

Memorandum**AGENDA ITEM 16C**

To: Renée Threadgill, Chief of Enforcement
Medical Board of California

Date: October 1, 2008

From: Susan Goetzinger
Expert Reviewer Program

Subject: Results of the Expert Survey Questionnaires

Questionnaires Sent this quarter (July 1-September 30, 2008)	47
Feedback Received from the questionnaires sent this 3 rd quarter	28 (60%)
Total Feedback Received for this 3 rd quarter's report	35

Questions 1-9, *positive response*: Yes
 Question 10, *positive response*: No
 Questions 11, *positive response*: Yes
 Question 12, *positive response*: Yes or No
 Questions 13-15, *positive response*: Yes

1	Were you provided sufficient information/evidence to allow you to render a medical opinion?	97 percent YES 3 percent did not respond
2	Were you encouraged to render an unbiased opinion?	100 percent YES
3	Was the case directly related to your field of expertise?	100 percent YES
4	Were you given sufficient time to review the case? If not, how much time would have been appropriate for this review?	97 percent YES 3 percent NO
5	Did the MBC staff meet your expectations to provide you with what you needed to complete your review? If no, what should have been provided to facilitate your review?	94 percent YES 3 percent NO 3 percent did not respond
6	Did the training material provided to you (the Expert Reviewer Guidelines and videotape/DVD) give you adequate information to perform your case review?	97 percent YES 3 percent responded N/A
7	Were you given clear, concise, and easy to follow instructions throughout the process?	91 percent YES 3 percent NO 6 percent responded N/A
8	Was the investigator and/or MBC staff readily available to answer questions or concerns about the case?	97 percent YES 3 percent responded N/A
9	Is the required written report adequate to cover all aspects of your opinion?	97 percent YES 3 percent NO
10	Do you feel the MBC has requested your services more frequently than you would prefer?	97 percent NO 3 percent YES

11	Would you be willing to accept more MBC cases for review?	100 percent YES
12	Did this case go to hearing? If the answer is no (skip 13 & 14) go to question 15.	94 percent NO 6 percent YES
13	If you were required to testify, was the Deputy Attorney General readily available to answer questions and provide direction?	100 percent YES
14	Did the Deputy Attorney General or his/her representative meet your expectations to provide you with what you needed prior to testifying? If no, what would have made testifying for the Board easier?	100 percent YES
15	Do you feel the reimbursement amount for case review is appropriate for the work you are required to perform?	63 percent YES 37 percent NO
<i>Level of satisfaction with overall experience performing case reviews for MBC</i>		85 percent HIGH 9 percent AVERAGE 6 percent did not respond

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT TO THE PROGRAM

I will get a call to possibly review a case and the investigator does not know enough of the details about the case for me to determine if I am qualified to review the case.

Investigators will call me about a case, I will ask for more information or clarification and then I may never hear back or it may take weeks for a response.

Investigators will call me about a case, I will agree to do the case as I have the time to do the review. The case may take 2-3 months to arrive and by which point I may not have the time to do the review.

Maybe increasing the hourly rate in the future.

Ability to request/receive more documents during review period or as a follow-up (e.g. in a case I just reviewed, certain periods of time were missing from records-helpful if these were made available or explanation given as to why not).

In a controlled substance prescribing case, pharmacy records from known locations used by MD/patient are very helpful because CURES is often very incomplete.

More secure shipping of records (mine arrived in ripped open envelope). Provide return envelope with prepaid shipping.

I would like follow-up - how did the case turn out? I think follow-up should be part of the process re-case outcome.

Make CDs Mac-compatible

Consider online (internet based review) rather than by mail correspondence.

COMMENTS REGARDING REIMBURSEMENTS

I have performed similar case reviews for managed care & insurance companies for \$300/hour. I agreed to \$150/hour for "civic responsibility."

I get \$300/hr for private reviews/cases, but \$150/hr is better than what it used to be.

I enjoy doing this and would even be available if a med reviewer were necessary on a more regular basis.

If possible increase reimbursement as rates are quite low compared to market rates.

Your rate of \$150 per hour is low compared to my usual fee for case reviews.

\$150/hr is well less than the rate for comparable work in the med-legal personal injury arena. However the MBC work is critically important to patient care and the medical profession, so I'll continue.

\$150/hr is okay. I receive double that for privately requested cases. Still have not been paid - that could be more prompt.

\$150/hr far below standard expert rates. Willing to review more cases.

Payment is low but then again, it is an important function for Society.

Reimbursement not in line with other medico-legal fees.

Reviews take a lot of time to do correctly and reimbursement is low considering the training and expertise of the reviewers (vs. \$450/hr attorneys charge). But I am willing to do reviews for the sake of medicine and because I find the process interesting and challenging.

GENERAL COMMENTS

There are many variables involved in psychiatric treatment and only a few issues are subject to "Standard of Care" whereas many treatment & diagnostic decisions are more controversial or so rare as not to easily be categorized as a "Standard of Care" but more aptly referred to as "preferred practice."

If I am considered as a possible expert in the future, I will not charge for Advice to one who is about to interview or cross examine the DR. to emphasize the most valuable things to ASK.

I was happy to be of help to the Medical Board of CA. I await the next case. I am being under utilized or requested too few times.

I am available any time the Board needs my services to review additional cases.

Memo to Renée Threadgill, Chief of Enforcement

Re: Survey Feedback (3rd Quarter/July 1-September 30, 2008)

Page: 4

Regarding report format, Consider requiring references.

Good program.

My first case was very dense and complicated, took a lot of time to review, also had many + multiple issues that needed documentation and commenting, as well as researching for references. Case took a lot of time to complete to the satisfaction of investigator, but was only compensated for some portion of time spent. There was no doubt that I spent a lot of time on case given finished product, but still not compensated appropriately.

