

Problem Doctors in Disciplinary Tribunals:

Who Do Protective Orders Protect?

An Analysis of Australian Tribunal Decisions from

2010 – 2013

Helen Kiel

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Technology

Sydney

2016

Certificate of original authorship

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Student:

Production Note:
Signature removed prior to publication.

Date: 9 March 2016

Acknowledgements

My thanks to my supervisors, Isabel Karpin and Anita Stuhmcke, for their encouragement, support and valuable feedback. They challenged my assumptions and kept me focussed.

I also thank my fellow postgraduate students at UTS who were always incredibly generous in sharing information and advice, and whose wisdom and sense of humour made the whole journey much more enjoyable.

I thank my family and my friends for their never-ending kindness, tolerance and support.

Last, but never least, I thank my partner Tim for his unfailing patience, his encouragement and his staying power. It meant everything.

Table of contents

Certificate of original authorship	iii
Acknowledgements.....	v
Table of contents	vii
List of tables.....	xiii
Abstract.....	xv
 Chapter 1 – Introduction	 1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Aim.....	2
1.3 Overview.....	4
1.4 Tribunal decisions.....	5
1.5 Is rehabilitation inconsistent with the protection of the public?	6
1.6 The ‘protection of the public’ – an elastic concept	7
1.7 Old wine in the changing bottles of regulation	10
1.8 The recognition of impairment – a significant development	18
1.9 A different ‘take’ on impairment	20
1.10 The framework as a navigational device.....	22
1.11 Recent research	25
1.11.1 Disciplinary proceedings.....	27
1.11.2 Impaired doctors in Australia	32
1.11.3 The use and effectiveness of protective orders.....	32
1.12 The rationale for this thesis.....	36
1.13 Conclusion.....	37
 Chapter 2 – The Health Practitioner Regulation National Law	 41
2.1 Introduction	41
2.2 The Health Practitioner Regulation ‘National’ Law – tensions and contradictions	42
2.3 Disciplinary tribunals.....	45
2.4 Becoming a problem doctor – unprofessional conduct and professional misconduct.....	46
2.4.1 Professional misconduct – judgment by peers.....	50
2.4.2 Less serious conduct – Unprofessional conduct (National Law) and unsatisfactory professional conduct (New South Wales)	51

2.4.3	More serious conduct – professional misconduct	54
2.4.4	Differences between New South Wales and the National Law	56
2.4.5	Human error, misconduct and systemic error	56
2.5	Inherent contradictions in protecting the public.....	60
2.5.1	Conspicuous by omission – the protection of the profession	66
2.5.2	Conspicuous by omission – the health of doctors	67
2.5.3	Mandatory reporting.....	68
2.6	The exercise of discretion – the gatekeepers.....	72
2.7	Health, performance and conduct pathways	73
2.8	Self- regulation under the National Law.....	77
2.9	Therapeutic jurisprudence.....	80
2.10	Protective orders	82
2.10.1	Factors taken into account	83
2.10.2	Rationale	84
2.10.3	Types of orders under the National Law	87
2.10.3.1	Deregistration.....	88
2.10.3.2	Suspension from practice	88
2.10.3.3	The imposition of conditions upon a doctor’s registration.....	89
2.10.3.4	Caution or reprimand	90
2.10.3.5	Fines	91
2.10.3.6	Some differences in New South Wales	91
2.10.4	Critical compliance conditions.....	93
2.11	How protective are protective orders?	94
2.12	Conclusion	97
	Chapter 3 – Methodology.....	99
3.1	Introduction	99
3.2	Rationale	99
3.2.1	The need for systematic analysis of disciplinary decisions in medical tribunals ...	99
3.2.2	A mixed methodology	101
3.2.3	The framework as a golden thread	102
3.3	A demographic profile	103
3.4	A qualitative methodology	103
3.5	Doctrinal legal research	104
3.6	The database	107
3.6.1	Applying the mixed methodology.....	109
3.6.1.1	Demographic analysis	109
3.6.1.2	A qualitative and doctrinal methodology	112

3.7 Research limitations	112
3.7.1 Cases as constructions	112
3.7.2 Inconsistencies in the data	114
3.7.3 Inconsistencies in the management of complaints.....	114
3.8 Conclusion	115
 Chapter 4 – Findings	 117
4.1 Introduction	117
4.2 The data.....	118
4.2.1 Age of doctor	120
4.2.2 Sex of doctor.....	120
4.2.3 GP or specialist.....	123
4.3 General findings.....	124
4.4 The most common forms of misconduct.....	125
4.5 State differences.....	126
4.5.1 Sexual misconduct.....	126
4.5.2 Inappropriate medical care	127
4.5.3 Inappropriate prescribing.....	128
4.5.4 Breach of conditions.....	129
4.5.5 Impairment.....	131
4.5.6 Other misconduct.....	131
4.6 Protective orders.....	132
4.6.1 Older doctors	133
4.7 Conclusion	141
 Chapter 5 – Impairment	 143
5.1 Introduction	143
5.2 Background.....	143
5.2.1 An overview	143
5.2.2 Impairment or illness.....	146
5.2.3 Impairment in the regulatory context	148
5.2.4 Impairment or misconduct.....	153
5.3 The medical or psychiatric model of misconduct	156
5.4 ‘Managing’ impaired doctors – the psychiatric model of misconduct.....	157
5.5 Psychiatry and its critics	162
5.6 Risk factors for impaired doctors	165
5.7 The impact of complaints and notifications	167
5.8 Conclusion	170

