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2017 REPORT

Executive Summary

The State Board for Professional Medical Conduct (Board) was created by the New York State Legislature in 1976 and, with the Department of Health’s (DOH/Department) Office of Professional Medical Conduct (Office/OPMC), administers the State’s physician discipline program. Its mission is patient safety -- to protect the public from medical negligence, incompetence and other kinds of professional misconduct.

The Board, through the OPMC, investigates complaints made against the over 112,500 physicians, physician assistants and specialist assistants, and prosecutes those charged with misconduct. It also monitors licensees who have been impaired or who have been placed on probation by the Board.

The Program achieved the following during 2017:

- The Board imposed 379 final actions. Of those, 78 percent (295) were serious sanctions, including the loss, suspension, or restriction of a physician’s medical license.

- The Office received 9,699 complaints, and closed 10,148 complaints. These closures include various administrative reviews, as well as full field investigations assigned to the Regional Offices and Investigative Units.

- 2,138 full field investigations were closed in 2017.

- The average time to complete a full field investigation is 321 days.

- The OPMC monitored 1,396 physicians, nearly the same as in 2016.
Protecting Patient Safety by Addressing Medical Conduct

Board for Professional Medical Conduct

The State Board for Professional Medical Conduct (Board), with the Department of Health’s Office of Professional Medical Conduct (OPMC), administers the State’s physician conduct program. Its mission is to protect the public from medical negligence, incompetence and other kinds of professional misconduct by the over 112,500 physicians\(^1\) licensed in New York State. The Board is a vital patient safety protection for those who access New York’s health care system.

Public Health Law (PHL) §230(14) requires an annual report to the Legislature, the Governor and other executive offices, the medical profession, medical professional societies, consumer agencies and other interested persons. This report discusses the Board’s 2017 experience.

As of December 31, 2017, the Board consists of 68 physician and 27 non-physician lay members. Lay members include members of the public, to ensure that the patient perspective is represented on the Board. Physician members are appointed by the Commissioner of Health with recommendations for membership received largely from medical and professional societies. The Commissioner, with the approval of the Governor, appoints lay members of the Board. By law, at least 20 percent of the Board’s members are appointed by the Board of Regents.

Through its activity, the Board ensures the participation of both the medical community and the public in this important patient safety endeavor.

Office of Professional Medical Conduct

The OPMC’s mission is to carry out its statutory mandate and the objectives of the Board to deter medical misconduct and promote and preserve appropriate standards of medical practice. Through its central office in Albany, New York and six field offices (Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, New York City, New Rochelle and Central Islip), the OPMC:

- Investigates all complaints and, with assistance of counsel, prosecutes physicians formally charged with misconduct;
- Monitors physicians whose licenses have been restored following a temporary surrender due to incapacity by drugs, alcohol or mental impairment;
- Monitors physicians placed on probation by the Board;

\(^1\) In this report, “physician” and “licensee” refer to licensed medical doctors [MDs], doctors of osteopathy [DOs], physicians practicing under a limited permit, medical residents, physician assistants and specialist assistants.
▪ Oversees the contract with the Medical Society of the State of New York’s Committee for Physician Health (CPH) – a non-disciplinary program to identify, refer to treatment and monitor impaired physicians, and to assist physicians’ return to safe practice;

▪ Collects and maintains reports of medical malpractice claims filed in New York State and their dispositions. The OPMC reviews medical malpractice reports to identify potential misconduct that warrant further review and, as appropriate, investigation;

▪ Oversees the administration of the New York State Physician Profile, a single source of public information about the education, training, practice, legal actions and professional activities of every physician licensed and registered to practice in New York State;

▪ Supports all Board activities, including appointments, training, recruitment of medical experts and coordination of the procedures for the 62 committees of the Board that were convened in 2017; and

▪ Educates the physician community and others on misconduct definitions, trends in investigative findings, and best practices to avoid misconduct. In 2017, the OPMC continued to provide educational programs to medical students, physician assistant students, local physician groups, and hospitals and their physicians.
New York’s Medical Conduct Process

PHL (PHL) and Education Law (EL) govern the State’s physician conduct program. The process is defined in PHL §230, while the definitions of misconduct are found in Sections 6530 and 6531 of the EL. The process is described in Figure 1.

