

## PEER REFERENCE EVALUATION FORM

## CONFIDENTIAL AND PRIVILEGED PEER REVIEW DOCUMENT

Piea.	se complete all parts of this form. If more room is no	zeaea, use a separate sneet.			
NAN	TE OF APPLICANT				
I.	VERIFICATION OF STATUS				
	Dates applicant was at your institution:  Applicant's status at your institution:	to			
TT	EVALUATION				

#### **EVALUATION**

Please base your evaluation of the following factors on the applicant's demonstrated performance. If the answer to any is "some concern," please give details on a separate sheet and attach.

	NO CONCERNS	SOME CONCERN	UNABLE TO ASSESS
Medical/clinical knowledge			
Staying current with developments in specialty			
Clinical judgment			
Technical skills and proficiency			
Management of multiple complex problems			
Interpersonal skills, including:			
Ability to work in a collegial and cooperative manner with others, including nurses and hospital staff			
Relationship with patients and their families			
Communication skills, including ability to understand,			
speak and write English			
Effective communication with patients and families			
concerning proposed treatments, alternatives and			
unanticipated outcomes			
Timely, comprehensive and accurate completion of			
medical records			

		NO CONCERNS	SOME CONCERN	UNABLE TO ASSESS
Profess	sionalism, including:			
Inte	egrity/ethical behavior			
Res	sponsible attitude toward patients			
	iform treatment of patients regardless of race,			
	nicity, social or economic status			
	nagement of personal stress/professional			
	meanor			
	icient and effective utilization of resources			
	nsitivity and responsiveness to the gender, age,			
	ture, religion, sexual preference, socioeconomic			
	tus, beliefs, behaviors and disabilities of patients			
	l professional colleagues			
	ship, including:			
	mpliance with bylaws and policies			
	mpliance with clinical protocols and guidelines			
	fillment of on-call responsibilities nstructive participation in performance			
	provement activities			
	nstructive participation in practitioner-specific			
	or review activities			
pec	Treview detrices			
III.	ACTIONS TAKEN			
1.	If the answer to any of the following questions is and attach.  Has this practitioner ever been subject to a foo			
	hospital?			J
	Yes No			
2.	Have any conditions ever been imposed on thi privileges at your hospital, including, but no proctoring, probation, additional training requestions behavior/professional conduct?  Yes No	t limited to, con	sultation requir	ements,
3.	Has any professional review action ever been taken at your hospital regarding this practitioner's clinical privileges, including but not limited to denial, suspension, restriction or revocation?  Yes No			
4.	Has this practitioner ever resigned or relinquishe Yes No	ed clinical privileg	es at your hospi	tal?

5.	or other legal body?  Yes No
6.	At the time the practitioner left your institution, were any peer review proceedings instituted, in process or pending?  Yes No
IV.	FITNESS TO PRACTICE
	Is the practitioner able to safely and competently exercise the clinical privileges requested and perform the duties and responsibilities of medical staff appointment?  Yes No  If "no," please explain on a separate sheet and attach.
V.	RECOMMENDATIONS
	ommend without reservation
	ommend with the following reservations
Do n	not recommend
VI.	EVALUATION INFORMATION
How	many years have you known the applicant?
What	t is your relationship to the applicant?
What	t is your present position? (Please be specific.)
What	t is the best time to contact you by telephone?
	phone number:
VII. My g	GENERAL IMPRESSION general impression of the applicant is:
Date	· Signature:

1105111	IAL
CREDENTIALING/PRIVILEGING REPORT AN	ND RECOMMENDATIONS
Presented to Board of Directors:	, 20

## PART 1: Applicants with No Questions or Issues Identified

The following statements apply to the applicants listed in this **Part 1**:

## 1. Eligibility Criteria

The applicants satisfy the *threshold eligibility criteria* set forth in the Credentials Policy.

### 2. Complete Applications

The applications were *complete* and able to be processed appropriately.

### 3. Primary Source Verification

- a. Primary source verification of credentialing information has been completed.
- b Confidential Peer Review Evaluations from other hospitals and peer references have been obtained and assessed.
- c. A query has been made to the National Practitioner Data Bank and response received.
- d. The Office of Inspector General's List of Excluded Individuals/Entities has been checked.
- e. A criminal background check has been completed. (for initial applicants)
- f. OPPE and FPPE information has been reviewed. (for reappointment applicants)

## 4. <u>Unanimous and Unqualified Recommendations</u>

The Department Chair, Credentials Committee, and MEC recommendations to appoint and grant privileges to these applicants were unanimous and unqualified.

