

Synopsis for the period ending February 28, 2008

1. *Standards of Practice (fitting contact lens):* A registrant duplicated a contact lens prescription from eyeglasses without a prescription or an automated refraction. A member of the public complained about this practice. The Committee warned the registrant that a prescription needs to be obtained before fitting contact lenses and an appropriate response has been forwarded to the member of the public in regards to her concerns. The Committee considers this matter closed.
2. *Health Professions Act (advertisement and right to title):* An optical retailer used the title “opticianry” in their retail sign. Section 13 (4) of the Health Professions Act prohibits a person other than a registrant from using a name, title description or abbreviation in a manner that expresses or implies that the person is a registrant or associated with the College of Opticians of British Columbia. This retailer has been asked to register and take their sign down. The store has since removed references to the title of “Optician” in their communications and signage. The Registrar will continue to monitor the use of title.
3. *Standards of Practice (eyeglasses):* A complaint was received from a member of public about the quality of a pair of eyeglasses dispensed to her by a registrant. A refund has been issued to the member of the public. The Committee considered the matter closed.
4. *Standards of Practice (eyeglasses):* A complaint was forwarded by the Board of Examiners in Optometry to the COBC. A member of the public was unsatisfied with a pair of eyeglasses dispensed by a registrant. The registrant provided the member of the public with a refund. The Committee considered the matter closed.
5. *Standards of Practice (automated refraction):* A member of the public complained that she paid for an automated refraction, but the results of the automated refraction were not released to her. The Committee directed the registrant to issue a refund to the member of the public for the automated refraction and to remove “Rx” from all automated refraction results. The Committee considered the matter closed.
6. *Professional Standards of Practice (eyeglasses):* A complaint was received from a member of public that she could not see properly through a pair of progressive eyeglasses dispensed by a registrant. After a copy of the complainant’s letter was forward to the registrant, the registrant provided a refund to the member of the public. The member of the public’s husband wrote a thank you letter to the College. The committee considers this matter closed.
7. *Professional Standards of Practice (eyeglasses):* A complaint was received from a member of public that he could not see properly from a pair of temporary eyeglasses dispensed by a registrant and that the pair of eyeglasses had visible gaps and grind marks. A member of the committee inspected the eyeglasses and found large gaps. The eyeglasses were returned to the registrant to fix. The registrant fixed the gaps. The member of public expected the lenses to be re-made but a member of the committee verified that the eyeglasses are functional and suited to correct the member of the public’s vision. The Registrar has contacted the member of public and explained to him that his eyeglasses are functional and is suited to correct his vision. The Committee considers this matter closed.

Synopsis for the period ending June 23, 2008

1. *Standards of Practice (eyeglasses)*: A complaint was received from a member of public regarding the progressive lenses filled by a registrant. After four tries, the member of the public was still unsatisfied with the lenses and demanded a refund. The Registrar resolved this issue between the complainant and the registrant. The Committee considers this matter closed.
2. *Standards of Practice (eyeglasses)*: A complaint was received from a member of public regarding lenses filled by a registrant. The member of the public tried several times to remedy the situation with the registrant but no satisfactory remedy was provided because the registrant was reluctant to fix the glasses properly. The College directed the member of the public to go to another registrant for a second opinion of the glasses and the other registrant reported his opinion back to the College. The member of the public received new glasses made from the other registrant and resolved the issue with the original registrant. The Committee recommended a disposition to create a permanent record regarding the registrant reluctance to cooperate with the College. This record may be used as a basis for future decisions. The Committee considers this matter closed.

Synopsis for the period ending October 28, 2008

1. *Standards of Practice (eyeglasses)*: There was a miscommunication between the member of public and the registrant. The member of public decided not pursue further with the complaint. The Committee considers this matter closed.
2. *Standards of Practice (eyeglasses)*: There was a miscommunication about the mailing address of where a pair of eyeglasses was to be sent, and this resulted in a shipping delay for the member of public. Better communication was mediated by the College and the patient received the eyeglasses. The Committee considers this matter closed.
3. *Standards of Practice (eyeglasses)*: There was a series of delays for the member of public to receive her eyeglasses. The member of public filed a complaint but received her eyeglasses shortly after and decided not pursue further with the complaint. The Committee considers this matter closed.
4. *Standards of Practice (eyeglasses)*: A member of public received her prescriptions from an optometrist. The registrant dispensed a pair of eyeglasses to the member of public using the first prescription. The member of public received the eyeglasses and realized that she could not see clearly. The member of public returned to the optometrist and received a second prescription. The optometrist explained that changes to the prescription were caused by the patient's wear of rigid contact lenses. The optometrist provided two prescriptions in total: the first prescription is different from the second prescription. The member of public returned with the second prescription and asked the registered optician to remake the lenses based on the second prescription without additional charges. The registrant offered to replace the eyeglasses at cost. The Committee is satisfied with the resolution. The rationale was explained to the patient. The Committee considers this matter closed.