**Figure 1 - The Professional Medical Conduct Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSIONAL MEDICAL CONDUCT PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investigation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A complaint is reviewed to determine if there are issues which warrant an investigation. The investigation may consist of interviews, reviewing documents (such as medical records) and other evidence, and consultation with medical experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>↓</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The complete investigation is reviewed by supervisors and medical staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>↓</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there is no evidence of misconduct, the case is closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>↓</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Committee of the Board (Board Investigation Committee) reviews all possible misconduct cases and recommends whether a hearing is warranted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>↓</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A DOH attorney prepares a Notice of Hearing and Statement of Charges which describes the substance of the alleged misconduct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>↓</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hearing provides the physician, with his/her attorney, an opportunity to present witnesses and evidence on his/her own behalf. The hearing is before a Board Committee of two physician members and a lay member. An Administrative Law Judge presides over the hearing process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>↓</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hearing Committee determines Findings of Fact, conclusions and imposes a penalty, if appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>↓</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review Board</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either the Department or the physician may appeal the hearing committee decision to the review board, consisting of five members of the board, three of whom are physicians. The Review Board issues a Final Order.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complaints

The OPMC is required by PHL §230(10) to review every complaint it receives. Complaints come from many sources including the public, the health care community and others. Complaints may also be opened as a result of a report in the media, a referral from another government agency, or OPMC’s own review of information, such as medical malpractice data and compliance with statutory requirements related to the New York State Physician Profile.

In 2017, the OPMC received 9,699 complaints (see figure 2).

Every complaint is reviewed to determine whether the subject of the complaint is a physician (thereby falling under the OPMC’s jurisdiction), and whether the allegation, if found true, could potentially be determined as medical misconduct. In 2017, 43 percent of all complaints moved forward after this initial review for further investigation. The OPMC makes referrals to other agencies as appropriate.

Figure 2

![Bar chart showing complaints received by the OPMC from 2013 to 2017.](source: The Office of Professional Medical Conduct)
About 46 percent of the complaints received in 2017 came from the public (see Figure 3). About 3 percent of complaints came from providers. Other sources of complaints include governmental agencies, including OPMC itself.

**Figure 3**

![2017 Complaints Received by Source](image)

Source: The Office of Professional Medical Conduct

**Investigations**

OPMC investigators and clinicians, including Board Certified physicians, gather and analyze all relevant information from documents such as medical records and interviews to determine whether the evidence suggests that misconduct occurred. The investigative process ensures a thorough review and supports an informed determination by the Office and the Board as to whether the allegation is substantiated and, if so, constitutes misconduct.

OPMC investigations include strong confidentiality protections. For example, Public Health Law requires the OPMC to keep the name of the complainant confidential. The very existence of an investigation is also confidential until and unless the investigation results in a public action. These provisions exist for the protection of both the complainant and the physician under review.

The physician is ensured due process throughout. The physician has a right to submit relevant information to the OPMC at any time during the investigation. Under the law, the OPMC must offer the physician an opportunity to be interviewed to comment on the
issues under investigation if the OPMC intends to refer the matter to the Board. The physician may have an attorney present and may bring a stenographer to transcribe the interview, at his/her expense. Cases are not referred to the Board when there is insufficient evidence to proceed or the issues are determined at that point to be outside its jurisdiction.

The Board can collect valuable information through its PHL §230(7) authority. Through a committee on professional conduct, the Board may:

- direct a physician to submit to a medical or psychiatric examination when a Board committee has reason to believe the licensee may be impaired by alcohol, drugs, physical disability or mental disability;
- direct the OPMC to obtain medical records or other protected health information pertaining to the licensee’s physical or mental condition when the Board has reason to believe that the licensee may be impaired by alcohol, drugs, physical disability or mental disability or when the licensee’s medical condition may be relevant to an inquiry into a report of a communicable disease; and
- direct a physician to submit to a clinical competency examination.

With these tools, the Board can determine the presence and magnitude of any issues facing the physician, and evaluate if these issues might present a risk to patients.

In investigations related to clinical care, information gathered by the OPMC is reviewed by medical experts who are board certified in their specialty, currently in practice and who are not employed by the OPMC. The expert identifies whether the physician under review met minimum standards of practice or did not. The peer review aspect of the process is key to making fair and appropriate determinations.

When the evidence indicates that misconduct has occurred, the matter is presented to an investigation committee of the Board for review. If a majority of the committee, comprised of two physician members and one non-physician lay member, concurs with the Director of the OPMC (Director) that sufficient evidence exists to support misconduct, then, and after consultation with the Executive Secretary to the Board, the Director would direct counsel to prepare charges. In 2017, the OPMC referred 240 physicians for charges.

