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Purpose of Wellbeing Committees

• CMA
  – An informal, confidential access point for persons who voluntarily seek their assistance
  – To serve as a resource to the LIP and Medical Staff for evaluating and coordinating services when there is a perceived need to address individual health related issues of LIP’s
  – To serve as an advisor to the Medical Staff in addressing patient safety issues that may arise from individual health related issues

Joint Commission MS 11.01.01

• Standard
  – The Medical Staff implements a process to identify and manage matters of individual health for licensed independent practitioners which is separate from actions taken for disciplinary purposes.
Joint Commission MS 11.01.01

• Rationale
  – To fulfill the Medical Staff’s obligation to protect patients, its members and other persons in the hospital from harm
  – To facilitate rehabilitation, rather than discipline, by assisting a practitioner to retain and regain optimal professional functioning that is consistent with protection of patients
  – If at any time during the process it is determined that a practitioner is unable to safely perform the privileges he or she has been granted, the matter is forwarded for appropriate corrective action that includes strict adherence to any state or federally mandated reporting requirements

Joint Commission MS 11.01.01

• Elements of Performance- Process Design to Address
  – Education of staff about illness and impairment recognition
  – Self-referral
  – Referral by Others
  – Maintenance of confidentiality, except as limited by applicable law, ethical obligation, or when the health and safety of a patient is threatened
  – Evaluation of the credibility of a complaint, allegation or concern
  – Monitoring the practitioner and the safety of patients during and after rehabilitation
  – Reporting to the medical staff leadership instances of unsafe treatment
California Title 22- Section 70703

• Standing Committee of the Medical Staff
• “The medical staff by-laws, and regulations shall include...provision for the performance of the following functions:...assisting the medical staff members impaired by chemical dependency and/or mental illness to obtain necessary rehabilitation services...”
  – Sec. 70703(d) requires reports of activities and recommendations relating to the functioning of the committee at least quarterly

Confidentiality of Activities vs. Responsibility to MEC

• The Wellbeing Committee Dual Function
  – Maintaining a safe space for physicians in need of assistance
  – To be an effective resource to the Medical Staff to assure patient safety
• California Evidence Code Section 1157 applies to Peer Review Committees
  – Protection may be waived if information disclosed improperly
Confidentiality of Activities

• *Goodstein v. Cedars-Sinai Medical Center* (1998) 66 CA 4th 1257
  – Dr. Goodstein reported by colleagues to have substance abuse problem- referred to wellbeing committee who recommends psychiatric evaluation
  – Dr. Goodstein refuses to cooperate until wellbeing divulges identity of sources
  – MEC suspends Dr. Goodstein for failure to cooperate with undergoing evaluation

Confidentiality of Activities

• *Goodstein v. Cedars-Sinai Medical Center* (cont’d)
  – Dr. Goodstein alleges denial of fair procedure because of WBC refusal to identify sources of complaints
  – Court of Appeal:
    • Wellbeing Committee is a peer review committee
    • Policy of non-disclosure is appropriate and not a violation of fair procedure
Confidentiality of Activities

• Are Wellbeing Committee Records Protected by the Physician-Patient or Psychotherapist-Patient Privileges?
  – CMA- “It is important to identify the role of the Committee as advisory in nature, and not as a substitute for a personal physician or a disciplinary body.”
  – Privileges should not apply to the communications between the physician and members of the Committee even when a member of the Committee may have a particular expertise,
  – **But,** the Committee must safeguard the confidentiality of any confidential records it receives in performing its functions.

Confidentiality of Activities

• CMA (cont’d)
  – “All records of the physician should be maintained in strictest confidence, preferably in locked files to which only certain key Committee members and staff have access…”

• Disclosure responsive to subpoena
  – Must notify clinician being reviewed and, in most cases, seek to obtain a patient authorization
  – Federal law, 42 CFR 2, strictly prohibits disclosure of records of substance abuse treatment without patient’s consent
Confidentiality of Activities

• So When Must the MEC Be Told?
  – CMA- “Except in an instance where there is a serious risk of harm to patients, the Committee should report only to the referral source and the physician in question.”
  – When harm likely, possible?
  – Any harm? “Serious” harm?

Confidentiality of Activities

• California Civil Code Section 43.8
  – There can be no monetary liability for communication of information to a peer review committee so long as “the communication is intended to aid in the evaluation of the qualifications, fitness, character or insurability of a medical practitioner.”
  – Business & Professions Code Section 809.08 encourages the sharing of information
• HCQIA also protects communications between peer review committees
Reports to the Medical Board of California

• California Business & Professions Code Sec. 805
  – Report is required for
    • Denial of application
      – Includes failure or refusal to renew a contract, or
      – Failure to renew, extend or reestablish staff privileges
    • Termination of membership, privileges or employment
    • Restrictions imposed or voluntarily accepted on membership, privileges or employment for cumulative total of 30 days or more for a 12 month period

Reports to the Medical Board of California

• Reporting is required only when “the action is based on medical disciplinary cause or reason.” (subdiv. (a)(5).)
• “‘Medical disciplinary cause or reason’ means that aspect of a licentiate's competence or professional conduct that is reasonably likely to be detrimental to patient safety or to the delivery of patient care.” (subdiv. (a)(6).)
Reports to the Medical Board of California

