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Meet Poppi- He is Still with Us and Still Driving

The Aging Physician Population

• According to the American Medical Association (AMA), the total number of physicians 65 years or older quadrupled between 1975 (50,993) and 2013 (241,641)
  – 39.3% of those above 65 were actively engaged in patient care
• In 2012, 42% of the nation’s one million physicians were older than 55 and 21% were older than 65. This is compared with 35% and 18% respectively in 2006. These percentages are increasing.
The Study of Aging and its Impact on Clinical Performance

• Research regarding the affect of aging on physician performance has been extensive in the US and beyond
    • “Overall 32 of the 62 evaluations (52%) demonstrated a negative association between increasing experience and performance (that is, performance decreased as experience increased) for all outcomes assessed”
  – AMA Medical Education Committee 2015 Report
    • “Published data demonstrate a negative impact of increasing age on physician assessment results”

The Study of Aging and its Impact on Clinical Performance

• Impact of age on individual physician is highly variable
  – Studies do not produce uniform results
  – Age highly correlated with wisdom, more accurate diagnoses, and tolerance of stress
• Studies do show overall decline with aging in:
  – Cognitive function
  – Manual dexterity
  – Visuospatial ability
  – Fluid intelligence (“mental efficiency”)
  – Attention
  – Verbal and non-verbal learning
The Study of Aging and its Impact on Clinical Performance

- AMA Medical Education Committee Report summary of findings relative to physician age show deficits in
  - History taking
  - Physical exams
  - Communication skills
  - Problem solving
  - Patient management
  - Record keeping
- Choudry, et al. document
  - Decreasing knowledge
  - Lower adherence to evidence based standards of care
  - Worse patient outcomes

Impaired Physician Policies

- Every hospital is required to have a policy for acting upon concerns that a practitioner is impaired
  - To assure patient safety by providing guidance on how to identify, report, and treat impaired medical staff members.
  - To provide assistance and rehabilitation to aid impaired medical staff member.
  - To provide medical staff members with information and education regarding potential
Impaired Physician Policies

• Question- Are impaired practitioner policies sufficient to address impairment related to aging?
  – Definition of Impairment: Unable to practice medicine with reasonable skill and safety to patients because of a physical or mental illness, including deterioration through natural causes or loss of motor skill, or excessive use or abuse of drugs, including alcohol.

Impaired Physician Reporting

• AMA Opinion 9.0305- Physician Health and Wellness
  – To preserve the quality of their performance, physicians have a responsibility to maintain their health and wellness...When health or wellness is compromised, so may the safety and effectiveness of the medical care provided

• AMA Opinion 9.031 - Reporting Impaired, Incompetent, or Unethical Colleagues
  – Physicians have an ethical obligation to report impaired, incompetent, and/or unethical colleagues in accordance with the legal requirements in each state
Impaired Physician Reporting

• State Laws
  – 11 states contain some variation of mandate to report impaired colleague, often referring to the state statute setting forth grounds for discipline
  – Arizona:
    • Any person may, and a doctor of medicine, the Arizona medical association, a component county society of that association and any health care institution shall, report to the board any information that appears to show that a doctor of medicine is or may be medically incompetent, is or may be guilty of unprofessional conduct or is or may be mentally or physically unable safely to engage in the practice of medicine.

Impaired Physician Policies

• Physician willingness to self-report or report colleagues is highly variable
    • 64% of surveyed physicians agreed with the professional commitment to report physicians who are significantly impaired or otherwise incompetent to practice.
    • 17% had direct personal knowledge of a physician colleague who was incompetent to practice medicine in their hospital, group, or practice.
      – 67% reported this colleague to the relevant authority
  – Campbell, et al. –
    • 45 percent of those with direct personal knowledge of a physician in their hospital group or practice who was impaired or incompetent did not always report that physician.
The Dilemma of the Aging Physician

- Hospitals and their medical staffs have an affirmative duty to oversee the quality of care rendered by medical staff members and monitor impaired physicians.
- Anti-discrimination laws prohibit discrimination on the basis of age and disability.

Late-Career Practitioner Policies in Hospitals

- Mandatory retirement vs. screening for age-related impairments
  - There are no reports of any hospital or medical staff requiring mandatory resignation from the medical staff based on age.
  - Advisory Board article estimates 5-10% of hospitals have adopted screening policies.
    - University of Virginia – 70
    - Stanford – 75
    - Swedish Hospital
  - Screening processes
    - Physical exam
    - Neurological or Cognitive exam
    - FPPE/Peer review
Late-Career Practitioner Policies in Hospitals (cont’d)

- If screening uncovers an impairment, hospital must determine if physician can safely practice with reasonable accommodations

- Goal is to be supportive and respectful and to suggest resources to assist the physician

