PTSD due to my experiences and duty in the military and I must admit that the dogs and cats that I have rescued have greatly assisted me with my recovery. The human animal bond is very important and each and every patient is valuable to his or her caretakers.

It is our innate responsibility to protect not only the practice of veterinary medicine by implementing standards of care for all of the animals but also guard against abuse.

The Nevada State Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners is responsible for monitoring proposed changes in the current law and drafting new regulations to improve and maintain the integrity of veterinary medicine. We are also responsible for monitoring complaints against veterinarians, veterinary technicians and other people involved in the care of animals.

Each complaint is investigated and after all of the information is reviewed a decision is made on the appropriate response to the complaint.

I feel that most of the complaints against the veterinarian and or hospital were due to miscommunication or lack of communication. I understand how difficult our jobs can be and I also feel that the majority of veterinarians are in

practice for the well being of not only our patients but also our clients.

Emotions can run high when dealing with loved ones and it is important that we provide the highest standard of care available.

The Board is also responsible for licensing the veterinarians and veterinary technicians that practice in Nevada. Each applicant is required to pass an examination and after the initial licensing we are required to attend continuing education in order to renew our license every year.

I graduated from Kansas State University School of Veterinary Medicine in 1995 and feel it is extremely important that we are knowledgeable of current treatment protocols, equipment and medications that are available in order to provide the best care possible.

Hopefully I will be an asset to the NSBVME and the community contributing to the health and welfare of our profession. I appreciate the job that all of our armed services do and wish for all of our soldiers to return home safe and sound to their families.



Thank-You To Our Past-Board Members



The Board and staff would like to thank our past President Richard Simmonds, DVM and Public Member Beverly Willard for their twelve years of leadership, dedication and commitment to this board and the citizens of Nevada.

Thank you to Dr. Mark Iodence and good luck with your radiology residency in Oregon; we will miss you.

Proposed New Regulations RO63-13 dated January 9, 2014

- New or revised definitions: veterinarian dentistry; informed consent; veterinary facility; veterinarian-in-charge; and veterinary specialist
- Revising continuing education requirements for reinstatement of a license and auditing of continuing education
- Requirements for veterinary facilities that board animals
- A fee for a duplicate wall certificate license
- Euthanasia Technician: The storage and security of sodium pentobarbital
- Laser therapy performed by an LVT or unlicensed assistant
- Professional Conduct for veterinary technicians

The detailed language for RO63-13 can either be obtained at www.nvvetboard.us or by calling the Board office.

2013 Disciplinary Cases

Disciplinary Action 2012-2013: Additional information on the individual discipline can be obtained by contacting the Board office. The following is summary of disciplinary action taken by the Board in the past year:

Case #	Area of NV	Violations	Conditions of the Order
WS01-112812 Letter of Reprimand	Las Vegas	(NRS) 638.140(1) (Violation of Regulation) and Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 638.046 (Violation of AVMA Principles/ Principle IIH in Particular) in that when the Licensee learned that the L.V.T. had euthanized the Yorkshire outside the presence of the owners, she was not honest in her communications with the owners which, as she learned, exacerbated an already bad situation.	The Licensee will pay attorney fees, investigative costs, and Board costs of \$400.00.
SN01-043013 Letter of Reprimand	Gardnerville	NAC 638.041 in that the Licensee failed to obtain the required continuing education for 2012.	The Licensee will pay attorney fees, investigative costs, and Board costs of \$200.00. The Licensee's renewal applications shall be audited for the next two renewal periods to assure that she has properly satisfied the continuing education requirements for each of those renewal periods.
AN01-020813 Consent Decree	Reno	NRS 638.140(1) and NAC 638.140(13) (Supervision of Unlicensed Personnel) NAC 638.0475 (Medical Records) 638.0604 (Failure to Meet Minimum Standards for Veterinary Facility).	The Licensee and the facility will jointly and severally pay attorney fees, investigative costs, and Board costs of \$400.00. The Licensees shall provide to the Board's office a copy of new policies and procedures relating to the boarding of animals at the facility which shall, at a minimum: (a) define and describe in lay terms a list of symptoms and behaviors for which kennel assistants must trained to observe and upon which they must report; and (2) require that when a kennel assistant has observed symptoms or behaviors on the list created by the Licensee or which otherwise concern the kennel assistant, the kennel assistant shall immediately communicate those concerns directly to the veterinarian on duty or on call.
AS02-091712 Letter of Reprimand	Las Vegas	(NAC) 638.045(2) (Negligence) and 638.0475 (Medical Records). In particular, the Licensee failed to remove the Labrador's bandage during his initial physical examination, failed to adequately consider and document potential differential diagnoses, and prescribed furosemide for edema. Additionally, the Licensee's records regarding his examination and treatment of the Labrador did not meet the standards required in NAC 638.0475.	The Licensee will pay attorney fees, investigative costs, and Board costs of \$400.00 and a fine of \$200.00.. The Licensee will take and successfully complete four hours of continuing education, two hours of which must relate to proper making of medical records and two hours of which must relate to wound care.

