

Jeffrey Driver, Esq. Chief Executive Officer







Learning Objectives

- PEARL and the History of the PEARL Program
- PEARL Program Design
- PEARL Enhancements
- PEARL Outcomes and Measures
- Impact of CMS Requirements for Medicare Beneficiary related Medical Malpractice Claims





The Disclosure and Resolution Program of the Stanford University Medical Network

What is PEARL?





The Disclosure and Resolution Program of the Stanford University Medical Network

History of the PEARL Program





PEARL is a Cornerstone of an Overarching Strategic Risk Management Practice







Stanford's Journey Into "Disclosure and Resolution"



"Discreet and selective practice" began with in-house claims management (September 2005)



- Successes and failures analyzed
- Pioneering programs, observations, and peer reviewed research studied (VA, UM, COPIC, Harvard)



SWOT assuming fully instituting a "full disclosure" approach



Formal program launched along side of on-going Stanford and University of Washington research project (September 2007)



Recent PEARL enhancements in 2012 (PEARL Patient and Family Site, Patient Advocate, Caring Conversations Simulation)





Entering a Controversial & Pioneering Space

MARKET WATCH

Disclosure Of Medical Injury To Patients: An Improbable Risk Management Strategy

Movement toward full disclosure should proceed with a realistic expectation of the financial implications and prudent planning to meet them.

by David M. Studdert, Michelle M. Mello, Atul A. Gawande, Troyen A. Brennan, and Y. Claire Wang

ABSTRACT: Pressure mounts on physicians and hospitals to disclose adverse outcomes of care to patients. Although such transparency diverges from traditional risk management strategy, recent commentary has suggested that disclosure will actually reduce providers' liability exposure. We tested this theory by modeling the litigation consequences of disclosure. We found that forecasts of reduced litigation volume or cost do not withstand close scrutiny. A policy question more pressing than whether moving toward routine disclosure will expand litigation is the question of how large such an expansion might be. [*Health Affairs 26*, no. 1 (2007): 215–226; 10.1377/hlthaff.26.1.215]





Entering a Controversial & Pioneering Space

MALPRACTICE

By Lindsey Murtagh, Thomas H. Gallagher, Penny Andrew, and Michelle M. Mello

Disclosure-And-Resolution Programs That Include Generous Compensation Offers May Prompt A Complex Patient Response

ABSTRACT Under "disclosure-and-resolution" programs, health systems disclose adverse events to affected patients and their families; apologize; and, where appropriate, offer compensation. Early adopters of this approach have reported reduced liability costs, but the extent to which these results stem from effective disclosure and apology practices, versus compensation offers, is unknown. Using survey vignettes, we examined the effects of different compensation offers on individuals' responses to disclosures of medical errors compared to explanation and apology alone. Our results show that although two-thirds of these individuals desired compensation offers, increasing the offer amount did not improve key outcomes. Full-compensation offers did not decrease the likelihood of seeking legal advice and increased the likelihood that people perceived the disclosure and apology as motivated by providers' desire to avoid litigation. Hospitals, physicians, and malpractice insurers should consider this complex interplay as they implement similar initiatives. They may benefit from separating disclosure conversations and compensation offers and from excluding physicians from compensation discussions.

 DOI:
 10.13.77/hithaft.2012.0185

 HEALTH AFFAIRS 31,

 NO. 12 (2012):

 0.2012 Project HOPE--

 The People-to-People Health

 Foundation, Inc.

Lindsey Murtagh is an

associate at the law firm Hogan Lovells, in Washington, D.C.

Thomas H. Gallagher is a

professor in the Department of Medicine and the Department of Bioethics and Humanities at the University of Weshington, in Seattle.

Penny Andrew is the clinical lead for quality at the Waitemata District Health Board, in New Zealand.

Michelle M. Melle (mmello@) hsphharvard.edu) is a professor of faw and public health in the Department of Health Policy and Management and director of the Program in Law and Public Health at the Harvard School of Public Health, in Boston, Massachusetts.





Overview of the Stanford Approach in the Disclosure and Resolution Space



- Once Optimistic and Cautious, now Convinced and Careful
- Heavily influenced by the Stanford research mission
- Quest to isolate and determine individual and <u>overall</u> *PEARL* outcomes and their success drivers



Annual independent actuarial monitoring and outcomes studies





The Disclosure and Resolution Program of the Stanford University Medical Network

PEARL Program Design





How we Describe PEARL: A Hybrid Values & Claims Centric Model

- PEARL is values and principles based as well as smart business practice
- PEARL promotes transparency, integrity, fairness, and healing
- PEARL is consistent with insurance company stewardship principles
- PEARL distinguishes between anticipated outcomes, unanticipated outcomes, and preventable unanticipated outcomes (PUO's)





How does **PEARL** work?



