

Model Principles for Medical Professional Review of Physicians within Health Insurance Companies

2010



**MASSACHUSETTS
MEDICAL SOCIETY**

The following principles are separate from the model principles that apply to medical peer review of physicians for health care facilities. The following principles include an independent appeal and review process for disputed peer review outcomes by a health insurance company.

*Massachusetts Medical Society Policy
Model Principles for Medical Professional Review of Physicians within
Health Insurance Companies*

Introduction:

Activities conducted by health insurance companies to evaluate the performance of physicians may or may not constitute “peer review” or “professional review activity” under Massachusetts or federal law, depending on whether or not such activities fall within the requisite statutory definitions. The MMS believes that all such activities, however, should follow a fair, evidence-based, ethical, and coherent process, and has therefore adopted the following Model Principles for Professional Review of Physicians within Health Insurance Companies as guidance for such activities as may be applicable to their setting.

The following recommendations are made based on the above considerations in order to enhance:

- Quality improvement
- Credibility in the process of medical professional/peer review of physicians
- Fairness and due process
- Patient access — by not inappropriately terminating, removing or sanctioning physicians
- System approaches to patient safety and quality of care.

Model Principles for Medical Professional Review of Physicians within Health Insurance Companies

1. Patient safety and quality of care must be the goal.
2. Evaluation of circumstances surrounding an adverse event should include not only pre-event factors, but also the contributory effects of the health care system.
3. All the relevant information should be obtained promptly from the subject physician on a confidential basis. In addition, relevant information from other sources should be obtained and made available to the subject physician to the fullest extent legally permissible followed by early discussion with the subject physician to evaluate the “incident” and explore alternate courses of action, all on a confidential basis.
4. The process should be mindful of, and attuned to, prevention; and the outcome should include recommendations, if appropriate, for individual remediation.
5. Triggers that initiate a medical professional review within a health plan should be valid, transparent and available to all credentialed, participating provider or contracted physicians and should be uniformly applied, with objective and evidence-based pre-screening, to all cases and physicians.
6. Physician health and impairment issues should be identified and managed by a medical peer review committee which is separate from the disciplinary process. Such cases should be referred to Physician Health Services, Inc., or another appropriate physician health or wellness program.
7. At a minimum, the standards set by the Healthcare Quality Improvement Act of 1986 (HCQIA) for eligibility to federal immunity for “professional review bodies” should be followed if a disciplinary process is engaged during medical professional review. These standards are the most elementary safeguards of due process for medical professional review activities.

Section 11112 Standards for professional review actions

“a. In general...professional review action must be taken—

- (1) in the reasonable belief that the action was in the furtherance of quality health care,
- (2) after a reasonable effort to obtain the facts of the matter,
- (3) after adequate notice and hearing procedures are afforded to the physician involved or after such other procedures as are fair to the physician under the circumstances, and
- (4) in the reasonable belief that the action was warranted by the facts known after such reasonable effort to obtain facts and after meeting the requirement of paragraph (3).”

“Adequate notice and hearing—A health care entity is deemed to have met the adequate notice and hearing requirement of subsection (a)(3) of this section with respect to a physician if the following conditions are met (or are waived voluntarily by the physician):

(1) Notice of proposed action

The physician has been given notice stating –

- (A) (i) that a professional review action has been proposed to be taken against a physician
- (ii) reasons for the proposed action
- (B) (i) that the physician has the right to request a hearing on the proposed action
- (ii) any time limit (of not less than 30 days) within which to request such a hearing, and
- (C) a summary of the rights in the hearing under paragraph (3).

(2) Notice of hearing—If a hearing is requested on a timely basis under paragraph (1)(B), the physician involved must be given notice stating –

- (A) the place, time and date of the hearing, which date shall not be less than 30 days after the date of the notice, and
- (B) a list of the witnesses (if any) expected to testify at the hearing on behalf of the professional review body.

