



**Florida Board of Medicine and Osteopathic  
Medicine's Physician Certification Pattern  
Review Panel Meeting**

**Telephone Conference Meeting  
Meet-Me-Number (888) 585-9008  
Participation Code 432-162-565  
November 20, 2020  
8 a.m.**

**Minutes**

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Sandra Schwemmer, at approximately 8:08 a.m.

Those present for all or part of the meeting included the following:

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Sandra Schwemmer, DO (Chair)  
Mr. Andre Perez, Consumer Member (Vice-Chair)  
Joel Rose, DO  
Shailesh Gupta, M.D.  
Jorge Lopez, M.D.  
Michelle Mendez, DO

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Luz Pages, M.D. (excused)

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Kama Monroe, Executive Director  
Claudia Kemp, J.D., Executive Director  
Carol Taylor, Program Operations Administrator  
Christa Peace, RSIII  
Crystal Sanford, Program Operations Administrator  
Shaila Washington, Regulatory Supervisor  
Rebecca Hewett, Regulatory Specialist III  
Edward Tellechea, Board Counsel  
Donna McNulty, Board Counsel  
Nancy Murphy, Certified Paralegal  
Cassandra Fullove, Paralegal  
Dr. Michelle Chandrasekhar, Senior Management Analyst Spvr  
Michael Dean, Data Analyst  
Whitney Carlquist, Data Analyst  
Savada Knight, Regulatory Supervisor

**COURT REPORTER:**

For the Record Reporting  
(850) 222-5491  
Julie Cover

Kama Monroe, Executive Director for the Board of Osteopathic Medicine provided instructions, followed by the roll call.

Dr. Schwemmer identified the purpose of the panel meeting as being to review the report provided in the materials. She further commented that hopefully the report will be the final version of the report, which will be presented to the Governor, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The report included recommendations made by the Boards of Medicine and Osteopathic Medicine's Joint Committee on Medical Marijuana, as well as, the panel's recommendations from an earlier meeting. Dr. Schwemmer opined that the easiest way to review the materials was to review the report page by page with the goal being to look at the report and the data and to allow members of the panel to make comments, ask questions and finally, to take a vote.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Schwemmer then proceeded to lead the panel through review of the report, page by page. She reminded the panel that the 2021 report included two years of data with only nine months of data being in 2019. The report reflects how the trends have evolved. Dr. Gupta inquired whether there was any detail available regarding how post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) was diagnosed/determined for the data included on table 3. He also inquired whether the numbers were correct. He was informed that the information was based on the statute; specifically, the information was based on the ordering physician's categorization. Dr. Gupta suggested that as that grows the panel may wish to look at the way this information is looked at in future. Clarification was provided by Michelle Chandrasekhar, that table 4 were examples, basically anything that related to neuro- or muscular degeneration would be in that group. Further clarification was provided, noting edibles were not included in the report as they were only added in 2020 and that inhalation indicated vaping, as smoking has its' own section. Dr. Gupta noted that it is important that clarification is provided regarding how the number is arrived at when listing the top physicians issuing certifications by certification.

Dr. Schwemmer noted the fact the specialties are not noted as an interesting item and opined that the specialties might be something the panel might want broke out on the next report. Ms. Kemp noted that listing the specialty is not a required field; therefore, the listing could include psychiatrists, but it is not listed. Dr. Schwemmer then suggested breaking out the specialties on the next report. Michelle Chandrasekhar identified one of the limitations of the data is that the physician issuing the certification does not have to be the physician making the diagnosis. The specialty area is something that is different from their medical marijuana certification. Ms. Kemp informed the panel that the specialty areas are found in the MQA database in the practitioner's profile; not the medical marijuana database. OMMU does not collect data on physicians. Dr. Schwemmer inquired whether given the information provided, this was something that is wanted on the report, as it could lead to incomplete data. Dr. Rose suggested adding the high points from the current discussion to the report to ensure that the data is interpreted with caution. Dr. Schwemmer asked for the panel's feelings about the matter. Dr. Mendez stated it is important to leave the information in the report. After further discussion, the panel indicated they wanted the explanation at the beginning of the report, but they also wanted an asterisk placed on the table that would refer the reader back to the section; thus ensuring it is not skipped over. The panel voted to have the explanation added to the current report. The panel also voted to have similar asterisks for tables 11 and 12.

Discussion ensued regarding the explanation for the tables being in the beginning. After discussion it was determined an introductory phrase will be added at the top of the table for tables 9-24.

Ms. Kemp informed the panel that the numbers for table 21 were duplicated, but the error has been identified and has now been corrected. Dr. Schwemmer provided the panel the correct information.

Following completion of the page by page review Dr. Schwemmer asked the panel for any additions, questions, comments, etc.

The conversation was taken back to table 4 which listed the top five like conditions. It was noted that the like conditions listed one type of anxiety and another that was chronic pain and an inquiry was made if in future

someone could look at these. Further comment noted that there are so many, the legislature might want to relook to see if they want to add those conditions to the statute. It was suggested this question be addressed during the joint committee meeting.

Further discussion included an inquiry whether on table 8 there was a reason for the dosage to increase. The response provided was that there was no information that would provide an explanation. Dr. Rose asked if there was a chart or graph that would compare the milligrams.

Extensive discussion ensued regarding tables, outliers, and the purpose for singling out the top prescribers. Explanation as to why the top prescribers were broken out was provided. It was opined that the aggregate data is more powerful, including outliers and a notation made that if the panel is concerned about the top five that data doesn't necessarily have to be in a report. That a graph might be more productive. Ms. Kemp requested confirmation that the panel wishes to see this information on the report for next year. The panel acknowledged. Ms. Kemp confirmed that Dr. Chandrasekhar had the information needed to provide the changes the panel requested.

The panel expressed their appreciation for the work completed by the OMMU team.

After discussion:

Motion: by Dr. Rose to move report as amended or corrected to final version of report, Gupta second. Motion carried.

**Public Comment:**

Dr. Schwemmer opened the floor for public comment. Inquiries included, but was not limited to, the following: the panel using someone actually doing this as a sounding board; obtaining practicing addresses for the doctors issuing orders, noting it would be helpful for patients to know where they are located; and the fact the increase in milligrams could be due to a request for increase in milligrams so that the individual would qualify for discounts being offered.

In response to a few of the comments, explanation regarding addresses was provided, as were other statutory requirements. Instructions were provided for the commenters to provide suggestions/recommendations in writing for review and consideration by the panel.

There was no old or new business.

After discussion;

Motion, by Dr. Rose to allow Dr. Schwemmer and Mr. Perez to sign the final copy of the report, Dr. Gupta seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Kemp then provided detail regarding the new cover design, the fact there will be two publications which include the annual report and the data tables.

Motion: by Dr. Gupta to adjourn, seconded by Dr. Schwemmer.

Meeting adjourned at 9:45 a.m.