



Federation of State Physician Health Program Statement on Sexual Misconduct in the Medical Profession

May 2019

Professional sexual misconduct with patients is always wrong and violates ethical standards of the medical profession. It is the physician's responsibility to prevent such occurrences, even when the patient initiates sexual overtures. Sexual conduct involving a physician and a patient can never be consensual, based on the disparity in power and the position of trust patients must have to seek medical care. The American Medical Association, the American Osteopathic Association, the American Psychiatric Association and other professional medical entities uniformly condemn sexual contact between physicians and their patients recognizing the potential harm to patients. State medical boards are a resource for the public regarding sexual misconduct and the procedures for reporting such misconduct. Knowledge of sexual misconduct should always be reported to the state medical board. Other elements of the civil and criminal justice system may also get involved.

Physicians have both an ethical and often statutory responsibility to report knowledge of professional sexual misconduct to their state's medical board. State medical boards have the authority to investigate allegations of sexual misconduct and issue formal discipline, including licensure suspension and revocation.

The PHP model is based on the concept of the PHP providing a therapeutic alternative to discipline for physicians with substance use and mental health disorders; however, because of the fundamental differences between these cases and cases involving sexual misconduct, PHPs cannot function as an alternative to discipline in these situations. The FSPHP member Physician Health Programs (PHPs) are available to assist professionals with potentially impairing conditions depending on the circumstances, but the jurisdiction, discipline, and legal consequences of professional sexual misconduct are ultimately determined by the legal system and respective state medical boards.

In instances involving physician illness concurrent to the sexual misconduct, such as substance use and mental health disorders, PHPs may be asked to coordinate comprehensive, multidisciplinary assessments

or forensic evaluations to identify any treatable conditions which may have contributed to poor judgment, or to assist with determination of fitness for duty with appropriate restrictions, if necessary.

PHPs have the experience and expertise to assess and monitor physicians who have substance use and mental health disorders. PHPs that elect to assist with cases involving sexual misconduct should have staff with expertise in this area. PHP involvement is not as an alternative to discipline but to support and assist a state medical board's responsibility to the public.

FSPHP supports the Federation of State Medical Board's policy "Addressing Sexual Boundaries: Guidelines for State Medical Boards" on this topic which calls for absolute intolerance of sexual misconduct in any form and prompt and decisive action against any licensee found to have participated in such misconduct.

Education is critical and an effective way to prevent sexual misconduct. The FSPHP and FSMB strongly support that medical schools, residency programs, and medical societies at state and national levels repeatedly emphasize the importance of professional boundaries and provide education through classes, grand round presentations and mentoring about the importance of maintaining objectivity in the doctor-patient relationship, which precludes even romantic involvement.

References:

1. Arora K S, Douglas S, Goold SD. What brings physicians to disciplinary review? A further subcategorization. *AJOB Empirical Bioethics*. 2014; 5(4): 53-60. doi:10.1080/23294515.2014.920427.
2. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. ACOG committee opinion no. 373 sexual misconduct. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2007; 110:441-4. <https://www.acog.org/Clinical-Guidance-and-Publications/Committee-Opinions/Committee-on-Ethics/Sexual-Misconduct?IsMobileSet=false>. Accessed May 22, 2019.
3. American Medical Association Council on Ethical and Judicial Affairs. Chapter 9: Ethics of professional self-regulation. In: Code of Medical Ethics of the American Medical Association. 2017 ed. Chicago, IL: American Medical Association; 2017.
4. American Medical Association Council on Ethical and Judicial Affairs, Code of Medical Ethics of the American Medical Association. Opinion 9.1.1. Romantic or sexual relationships with patients. <https://www.ama-assn.org/delivering-care/romantic-or-sexual-relationships-patients>. Accessed May 22, 2019.
5. American Psychiatric Association. The Principles of Medical Ethics, 2013 Ed. Arlington, VA. American Psychiatric Association. 2013. <https://www.psychiatry.org/File%20Library/Psychiatrists/Practice/Ethics/principles-medical-ethics.pdf>. Accessed May 22, 2019.

6. Brooks E, Gendel MH, Early SR, Gunderson DC, Shore JH. Physician boundary violations in a physician's health program: A 19-year review. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law Online*. 2012, 40 (1) 59-66. <http://jaapl.org/content/40/1/59.long>. Accessed May 22, 2019.
7. Carr, GD. Professional sexual misconduct—An overview. *Journal of the Mississippi State Medical Association*. 2003; 44(9): 283-300.
8. Celenza A, Gabbard GO. Analysts who commit sexual boundary violations: a lost cause? *J Am Psychoanal Assoc*. 2003; 51(2):617-36.
9. d'Oronzio JC. Professional codes, public regulations, and the rebuilding of judgment following physicians' boundary violations. *AMA Journal of Ethics*. 2015; (17)5: 448-455.
10. DuBois JM, Walsh HA, Chibnall JT, et al. Sexual violation of patients by physicians: A mixed-methods, exploratory analysis of 101 cases. *Sexual Abuse*. 2017. doi.org/10.1177/1079063217712217.
11. Enbom JA, Parshley P, Kollath. A follow-up evaluation of sexual misconduct complaints: the Oregon Board of Medical Examiners, 1998 through 2002. *J.Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2004; 190(6):1642-50; discussion 1650-3, 6A. DOI: 10.1016/j.ajog.2004.02.058.
12. Federation of State Medical Boards. Addressing sexual boundaries: Guidelines for state medical boards. 2006. http://www.fsmb.org/siteassets/advocacy/policies/grpol_sexual-boundaries.pdf. Accessed May 22, 2019.
13. Finlayson AJ, Dietrich MS, Neufeld R, Roback H, Martin PR. Restoring professionalism: the physician fitness-for-duty evaluation. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry*. 2013 Nov-Dec;35(6):659-63. doi: 10.1016/j.genhosppsy.2013.06.009.
14. Grant D, Alfred KC. Sanctions and recidivism: An evaluation of physician discipline by state medical boards. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*. 2007; (32): 867-885. doi:10.1215/03616878-2007-033.
15. Hanson RK, Morton-Bourgon KE. The characteristics of persistent sexual offenders: A meta-analysis of recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2005; 73 (6): 1154–1163. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.73.6.1154
16. McMurray RJ, Clarke OW, Barrasso JA, et al. Sexual misconduct in the practice of medicine. *JAMA*.1991;266(19):2741–2745. doi:10.1001/jama.1991.03470190089035.
17. Sansone RA, Sansone L A. Crossing the line: Sexual boundary violations by physicians. *Psychiatry*. 2009; 6(6): 45-48.
18. State of Washington Department of Health. Sanctions general provisions: Sexual misconduct or contact. WAC 246-16-800. Adopted 2009. <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/wac/default.aspx?cite=246-16-820>
19. Tillinghast E, Cournos F. Assessing the risk of recidivism in physicians with histories of sexual misconduct. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*. 2000; (45): 1184-1189.