The Board is required to make charges public no earlier than five business days after charges are served upon a physician, after an investigation committee has unanimously concurred with the Director’s determination that a hearing is warranted. In the event of a majority concurrence (as opposed to unanimous), a second vote is taken to determine whether or not the charges are to be published. A statement advising that the charges or determinations are subject to challenge by the physician accompanies the public charges.

The committee may take actions other than concurring that a disciplinary hearing is warranted. These range from a recommendation to the Commissioner of Health that a
physician’s license be summarily suspended because he or she poses an imminent danger to the public health, to a confidential administrative warning if there is evidence of a minor or technical violation, or of substandard medical practice which does not rise to the level of prosecutable professional misconduct.

**Disciplinary Hearings**

For some investigations that result in a referral for charges, a disciplinary hearing is avoided through a signed consent agreement between the physician and the Board. These agreements are reached only if they include terms that adequately protect the public and address the physician’s misconduct. The benefit of these negotiated settlements is that they avoid the time and expense of a hearing. In 2017, approximately 70 percent of Board actions resulted from negotiated agreements (see Figure 4).

**Figure 4**

![Bar Chart: Board Final Actions by Type](source: The Office of Professional Medical Conduct)

If the investigation proceeds to a hearing, or the Commissioner of Health orders a summary suspension, another three-member Board panel (two physicians and one non-physician lay member), known as a Hearing Committee, hears the case. An administrative law judge assists the committee on legal issues, and evidence and testimony may be presented by attorneys for the Department and the physician.

The Board Hearing Committee rules on whether misconduct exists or not by sustaining or not sustaining specific charges. If the committee sustains charges, it decides on an
appropriate penalty. Penalties can range from a censure and reprimand to license revocation, including but not limited to, suspension of a physician’s license, limitation of his or her practice, requiring supervision or monitoring of a practice, a fine, or any combination of these. Hearing committee determinations are immediately made public.

Revocations, actual suspensions and license annulments go into effect at once and are not stayed (postponed) if there is an administrative appeal. Other penalties are stayed until the period for requesting an appeal has passed, and if there is an appeal, disciplinary action is stayed until there is a resolution.

Most of the final Board actions (over 70 percent) are related to five areas of misconduct: negligence/incompetence, sexual misconduct, inappropriate prescribing, impairment, and fraud (see Figure 5).

**Figure 5**

![Graph showing Board Final Actions by Misconduct Type](image)

Source: The Office of Professional Medical Conduct

In 2017, the Board issued 379 final actions; 295 of these final actions (78 percent) were serious sanctions including the revocation, surrender, or suspension of a physician’s medical license, or a limitation or restriction placed on the doctor’s license (see Figure 6). This demonstrates the Board’s stern response to misconduct that presents serious risk to patient safety.
Serious sanctions include revocations, surrenders, suspensions and restrictions or limitations of medical licenses.

The Board has jurisdiction over all physicians licensed to practice in New York. Many physicians who are trained in New York move to live and practice in other states but retain their New York license. When a medical board in the state in which they practice takes an action against the physician, New York and any other state in which the physician is licensed are notified through the Federation of State Medical Boards (FSMB).

The Board may impose a penalty against the physician to ensure that patients in New York State are protected. For example, if the nature of the misconduct is such that the physician presents a serious safety risk, the Board may revoke the doctor’s license to practice in New York. The Board might otherwise impose a penalty that includes appropriate monitoring provisions to ensure that, if the physician does commence practice in New York, the risk to the health and safety of patients is minimized. This patient safety goal is the foundation for all Board actions, whether imposed against physicians practicing in New York or elsewhere.

**Appeals**

Either side may appeal the decision of a hearing committee to the Administrative Review Board (ARB), comprised of three physician members and two non-physician lay members of the Board. The ARB hears all administrative appeals.
There are no appearances or testimony in the appeals process. The ARB reviews whether the determination and penalty of the hearing committee are consistent with the hearing committee’s findings and whether the penalty is appropriate. The ARB must issue a written determination within 45 days after the submission of briefs from both the physician and the Department.

From 2015-17, the ARB issued 42 decisions (see Figure 7). The ARB upheld the hearing committee determination in all but one of these proceedings. In 2017, the ARB reduced the penalty imposed in three (18 percent) of the decisions it reviewed, and increased the penalty imposed 9 times (53 percent).

