Enabling Practice-Level Decision Making About Team-Based Care

State law requirements for PAs to have a specific relationship with a physician in order to practice were included in early PA practice acts. Fifty years ago when the PA profession was new, these requirements were intended to ensure strict oversight of the then-untested profession. Today, this unnecessary and outmoded requirement serves not only as a delay to a PA's entry into the clinical workforce but also as an agent of provider shortages.

PAs must fulfill strict licensing requirements and the PA profession is well established, highly trusted, and essential to the U.S. healthcare workforce. Study after study confirms that PAs provide high-quality care.[1,2,3,4] Nevertheless, in most states, PAs are still legally required to have a specific relationship with a physician or group of physicians in order to practice. A regulatory authority may compel evidence of this relationship or tether through a formal agreement or other documentation that must be executed by a PA(s) and a physician(s).

Any mandate of a legal requirement for a specific relationship between a PA, physician, or any other healthcare provider in order for a PA to practice to the full extent of their education, training, and experience should be eliminated from state law. This will facilitate in the creation of a more streamlined process to enter and continue PA practice, enable practice-level decisions about team-based care, and better position PAs to meet patient needs. In addition, nothing in state law should require or imply that a physician is responsible for care provided by a PA, unless the PA is acting on the specific instructions of the physician. Like every clinical provider, PAs are and should be responsible for the care they provide.

PA COMMITMENT TO TEAM PRACTICE

Enabling PAs to practice without a specific relationship with a physician does not mean the profession is abandoning team practice or seeks to change the well-established PA role. In fact, the profession remains fiercely committed to team practice with physicians and believes the degree of collaboration should be determined at the practice level. This is consistent with what PAs have long held true — the best medicine is practiced in teams. In a survey of PAs and PA students conducted in January 2017, 96% of respondents voiced support for PA-physician team practice.[5] And it is well established that team practice allows for better use of the skills of each member of the team, including the physicians.[6]

Some have suggested the profession seeks independent practice — that PAs seek to work alone, without collaborating with physicians or other providers. That is not the case. AAPA's policy on Optimal Team Practice (OTP) includes two important points that distinguish it from independent practice:

- Optimal Team Practice reinforces PAs' commitment to team practice with physicians and explicitly states the PA-physician team model continues to be relevant, applicable, and patient-centered; and

Optimal Team Practice calls for a decision about the degree of collaboration between PAs and physicians to be made at the practice level, in accordance with the practice type and the education and experience of the PA.

2318 Mill Road, Suite 1300 | Alexandria, VA 22314 | P 703.836.2272 | F 703.684.1924 | aapa.org

Currently PAs are held to professional and ethical standards by state regulatory authorities. Under an OTP framework, if a patient's condition falls outside of a PA's training, education, and experience, a PA will still consult with other healthcare providers and make referrals when appropriate. If they don't, the PA will be subject to disciplinary action by the state medical board, just as any other medical provider would be.

MARKETPLACE CHANGES REQUIRE OPTIMAL TEAM PRACTICE

In addition to the research on the quality and efficacy of PA-provided care, changes in the healthcare marketplace necessitate the repeal of these archaic requirements. When the PA profession was created five decades ago, physicians were likely to be solo or joint practice owners. As owners, physicians saw multiple benefits from hiring PAs and entering into agreements with them. Although these physician-owners may have been burdened with increased potential liability due to the agreement with a PA, this was offset by the financial and practice benefits of working with a PA. Not only were the physician-owner's day-to-day burdens of providing patient care and coverage of call reduced, but the practice could also care for a greater number of patients at a lower cost than if another physician were added.

Today, however, physicians are more likely to be employees rather than practice owners,[7] and physicians are increasingly practicing in larger groups.[8] These dramatic changes in practice ownership mean fewer physicians — who are now employees rather than employers — are able to take advantage of the financial benefits that accrue to a medical practice that employs PAs, because they do not share in the overall profits generated by the practice. Yet if a physician agrees to enter into a formal practice arrangement with a PA as evidenced through an agreement (or other state mandated documentation) required by states for PA practice, the physician will still incur the potential liability that accompanies that agreement. In addition, as more physicians and PAs are practicing in large groups, requirements for these arrangements are increasingly difficult to manage and put all providers involved at risk of disciplinary action for administrative infractions that are unrelated to patient care or outcomes. As a result, physicians are increasingly unwilling to enter into them with PAs.

Simultaneous with these changes in physician employment, nurse practitioners (NPs) have been gaining full practice authority. As of 2019, 22 states and the District of Columbia allow NPs to practice without an agreement with a specific physician,[9] which makes it easier for employers to hire and manage NPs than PAs. These conditions put PAs at a significant disadvantage relative to NPs when it comes to hiring.

