

Memorandum

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

Date: April 2, 2007

From: Susan Goetzinger
Expert Reviewer Program

Agenda Item 6-A

Subject: Results of the Expert Survey Questionnaire

Questionnaires Sent this quarter (Jan-Mar 2007)	22
Feedback Received from the questionnaires sent this quarter	15 (68%)
Total Feedback Received for this quarter's report	20

Questions 1-8, *positive response*: Yes

Question 9, *positive response*: No

Questions 10-13, *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?	100 percent YES
4	Were you given sufficient time to review the case?	100 percent YES
5	Did the training material provided to you (the Expert Reviewer Guidelines and videotape/DVD) give you adequate information to perform your case review?	95 percent YES 5 percent responded N/A
6	Were you given clear, concise, and easy to follow instructions throughout the process?	100 percent YES
7	Was the investigator and/or MBC staff readily available to answer questions or concerns about the case?	90 percent YES 10 percent responded N/A
8	Is the required written report adequate to cover all aspects of your opinion?	100 percent YES
9	Do you feel the MBC has requested your services more frequently than you would prefer?	85 percent NO 5 percent YES 10 percent responded N/A
10	Would you be willing to accept more MBC cases for review?	85 percent YES 10 percent NO 5 percent responded N/A
11	If you were required to testify, was the Deputy Attorney General readily available to answer questions and provide direction?	90 percent N/A 5 percent YES 5 percent did not respond/blank

12	Do you feel the reimbursement amount for case review is appropriate for the work you are required to perform?	40 percent YES 60 percent NO
13	Do you think that more physicians would be willing to become experts if the Board offered CME in addition to monetary compensation?	40 percent YES 55 percent NO 5 percent did not respond
<i>Level of satisfaction with overall experience performing case reviews for MBC</i>		65 percent HIGH 25 percent AVERAGE 10 percent did not respond

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT TO THE PROGRAM

The review period should begin at 60 days rather than 30. More examples of Expert Reviewer reports would be helpful.
After an opinion is delivered on a case, I find it frustrating that there is no feedback. Was it a satisfactory opinion, how could it be improved, could we as experts do a better job. Maybe a critique from your medical doctors would be helpful.
Better reimbursement for time spent and expertise.
I am quite busy in my practice and do not have the time to review more cases for the Board.
Sample report - extremely helpful. I don't mind reviewing cases, but doing them along with a written report takes time.

COMMENTS REGARDING REIMBURSEMENTS/CME

The reimbursement is low, but I see this as a public support activity.
The hourly rate is too low. It realistically needs to be increased to \$200 per hour. It is not what physicians get paid for an hour work.
Most MDs doing this work have sufficient CMEs. An increase in hourly pay would be appreciated.
Increase compensation.
Higher and timely reimbursement. Reimbursement should be <u>appropriate to specialty and years of training</u> .

GENERAL COMMENTS

I can take only a few (one at a time).

I have more medical legal case than I can handle. I get \$500/hr for those cases. This is not my primary job so the time is limited. Your payments are very very low and slow

At times I felt it would be useful to have some basic secretarial help - reimbursement for this (occasional use) might be helpful. Reimburse for child care when meeting in person & supplemental child care necessary (pertains to prior case)

Investigator for this case (SM/Glendale) was great, helpful, available, patient, always prompt in returning my calls.

This was a complex case involving two separate doctors & reports. EC (Valencia investigator) was clear and helpful in explaining what the report + eval needed to cover. I was really happy to get this very unfortunate case. Reviewing the case and researching presentation of pediatric brain tumor has had a real positive impact on my clinical practice. Because of this case, I have diagnosed seizure in one girl with visual hallucinations! I am happy to take on as many psychiatry case reviews as you can send me. I really enjoy this kind of work!

All the materials given to me were well organized and sufficient data was given to me. I will be happy to review more cases. Investigator (EC/DBar) was a pleasure to work with.

All aspects of review went very smoothly.

The investigator and deputy attorney general who requested my assistance were helpful in giving me unbiased suggestions to render an opinion.

Please let me know if I can help in the future.

Convince doctors they are working on the side of the angels not getting themselves ____ (*illegible*) by doing the work of the ____ (*illegible*).

It's not the money - it is the fear of involvement.