Disciplinary Action 2012-2013: Additional information on the individual discipline can be obtained by contacting the Board office. The following is summary of disciplinary action taken by the Board in the past year:

QN01-110112 Consent Decree	Reno	(NRS) 638.140(6) and (NAC) 638.045(2). The Licensee's treatment of the dog was negligent because: (a) The Licensee did not repeat or validate the grossly abnormal blood work results; (b) The Licensee lacked adequate diagnostic indicators to support his diagnosis and course of treatment for the dog's heart abnormalities; (c) Some of the drugs prescribed by The Licensee to address the heart condition he diagnosed were inappropriate even for the diagnosis he made; (d) The Licensee obtained only one view in the only radiographs he created where the standard of care is to obtain at least two views; and (e) The Licensee did not ever seek diagnostics additional to the insufficient diagnostics obtained on May 18, 2012.	The Licensee shall pay the Board's attorney fees and investigative costs of \$400.00. The Licensee shall satisfactorily complete twelve hours of continuing education specifically regarding canine heart disease and radiological interpretation.
PS01-103012 Letter of Reprimand	Las Vegas	(NRS) 638.140(1) and (NAC) 638.057(1)(e) (2) (Veterinarian Responsible for Assuring Licensed Personnel Perform Certain Acts) in that the Licensee and the facility directed and authorized unlicensed personnel to twice place intravenous catheters in the presence of a Board inspector where the placing of intravenous catheters is a duty reserved to licensed veterinary technicians.	The Licensee and the facility will jointly or severally pay attorney fees, investigative costs, and Board costs of \$400.00. The Licensee and the facility shall assure that no unlicensed personnel will ever again be directed to, authorized to, or allowed to perform any tasks for which licensure as a licensed veterinary technician or as a licensed veterinarian is required.
MS01-091012 Letter of Reprimand	Las Vegas	(NRS) 638.140(6) (Negligence) and Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 638.045(2) (Negligence) in that The Licensee's examination of the dog showed a departure from the standard of care in two ways: (1) The Licensee did not stabilize the pug pre-operatively, and (2) the dog was not sufficiently stable to be released to the owner's care, therefore The Licensee should have insisted on postoperative monitoring at an overnight facility. While the Board acknowledges that the Licensee was constrained by the financial capabilities of the pug's owners, the Board has consistently held that the standard of care always applies even where financial issues are involved in the care of the animal. Once a veterinarian has undertaken care of an animal, the veterinarian must deliver the standard of care regardless of financial considerations or must suggest other humane courses if the financial considerations prevent the delivery of the standard of care.	The Licensee will pay attorney fees and investigative and Board costs of \$400.00.

Disciplinary Action 2012-2013: Additional information on the individual discipline can be obtained by contacting the Board office. The following is summary of disciplinary action taken by the Board in the past year:

<p>CN01-120111 Letter of Reprimand</p>	<p>Carson City</p>	<p>(NAC) 638.045(2). The Licensee saw the cat in an after-hours critical care capacity, and the standard of care where the working diagnosis was FUS would be that the Licensee offer treatment for pain in the overnight care of the cat until the owner could take the cat to its regular veterinarian for a continuation of care. The Licensee's failure to offer such care fell below the standard of care.</p>	<p>The Licensee will pay attorney fees, investigative costs, and Board costs of \$400.00.</p> <p>The Licensee will take and complete two hours of continuing education regarding the current diagnosis and treatment of FUS in cats.</p>
<p>HO01-053013 Letter of Reprimand</p>	<p>Out of State</p>	<p>NAC 638.041 in that the Licensee failed to obtain the required continuing education for 2012.</p>	<p>The Licensee shall provide to the Board written proof of the satisfactory completion of twenty hours of continuing education by September 30, 2013.</p> <p>The Licensee shall be audited for the next three renewal periods and will be required to provide supporting documentation proving that she has satisfied the continuing education requirements for each of those renewal periods.</p> <p>The Licensee will pay attorney fees, investigative costs, and Board costs of \$400.00 and a fine of \$250.00, for a total due of \$650.00.</p>
<p>GS02-102212 Consent Decree</p>	<p>Las Vegas</p>	<p>NAC 638.045(2)The Licensee was negligent because he administered Depo-Medrol and Rimadyl in combination to a post-gastrotomy patient, which combination is contraindicated and below the standard of care.</p>	<p>The licensee had forfeited his license pursuant to NRS 638.127(4) because it was not timely renewed. The licensee voluntarily agreed never to renew or reinstate his Nevada license. The Licensee understands and acknowledges that by agreeing not to renew his license he may not practice veterinary medicine in Nevada and that his license will permanently lapse as of January 1, 2014.</p>
<p>GS02-051012 Letter of Reprimand</p>	<p>Las Vegas</p>	<p>(NAC) 638.0475 because the medical records were incomplete. In particular, the Board finds that the Licensee's records lacked monitoring of the urinary output or the content of the urine, lacked any recording of the dog's hydration status, and lacked record of volume and route of fluid administration of a dog that was, at the time, critical. Additionally, the investigation showed the Licensee's practice lacked the requisite notification that there would be no employee present overnight and that animals left with the practice would be unattended, thus violating NRS 638.140(1) and NAC 638.0655.</p>	<p>The Licensee will pay attorney fees, investigative costs, and Board costs of \$400.00.</p> <p>The Licensee will take and successfully complete three hours of continuing education in the treatment of diabetic dogs, proof of which must be provided to the Board's office within 90 days of the date of the Board's approval of this Letter of Reprimand.</p>

Disciplinary Action 2012-2013: Additional information on the individual discipline can be obtained by contacting the Board office. The following is summary of disciplinary action taken by the Board in the past year:

HS01-122612 Consent Decree	Pahrump	<p>NAC 638.045(2), negligence because he showed in his records and charged the dog's owner for the extraction of the dog's damaged right lower canine where, in fact, he did not perform such an extraction.</p> <p>NAC 638.0475, medical recordkeeping was below the standards required of Nevada veterinarians.</p> <p>NAC 638.045(3), incompetence because the pre-surgical blood work showed significant abnormalities about which there is not evidence that they were considered in relation to the impending surgery.</p>	<p>The Licensee shall pay the Board's attorney fees and investigative costs of \$400.00.</p> <p>The Licensee shall satisfactorily complete twelve hours of continuing education specifically regarding internal medicine and the use and evaluation of clinical laboratory work. The Licensee shall satisfactorily complete six hours of continuing education specifically regarding medical records.</p>
BS01-051112 Letter of Reprimand	Las Vegas	<p>Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 638.041 in that the Licensee has provided no evidence of completion of two of her requisite continuing education units for her 2012 renewal.</p>	<p>The Licensee will pay attorney fees, investigative costs, and Board costs of \$250.00.</p> <p>The Licensee shall provide to the Board written evidence of the satisfactory completion of two hours of continuing education by December 31, 2012. Neither of these two hours of continuing education may be counted towards the Licensee's ten hours of continuing education that would otherwise be required for her 2013 renewal.</p> <p>The Licensee's renewal applications shall be audited for the next two renewals to assure that she has properly satisfied the continuing education requirements for each of those renewal periods.</p>
FS01-042213 Letter of Reprimand	Boulder City	<p>NAC 638.045(2), Negligence in that the Licensee continued to perform and then completed an elective dental procedure despite the dog having critically low SPO2 readings (low oxygen levels in the bloodstream). He did not provide urgent intervention to substantiate the readings and treat the patient accordingly.</p>	<p>The Licensee shall pay the Board's attorney fees and investigative costs of \$400.00.</p>
PRO2-060912 Letter of Reprimand		<p>(NRS) 638.140(1) and (NAC) 639.0625(2). The Licensee's facility did not have the capacity to perform an adequate diagnostic radiological series in the facility or through another commercial facility.</p>	<p>The Licensee will pay attorney fees, investigative costs, and Board costs of \$400.00.</p> <p>The Licensee shall provide evidence that her practice complies with NAC 638.0625(2) within 30 days of the date of the Board's approval of this Letter of Reprimand.</p>

