

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

JEAN CHARLES, JR., etc., et al.,

Appellants,

vs.

Case No. SC15-2180
DCA Case No. 1D15-0109
L.T. Case No.
2012-CA-002677

SOUTHERN BAPTIST HOSPITAL OF
FLORIDA, INC., et al.

Appellees.

**AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF OF THE JOINT COMMISSION IN SUPPORT
OF APPELLEE SOUTHERN BAPTIST HOSPITAL OF FLORIDA, INC.**

KATHERINE E. GIDDINGS, BCS (949396)
katherine.giddings@akerman.com
KRISTEN M. FIORE (25766)
kristen.fiore@akerman.com
elisa.miller@akerman.com
michele.rowe@akerman.com
Akerman LLP
106 East College Avenue, Suite 1200
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
Telephone: (850) 224-9634
Telecopier: (850) 222-0103

KIRK S. DAVIS, BCS (362220)
kirk.davis@akerman.com
lisa.schindler@akerman.com
Akerman LLP
401 E. Jackson Street, Suite 1700
Tampa, Florida 33602
Telephone: (813) 223-7333
Telecopier: (813) 223-2837

KATHLEEN T. PANKAU
Senior Legal Counsel
kpankau@jointcommission.org
The Joint Commission
One Renaissance Boulevard
Oakbrook Terrace, Illinois 60181
Telephone: (630)792-5675
**Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

Attorneys for *Amicus Curiae* The Joint Commission

RECEIVED, 04/29/2016 11:43:35 AM, Clerk, Supreme Court

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

STATEMENT OF INTEREST 1

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT 5

ARGUMENT 8

 I. THE JOINT COMMISSION HAS UNIQUE INSIGHT INTO
 THE PATIENT SAFETY ACT GIVEN ITS EXTENSIVE
 INVOLVEMENT IN ITS DEVELOPMENT—AND THE ACT
 IS CRITICAL TO PATIENT SAFETY PROTECTION..... 8

 II. JOINT COMMISSION ACCREDITATION STANDARDS
 DO NOT PREEMPT THE CONFIDENTIALITY AND
 PRIVILEGE OF PATIENT SAFETY WORK PRODUCT 11

 III. THE PATIENT SAFETY ACT ALLOWS PATIENT SAFETY
 WORK PRODUCT TO CONTAIN INFORMATION
 REQUIRED FOR OTHER OBLIGATIONS AND PROVIDES
 A MECHANISM FOR MEETING THOSE OBLIGATIONS..... 19

CONCLUSION 20

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 22

CERTIFICATE OF FONT SIZE 25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>Cases</u>	<u>Page</u>
<i>Bayfront Med. Ctr., Inc. v. Fla. Agency for Healthcare Admin.</i> , 741 So. 2d 1226 (Fla. 2d DCA 1999).....	17, 18
<i>Brandon Reg. Hosp. v. Murray</i> , 957 So. 2d 590 (Fla. 2007).....	18
<i>Fla. Eye Clinic, P.A. v. Gmach</i> , 14 So. 3d 1044 (Fla. 5th DCA 2009).....	18
<i>Southern Baptist Hosp. of Fla. v. Charles</i> , 178 So. 3d 102 (Fla. 1st DCA 2015)...	11
<i>Upjohn Co. v. United States</i> , 449 U.S. 383 (1981).....	18
 <u>Florida Statutes & Federal Code Provisions</u>	
§ 394.90, Fla. Stat	4
§ 395.1055, Fla. Stat	4
§ 400.9935, Fla. Stat.	4
§ 430.80, Fla. Stat	4
26 U.S.C. § 501(c)(3).....	1
42 U.S.C. § 299b-21.....	1
42 U.S.C. § 299b-21(7).....	12
42 U.S.C. § 299b-22(c)(2)(E)	16
42 U.S.C. § 299b-22(d)(1)	15
42 U.S.C. § 299b-22(f)	16
42 U.S.C. § 922(c)(2)(E).....	15

Rules and Regulations

Rule 59A-3.253, F.A.C.4
Fla. R. App. P. 9.210(a)(2).....25
42 C.F.R. § 3.102(a)(2)(ii)(A)3
45 C.F.R. § 488.84

Other Authorities

73 Fed. Reg. 70742 (Nov. 21, 2008).....20
Kelly Devers, et al., *What is Driving Hospitals' Patient-Safety Efforts?*
Health Affairs, Vol. 23, No. 2 (Mar./Apr. 2004)2
Jens Rasmussen, Annelise M. Pejtersen, L.P. Goodstein, *Cognitive Systems
Engineering* (1994).....13
The Joint Comm'n, *Comprehensive Accreditation Man. for Hosps.*,
(Jan. 2015)12, 13
The Joint Comm'n., *Mission Stmt.* (Aug. 15, 2009).....1
World Health Organization, Health Topics, *Patient Safety*,
www.who.int/topics/patient_safety/en/8
U.S. Dep't of Health and Human Servs., Agency for Healthcare Research and
Quality, *Patient Safety Primers, Root Cause Analyses*,
psnet.ahrq.gov/primer.aspx?primerID=10.....14

STATEMENT OF INTEREST

Amicus Curiae, The Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations ("**The Joint Commission**") files this *Amicus Curiae* Brief in support of Appellee, Southern Baptist Hospital of Florida, Inc. ("**Baptist**"). The Joint Commission is a not-for-profit, 26 U.S.C. § 501(c)(3) tax exempt corporation, which evaluates, accredits, and certifies nearly 20,500 health care organizations and programs in the United States, including Baptist's programs. Founded in 1951, it is the nation's oldest and largest standards-setting and accrediting body in the healthcare field.