**Figure 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Review Board Decisions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Committee Determination Upheld</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Committee Determination Not Upheld</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Committee Penalty Upheld</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Committee Penalty Increased</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Committee Penalty Decreased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Office of Professional Medical Conduct

**Physician Monitoring Program**

**Impaired Physicians**

Ensuring that physicians who may be impaired by an illness can safely practice medicine is a priority patient safety goal of the Board. PHL§230(13) allows a physician who is temporarily incapacitated, is not able to practice medicine, and whose incapacity has not resulted in harm to a patient, to voluntarily surrender his or her license to the Board. The OPMC uses this tool to identify these impaired physicians, rapidly remove them from practice, refer them to rehabilitation and place them under monitoring upon their return to active practice to ensure that they practice safely.

When a surrender is accepted, the Board promptly notifies entities, including the State Education Department (SED) and each hospital at which the physician has privileges. The physician whose license is surrendered notifies all patients of temporary withdrawal from the practice of medicine. The physician is not authorized to practice medicine, although the temporary surrender is not deemed to be an admission of permanent disability or misconduct. At the end of 2017 the OPMC was holding 48 temporarily surrendered licenses.
A surrendered license may be restored when the physician can demonstrate to the Board that he/she is no longer incapacitated for the active practice of medicine. A Board committee (two physicians and one lay member) determines whether the physician has made an adequate showing as to his or her rehabilitation. In 2017, four physicians petitioned the Board for license restoration. All four licensees were granted a license restoration.

If the Board restores the license, the physician is placed under a minimum monitoring period of five years. Monitoring terms generally require abstinence from drugs and/or alcohol with random and unannounced drug screens, a medical practice supervisor, a treatment monitor and self-help group attendance such as Alcoholics Anonymous. As of December 31, 2017, the OPMC was monitoring 453 licensees who were in recovery from alcohol, drugs, mental illness or physical disability. Throughout 2017, the OPMC monitored 480 licensees for these reasons.

Probation

The OPMC also monitors physicians placed on probation, pursuant to a determination of professional misconduct, under PHL §230(18). The Board places a physician on probation when it determines that he/she can be rehabilitated or retrained in acceptable medical practice. It is the same underlying concept used in placing physicians impaired by drugs/alcohol under monitoring, that is, prioritizing patient safety.

Probation ensures compliance with the Board order, and supports the physician’s education and remediation. Working with professional societies, hospitals and individual practitioners, the program allows for scrutiny of the physician's practice, early identification of, necessary adjustments to, and support for, the physician's rehabilitation and training. During 2017, the OPMC monitored 1,396 licensees: 480 for impairment issues and 916 for probation not related to impairment.

Sometimes, a physician does not comply with the terms of his/her Board order. Violation of the terms of a Board order is a serious matter; it may reflect a disregard for, or a lack of understanding of, the purpose and importance of the requirement. The Office and the Board must respond to these violations vigorously, to ensure the physician’s compliance with these important patient safety protections.

In 2017, the Board imposed disciplinary actions against nine (9) physicians resulting from failure to comply with previous Board orders; seven (7) of the actions resulted in the loss of the physician’s license to practice medicine. Additionally, three (3) physicians were referred to disciplinary hearings for failure to comply with probation terms.
Committee for Physician Health and the Board for Professional Medical Conduct

The OPMC oversees the contract with the Medical Society of the State of New York, Committee for Physician Health (CPH) – a non-disciplinary program to identify, refer to treatment, and monitor impaired physicians. The goal of the program is to facilitate and monitor treatment and support, so that physicians who are dealing with stress, burnout, illness, or other issues can return to health, ensuring the safe practice of medicine.

The OPMC and the CPH conduct presentations and provide education to hospitals, medical societies, specialty societies, and other groups, sometimes jointly. Both organizations emphasize the risk that impairment presents to patients, the benefits of the program to the physician, and the importance of referring physicians with actual or possible impairment issues to the program.

At the end of 2017, 388 physicians were enrolled in the CPH. During the year, 86 physicians enrolled in the program; 14 of the 86 had previously been enrolled in CPH. Of the 86 enrollees, 26 (30 percent) were self-referrals, and 42 (49 percent) were referred by their provider organizations (hospitals, nursing homes, clinics, etc.) or a colleague. This demonstrates that the OPMC and CPH message has been heard. Providers, physicians, and other health care practitioners recognize the magnitude of the problem and the value of the CPH program in terms of enhanced patient safety, as well as increased physician well-being. Other enrollees were referred by family members or others.