Response of Medical Organizations

- AMA Medical Education Committee Policy 2015
  - It is the opinion of the Council on Medical Education that physicians should be allowed to remain in practice as long as patient safety is not endangered and that, if needed, remediation should be a supportive, ongoing and proactive process.
  - Physicians must develop guidelines/standards for monitoring and assessing both their own and their colleagues’ competency.
  - Formal guidelines on the timing and content of testing of competence may be appropriate and may head off a call for mandatory retirement ages or imposition of guidelines by others.
Response of Medical Organizations

  - No specific recommendation for screening at particular age.
  - "ACS does not favor a mandatory retirement age because the onset and rate of age-related decline in clinical performance varies among individuals. Furthermore, a mandatory retirement age may have a deleterious impact on access to experienced surgical care, particularly in rural and underserved areas. Objective assessment of fitness should supplant consideration of a mandatory retirement age."

History of Age Discrimination Laws

- Civil Rights Act of 1964 signed into law by Lyndon B. Johnson on July 2, 1964
History of Age Discrimination Laws

• Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964
  – Age discrimination not included because age is not an immutable characteristic
  • “Age discrimination is not the same as the insidious discrimination based on race or creed prejudices. These discriminations result in non-employment because of feelings about a person entirely unrelated to his ability to do a job. This is hardly a problem for the older worker. Discrimination arises for him because assumptions are made about the effects of age on performance.” – Representative Burke

• 1967 – Age Discrimination in Employment Act (“ADEA”)
  – Prohibited age discrimination for individuals ages 40-65
  • Employers may not “fail or refuse to hire, or fire, any worker based on age”
  – Applied to employers with more than 20 employees
  – Did not apply to states or local governments
  – Administration and enforcement by U.S. Dept. of Labor
History of Age Discrimination Laws

• Age Discrimination Act of 1975
  – Prohibits age discrimination in all programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance
  – Includes state and local government

• 1978 – Amendments to ADEA
  – Extended age range of protected employees to 40-70
  – Eliminated mandatory retirement for most federal employees
  – Created exceptions for:
    • Highly paid executives
      – Companies not prohibited from imposing mandatory retirement for employees 65 years old who for 2 years before have been employed in a bona fide executive or high policy-making position
    • Tenured professors and teachers
      – Compulsory retirement of teachers and professors at 65 is not prohibited if serving under a contract of unlimited tenure at
        » An institution of higher learning; and
        » Local education agency
History of Age Discrimination Laws

• 1986 – Amendments to ADEA
  – Removes upper age limit of 70, thus banning mandatory retirement
  – Allows state and local governments to keep in place age restrictions for firefighters and law enforcement officers
  – Directs Secretary of Labor and Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (“EEOC”) to conduct a study to determine whether physical and mental fitness tests are valid measurements of the ability and competence of law enforcement officers and firefighters
  – Increases compulsory retirement age of tenured professors to 70
    • Directs EEOC to study the consequences of eliminating mandatory retirement for professors

1990 – Older Workers Benefit Protection Act

– Protects older workers from discrimination in implementation of employee benefit plans
– Prohibits reduction in benefits based on age such as life insurance, health insurance, disability benefits, etc.
Bona Fide Occupational Qualification (“BFOQ”) Defense

- It is not discrimination if an employer establishes that an age requirement is in furtherance of a *bona fide occupational qualification*
  - In industries in which public safety is at risk, Courts have allowed legislatures and industries to establish age-based retirement, screening, or restrictions

Age-Based Restrictions Permitted for Certain Professions

- Pilots (49 U.S.C. § 44729)
  - Federal Law
    - 1959 – Mandatory retirement at age 60 for commercial pilots
    - 2007 – Domestic flights with two pilots up to age 65; international flights require one pilot under 60
  - Case Law
    - Courts reject all challenges to pilot retirement at 60
    - Permit challenge to 60 retirement for flight engineers
    - Struck down restriction requiring new hires under 35
    - No cases challenging right of airlines or private companies to require pilots to submit to a medical exam
      - *E.E.O.C. v. Exxon Mobil Corp.*, 560 F. App’x 282 (5th Cir. 2014) Court upheld Exxon’s requirement that its corporate pilots retire at 60.
• **Law Enforcement (5 U.S.C. §§ 8335(b)(1) and 8425)**
  – Age: 57
  – **Mahoney v. Trabucco,** 738 F.2d 35 (1st Cir. 1984)
    • State police officer who was mandatorily retired at age 50 brought action challenging forced retirement under ADEA.
    • The Court of Appeals held that bona fide occupational qualification exception was to be analyzed in general terms of recognized vocations rather than by analysis of actual duties of specific individual
    • Police Officer involuntarily retired pursuant to statute setting mandatory retirement age at 50
    • Supreme Court held that the age classification was rationally related to furthering a legitimate state interest, *i.e.*, protection of the public by assuring physical preparedness of its uniformed police
    • State’s choice not to base decision on individual physical testing after age 50 was acceptable

