# SAFEGUARDING QUALITY:

# WHY HOSPITAL PEER REVIEW AND

# QA POLICIES NEED CLEAR BOUNDARIES

AUTHORED BY:
ERIN LYON, ESQ.

WWW.HALLBOOTHSMITH.COM

H|B|S HALL BOOTH SMITH, P.C.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

## INTRODUCTION

At the heart of the care delivered in hospitals is the pursuit of excellence in patient care. Integral to this endeavor are robust Peer Review and Quality Assurance (QA) programs, which are designed to critically evaluate medical practice, identify areas for improvement, and ultimately enhance patient safety and outcomes. However, the effectiveness and, crucially, the legal protection of these vital activities hinge on a often-overlooked aspect: the clear delineation and separation of their governing policies from general policies regarding hospital operations.

In the intricate world of healthcare law, maintaining the confidentiality of peer review and QA activities is paramount. Most states have enacted statutes granting privilege to these processes, shielding their discussions, documents, and conclusions from discovery in litigation. This "peer review privilege" and "quality assurance privilege" are designed to foster open, candid self-assessment without fear of reprisal or exploitation in malpractice lawsuits. However, these privileges are not absolute, and their protection can be jeopardized by poorly constructed or overlapping hospital policies.

# THE PERIL OF POLICY OVERLAP: BLURRED LINES, LOST PRIVILEGES

When a hospital's general policies bleed into or dictate the specifics of its peer review and QA functions, it creates a dangerous ambiguity that can undermine the protections these privileges are meant to provide. Here's why clear boundaries are so critical:

- **Risk of Discoverability**: The primary risk of policy overlap is the potential loss of privilege. If a hospital's policies generally are interpreted by a court as governing or directing the specifics of how peer review or QA is conducted, an argument can be made that these activities are no longer solely for the purpose of quality improvement but are instead intertwined with administrative or other functions. This can open the door for plaintiffs' attorneys to argue that the privilege has been waived or never truly applied, making sensitive information discoverable in litigation.
For example, if a general HR policy outlines disciplinary procedures that are then directly referenced and followed within a peer review investigation, a plaintiff might argue that the peer review was primarily a disciplinary action rather than a quality improvement one, thus weakening the privilege.

- **Undermining Candidness**: The very essence of effective peer review and QA is an environment of psychological safety where healthcare professionals can frankly discuss errors, near misses, and areas for improvement without fear of the information being used against them in a legal setting. When policies are ambiguous, this psychological safety erodes.

Physicians and staff may become hesitant to participate fully, offer critical feedback, or even self-report concerns if they believe their discussions could later become public. This directly compromises the effectiveness of these processes in improving patient care.

- **Difficulty in Legal Defense**: In the event of a lawsuit, a hospital's legal team needs to clearly demonstrate that peer review and QA activities were conducted solely for quality improvement purposes, falling squarely within the scope of applicable privilege statutes. Ambiguous policy language makes this defense significantly more challenging. Attorneys may struggle to clearly differentiate between privileged quality improvement activities and routine administrative functions, leaving the hospital vulnerable.

- **Compliance Challenges**: While peer review and QA privileges are state-specific, many states have detailed requirements for what constitutes a privileged activity. Policies that are not precisely tailored to the state-specific statutory definitions risk non-compliance, further jeopardizing legal protections.

## ESTABLISHING CLEAR BOUNDARIES: A BLUEPRINT FOR PROTECTION

To safeguard the integrity and confidentiality of peer review and QA, hospitals should adopt a meticulous approach to policy development and separation:

1. **Dedicated Policies for Peer Review and QA**: The most fundamental step is to have entirely separate and distinct policy documents solely dedicated to peer review and quality assurance. These policies should explicitly state their purpose: to improve the quality of medical care, reduce morbidity and mortality, and enhance patient safety.

2. **Explicit Statement of Privilege**: These dedicated policies should clearly articulate the hospital's intent to invoke and protect the peer review and quality assurance privileges as defined by state law. They should emphasize the confidential nature of all discussions, documents, and proceedings.

3. **Distinct Scope and Authority**: The peer review and QA policies should clearly define the scope of their activities, who participates, and their authority. This includes outlining the composition and function of relevant committees (e.g., Patient Safety Committee, Peer Review Committee), their reporting structures, and how their recommendations are handled.

4. **Avoid Cross-Referencing with General Policies**: Minimize or, ideally, eliminate direct cross-referencing between general hospital policies (e.g., HR, credentialing, disciplinary policies) and peer review/QA policies. If a procedural step in peer review aligns with a general policy, it should be re-articulated within the peer review policy itself, rather than simply referring to the

general policy.

5. **Focus on Quality Improvement, Not Discipline**: While peer review findings can certainly inform disciplinary actions, the peer review process itself should be framed and executed solely for quality improvement. The policies should reflect this, emphasizing educational and corrective actions over punitive measures. Any disciplinary action that stems from peer review findings should be handled through separate, appropriate channels under the hospital's general disciplinary policies.

6. **Training and Education**: Regularly educate hospital staff, medical leadership, and committee members on the importance of maintaining confidentiality and adhering to the specific policies governing peer review and QA. This helps create a culture that understands and respects the boundaries.

7. **Regular Legal Review**: Hospitals should engage legal counsel experienced in healthcare law to regularly review and update all peer review and QA policies. This ensures they remain compliant with evolving state statutes and best practices in privilege protection.

In conclusion, the careful crafting and separation of hospital policies governing peer review and quality assurance are not mere administrative formalities. This is a critical function to openly assess a hospital's performance, learn from its experiences, and continuously elevate the quality of patient care – all while safeguarding the vital confidentiality that makes these processes truly effective. By establishing clear boundaries, hospitals not only protect QA and peer review activities from discoverability in litigation, but also the very culture of continuous improvement that defines excellence in healthcare.

**Disclaimer**

This material is provided for informational purposes only. It is not intended to constitute legal advice nor does it create a client-lawyer relationship between Hall Booth Smith, P.C. and any recipient. Recipients should consult with counsel before taking any actions based on the information contained within this material. This material may be considered attorney advertising in some jurisdictions. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.