



MEMORANDUM

DATE	April 1, 2026
TO	Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee (MDC)
FROM	<u>Enforcement Subcommittee (Subcommittee)</u> Jeni Goedken, DVM Cheryl Waterhouse, DVM
SUBJECT	Agenda Item 7. Update and Discussion from the Enforcement Subcommittee

Consultant and Subject Matter Expert Roundtables

Background: The California Veterinary Medical Board (Board) utilizes Consultant Veterinarians (Consultants) to perform an initial evaluation of a case file to determine whether there exists a potential departure from the standard of care; if this is the case, it is then forwarded to a Subject Matter Expert (Expert) to perform a full written review. Round Table meetings are held to give Consultants and Experts an opportunity to address any questions/issues discovered during the review process as well as to go over Standard of Care scenarios.

Since the last quarterly Board meeting report, the Board added one Consultant to its team, bringing its total to six Consultants to initially filter cases. In addition, the Board added three new Experts over that same period, two of which are general practitioners and one of which is a specialist. In total, the Board is sitting at 56 contracted Experts, consisting of 36 general practitioners and 20 specialists, with ten additional Experts that are in the contracting/vetting process. However, it should be noted that ten of our contracted Experts are unavailable to review cases at this moment.

Case Reviews

As indicated in Attachment 1, from July 2025 through March 2026 (current Fiscal Year (FY)), Consultants reviewed 553 cases, of which 301 were determined to be no violation; 21 were found to be educational opportunities; 20 had insufficient evidence; and 211 (38% of cases reviewed) were determined to need a full Expert review. This means Board Consultants resolved 62% of the standard of care cases without the need for a full Expert review/report.

In that same timeframe, the Board closed 202 cases involving an Expert review, with 84 closed as no violation; 66 closed with an educational letter; 40 closed due to insufficient evidence/other; three citations; and 9 disciplinary actions. Based on this data, around 94% of cases closed involving an Expert review did not result in a citation or discipline against an individual Respondent.

The average number of cases reviewed monthly by Experts this FY is around 22 cases, which is slightly down from the average of 25 over the prior FY. Similarly, the average number of cases reviewed by Consultants is 61, which is slightly down from the prior FY's average of 65 cases. The number of cases pending Expert review rose slightly from the prior meeting, coming in at 607 cases against 429 Respondents. As mentioned during the prior meetings, Board staff is proactively requesting records for all complaints as they are submitted, resulting in a steady increase in the number of cases pending Consultant review (now at 1,469 against 1,214 Respondents). This number will continue to rise, as staff continue to request records for all standard of care complaints, which are then added to the Consultant queue.

*Please note that these numbers may differ from the prior report as it was previously duplicating some case numbers in the data. In addition, only the main case out of a group of cases was placed into the citation/discipline sections, while the consolidated cases of that group were added to the "other" category.

Round Tables

Round Tables were held on February 25, 2026, for Consultants and February 26, 2026, for Experts. The Consultant Round Table had all six Consultants in attendance, and the Expert Round Table had 16 (not including the Consultants). Beyond some hypothetical standard of care scenarios, a variety of review points were covered, including:

- Explaining why a Respondent's rebuttal to a potential violation doesn't change the opinion of the Expert.
- Covering in the findings whether an action of failure to do an action led to the negative outcome – especially death.
- Touching on a sample document showing differences between passive and active voice in writing.
- Avoiding using the title of "Board Expert" inappropriately.
- Not using "gold standard" and sticking to the standard of care.
- Restating that any standard of care departures found should be noted in the report.
- Not providing a subjective opinion of the Respondent.
- Timely response when it comes to reports and response reviews.

Post-Discipline Expert Reviews and Feedback

Due to the lack of public enforcement cases finalized since the prior Board meeting involving a current Expert, no cases were reviewed by the Subcommittee. However, Expert report reviews will continue to be done, provided there are finalized cases from active Experts for the Subcommittee to review.

Attachment

1. Reviews and Inspections Performed

Case Reviews

		Consultant Reviews Completed 2025									
	FY 24/25	July	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Total
Reviews	789	96	72	38	62	67	62	67	44	45	553
No Violation	422	55	39	20	33	45	32	37	15	25	301
Insufficient	26	0	3	3	6	0	2	5	1	0	20
Educational	14	1	6	3	3	1	2	3	1	1	21
Referred to Expert	327	40	24	12	20	21	26	22	27	19	211
Pending	~920 (694)	-	798 (663)	913 (763)	1126 (943)	1193 (1007)	1287 (1083)	1359 (1131)	1444 (1194)	1469 (1214)	1469 (1214)
		Cases Closed via Expert Review FY 25/26									
	FY 24/25	July	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Total
Reviews	300	29	20	24	19	21	21	23	20	25	202
No Violation	130	8	6	8	6	16	9	8	11	12	84
Insufficient/ Other	42	7	0	13	5	3	6	5	0	1	40
Educational	109	12	12	1	7	1	5	9	8	11	66
Citation	10	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	3
Discipline	9	2	2	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	9
Pending	~671 (458)	-	633 (429)	-	628 (431)	623 (430)		567 (395)	607 (430)	607 (429)	607 (429)

*Parenthesis indicates number of Respondents

Inspections Performed

FY 24/25		FY 25/26									
Month	Total	July	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Total
Inspections	203	16	27	15	26	23	16	19	13	35	190