State of California Department of Consumer Affairs

Memorandum

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

Date: January 1, 2009

From: Susan Goetzinger
Expert Reviewer Program

Subject: Results of the Expert Survey Questionnaires

Questionnaires Sent this 4th quarter (Oct-Dec 2008)	27
Feedback Received from the questionnaires sent this quarter	19 (70%)
Total Feedback Received for this quarter's report	22

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

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.	27 percent YES 73 percent NO
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?	83 percent YES 17 percent NO
15	Do you feel the reimbursement amount for case review is appropriate for the work you are required to perform?	59 percent YES 23percent NO 18 percent did not respond
Level of satisfaction with overall experience performing case reviews for MBC		82 percent HIGH 6 percent AVERAGE 12 percent did not respond

GENERAL COMMENTS

The whole process (preparation and testimony) was smooth and efficient (with DAG J Simon). Nicely done.
David Carr (DAG) was very informative and highly professional in assisting me. He did an excellent job.
Why not ask reviewers for recommendations regarding the need for medical information update in specific cases - i.e., in what subjects the reviewed MD appears deficient. Focus the remedy.
Excellent hearing preparation. (DAG Thorpe)
Process went smoothly. No suggestions at this time. Perhaps easier access to investigator and/or medical consultants for questions would be good. However, given state budget cuts this is lower priority.
Michael Cochrane (DAG) was a pleasure to work with and was considerate of my time and informative re- the case.
Would be happy to review more cases. I am honored to be a Medical Expert reviewer. I have enjoyed working on the cases and have gotten to know many of the investigators. I hope my work and reports have been of good value to the MBC & the people of the State. I look forward to a mutually rewarding year in 2009. Thank you.
I think the cases I've reviewed have been worthy & well handled by MBC staff.
Senior Investigator Veronica Alva was very helpful, knowledgeable and very competent.

CASES BY SPECIALTY SENT FOR REVIEW
USE OF EXPERTS BY SPECIALTY
ACTIVE LIST EXPERTS BY SPECIALTY

Calendar Year (JAN-DEC 2008)

SPECIALTY	Number of cases reviewed/sent to Experts	Number of Experts used and how often utilized	Active List Experts Y-T-D (TOTAL= 1,146 ↓)
ADDICTION	5	3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 2 CASES	11
AEROSPACE MEDICINE			1
ALLERGY & IMMUNOLOGY	1	LIST EXPERT	10
ANESTHESIOLOGY	17	8 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 2 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 3 CASES 2 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 4 CASES [1]	92 ↑
COLON & RECTAL SURGERY	3	1 LIST EXPERT	5
COMPLEMENTARY/ALTERNATIVE MEDICINE	4	1 LIST EXPERT	14
CORRECTIONAL MEDICINE	7	2 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 3 CASES	12 ↑
DERMATOLOGY	9	3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 2 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 3 CASES	12
EMERGENCY	25	17 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 4 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES	59 ↓
ETHICS	1	LIST EXPERT	2
FAMILY	70	28 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 12 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES 2 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 3 CASES 3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 4 CASES	96 ↑
HOSPICE & PALLIATIVE CARE			7 ↑
INTERNAL General Internal Med & sub-specialties not listed below	67	39 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 7 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES 3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 3 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 5 CASES [2]	227 ↓
CARDIOLOGY Interventional Cardiology	16	9 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 OUTSIDE EXPERT REVIEWED 1 CASE 3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES	35 [20]
ENDOCRINOLOGY & METABOLISM			8
GASTROENTEROLOGY	7	5 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 2 CASES	18 ↑
INFECTIOUS DISEASES			9 ↓
NEPHROLOGY			8
ONCOLOGY			14
MEDICAL GENETICS			1

[1] involved companion cases

[2] involved preparation and testimony of cases previously reviewed

CASES BY SPECIALTY SENT FOR REVIEW
USE OF EXPERTS BY SPECIALTY
ACTIVE LIST EXPERTS BY SPECIALTY
(CALENDAR YEAR 2008)

MIDWIFE	1	LIST EXPERT	12
NEUROLOGICAL SURGERY	8	1 OUTSIDE EXPERT REVIEWED 1 CASE 4 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 3 CASES	15
NEUROLOGY	6	1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 2 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 3 CASES	18 ↓
NEUROLOGY (CHILD)			5
OBSTETRICS & GYNECOLOGY	51	16 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 6 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 3 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 4 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 5 CASES[3] 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 7 CASES[3]	86 ↑
REPRODUCTIVE ENDOCRINOLOGY & INFERTILITY			6
OCCUPATIONAL MEDICINE	1	LIST EXPERT	7
OPHTHALMOLOGY	24	3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 2 CASES 2 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 3 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 4 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 9 CASES[4]	43 ↓
ORAL & MAXILLOFACIAL SURGERY			1
ORTHOPAEDIC SURGERY	29	10 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES 3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 3 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 4 CASES	47 ↓
OTOLARYNGOLOGY	5	1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 4 CASES	32
PAIN MEDICINE	20	2 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 2 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES 3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 3 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 5 CASES[4]	26
PATHOLOGY	5	1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 1 CASE 2 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES	14 ↑
PEDIATRICS	4	4 LIST EXPERTS	63 ↑
PEDIATRIC CARDIOLOGY	1	LIST EXPERT	5
PEDIATRIC CARDIOTHORACIC SURGERY	1	LIST EXPERT	2
PEDIATRIC HEMATOLOGY/ONCOLOGY			5

[3] involved preparation & testimony of cases previously reviewed

[4] involved companion cases

CASES BY SPECIALTY SENT FOR REVIEW
USE OF EXPERTS BY SPECIALTY
ACTIVE LIST EXPERTS BY SPECIALTY
(CALENDAR YEAR 2008)

PEDIATRIC INFECTIOUS DISEASES (BOARD CERTIFIED)			3
PEDIATRIC SURGERY	4	2 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES	4
PHYSICAL MEDICINE & REHABILITATION			9
PLASTIC SURGERY	33	1 OUTSIDE EXPERT REVIEWED 1 CASE 9 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 3 CASES 2 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 4 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 6 CASES[5]	51 ↓
PSYCHIATRY	62	2 OUTSIDE EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 17 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 11 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES 3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 3 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 4 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 8 CASES[6]	108 ↑
PUBLIC HEALTH & GENERAL PREVENTIVE MEDICINE			6
RADIOLOGY	15	5 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 2 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 3 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 5 CASES[5]	35
VASCULAR/INTERVENTIONAL RADIOLOGY (Board Certified)			2
RADIATION ONCOLOGY / THERAPEUTIC RADIOLOGY			3
SLEEP MEDICINE			7 ↓
SURGERY	22	10 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 6 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 2 CASES	57 ↓
VASCULAR SURGERY	1	LIST EXPERT	7
THORACIC SURGERY	8	5 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 3 CASES	20
TOXICOLOGY			4
UROLOGY	9	3 LIST EXPERTS REVIEWED 1 CASE 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 2 CASES 1 LIST EXPERT REVIEWED 4 CASES	14 ↓
WORKERS' COMP/QME/IME	1	LIST EXPERT	14 ↑
TOTAL CASES SENT TO EXPERTS FOR REVIEW	**543**	FEEDBACK SENT TO EXPERTS (regarding outcome/ status of cases reviewed) = **223** (41% *of cases - feedback was provided to the experts*)	
TOTAL EXPERTS USED IN 2008 *(an average of 1.7 cases per expert)*	**318**		

/susan (12.31.08)

[5] involved companion cases

[6] involved mental evaluations (1 case review, 1preparation and testimony of a case previously reviewed, 6 psychiatric evaluations)