Disciplinary Action 2012-2013: Additional information on the individual discipline can be obtained by contacting the Board office. The following is summary of disciplinary action taken by the Board in the past year:

<p>FS02-102912 Letter of Reprimand</p>	<p>Las Vegas</p>	<p>Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 638.045(2), Negligence and 638.046 (V) (A) (Violation of AVMA Principles of Medical Ethics) in that the Licensee's lack of communication to Animal Control regarding the seriousness of the dogs condition and failing to make any recommendations regarding further treatment, diagnostic tests, or the possibility of euthanasia showed a departure from the standard of care for a dog presenting in a unstable condition, despite any limiting contractual agreements or owner notification constitutes negligence.</p>	<p>Pay attorney fees and investigative and board costs of \$400.00.</p>
<p>CR13-1646 Unlicensed Activity</p>		<p>Felony offense of Practicing Veterinary Medicine Without a License, in violation of NRS 638.090 as defined by NRS 638.008.</p>	<p>In exchange for my plea of guilty, the State, my counsel and I (<i>the unlicensed person</i>) have agreed to the following: the State will affirmatively recommend probation. After one year, the State will allow me to withdraw my plea to the felony charge and plead guilty to a gross misdemeanor contingent on certain conditions. During the first year, I may not be involved in any professional or volunteer capacity working in any facility which provides, in any way, for the housing, care, adoption, and/or medical treatment of animals. Additionally, I will be required to pay a minimum \$1000 towards a total of \$3000 in investigative fees. I must also abide by all of the rules mandated by the Division of Parole and Probation.</p> <p>If I am successful during the first year of probation, and pay only a portion of the \$3000 investigative costs, I will remain on probation for a two year period following my plea to a gross misdemeanor. During this time, I will be required to pay the remaining \$2000 in investigative costs and will be prohibited from working with animals as described above.</p> <p>If I pay the entire \$3000 during the first year and abide by all of the other conditions, the state will recommend time served following my plea to a gross misdemeanor.</p>

Disciplinary Action 2012-2013: Additional information on the individual discipline can be obtained by contacting the Board office. The following is summary of disciplinary action taken by the Board in the past year:

<p>BS01-051912 Letter of Reprimand</p>	<p>Las Vegas</p>	<p>Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 638.045(3) in that the Licensee's examination of the dog showed a lack of knowledge, skill, or ability, namely that the Licensee did not utilize fluorescein stain where such staining is necessary to perform the examination sought by the owner.</p>	<p>The Licensee will pay attorney fees, investigative costs, and Board costs of \$400.00. The Licensee will take and successfully complete four hours of continuing education in the diagnosis and treatment dogs for ophthalmic disease which continuing education should include, if possible observation with a board-certified ophthalmologist for part or all of the continuing education</p>
<p>BS01-071013 Consent Decree</p>	<p>Las Vegas</p>	<p>In providing chiropractic treatments to animals without a referral by or under the direction of a Nevada veterinarian who had established a valid veterinarian-client-patient relationship, The Licensee violated Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 638.840(1) and 638.830(1)(a). By failing to provide medical records related to her chiropractic care of animals to the veterinarians under whose direction the Licensee performed the animal chiropractic, The Licensee violated NAC 638.840(1) and 638.830(3)(b) and (c).</p>	<p>The Licensee shall pay the Board's attorney fees and investigative costs of \$800.00. The Licensee's animal chiropractic certificate of registration shall be placed upon probation for a period of one year subject to the following terms and conditions: (a) The Licensee shall notify in writing each and every of the owners of the animals that she has been treating that she cannot treat their animals until they have established a valid veterinarian-owner-patient relationship with a veterinarian and that the veterinarian has referred to and directed the Licensee to provide animal chiropractic to the animals. The Licensee shall provide to the Board's office a copy of the notification she has provided to the owners. b) Each month of the probationary period, the Licensee shall provide to the Board's office by the fifth day of each month a list of the animals to which she provided chiropractic services the preceding month. Upon receiving the list, the Board shall notify the Licensee the names of two animals from the list for which the Licensee will thereafter provide copies of the medical records. The Board's staff shall review the provided medical records to assure compliance. The Board's staff shall notify the Licensee in writing of whether it has determined that the records indicate compliance or non-compliance with NAC 638.830. (c) At least once during the probationary period, the Board's staff shall visit the Licensee's practice to perform an inspection of the facility in which she is performing animal chiropractic.</p>