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Disclaimer

The purpose of this presentation is to provide information, rather than advice or opinion. It is accurate to the best of the speaker's knowledge as of the date of the presentation. Accordingly, this presentation should not be viewed as a substitute for the guidance and recommendations of a retained professional. In addition, CNA does not endorse any coverages, systems, processes or protocols addressed herein unless they are produced or created by CNA.

Any references to non-CNA Web sites are provided solely for convenience, and CNA disclaims any responsibility with respect to such Web sites.

To the extent this presentation contains any examples, please note that they are for illustrative purposes only and any similarity to actual individuals, entities, places or situations is unintentional and purely coincidental. In addition, any examples are not intended to establish any standards of care, to serve as legal advice appropriate for any particular factual situations, or to provide an acknowledgement that any given factual situation is covered under any CNA insurance policy. Please remember that only the relevant insurance policy can provide the actual terms, coverages, amounts, conditions and exclusions for an insured. All CNA products and services may not be available in all states and may be subject to change without notice.

CNA is a registered trademark of CNA Financial Corporation. Copyright © 2011 CNA. All rights reserved.
Objectives

• Describe the use of negotiated risk agreements with patients in healthcare settings
• Relate the impact of negotiated risk agreements in liability claims
• Implement strategies to manage patients and families in risky situations
Today’s Healthcare and Litigation Environment

• Patients with higher acuity levels
• Aging patient population
• Challenging economic environment
• Changes in reimbursement
• Consumerism
• Higher expectations of patients
• Focus and influence from regulatory bodies
• Severity and frequency of malpractice claims increasing
## Medical Malpractice Award Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$ 971,250</td>
<td>$4,379,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$ 850,000</td>
<td>$3,498,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$ 870,000</td>
<td>$3,697,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$1,013,000</td>
<td>$3,340,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$3,950,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$3,699,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$3,722,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$3,770,644</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Consumer Bill of Rights and Responsibilities

(President’s Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry, 1997)

“Consumers have the right and responsibility to fully participate in all decisions related to their health care. Consumers who are unable to fully participate in treatment decisions have the right to be represented by parents, guardians, family members, or other conservators.”

Consumer-directed Care

• Promotes personal autonomy and self-determination
• Enhances satisfaction with services
• Provides greater sense of empowerment
• Improves perception of better quality of life
• Fosters cost-effective provision of services

Balance of Consumer Rights vs. Statutes and Regulations

Governing the Provision of Care

Consumer-directed care > Informed consent > Negotiated risk agreement
Negotiated Risk Agreements (NRAs)

- Primary utilization in assisted living facilities
- Potential use in other settings and services such as long-term support services
- Other references - “shared risk,” “managed risk”, “shared responsibility”
- Definition by the Assisted Living Federation of America (ALFA):
  - Formal mechanism to allow residents to make informed decisions about their care and to document that the parties have had an open and frank discussion regarding the decision and possible outcomes

Proponents of NRAs Cite the Following Advantages

• Help identify potential risks
• Foster discussions about risk issues with patients and families
• Seek creative alternatives to lessen risks
• Formalize informal exchange between healthcare providers and patient/resident and/or family through documentation of awareness and efforts to address identified concerns

Opponents of NRAs Cite the Following Disadvantages

• National Senior Citizens Law Center
  - Coercive and unfair when included in admission agreements
  - Illegal and unenforceable waivers of liability

• Other Opponents
  - Attempt to avoid liability for negative outcomes
  - Force patients/residents to accept substandard care
  - Present unequal bargaining position due to compromised condition, lack of alternatives and relocation
  - Provide excuses for understaffing and retaining patients/residents to improve profits

Concerns with Negotiated Risk Agreements

• Consumer decision making
  – Decision-making ability
  – Legal capacity
• State licensing laws
• Liability

Consumer Decision Making

• Decision-making ability
  - Understanding and evaluation of potential consequences of selecting an option, as well as personal values and preferences

• Legal capacity
  - Capacity to sign contracts, provide for their own needs, manage property or finances, consent to medical treatment, etc.
  - Defined by state laws and court decisions
  - Durable power of attorney and court-appointed guardians

Source: http://hcbs.org/files/7/332/Negot_Risk2.pdf (accessed 2/18/11)
Licensing, Health and Safety Laws

- State licensing laws may restrict types of services, staffing, levels of care.
- State licensing laws may impose fines and penalties for health and safety violations.
- Medicare/Medicaid program may require certain safeguards to protect patients’ health and welfare.