Chapter 6 – Impairment Findings	171
6.1 Introduction	171
6.2 Findings.....	171
6.2.1 Demographic data	173
6.3 Types of impairment	175
6.4 State differences	178
6.5 Protective orders	180
6.6 The concept of ‘fitness to practice’ and bureaucratic delay	182
6.7 Doctors deregistered – sad or mad, but also bad	183
6.8 Doctors suspended.....	189
6.9 Conditions on registration	192
6.10 Conditions imposed in spite of previous breaches	195
6.11 Conditions imposed where no previous breaches	200
6.12 Psychiatrists in a surveillance role	204
6.13 Psychiatry and law – the benign big stick.....	206
6.14 Sad, mad or bad – impairment or misconduct.....	207
6.15 Managing risk with conditions on practice	212
6.16 The discourse in criminal cases	216
6.17 Should impairment be managed under the National Law?	217
6.18 A conspiracy of silence?	218
6.19 The rhetoric and reality of protecting the public.....	219
6.20 Conclusion	220
 Chapter 7 – Sexual misconduct	 223
7.1 Introduction	223
7.2 Background.....	223
7.3 Findings.....	227
7.3.1 What constitutes sexual misconduct	228
7.3.2 The distinction between personal and professional misconduct	229
7.3.3 Principles derived from the cases – the rhetoric and reality.....	234
7.3.4 Protective Orders.....	240
7.3.5 Deregistration	243
7.3.6 Suspension from practice	245
7.4 Differences between the states in terms of conditions imposed upon a doctor’s registration.....	246
7.4.1 ‘Frequent flyers’ and the discourse on risk	249
7.4.2 Health conditions	251

7.4.3	Chaperone conditions – how protective are they?	252
7.5	The role of psychiatrists	256
7.6	Discussion	258
7.7	Conclusion	259
	Chapter 8 – Conclusion	261
8.1	Introduction	261
8.2	Overview.....	261
8.3	Tensions between the rehabilitation of doctors and protection of the public – key findings	263
8.4	Protective orders – a research vacuum.....	265
8.5	Protection of the public – changing hindsight into foresight	266
8.5.1	The National Law	266
8.5.2	Ensuring appropriate and timely monitoring of conditions on a doctor’s registration.....	267
8.5.3	Expanding the range of tools available to predict future risk to the public	268
8.5.4	Educational programs	269
8.6	The rehabilitative focus – can it be calibrated?	270
8.7	Conclusion	272
	Appendix A: Master case list.....	275
	Appendix B: Master case table.....	287
	Appendix C: Governing legislation for tribunal decisions other than the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law	335
	Appendix D: Cases dealt with under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law	349
	Appendix E: Formal impairment cases	353
	Appendix F: Sexual misconduct cases	357
	Appendix G: Women doctors found guilty of misconduct.....	361
	Appendix H: Specialists found guilty of misconduct.....	364
	Appendix I: Inappropriate prescribing	368
	Appendix J: Inappropriate medical care	371
	Appendix K: Breach of Conditions.....	375
	Appendix L: Other types of complaints.....	376
	Appendix M: Protective orders	378
	Bibliography	380

List of tables

Table 4.1: Number of registered doctors in each state on 30 June 2013	118
Table 4.2: Number of Doctors Disciplined in each state and territory	119
Table 4.3: Medical practitioners – percentage by gender	122
Table 4.4: Differences between the most populated states	126
Table 6.1: Types of impairment and protective orders	175
Table B1: Master Table of Tribunal Decisions	287

Abstract

This thesis questions whether the approach to ‘problem’ doctors adopted by medical disciplinary tribunals in Australia undermines a key objective of the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law, namely, the protection of the public. The thesis analyses medical tribunal decisions in Australia from 1 July 2010 to 1 July 2013, with a particular focus on ‘impaired’ doctors. It argues that the concept of the protection of the public has been undermined by protective orders (also known as disciplinary sanctions), which focus on the rehabilitation of problem and impaired doctors in the management of risk, rather than more severe protective orders, such as suspension or deregistration. The tribunal decisions create a rich database for a nuanced examination of the way in which the culture of ‘the therapeutic state’ has permeated disciplinary decision-making in relation to protective orders, under both the old State and Territory laws and the current Health Practitioner Regulation National Law. This culture medicalises professional misconduct that may attract negative moral judgment, and redefines it in terms of illness, in particular, psychiatric illness. The thesis critically assesses how tribunals struggle to distinguish between misconduct as a function of illness or impairment, and other misconduct, and identifies the key role played by psychiatrists in this process. The findings indicate that the most common form of risk management in medical tribunals was the use of protective orders to impose conditions upon a doctor’s registration, such as supervision of a doctor’s practice, psychiatric treatment, drug testing or the use of a chaperone. It is argued that in view of the paucity of research on the rationale and utility of such protective orders, tribunals show too much trust in their effectiveness. The thesis concludes that the pendulum has swung too far towards the rehabilitation of doctors at the cost of protection of the public.