- California Business & Professions Code Sec. 805 (cont’d)
  - Report is required when any of the following occur after licentiate receives “notice of a pending investigation initiated for a medical disciplinary cause or reason or after receiving notice that an application... is or will be denied for medical disciplinary cause or reason.”
  - Resignation or leave of absence from membership, privileges or employment
  - Withdrawal or abandonment of request for membership and privileges
  - Withdrawal of request for renewal

National Practitioner Data Bank

- Health Care Quality Improvement Act (HCQIA)
  - 42 USC 11000 et seq created the NPDB to improve the quality of medical care
- Hospitals and Healthcare Entities that Conduct Peer Review Must Report
  - Adverse Professional Review Actions
    - Based on a physician or dentist’s professional competence or conduct that adversely affects or could adversely affect the health and welfare of any patient
    - That adversely affects the clinical privileges of a physician or dentist for more than 30 days
- Failure to Report can lead to sanctions, loss of peer review immunity
National Practitioner Data Bank

• Voluntary Actions by Clinician
  – Hospitals and Healthcare Entities that Conduct Peer Review Must Report:
    • The acceptance of a physician’s or dentist’s surrender or restriction of clinical privileges, or the voluntary withdrawal of an application for renewal of a medical staff appointment or clinical privileges
      – While under investigation for possible professional incompetence or improper professional conduct, or
      – In return for not conducting an investigation, or
      – In return for not taking a professional review action

2015 NPDB Guidebook

• NPDB Issues Final Revised Guidebook April 2015
  – Retains expansive definition of "investigation“
    • May look at health care entity's bylaws or
    • Other documents to assist determination of whether an investigation has started or is ongoing, but
    • NPDB retains the ultimate authority to determine whether an “investigation” exists
  – “In other words, an investigation is not limited to a health care entity's gathering of facts or limited to the manner in which the term ‘investigation’ is defined in a hospital's by-laws.”
Examples from NPDB Guidebook

32. An “impaired physician” member of a hospital’s medical staff has been repeatedly encouraged to enter a rehabilitation program. The practitioner continues to disregard the hospital’s advice and offers of assistance. If an authorized hospital official, such as the CEO or department chair, directs the practitioner to give up clinical privileges and enter a rehabilitation program or face investigation relating to possible professional competence or conduct, and the physician surrenders his privileges, must the surrender of clinical privileges be reported to the NPDB?

– Yes. If the authorized hospital official directs the physician to surrender his or her clinical privileges or face investigation by the hospital for possible professional incompetence or improper professional conduct, the surrender must be reported to the NPDB. The surrender of clinical privileges in return for not conducting an investigation triggers a report to the NPDB, regardless of whether the practitioner is impaired.

Examples from NPDB Guidebook

33. If an “impaired practitioner” takes a leave of absence and enters a rehabilitation program, must it be reported?

– The fact that an impaired practitioner voluntarily enters a rehabilitation program should not be reported to the NPDB if no professional review action was taken and the practitioner did not relinquish clinical privileges while under investigation or in return for not conducting an investigation.

– If a professional review action is taken against an impaired physician’s or dentist’s clinical privileges (e.g., suspension of clinical privileges), and the physician or dentist is required to involuntarily enter a rehabilitation program, the suspension must be reported to the NPDB. The reporting entity should explain in the narrative that the practitioner’s privileges were suspended for reasons related to professional competence and conduct. The fact that the practitioner entered a rehabilitation program should not be reported.
Examples from NPDB Guidebook

34. A physician who holds clinical privileges at a hospital tests positive for a nonprescribed drug. He enters into a treatment plan, but he continues to practice while gradually working to modify his addictive behavior. Is this reportable to the NPDB?

– It depends. If there was a professional review action taken by the hospital that limits the physician’s privileges while he seeks treatment, the restriction or limitation of clinical privileges must be reported to the NPDB. If there is no restriction or limitation, but the practitioner must be interviewed and screened periodically for a relapse, this would not be reportable to the NPDB.

Examples from NPDB Guidebook

35. Laws related to drug and alcohol treatment programs have confidentiality provisions. Won’t a report concerning a practitioner in a treatment program violate those provisions?

– No. Only the adverse actions affecting privileges must be reported to the NPDB; the fact that a practitioner entered a treatment or rehabilitation program should not be reported.
Accommodation vs. Restriction

• Americans with Disabilities Act requires accommodations for practitioners with a disability
  – Independent contractors are protected from discrimination by Title III of the ADA, which applies to public accommodations (such as hospitals, schools, restaurants, hotels, movie theaters, daycare facilities, and recreation centers), and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which applies to any program or activity receiving federal funding
  – Alcohol addiction & drug addiction can be considered a disability

• Reasonable accommodation vs. surrender/restriction of privileges
  – Reasonable accommodations reportable?
  – What are reasonable accommodations?

Endangered Species?
Where Do We Go From Here?

• Bylaws
  – Definition of “Investigation” should explicitly exclude referral to Well-Being Committee
  • Also consider addressing definition of investigation in bylaws
  – Role of Well-Being Committee and relationship with Medical Staff should be clearly defined
  • When should conduct be reported, when should referrals be made, what information will be shared between the two committees, etc.
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