Of the 388 physicians who were engaged with the program at some point during 2017, 101 physicians left the program during the year. Of those, 79 (78 percent) successfully completed their program. The remainder left the program for reasons such as dying while in the program, transferring to a similar program in another state, or not complying with their program. Nine enrollees were reported by CPH to OPMC for noncompliance, as CPH is required to do by law. CPH and OPMC continue to work collaboratively to protect patient safety and ensure access to effective physician support services.

Hospital Reporting to the OPMC

Hospitals are statutorily required by PHL §2803-e to report any information to the Board that reasonably appears to show that a licensee may be guilty of misconduct. In 2017, the OPMC received 55 reports from hospitals regarding physician misconduct. Of these, eleven (20%) pertained to concerns of physician impairment.

Medical Malpractice Information

One source of information that OPMC continuously uses to identify potential medical misconduct is medical malpractice experience. State Insurance Law Section 315 mandates the reporting of any claim filed for medical malpractice against a physician,
physician assistant or specialist assistant, and the disposition of that claim, to be reported to the Commissioner of Health and the Superintendent of Insurance.

PHL §230 directs the OPMC to continuously review medical malpractice information to identify potential misconduct. The Office reviews information such as the licensee’s malpractice history, the number and dollar amount of any payouts made, and current malpractice insurance status when determining whether to open an investigation.

Of the 156 investigations completed in 2017 that were based on medical malpractice criteria, about five (5) percent resulted in a Board action or administrative warning.

The OPMC will continue to monitor malpractice experience to maximize its use as a predictor of possible misconduct.

**Ensuring Safety in Office-based Surgery Settings**

PHL §230-d requires licensees to report adverse events following OBS to the DOH’s Patient Safety Center (PSC). Adverse events that must be reported include: 1) patient death within 30 days; 2) unplanned transfer to the hospital; 3) unscheduled hospital admission within 72 hours of the OBS for longer than 24 hours; or, 4) any other serious or life-threatening event. Failure to report an OBS adverse event within one business day of when the licensee became aware of the adverse event may constitute professional misconduct. PHL §230-d also requires physicians to perform OBS only in accredited practice settings.

After reviewing an Adverse Event Report, if the PSC believes further review and investigation is warranted, it may refer the report to the OPMC for an investigation. At that point, the OPMC will commence an investigation which may include, but not be limited to, the following: medical record review by a board-certified physician, interviews of various participants, and a site visit of the office setting. In 2017, OPMC opened ten investigations based on referrals from the Patient Safety Center.

**Internet Access to Physician Information**

Information regarding the OPMC and the Board can be accessed through the DOH Web site, [www.nyhealth.gov/professionals](http://www.nyhealth.gov/professionals), by clicking on "Professional Misconduct and Physician Discipline.” All disciplinary actions taken since 1990 are posted on the OPMC site, as well as information on how to file a complaint, brochures regarding medical misconduct, frequently asked questions and relevant statutes.

**Expanding Outreach**

The OPMC Director, Deputy Director, Chair of the Board, and Executive Secretary of the Board frequently meet with county medical societies, state specialty societies, and hospitals to educate physicians and medical residents about the medical conduct process, outcomes of the Board’s work, and how to prevent misconduct. These meetings also provide an opportunity to invite physicians to get involved in the process through the medical expert program. In 2017, the OPMC continued to present
educational programs to Physician Assistant (PA) students on professional misconduct issues, to assist them in engaging in appropriate patient care and avoiding misconduct once they begin practice. In 2018, the OPMC plans to expand this education to medical schools.

**Addressing the Opioid Epidemic**

The Board and the OPMC have battled the public health crisis of opioid abuse for several years. Evidence demonstrates that inappropriate prescribing practices of opioid medications significantly contribute to abuse of and addiction to these drugs. Many physicians are not adequately trained in safe prescribing protocols that ensure appropriate treatment but minimize the risk of abuse.

Over the past few years, the Board and OPMC have provided dedicated educational programs for physicians on safe prescribing practices. In addition, all OPMC physician education presentations include a discussion of opioid prescribing. These efforts are intended to help physicians understand current standards and how to protect their patients from potential abuse while effectively treating their conditions. The Board and the OPMC also partner with the Department’s Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement (BNE), to identify potential inappropriate prescribing, investigate and enforce appropriate prescribing standards, and educate prescribers and the public on ways to address this epidemic. The OPMC and the BNE continually work together to monitor prescribing practices and make referrals to initiate investigations when appropriate.