HOCDITAL

Initial Applicants					
Practitioner Name/Degree	Practitioner Name/Degree Department/Section		Requested Clinical Privileges		
	Reappointme	ent Applicants			
Practitioner Name/Degree	Department/Section	Requested Category	Requested Clinical Privileges		

## PART 2: Special Review Applicants – Favorable Medical Staff Recommendations

The following statements apply to the applicants listed in this **Part 2**:

#### 1. "Red Flag" Issue

A "red flag" question or concern was identified during the processing of the application (Reference: Applicant Red Flag Credentialing Guidance), OR

#### 2. Waiver Request

The individual did not satisfy a *threshold eligibility criterion* set forth in the Credentials Policy and requested that a waiver of that criterion be granted so that he/she could apply, *AND* 

#### 3. Favorable Recommendation

After a focused review of the issue and obtaining additional information, and after considering the recommendations from the Department Chair and Credentials Committee, the MEC determined that the issue was satisfactorily resolved and that:

- a. The applicant should be appointed and granted the clinical privileges requested, or
- b. The individual should be granted a waiver of the eligibility criterion at issue and permitted to have his/her application processed.

## **Initial Applicants**

Practitioner Name/Degree	Department/Section	Requested Category	Requested Clinical Privileges	Red Flag Issue/ Waiver Request*	Comments
				(see sample)	(see sample)
				(see sample)	(see sample)
				(see sample)	(see sample)
				(see sample)	(see sample)
				(see sample)	(see sample)

## **Reappointment Applicants**

Practitioner Name/Degree	Department/Section	Requested Category	Requested Clinical Privileges	Red Flag Issue/ Waiver Request*	Comments
				(see sample)	(see sample)
				(see sample)	(see sample)
				(see sample)	(see sample)
				(see sample)	(see sample)
				(see sample)	(see sample)

<sup>\*</sup> See Applicant Red Flag Credentialing Guidance (e.g., gaps in work history; unfavorable references; unusual malpractice activity) and Threshold Eligibility Criteria set forth in Articles 2 and 5 of the Credentials Policy.

PART 3: S	Special Review.	<b>Applicants – U</b>	ifavorable Medical	Staff Recommendations

For the following applicant(s), the MEC considered the recommendations of the Department Chair and Credentials Committee and recommended that:

- 1. The applicant's request for a waiver of an eligibility criterion not be granted. If the Board agrees, the applicant will not be entitled to a Medical Staff hearing or appeal; or
- **2.** The applicant's request for appointment and clinical privileges be *denied*. The applicant has exercised his or her right to a Medical Staff hearing or appeal or waived that right (*see attached documentation*).

Practitioner Name/Degree	Department/Section	Requested Category	Requested Clinical Privileges	Red Flag Issue/ Waiver Request*	Comments

<sup>\*</sup> See Applicant Red Flag Credentialing Guidance (e.g., gaps in work history; unfavorable references; unusual malpractice activity) and Threshold Eligibility Criteria set forth in Articles 2 and 5 of the Credentials Policy.

# PART 4: Other Credentialing/Privileging Actions that Require Board Approval Requests for Change in Clinical Privileges Unless indicated otherwise in the "Recommendations/Comments," the statements in **Part 1** also apply to these requests for changes in clinical privileges (i.e., applicants meet eligibility criteria and submitted complete requests, MSO conducted primary source verification, and MS Committees made unanimous and unqualified favorable recommendations,) **Practitioner Name/Degree Requested Change Recommendation/Comments** Requests for Change in Medical Staff Category **Practitioner Name/Degree Requested Change Recommendation/Comments** FPPE to Confirm Competence Process for New Medical Staff Members/New Privileges Results in Adverse Recommendation from MEC **Recommendation\* Practitioner Name/Degree Comments** (e.g., restrict privileges; revoke appointment) Requested Return from Leave of Absence – Adverse Recommendation from MEC Recommendation\* (e.g., deny reinstatement; deny certain clinical **Practitioner Name/Degree Comments** privileges upon reinstatement)

<sup>\*</sup> The applicant has exercised his or her right to a Medical Staff hearing or appeal or waived that right (see attached documentation).

PART 5: Informational Items – No Board Action Required	
Successful Completion of FPPE to Confirm Competence F	Process for New Medical Staff Members/New Privileges
Practitioner Name/Degree	Department/Section
Leaves of A (Those Granted and Those R	
Practitioner Name/Degree	Department/Section
Resigna	tions
Practitioner Name/Degree	Department/Section
Retirem	
Practitioner Name/Degree	Department/Section
Expiration of Appointme	ent/Clinical Privileges
Practitioner Name/Degree	Department/Section
S	•
[Insert Additional Cates	gories, if necessary]