

Senate Fiscal Agency
P. O. Box 30036
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7536

SFA**BILL ANALYSIS**

Telephone: (517) 373-5383
Fax: (517) 373-1986
TDD: (517) 373-0543

Senate Bill 700 (as passed by the Senate)
Sponsor: Senator Joe Conroy
Committee: Health Policy and Senior Citizens

Date Completed: 3-20-98

RATIONALE

The Public Health Code contains a number of requirements and qualifications that a health professional must meet to obtain licensure or registration in Michigan, and allows the Department of Consumer and Industry Services (DCIS) to investigate activities related to the practice of a health profession by a licensee, registrant, or applicant for licensure or registration. The appropriate disciplinary subcommittee may impose specified sanctions against the person if it finds certain violations, including final adverse administrative action by a board in another state or U.S. territory, or if sanctions have been imposed by an out-of-State board and the sanctions are still in force. It has been pointed out that the investigative ability of the DCIS has been hindered by the lack of certain provisions in the Code. According to the DCIS, there have been instances in which the Department knew of, or suspected, that the holder of or applicant for a Michigan health profession license or registration had been disciplined by a health profession board in the U.S. military, or in another country; however, the DCIS was unable to take disciplinary action against the licensee or deny the application because the Code does not specifically allow the DCIS to do so based on the final adverse administrative action of a board in the military or another country. Further, currently under the Code there is no requirement that an applicant sign a release allowing the DCIS to investigate possible disciplinary action taken against the applicant by another state, the U.S. military, or another country. It has been suggested that the Code be amended to allow the use of an adverse action of additional boards outside the State as the basis for disciplinary action against a licensee or to deny an applicant for licensure, and to require applicants to consent to the release of information regarding a disciplinary investigation by a health profession board of the U.S. military or another country.

CONTENT

The bill would amend the Public Health Code to revise certain qualifications that a health professional must meet to be licensed or registered under the Code; and expand the powers of the Department of Consumer and Industry Services to sanction a licensee regarding final adverse administrative action by a regulatory body of the U.S. military, Federal government, or another country.

Currently, an applicant for licensure or registration as a health professional must establish that he or she has no disciplinary proceedings pending before, or sanctions imposed by, a similar licensure, registration, or certification board in Michigan or another state or country. Under the bill, an applicant also would have to establish that there were no disciplinary proceedings pending before, or sanctions imposed by, a similar board of the U.S. military or Federal government. In addition, the applicant would have to file with his or her health occupation board or task force a written, signed consent to the release of information regarding a disciplinary investigation involving the applicant conducted by a similar board of Michigan, another state, the U.S. military, the Federal government, or another country.

Under the Code, if a board, a task force, or the Department determines, after issuing a license, registration, or certificate, that sanctions have been imposed against a licensee or registrant by a similar board of this or another state or country, the health professional's disciplinary subcommittee may impose sanctions on the person, if the sanctions are still in force. The bill would remove the requirement that the sanctions still be in force, and would include sanctions imposed by a similar board of the U.S. military or the Federal government.

MCL 333.16174 & 333.16221

ARGUMENTS

(Please note: The arguments contained in this analysis originate from sources outside the Senate Fiscal Agency. The Senate Fiscal Agency neither supports nor opposes legislation.)

Supporting Argument

Current provisions in the Code are inadequate to allow the DCIS to investigate fully possible disciplinary actions against holders of, or applicants for, Michigan health professional licenses or registrations. The Code does not specifically allow the DCIS to investigate and take disciplinary action against a license holder or applicant if a final adverse action was taken by a health profession board of the U.S. military, the Federal government, or another country. Further, the Code contains no provision to require applicants for licensure to consent to the release of information by a board of another state, the U.S. military, the Federal government, or another country. This has sometimes frustrated the efforts of the DCIS in the past in considering applications for licensure, fully investigating the professional history of license holders or applicants who came from other countries or from the military, or obtaining critical information from jurisdictions outside the State. The bill would address these concerns by specifically allowing the DCIS to use adverse actions taken by another country, the U.S. military, or U.S. government as the basis to investigate a license holder or applicant and take the appropriate action; and by requiring applicants for licensure to consent to the release of information in other jurisdictions where they have been licensed. The bill also would enable the DCIS to proceed against a licensee when sanctions had been imposed in another jurisdiction but were no longer in force. These changes would help the DCIS more thoroughly and efficiently to scrutinize license holders and applicants who were suspected of wrongdoing elsewhere, and thus offer State residents greater safety by making it harder for unqualified or unscrupulous health professionals to practice in Michigan.

Legislative Analyst: G. Towne

FISCAL IMPACT

The bill would have no fiscal impact on State or local government.

Fiscal Analyst: M. Tyszkiewicz

A9798\S700A

This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan Senate staff for use by the Senate in its deliberations and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.