In 2017, the OPMC initiated 191 investigations related to potential inappropriate controlled substance prescribing. The Board issued 88 orders against physicians found to have committed misconduct related to inappropriate/excessive prescribing. These actions primarily included sanctions such as license surrender or revocation (38), suspension (23), and/or a restriction or limitation against the physician’s license (20). Since 2011, the Board has imposed 560 sanctions against 450 physicians for misconduct related to inappropriate prescribing.

The Board and the OPMC will continue to use both provider education and strong enforcement to contribute to the battle against opioid abuse and addiction, at the same time recognizing the role that the appropriate use of opioid medications has in treating certain conditions.

**The New York State Physician Profile**

The New York State Physician Profile is a public website providing information to consumers of healthcare and other stakeholders on currently licensed and registered physicians in NYS. The Physician Profile was established in 2000 by the New York Patient Health Information and Quality Improvement Act (PHL §2995 et seq.). In 2017, the Physician Profile was one of the Department of Health’s most popular sites, averaging over 3.3 million page views per month.
In 2016, Consumer Reports rated the NYS Physician Profile as second in the nation among all 65 state medical and osteopathic boards’ websites. The ranking was based on 61 different criteria, include how comprehensive and available information was on physicians. At the same time, the Department conducted a study of the Profile to gather input from interested parties including consumers, physicians, hospitals, insurers, researchers, and others, to identify how the Profile could be even more informative. The study report, published in 2016, included several recommendations, including some that require changes to existing law. The Department’s annual report on the NYS Physician Profile, to be released in late Spring 2018, articulates steps that the Department of Health will take to begin implementing those steps that do not require changes to the law to put in place.

The OPMC monitors compliance with Profile reporting requirements. The OPMC closed over 2,300 investigations in 2017, achieving 98.5% profile initiation or update compliance for that group. The Board issued penalties against three physicians for failure to comply with physician profile regulations. These actions included a suspension, a fine and a preclusion from the practice of medicine. Since OPMC took over management of the Profile, the Board has issued 10 actions against physicians for failing to comply with Profile requirements, primarily because of the success in achieving physician compliance.

Summary

The Board and the Office continue to effectively investigate allegations of medical misconduct and take appropriate action when evidence demonstrates that misconduct occurs. These efforts will continue to ensure that medical care is delivered consistent with today’s standards, to protect the health and safety of all individuals who received medical care in New York State.
Office of Professional Medical Conduct

Summary Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complaints Received</td>
<td>8,787</td>
<td>10,241</td>
<td>9,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints Closed</td>
<td>8,896</td>
<td>10,095</td>
<td>10,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensees Referred for Charges</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Warnings/Consultations</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Actions</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrender</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Suspension</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension - Actual / Stayed</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restriction/Limitation</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censure and Reprimand/Probation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censure and Reprimand/Other</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Only / No Penalty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrenders under 230(13)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Agreements</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL ACTIONS         | 319   | 421   | 379   |

Source: The Office of Professional Medical Conduct

- Public Health Law §230 (12) authorizes the Commissioner to order a summary suspension: (a) when there is information that a licensee is causing or engaging in or maintaining a condition or activity which has resulted in the transmission or suspected transmission, or is likely to lead to the transmission, of communicable disease or HIV AIDS or when the licensee is causing, engaging in or maintaining a condition or activity which constitutes an imminent danger to the health of the people or (b) when a licensee has pleaded or been found guilty or convicted of committing an act constituting a felony under New York state law or federal law, or the law of another jurisdiction which, if committed within this state, would have constituted a felony under New York state law, or when a licensee has been charged with committing an act constituting a felony under New York state or federal law or the law of another jurisdiction, where the licensee's alleged conduct, which, if committed within this state, would have constituted a felony under New York state law, and in the commissioner's opinion the licensee's alleged conduct constitutes an imminent danger to the health of the people, or when the duly authorized professional disciplinary agency of another
jurisdiction has made a finding substantially equivalent to a finding that the practice of medicine by the licensee in that jurisdiction constitutes an imminent danger to the health of its people. **If, at any time, the felony charge is dismissed, withdrawn or reduced to a non-felony charge, the commissioner’s summary order shall terminate.**

The bolded language in 230(12)(b) relating to a licensee being charged with committing a felony is new and was enacted in April 2018 as part of the Budget Bill.