- PEARL provides around-the-clock telephonic consultation for "concerning outcomes"
- Consultation is provided by trained "PEARL Risk & Claims Advisors" acting within approved insurance company protocol
 - *PEARL* embraces and builds upon any disclosure policy
- 0
- PEARL utilizes "Just-In-Time" expert coaching
- PEARL is always initially focused on "assessment" to determine if the medical outcome is a PUO





How does **PEARL** approach a PUO?



Once a PUO is established, the *PEARL Risk & Claims Advisor* will coach selected spokesperson (hospital and/or physician) on:



- Full disclosure
- Communicating lessons learned



Approaching needs assessment







Five PEARL Instructions



Stabilize patient

- Take all necessary actions to promote patient safety
- Call PEARL Risk & Claims Advisor ASAP, but < 4 hours after PUO
- Proceed with documenting the patient's care after speaking to your PEARL Risk & Claims Advisor



Record *PEARL Risk & Claims Advisor* name and phone number as exclusive contact regarding PUO, unless instructed otherwise





Three **PEARL** Cautions



- Do not jump to conclusions
- Do not blame or accuse others
- Never make promises or offer to waive bills or make offer of compensation without express approval of PEARL Risk & Claims Advisor





PEARL 7- Day Investigatory Process Flow

- Threshold Determination
 - Investigative Notice
- Risk Management Huddle
 - Notice to Investigative Partners
 - Concurrent Quality, Risk and Claims Investigation
- 3-Day "Wet-Read"



Pearl Conclusion and Follow-up



Stanford's PEARL

PEARL Process

To receive a copy of the PEARL process diagram, please contact: riskmanagement@stanfordmed.org

© The Leland Stanford Jr. University 2013





The PEARL Process







The PEARL Process





PEARL Investigation

PATIENT/FAMILY Experience

Family & friends, powerless to substantially help, suggest contacting lawyers, probably giving specific names & contact information.

"Physicians & facilities do a great job of initially talking with the patient & even investigating what occurred, but then fail to circle back to the family or provide additional subsequent support."1

KEEP COMMUNICATIONS OPEN

- Do not put communication with family on hold
- Work in tandem with Social Workers
- · Do not fall into the relief of letting the Family take the lead in communication & the relationship; help them avoid MSU. "It is critical to assume the burden of maintaining open communication."3

If Families or Patients do not get answers or feel part of the process they will seek sources to tell them what they want to hear.

The process of investigation & legal preparations are well underway by Risk Management, but for the Patient or Family the process of understanding what happened and or grieving has barely started.







The PEARL Process





PATIENT/FAMILY Experience

Detailed Investigation

SET EXPECTATIONS

As investigation continues, provide more specific information to the patient/family.

- Explain investigation process, internal & external reviews
- Explain Standard of Care, Known Complication, etc.
- Explain legal mandates & how compsensation amounts are determined.

"... extend legal transparency to all aspects of care, including science, costs, outcomes, processes and errors."4

SOURCES

- 1 Sorry Works! 2.0, Doug Wojcieszak, pg 40.
- 2 RL Solutions webinar, Next Steps: Continuing Care for our Patients.
- Dr. Stefanie Simmons & Dr. Robert McCurd.
- St. Joseph Mercy Hospital.
- 3 Disclosing Medical Errors: Best Practices from the "Leading Edge." Eve Shapiro, pg. 20.
- 4 Bridging Physician-Patient Perspectives Following an Adverse Medical Outcome, The Permanente Journal, Fall 2011, Ouoting Donald Berwick, MD. Administrator for the Center for Medicare & Medicaid Services and Former President/CEO Institute for Healthcare Improvement.







How does *PEARL* approach a settlement offer?



Once a family needs assessment is done, the *PEARL Risk & Claims Advisor* will authorize an early offer for discussion with patient and/or family



Offers are based on needs assessment



Offers are up to full indemnity reserve valuation*



Settlement agreement required and use of counsel encouraged



- Minors compromise is sought (California)
- 0

Sponsored mediation on case-by-case basis

*Utilizing DART Process





Decision Analysis Reserve Targeting



Provides a theoretically sound, proven, systematic, transparent and defensible process for setting loss reserves which fully considers the uncertainty inherent in each case and which makes full use of experience and judgment.





Decision Analysis Reserve Targeting



DART applies to all PEARL cases and high-value cases where the amount of indemnity and expense reserves are over \$25,000





Decision Analysis Reserve Targeting

"Forecasted vs. Actual" Total Incurred Values



Provides a means of evaluating process validity and quality and assuring both on an ongoing basis.