OPTIMAL TEAM PRACTICE EXPANDS ACCESS TO CARE

There is no evidence that requiring PAs to have or report an agreement or other relationship with a specific physician or group of physicians in order to practice has a positive impact on quality or access to care. However, the repeal of these requirements has significant potential to benefit patients, especially for medically underserved populations and patients in rural areas.

The rural physician workforce is aging.[10,11,12] As those physicians retire, PAs who staff rural health clinics are having difficulty identifying and securing agreements with specific physicians. For example, a PA in rural Oregon is concerned the community's only clinic may be forced to close when his supervising physician retires,[13] and a Wyoming PA reports he was forced to abruptly close the clinic, with patients waiting to be seen, when the physician he had an agreement with died unexpectedly. Even though the specialist physicians with whom the PA routinely consulted were available, the fact that the PA no longer had an agreement with a specific physician made him unable to see patients.[14]

© American Academy of PAs. All rights reserved.

BENEFITS TO HEALTHCARE TEAMS

Optimal Team Practice isn't just good for patients; it's good for PAs, physicians, and the entire healthcare team:

- PAs will have more latitude to provide volunteer medical services and to provide assistance during a natural disaster or an emergency;
- Healthcare teams will be empowered to make decisions about team design and practice at the practice level; and
- Physicians will be able to focus more on patient needs, instead of burdensome paperwork and unwarranted liability.

Repealing state law requirements for a PA to have a specific relationship with a physician or other healthcare provider in order to practice, and enabling practice-level decision making about collaboration will allow PAs to be more effective and available healthcare providers without a change in the well-established PA role.

© American Academy of PAs. All rights reserved.

REFERENCES

[1] Kurtzman E, Barnow B. *A comparison of nurse practitioners, physician assistants, and primary Care physicians' patterns of practice and quality of care in health centers*. *Medical Care*. 2017; 55(1): 615

[2] *U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration*. National Practitioner Data Bank. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health; 2016.

[3] , Liu, H., et al. (2017). *The impact of using mid-level providers in face-to-face primary care on health care utilization*. *Medical Care*, 55(1): 12; Costa, D.K., Wallace, D.J., Barnato, A.E., & Kahn, J.M. (2014). *Nurse practitioner/physician assistant staffing and critical care mortality*. Chest Journal, 146(6):1566-

[4] U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment. (1986). *Nurse practitioners, physician assistants, and certified nurse- midwives: a policy analysis*. Health Technology Case Study 37. Washington, DC.

[5] AAPA Research Department, AAPA. *2017 Full Practice Authority and Responsibility Survey Report: Report to the Joint Task Force on the Future of PA Practice Authority*. Alexandria, VA: AAPA; 2017

[6] Salsberg, E. (2015). *Is the physician shortage real? Implications for the recommendations of the Institute of Medicine Committee on the governance and financing of graduate medical education*. *Academic Medicine*, 90(9):1210-1214

[7] American Medical Association. *Updated Data on Physician Practice Arrangements: Physician Ownership Drops Below 50 Percent*. https://www.ama-assn.org/sites/default/files/media-browser/public/health-policy/PRP-2016-physician-benchmark- survey.pdf. Accessed October 20, 2017.

[8] David B. Muhlestein and Nathan J. Smith. *Physician Consolidation: Rapid Movement from Small to Large Group Practices 2013-15*. *Health Affairs* 35, no. 9 (2016): 1638-1642.

[9] Nurse Practitioners. State Practice Environment. American Association of Nurse Practitioners, AANP Website. https://www.aanp.org/legislation-regulation/state-legislation/state-practice-environment/66-legislation-regulation/state-practice-environment/1380-state-practice-by-type. February, 2017. Accessed October, 20, 2017.

[10] Jessica Wolf, *Eliminating Scope of Practice Barriers for Illinois Physician Assistants*, 23 Ann. of Health L. Advance Directive 16, 23 (2013).

[11] Leighanne Root, *Closing the Primary Care Gap: Is Pharmacists Prescriptive Authority the Answer*, 23 Ann. Health L. Advance Directive 66, 66 (2013).

[12] Suzanne Sataline & Shirley S. Wang, *Medical Schools Can't Keep UP*, Wall St. J. (April 12, 2010), https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052702304506904575180331528424238

[13] American Academy of PAs, *Outdated Laws Threaten Future of Patient Care in Rural Oregon*, November 9, 2017, https://www.aapa.org/news-central/2017/11/outdated-laws-threaten-future-patient-care-rural-oregon/.

[14] American Academy of PAs, WY PA Unable to Care for Patients after Physician Death, December 12, 2017, https://www.aapa.org/news-central/2017/12/wy-pa-unable-care-patients-physician-death/.

© American Academy of PAs. All rights reserved.