The purpose of accreditation is "[t]o continuously improve health care for the public...by evaluating health care organizations [such as Baptist] and inspiring them to excel in providing safe and effective care of the highest quality and value." The Joint Comm'n., Mission Stmt. (Aug. 15, 2009).¹ The standards adopted by The Joint Commission are implemented voluntarily by their participating organizations. They are aspirational and intended to set a threshold for patient safety but not to limit new and innovative approaches like those made possible by the Patient Safety and Quality Improvement Act of 2005, 42 U.S.C. § 299b-21, *et. seq.* ("**Patient Safety Act**").

¹ Available at www.jointcommission.org/assets/1/18/Mission_Statement_8_09.pdf.

The Joint Commission is governed by a 32 member Board of Commissioners that includes physicians, nurses, healthcare administrators, quality experts, and business leaders, among others. Corporate members include: The American College of Physicians; The American College of Surgeons; The American Dental Association; The American Hospital Association; and The American Medical Association.

The Joint Commission's mission is to continuously improve health care for the public, in collaboration with other stakeholders, by evaluating health care organizations and inspiring them to excel in providing safe and effective care of the highest quality and value. It has long been concerned with the need to improve the level of safe and effective patient care in the United States, and has been at the forefront of driving needed patient safety initiatives. *See Kelly Devers, et al., What is Driving Hospitals' Patient-Safety Efforts? Health Affairs, Vol. 23, No. 2 (Mar./Apr. 2004).* However, The Joint Commission is well aware that its activities alone cannot fully support healthcare organizations to deliver safe and effective care of the highest quality and value without the involvement of other stakeholders—which is why it is so vitally important that one of those stakeholders, patient safety organizations ("**PSOs**"), successfully perform what Congress intended PSO's to accomplish.

Despite The Joint Commission's focus on promoting quality improvement and patient safety, its accreditation activity precludes it from becoming a certified patient safety organization under the Patient Safety Act.² Certain entities may not seek listing as a PSO, including "[a]n entity that accredits or licenses health care providers." 42 C.F.R. § 3.102(a)(2)(ii)(A). Therefore, The Joint Commission has no direct corporate interest in this matter. The Joint Commission's only interests in submitting this brief are to: (1) assist this Court; (2) support the confidentiality and privilege of "patient safety work product" ("PSWP"); (3) further patient safety enhancing efforts; (4) and hasten the introduction of evidenced-based solutions for some of the more vexing and recurring adverse patient safety events.

The Joint Commission goes beyond accreditation to help organizations improve patient healthcare. It is also a healthcare quality and patient safety improvement organization, along with its affiliates, Joint Commission Resources and the Center for Transforming Healthcare. The ultimate purpose of The Joint Commission's accreditation process is to enhance quality of care and patient safety, and it provides numerous resources to help accredited organizations meet accreditation requirements. Joint Commission Resources provides consultation and education to healthcare organizations on quality and patient safety issues. The

² Under the Patient Safety Act, The Joint Commission's affiliates can obtain certification as "component patient safety organizations" so long as certain firewall protections are established between accreditation and PSO activities. The Joint Commission has no component PSO at this time.

Center for Transforming Healthcare's mission is to transform healthcare into a "high reliability" industry by developing highly effective durable solutions to healthcare's most critical safety and quality problems and by disseminating solutions widely and facilitating their adoption.

Upon becoming accredited by The Joint Commission, many healthcare organizations, including the vast majority of hospitals in the United States, are deemed to meet the Medicare and Medicaid regulations, making them eligible to participate in these programs without the need for a separate government quality inspection. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 488.8. Because the aspirational standards of The Joint Commission have been so effective at promoting quality health care, the vast majority of states recognize The Joint Commission accreditation for licensure purposes. This includes the State of Florida, which accepts Joint Commission accreditation as evidence that a hospital meets the licensing requirements for hospitals [Rule 59A-3.253, F.A.C.; § 395.1055, Fla. Stat.]; ambulatory health care organizations [§ 400.9935, Fla. Stat.]; nursing care centers [§ 430.80, Fla. Stat.]; behavioral health programs [§ 394.90, Fla. Stat.]; and others.