---

**Age-Based Restrictions Permitted for Certain Professions**

• **Air Traffic Controllers (5 U.S.C. §§ 8335(a) and 8425)**
  – Age: 57
  – Federal Aviation Administration established maximum entry and retention age provisions
    • Maximum entry age is 30 years old
    • Exceptions for those with military or prior air traffic control experience
  – **Dungan v. Slater and Yap v. Slater,** 252 F.3d 670 (3d Cir. 2001) – court finds law constitutional and not in violation of ADEA or Equal Protection clause
Age-Based Restrictions Permitted for Certain Professions

• Bus Drivers
  – Hodgson v. Greyhound, 499 F.2d 859 (7th Cir. 1974)
    • Greyhound demonstrated that it had reasonable cause to believe that safety would be endangered by hiring drivers over 40
    • Question of BFOQ requires analysis of economic and human risks involved in hiring unqualified applicant
    • Where job clearly requires a high degree of skill and risks in hiring an unqualified applicant are great, burden imposed on employer to justify age limitation will be lighter.

Age-Based Restrictions Permitted for Certain Professions

• Bus Drivers
  – Usery v. Tamiami, 531 F.2d 224 (5th Cir. 1976) – Established Test for Age Restrictions on Bus Drivers:
    • Employer (bus company) must prove that:
      – The age restriction is reasonably necessary to the essence of the business – the safe transportation of passengers;
      – It reasonably believed that all or substantially all of individuals over age restriction could not operate a bus safely; or
      – The safety risks cannot reasonably be ascertained by tests or means other than an age-based restriction
    – Usery highlights case-by-case nature of the analysis
Additional Age-Based Restrictions Permitted for Certain Professions

- **Firefighters**
  - 5 U.S.C. §§ 8335(a) and 8425

- **Tenured Professors**
  - Certain states like California (Cal. Gov. Code § 12942(c)) and New Jersey (N.J.S.A. 10:5-2.2) allow higher education institutions to impose retirement policies for tenured faculty members

- **Judges**
  - 33 states and District of Columbia have mandatory retirement ages; Majority of states require that judges retire at 70, Vermont allows Judges to serve until age 91. (4 V.S.A. § 609.)

- **High Policy-Making Executives**
  - 29 CFR 1625.12

- **Law Firms**

- **Physicians?**
  - Cal. Gov't Code § 12942(c)

Challenges to Age-Based Screening

- **E.E.O.C. v. Com. of Mass.**
  - 858 F.2d 52 (1998)
  - Court strikes down Massachusetts law requiring all state employees over 70 to take an annual physical examination as violation of the ADEA

- **Epter v. New York City Transit Authority**
  - New York Transit Authority policy of requiring all candidates over 40 seeking promotion to undergo a physical exam is discriminatory on its face
  - Court distinguishes cases where public safety is involved e.g. police officers
Disability Discrimination Laws

• 1990 – Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
  – Prohibits discrimination based on disability in the private sector

• 2008 – ADA Amendments of 2008
  – Intended to give broader protections for disabled workers and nullify court rulings that Congress deemed too restrictive

Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA")

• Title I
  – Prohibits employers from discriminatorily terminating an otherwise qualified individual due to a disability
  – Must make “reasonable accommodations” unless would cause an “undue hardship” to employer
  – Must engage in interactive process with employee to find ways to reasonably accommodate
Americans with Disabilities Act

Title III
- Prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability with respect to public accommodations
- No employment relationship requirement
- Courts have held Title III of the ADA applies to non-employee medical staff members
  - *E.g. Menkowitz v. Pottstown Memorial Medical Center, 154 F.3d 113 (1998)*
    - Physician has standing to sue under Title III
    - Hospital summarily suspended medical staff privileges of physician with Attention Deficit Disorder, despite psychologist’s report that it would not affect his ability to treat patients.

ADA Limitations on Disability-Related Inquiries

- Job related and consistent with business necessity
- Generally, a medical staff can request an examination and documentation from a member regarding a disability so long as it is reasonably related to job functions and based on reliable information that clinical performance and/or safety may be impaired.
Periodic Testing and Monitoring Under the ADA

- Direct Threat – Medical Staff may require examination if it reasonably believes physician poses a direct threat to safety of him or herself, or others.
- Question of whether physician poses a direct threat must be based on individualized assessment of employee's ability to safely perform job duties.

Responding to Concerns of Age-Related Impairments

- If screening uncovers an impairment ADA requires:
  1. Interactive process for addressing impairments
  2. Reasonable accommodations
     - Create co-management privileges to transition from independent privileges to refer-and-follow
     - Refer-and-follow privileges are ambulatory privileges that allow physicians to refer patients to the hospital, order ancillary studies from an outpatient setting, and follow their patients in the hospital
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