Overall, I very much enjoyed this work and would like to participate more in the future. It's likely that future cases will not be so time-intensive.

Everyone was very helpful and timely in responding to any questions or issues.

I have always found working as a Medical Board Expert Reviewer to be an excellent learning experience. It helps to keep me focused and grounded as a clinician and (medical student/resident/fellow) teacher.

This was my first review. My contact with the Board (Chris Figueroa) was excellent. I appreciated his help and thoroughness, which made it easy for me to review the case.

CASES BY SPECIALTY SENT FOR REVIEW
USE OF EXPERTS BY SPECIALTY
ACTIVE LIST EXPERTS BY SPECIALTY
Calendar Year 2008

SPECIALTY	Number of cases reviewed/sent to Experts Jan-Sep 2008	Number of Experts used and how often utilized Jan-Sep 2008	Active List Experts Y-T-D (TOTAL= 1,150 ↓)
ADDICTION	3	1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 2 CASES	11
AEROSPACE MEDICINE			1
ALLERGY & IMMUNOLOGY	2	1 LIST EXPERT	10
ANESTHESIOLOGY	18	7 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 2 CASES 3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 3 CASES	91 ↑
BIOETHICS			1
COLON & RECTAL SURGERY	2	1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 2 CASES	5
COMPLEMENTARY/ALTERNATIVE MEDICINE	2	1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 2 CASES	14 ↑
CORRECTIONAL MEDICINE	7	5 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 2 CASES	11
DERMATOLOGY	8	2 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 2 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 3 CASES	12
EMERGENCY	20	14 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES	60 ↓
ETHICS	1	1 LIST EXPERT	2
FAMILY	47	32 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 7 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 3 CASES	94 ↓
HAND SURGERY	1	1 LIST EXPERT	6
HOSPICE & PALLIATIVE CARE	1	1 LIST EXPERT	6 ↓
INTERNAL General Internal Med & sub-specialties not listed below	45	27 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 3 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 4 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 5 CASES	229 ↓
INTERNAL - CARDIOLOGY Interventional Cardiology	13 [6]	10 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 OUTSIDE EXPERT REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 2 CASES	35 [20 ↓]
INTERNAL-ENDOCRINOLOGY & METABOLISM			8
INTERNAL - GASTROENTEROLOGY	4	4 LIST EXPERTS	17 ↓
INTERNAL -INFECTIOUS DISEASES			10
INTERNAL - NEPHROLOGY			8
INTERNAL - ONCOLOGY			14 ↑
MEDICAL GENETICS			1
MIDWIFE	1	1 LIST EXPERT	12

**CASES BY SPECIALTY SENT FOR REVIEW
 USE OF EXPERTS BY SPECIALTY
 ACTIVE LIST EXPERTS BY SPECIALTY
 (CALENDAR YEAR TO DATE: JAN - SEP 2008)**

Page 2

NEUROLOGICAL SURGERY	10	1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 OUTSIDE EXPERT REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 2 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 6 CASES	15
NEUROLOGY	4	2 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 2 CASES	20
NEUROLOGY (CHILD)			5
OBSTETRICS & GYNECOLOGY	42	11 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 6 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES 3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 3 CASES 2 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 5 CASES	85 ↓
REPRODUCTIVE ENDOCRINOLOGY & INFERTILITY			6
OCCUPATIONAL MEDICINE	1	1 LIST EXPERT	7 ↓
OPHTHALMOLOGY	15	6 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 9 CASES	45 ↓
ORAL & MAXILLOFACIAL SURGERY			1
ORTHOPAEDIC SURGERY	24	11 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 3 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 4 CASES	48 ↓
OTOLARYNGOLOGY	5	1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 4 CASES	32 ↓
PAIN MEDICINE	16	3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 2 CASES 2 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 3 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 5 CASES	26
PATHOLOGY	3	1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 2 CASES	13
PEDIATRICS	2	2 LIST EXPERTS	62 ↓
PEDIATRIC CARDIOLOGY	1	1 LIST EXPERT	5
PEDIATRIC CARDIOTHORACIC SURGERY	1	1 LIST EXPERT	2
PEDIATRIC HEMATOLOGY/ONCOLOGY			5
PEDIATRIC INFECTIOUS DISEASES (BOARD CERTIFIED)			3
PEDIATRIC SURGERY			4
PHYSICAL MEDICINE & REHABILITATION			9
PLASTIC SURGERY	24	7 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 4 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 4 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 5 CASES	52 ↓
PSYCHIATRY	50	16 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 6 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES 5 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 3 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 7 CASES	106 ↓
PUBLIC HEALTH & GENERAL PREVENTIVE MEDICINE			6

**CASES BY SPECIALTY SENT FOR REVIEW
 USE OF EXPERTS BY SPECIALTY
 ACTIVE LIST EXPERTS BY SPECIALTY
 (CALENDAR YEAR TO DATE: JAN - SEP 2008)**

Page 3

<u>RADIOLOGY</u>	15	4 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 5 CASES	35
VASCULAR/INTERVENTIONAL RADIOLOGY (Board Certified)			2
RADIATION ONCOLOGY -4 / THERAPEUTIC RADIOLOGY -3			7
SLEEP MEDICINE			8
SPINE SURGERY (ABSS-MBC APPROVED)			1
SURGERY	17	11 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES	58 ↓
THORACIC SURGERY	6	4 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 2 CASES	21 ↑
VASCULAR SURGERY	1	1 LIST EXPERT	6
UROLOGY	5	3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 2 CASES	16 ↓
WORKERS' COMP/QME/IME			12 ↑

/susan (10/1/08)