< Not actual data For illustration only

\$20

\$40

(SMM)

\$60

\$80





The Full Disclosure Program of the Stanford University Medical Institutions

PEARL Enhancements





Stanford's PEARL Patient and Family Portal





2 MINUTE HIGH-LEVEL OVERVIEW OF PEARL AND HOW TO ACCESS

FEATURES PATIENT LIAISON

CONNECTS PEARL TO HOSPITAL MISSION AND VISION ASSESSMENT HELPS PATIENTS DETERMINE IF THEIR CONCERN IS A PEARL

Assessment

IF NOT A PEARL, PATIENTS ARE REFERRED TO GUEST SERVICES FOR TIMELY RESPONSE



DESIGNED FOR PATIENTS AND THEIR FAMILIES

SUMMARIZES THE PEARL PROCESS

DESCRIBES HOW PATIENTS CAN ACCESS







Emerging PEARL Communication Model

PEARL Patient

- Advocate

Risk Management Claims Team

Risk Management/Claims investigates possible liability.

- Risk/Claims keeps PA informed of investigation as relevant to patient.
- Answers questions from Patient.
- Makes final recommendation after conclusion of investogation.

Patient Advocate is intermediary between Patient or Family & Risk Management.

- In consistent contact with Patient, explaining PEARL process & setting expectations.
- All questions/concerns are relayed to Risk/Claims Team.
- PA is in consistent contact with Risk/Claims regarding status of investigation and mindset of Patient or Family.
- When necessary PA, introduces Patient to Risk/Claims.

Patient or Family

Patient or Family may become part of PEARL after experiencing an unexpected event in their care.

- Patient is introduced to PEARL by PA.
- Contact information for PA is given to Patient.
- PA is Patient's direct contact for questions/concerns about PEARL.





PEARL Patient and Provider Education



PEARL Patient and Family Video



PEARL Physician Education Video





Caring Conversations Simulation Project



What is the best way to communicate with patients and families after determining a PEARL result?

How can we build an atmosphere of trust with patients after a disclosure?





Caring Conversations Simulation Project

<u>Goal:</u>

To develop a framework of successful methods for approaching post-disclosure conversations with patients & families through use of fully developed & tested simulations.

Process:

Use actors and scenarios to 'play-out' after disclosure discussions with patients & families to find the responses that are most helpful.

Two Scenarios:

- Medication allergy procedure is not followed
- Medication allergy is not anticipated



Simulation Video





The Disclosure & Resolution Program of the Stanford University Medical Institutions

PEARL Outcomes and Measures





15+1 PEARL Outcomes Measures



- Indemnity paid
- Case reserves
- Comparison of Paid v. Reserved



- Pending lawsuits
- Case open time
 - Physician well-being

Patient satisfaction/distress
 Physician satisfaction/distress
 SUMIT staff satisfaction
 Patient forgiveness
 Time of report/recognition
 Report to NPDB & CMB
 Corporate morale/Culture
 Resolution method





PEARL Results

	Metric	Desired Result	Observed Result	Comment	
	Reporting Pattern	Faster	Unchanged	Average incident to report lag is one year	
	Frequency	Lower	Lower	Annual reported claims dropped from 23 to 15	
	Closing Pattern	Faster	Inconclusive	Small number of closed claims	
	Severity	Lower	Inconclusive	Some large post-PEARL closed claims	
	Overall Cost	Lower	Lower	38% reduction over 5 years	
Millima	n * Reinvestr	* Reinvestments in Loss Control Programs vs. Premium Rebates and Holidays			





Lessons Learned



Prompt evaluation of patient concerns and appropriate intervention is critical

Education and training is an important component to *PEARL* success





Early investigations pay dividends in warding off and defending claims, as well as reducing claims expenses





New CMS Requirements for Medicare beneficiary related medical malpractice claims





Impact of New CMS Requirements on Disclosure and Resolution Programs

- MMSEA does not change the underlying and already existing responsibility of the patient to pay for any outstanding medical liens at the time of settlement of a claim
- CMS continues to modify their rules, but as written MMSEA only requires the settling party to give formal notice of the settlement
- Current release language should always include a paragraph that states that the patient has sole responsibility for satisfying any liens that may exist, medical or otherwise, whether known or unknown
- Consider including a sentence in settlement releases that informs the plaintiff of MMSEA reporting and reiterate the fact that the patient will have the sole responsibility to satisfy any liens that may exist, now or in the future





Impact of New CMS Requirements on Disclosure and Resolution Programs

- Anticipate plaintiffs being much tougher to settle, unless the hospital agrees to pay a specific amount in settlements that represents the value of the medical lien Plaintiffs already make this argument, but the settling parties rarely respond to such, in part due to the fact that we all know historically that the liens have not been enforced, or have been significantly discounted
- If Medicare becomes more serious about enforcing liens, anticipate plaintiffs to become more serious about refusing a settlement that does not satisfy the amount of the lien





Tracking Our Progress



To stay current on PEARL's progress and find public information, visit our website at:

http://theriskauthority/resources/



Jeffrey Driver, Esq. Chief Executive Officer

