



TO CREDENTIAL OR NOT TO CREDENTIAL

2016 (November) – Day 2, Q6 (Choice)

Medical Leader	
Medical Expert	•
Communicator	✓
Advocate	
Scholar	
Professional	✓
Collaborator	✓
Manager	✓

You are medical director at a large metropolitan private hospital. One of your cardiologists is up for reappointment at the end of his current five year term.

In line with usual practice in your hospital, you seek advice from your medical advisory committee and both of the cardiologists who currently serve on the committee recommend against the reappointment of their colleague. They cite a range of reasons including poor clinical knowledge, prescribing errors and poor management of the families of patients. They refuse to document their reasons in writing for fear of litigation as they've heard the applicant has "lawyered up".

The application appears to be in order and the reference checks are satisfactory. The doctor seeking reappointment does have a few complaints on his file, but nothing that on the face of it that would warrant refusal of his reappointment.

Question:

How are you going to sort this out?



CENSOR NOTES

Pass Candidates

Pass candidates will be able to address credentialing processes in detail and will explicitly refer to By-Laws. They will identify the need for procedural fairness and will describe the elements of natural justice that apply in the management of this case. In particular, they will identify the need to make the practitioner aware of the particulars and to invite the practitioner to respond to concerns.

Pass candidates would be expected to describe a method by which they would undertake a performance assessment in this context.

Pass candidates will also demonstrate a need to protect and preserve privacy and confidentiality and will refer to performance assessment in private practice. Candidates should at least mention mandatory reporting if, in discussing the analysis of the practitioner's performance, significant deficiencies emerge.

Superior Candidates

In addition to the above, superior candidates will demonstrate experience in managing complex complaints about colleagues and will identify the conflicts of interest that invariably emerge. These candidates will discuss the possibility of seeking external peer opinion, but will do so by explicitly referring to terms of reference, bias in case selection referred for opinion, liability considerations and the need for legal oversight.

Superior candidates will appreciate that there are potential regulatory considerations in that the practitioner, if indeed found to be below standard, may pose a risk at other hospitals in the event that the practitioner resigns or is not re-appointed.

Superior candidates will also be able to describe the likelihood of a formal appeal and will know how such an appeal will be heard, highlighting the relevant elements of natural justice (lack of bias, particulars, and adequate opportunity to prepare, right to respond to particulars).

Scores		Knowledge Knows what to do	Skills Knows how to do	Attitude/Behaviour Shows s/he knows the consequences, leadership responsibility
Poor	1	A rambling answer that does not indicate that the candidate understands the main issues that need to be considered.	Does not suggest a logical framework as to how they would investigate the issue and attempt to come up with some solutions.	Does not demonstrate an appreciation of the significance of trying to solve this problem and why it presents a number of risks.
Limited	2	Attempts to explain a number of the issues involved but does not do it in a logical manner.	May describe one or two possible solutions or measures but does not convince the censors that they could actually do each activity or they understand the implications.	Only minimal appreciation of the consequences of doing or not doing the required activities to provide safe and adequate patient care and the implications for the private hospital.
Marginal	2.5	With, or without prompting, only covers a few of the issues involved and only provides a couple of solutions or observations of what should be attempted.	May understand a number of the issues involved but can't demonstrate more than a couple of solutions that should be tried to improve the situation.	May have described with or without prompting some solutions but does not understand the ramifications for the private hospital or the individuals involved.
Meets standard	3	Gives a reasonable overview of the main issues involved and how he/she would try to implement solutions.	Demonstrates that they have the skills to try and implement a number of measures to improve the situation. Must be a clear focus on ensuring that natural justice is ensured.	Demonstrates that he/she understands the basic significance of the actions that are undertaken / not undertaken, and the broader ramifications for the hospital, its staff and patients and the individual practitioners involved.
Good	4	As well as providing the basic overview of all the key issues, the candidate indicates that this is not an uncommon issue and that it will probably require ongoing	Not only outlines the basic activities that can be tried but also demonstrates an appreciation of just how difficult it can be to resolve inter-professional	Not only demonstrates an understanding of the significance of trying to address patient safety and procedural fairness issues, but also demonstrates



		education of doctors who participate in decision-making committees that affect peers. Mention of possible review of By Laws.	tensions. May raise possible notification to AHPRA if peer concerns appear justified.	appropriate empathy for all of the affected parties whilst trying to negotiate / implement solutions.
Outstanding	5	Excellent coverage of all of the issues with a sophisticated exposition on the application of natural justice principles and on the relevant aspects of clinical governance.	Excellent presentation with a clear and methodical logic as to how they would manage the scenario. A good understanding of the needs to balance safe patient care with the professional working relationships needed in the private sector.	Clearly demonstrates that they know the full implications of the consequences of both successful and unsuccessful actions, including the potential ongoing implications for him/her self, and the needs of the private hospital and its other staff.