(3) Conduct of hearing and notice—If a hearing is requested on a timely basis under paragraph (1)(B) –

(A) subject to subparagraph (B), the hearing shall be held (as determined by the health care entity) –

- (i) before an arbitrator mutually acceptable to the physician and the health care entity,
- (ii) before a hearing officer who is appointed by the entity and who is not in direct economic competition with the physician involved, or
- (iii) before a panel of individuals who are appointed by the entity and are not in direct economic competition with the physician involved;

(B) the right to the hearing may be forfeited if the physician fails, without good cause, to appear;

(C) in the hearing the physician involved has the right –

- (i) to representation by an attorney or other person of the physician’s choice,
- (ii) to have a record made of the proceedings, copies of which may be obtained by the physician upon payment of any reasonable charges associated with the preparation thereof,
- (iii) to call, examine, and cross-examine witnesses,
- (iv) to present evidence determined to be relevant by the hearing officer, regardless of its admissibility in a court of law, and
- (v) to submit a written statement at the close of the hearing; and

(D) upon completion of the hearing, the physician involved has the right–

- (i) to receive the written recommendation of the arbitrator, officer, or panel, including a statement of the basis for the recommendations, and
- (ii) to receive a written decision of the health care entity, including a statement of the basis for the decision.”

In addition, the notice of hearing should contain a summary of the allegations and of the episodes of care under evaluation.

8. Summary termination of credentials or of participating provider contract or status (or, if applicable, suspension or restriction of clinical privileges) should only be used to prevent “imminent danger to the health of any individual.” Such summary actions should be followed by adequate notice and hearing procedures prior to becoming final.
9. All parties involved in the medical professional review process must preserve the confidentiality of all records, information and proceedings. However, all of the facts obtained for and in the medical professional review process should be available to the subject physician to the fullest extent legally permissible.
10. A medical professional review panel or peer review committee, engaged in a formal medical professional/peer review, corrective action or disciplinary proceeding, should not include direct economic competitors of the subject physician or those for whom there may be bias or lack of objectivity vis-à-vis the subject physician, and should, whenever feasible, include a fair representation of specialists/subspecialists from the subject physician’s specialty/subspecialty from among credentialed, participating provider or contracted physicians within the health plan. The subject physician shall have the right to challenge, in writing, proposed peer review committee participants for cause prior to the commencement of the proceedings. Such challenge would be part of the procedure specified in the health insurance company bylaws outside of peer review protections and not a part of the actual conduct of peer review and shall not be protected by peer review statutory protections.