Source: http://hcbs.org/files/7/332/Negot_Risk2.pdf (accessed 2/18/11)
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Limitation of Liability

• Individual with signed NRA may be less likely to file lawsuit
• Healthcare provider may use NRA in defense of claim
• Waiver of liability sometimes included in NRA
• Enforceability of waivers of liability depends upon:
  − NRA design and implementation
  − State laws
  − Public policy
  − Contract law

Laws/Regulations

- State laws/regulations may expressly allow/prohibit use of NRAs relating to discharge requirements.
- Federal laws may affect the use of NRAs when admission/discharge criteria are successfully challenged relating to disability and “reasonable accommodations.”
  - Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990
  - Fair Housing Act of 1968
  - Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988

State Laws/Regulations and NRAs

- Provisions in 15 states
- NRA format/process
  - Required signatures
  - Part of service plan
  - Method of recordkeeping
  - Timeframe for review
- Characteristics and requirements
  - Autonomy and choice
  - Capacity to understand
  - Provider liability
  - Residency criteria and role of NRA in discharge
  - References in resident rights

## Negotiated Risk Agreement Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Resident’s Signature Required</th>
<th>Provider’s Signature Required</th>
<th>Defined as Part of Service Plan</th>
<th>Method of Record-Keeping Specified</th>
<th>Timeframe for Review Specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Provider’s signature required only if the agreement is part of the service plan.

### Characteristics of States’ NRA Provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>NRA Required</th>
<th>Rules Reference</th>
<th>NRA Process/Format Defined</th>
<th>Capacity to Understand NRA is Addressed</th>
<th>Provider Liability Addressed</th>
<th>Residency Criteria Addressed</th>
<th>Role of NRA in Discharge Defined</th>
<th>Residents’ Rights Reference NRAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Specific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of State Regulatory Provisions

• Arkansas
  – Compliance agreement – written plan, shared responsibility, specific process outlined

• Oregon
  – Managed risk - process/plan, reviewed quarterly

• Wisconsin
  – Risk agreement – jointly signed at occupancy

Elements of Negotiated Risk Agreements

• Circumstances
  − Deviance from accepted standard, protocol, policy
  − Lack of consensus on course of action
  − High risk of adverse outcome

• Goals
  − Empower individual to exercise choice
  − Identify preferences
  − Perform assessment of potential harm due to preferences
    − Identify potential outcomes
    − Seek consensus of decision
    − Document negotiation and decision process
    − Provide acknowledgement of discussion

Elements of Negotiated Risk Agreements - Sample

- Cause for concern:______________________________________________
- Person’s preferences:__________________________________________
- Possible consequences for preferences:___________________________
- Possible alternatives to minimize risk:___________________________
- Final consensus reached by all parties:___________________________
- Frequency of follow up and reassessment:________________________
- Staff involved:________________________________________________

- Signatures:
  Names:    Relationships:    Dates:
__________________________________________________________

Sample Negotiated Risk Agreement
A Study of Negotiated Risk Agreements in Assisted Living: Final Report
February 2006

Implementation Considerations for NRAs

- Updated knowledge of applicable state statutes/regulations
- Review of marketing materials, Website and contract terms
- Adequate staffing based upon patient population needs
- Policies/procedures address level-of-care changes, discharge criteria
- Policy and staff training, if NRAs allowable
- Policies/procedures to address high-risk issues (falls, wandering, refusal of care, etc.)
- Programs and staff training for patients with cognitive impairment
- Communication/negotiation skills and training
- Collaboration with patient advocate, risk manager, legal counsel
- Communication with state ombudsmen, as applicable
Case Study # 1

• 82 year-old woman admitted to assisted living facility
• History of stroke, memory loss, speech and balance difficulties
• Mobile, no assisted walking device, balance concerns, some falls but not in recent past
• Daughter (durable power of attorney) signed residency agreement upon admission
• Six months after admission, two falls in one month
• Initiated fall protocols, including bed and chair alarms
• One month later, daughter wanted bed alarms removed
• Negotiated risk agreement signed by daughter
• Four additional falls with noncompliance of safety measures
• Developed dehydration, urinary tract infection, admitted to hospital, treated and returned to the facility
Case Study # 1

• What do you think could be done to manage this situation?

• What measures can be taken to address health, safety and communication concerns?

• Should another negotiated risk agreement be initiated? If so, what steps should be taken?
Case Study # 2

• 45 year-old man with history of debilitating neuromuscular disease is admitted to hospital for pneumonia
• Wheelchair bound with history of pressure ulcers
• Noncompliant with turning and heel protection measures
• Pressure ulcers developing and worsening
• Patient seeks support from nursing/hospital staff
Case Study # 2

• What do you think could be done to manage this situation?

• What measures can be taken to address health, safety and communication concerns?

• Should a negotiated risk agreement be initiated? If so, what steps should be taken?
Resources

• A Study of Negotiated Risk Agreements in Assisted Living
  http://aspe.hhs.gov/daltcp/reports/2006/negrisk.htm

• Assisted Living Federation of America
  http://www.alfa.org/alfa/PublicPolicyPositions.asp?SnID=875938434

• Negotiated Risk Agreements in Long-Term Support Services
  http://hcbs.org/files/7/332/Negot_Risk2.pdf

• Sample Negotiated Risk Agreement
  http://www.med-pass.com/Docs/Products/samples/al1019sp.pdf
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Questions?