11. Health plans should employ mechanisms to rotate service on their medical professional review panels or peer review committees among their credentialed, participating provider or contracted physicians.
12. Membership on the medical professional panel or peer review committee should be open to all credentialed, participating provider or contracted physicians in the health plan and not be restricted to one or more groups such as employed or salaried physicians only. The committee should include more than just medical directors, medical officers or other administrative officers of the health plan.
13. Only physicians are peers of the subject physician, and only physicians should be voting members of committees conducting medical professional review of physicians.
14. Whenever a medical professional review panel or peer review committee adequately representing the specialty/subspecialty of the subject physician cannot effectively be constituted with physicians from within the health plan while excluding direct economic competitors, or at the request of the subject physician, qualified external consultants or an external peer review panel through another appropriate institution (e.g., medical specialty society) authorized to conduct peer review of physicians should be appointed in accordance with the health plan's bylaws if such actions fall within statutory medical professional/peer review protections.
15. Physicians serving on the medical professional review panel or peer review committee should receive information and, where available, training, in the elements and essentials of medical professional/peer review.
16. The health plan should ensure that the physicians serving on any medical professional review panel or peer review committee are provided with appropriate indemnification and insurance for medical professional/peer review acts taken in good faith. The health plan should also provide assistance to the panel or committee in abiding by the requirements of HCQIA to be eligible for federal immunity if applicable.
17. The medical professional review panel or peer review committee of a health plan should be guided by generally accepted clinical guidelines and established standards and practices, when available, in making their determination on matters of quality care or professional competency. When the matter before the medical professional review panel or peer review committee involves professional conduct, such as an allegation of disruptive behavior, the medical professional review panel or peer review committee should be guided by applicable professional ethical principles (e.g., MMS Code of Ethics, AMA Principles of Medical Ethics, relevant specialty society ethical codes). Those guidelines, standards, practices and principles should be made available in a timely manner to the subject physician before any hearing on the matter.
18. Clinical guidelines, standards and practices used for evaluation of quality of care should be transparent and available to the extent feasible.
19. Wherever feasible, structured assessment instruments and, if available, multiple reviewers should be used to increase reliability.
20. Where feasible, statistical analysis to compare with peers' performance should be used with appropriate case mix adjustment.
21. Adequate notice (no less than 30 days) should be given to the subject physician for any formal hearing or appeal.
22. All the pertinent information obtained by the medical professional review panel or peer review committee regarding the subject matter should be made available to the subject physician to the fullest extent legally permissible in a timely manner before the hearing.
23. To the extent feasible, the reviewers should evaluate the process of care given while blinded to the outcome.
24. Any conclusion reached or action recommended or taken should be based upon the information presented to the medical professional review panel or peer review committee and made available to the subject physician. Indefensible and vague accusations, personal bias and rumor should be given no credence and should be carefully excluded from consideration. Any conclusion reached should be defensible under a "reasonably prudent person" standard.
25. If the conclusion reached is that improvement is necessary, any action recommended by a health plan should include, as an important focus, steps for remediation, as needed, for the subject physician.
26. The findings, recommendations and actions of the medical professional review panel or peer review committee of a health plan should not be vague or stated in general terms, but should clearly and specifically state in writing the nature of the physician's act or omission, how it deviated from the standard of care or ethical principle, what the standard or ethical principle is and its source, and what specific step

the physician could have taken or not taken to meet the standard of care or ethical principle. Where applicable, it should address what specific remediation, if any, is recommended for the physician (whenever feasible, in terms that permit measurement and validation of remediation, when completed).

27. A process should be available to appeal any disciplinary finding of a health plan following the hearing, and the requirements and procedures for all existing appeal mechanisms should be made available to the subject physician. An appeals process before a disinterested third party, not connected to the health plan, should be made available to the subject physician within statutory medical professional/peer review protections. If the original action was part of a peer-review protected process, the appeal should be part of the peer-review protected process as well.
28. In all instances of medical professional review activities conducted within health insurance companies, the applicable processes and procedures should be clearly stated, with specific detail, in health plan provider manuals or written policies, of uniform application, made available in advance to the subject physician. Such processes and procedures should contain the particular due process, hearing and appeals rights available to the subject physician, and, to the extent that medical professional review or peer review privilege, confidentiality and immunity legal protections are available to such medical professional review activities, such processes and procedures should conform to the requirements of federal and state law. In conformity with Principle No. 12, to avoid or at least mitigate conflicts of interest, or the perception thereof, the medical professional review panels or peer review committees of health insurance companies should include as members with full participation and voting rights physicians who are not employees or contractors (other than contracting as a participating provider) of the health insurer.
29. The Society recognizes that when a physician performs a medical peer review function he/she should render the same opinions that would pertain if he/she were the treating physician with responsibility to provide appropriate patient care. These opinions should not be rendered solely on the basis of cost containment. *(MMS Council, 5/17/91; Reaffirmed, House of Delegates, May 7, 1999)*
30. These Model Principles for Medical Professional Review of Physicians within Health Insurance Companies are intended to apply to all medical professional review activities conducted by health insurance companies of their credentialed, participating provider or contracted physicians, however designated: e.g., professional review, peer review, credentialing appeals, corrective actions or otherwise.

(HP)

(MMS House of Delegates, 5/08/09)