Based on The Joint Commission's accreditation experience, it knows that safety improvement efforts should be confidential and privileged to encourage open, candid, and honest evaluations of adverse patient safety events to the benefit of patients. Unfortunately, the lack of adequate confidentiality and privilege

protection has been an enormous barrier to progress in patient safety. The Joint Commission has a compelling interest in this case because, long before the Patient Safety Act was passed, The Joint Commission sought federal legislation to create safe harbors for information collected or developed for the purpose of reducing risks associated with delivering patient care and health care services. As explained in this brief, the confidentiality of information provided under the Patient Safety Act is imperative to developing efficient processes for reducing those risks.

The Joint Commission files this *amicus* brief only to inform the Court about national matters of extreme importance to patient safety and quality improvement in health care and to provide context for Baptist's position. The Joint Commission is not filing this *amicus* brief to discuss the specific medical facts of the case or the standard of care for this liability dispute—and its participation should not be taken as expressing any view on the merits of the underlying claims or defenses.

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

The Joint Commission is in a unique position of understanding the important need—on a national level—to maintain the privilege and confidentiality of the information at issue. The answer is simple. Information provided through the patient safety evaluation system ("**PSE System**") under the Patient Safety Act is protected—regardless of state laws or constitutional amendments to the contrary. Information that is not in the PSE System is not protected. The information not in

the PSE System information, such as the factual basis for the issues in a particular case, is available for a states' review and may be reported in an incident report.³ But federal law protects against disclosure of submissions provided to the PSE System, which includes much more than pure facts.

Information provided under the Patient Safety Act is critical to promoting quality patient care, which is why The Joint Commission sought and received a permitted disclosure of PSWP by a provider to the provider's accrediting body. The trial court's order in this case is flawed because it requires an organization to produce records created before submission to its accrediting body—The Joint Commission—notwithstanding the fact those records include documents considered PSWP (such as root cause analyses) by an express waiver under federal law. Deeming this information unprotected from discovery severely thwarts the interaction between patients, providers, and The Joint Commission's accreditation program itself.

In formulating the Patient Safety Act, Congress understood the difference between the hard, cold facts of a particular event, which are discoverable, and the

³ As explained more fully in Baptist's Answer Brief, "occurrence reports" are a "central feature of [Baptist's] PSE System" and "record any and all events inconsistent with the routine operation of the hospital or the routine care of a patient." [AB at 5.] "Occurrence reports are labeled 'Patient Safety Work Product' and have not been disclosed to state agencies." *Id.* at 6. "The 'incident reports' that the State requires [Baptist] to create and maintain (but not report) are a subset of [Baptist's] occurrence reports." *Id.* at 7.

research and analyses that are developed for patient safety activities in accordance with the Patient Safety Act, such as root cause analyses.⁴ Obviously, patients' rights are paramount—which is why a patient's medical records, billing, discharge information, or other original patient information is specifically excluded from the definition of PSWP. The Joint Commission also understands and supports the states' need for factual information to carry out independent licensure actions. But organizations supply more than the facts of an incident when they conduct patient safety activities; and when that data is contained within a PSE System, it is protected from discovery under federal law.

At issue are systems and processes that are constantly in need of change as new problems arise. To open up to litigation all of a provider's efforts to make the system better and prevent patient harm thwarts Congressional intent and The Joint Commission's mission. Allowing for confidentiality of information provided under the Patient Safety Act is critical so problems in the system can be quickly addressed and changed when necessary to prevent reoccurrence. Allowing discovery of this information would not only be in derogation of federal law; it would also be harmful both nationally and to Florida's citizens, all of whom have an interest in promoting and obtaining quality healthcare and patient safety.

⁴ A root-cause analysis attempts to identify the causes of variation in performance, with a particular focus on systems and processes. *See* [Ans. Br. at 46-48].

ARGUMENT

I. THE JOINT COMMISSION HAS UNIQUE INSIGHT INTO THE PATIENT SAFETY ACT GIVEN ITS EXTENSIVE INVOLVEMENT IN ITS DEVELOPMENT—AND THE ACT IS CRITICAL TO PATIENT SAFETY PROTECTION.

"Patient safety" is the prevention of errors and adverse effects to patients that are associated with health care. See World Health Organization, Health Topics, *Patient Safety*, www.who.int/topics/patient_safety/en/ (last visited Apr. 28, 2016). In health care, mistakes are often the result of systems and processes that invite human error or, more importantly, that do not prevent humans from causing inadvertent harm. Health care processes must establish defensive barriers to prevent patient injury, wrapping risk points with protections that prevent errors from reaching the patient. When The Joint Commission began its quest in 1997, calling for Congressional action on this issue, the term "patient safety" was not yet widely used in healthcare. At that time, few in the healthcare field appreciated that many of the reasons for the occurrence of adverse patient safety events were due to the failure of organizations and practitioners to systematically identify, analyze, and take appropriate action against preventable risks. Serious adverse events, or risks thereof, were not routinely reported, nor shared among providers, for fear of reprisal, shame, or litigation.

To improve systems and processes for the enhancement of safety, hospitals and other health care providers need to learn from patient safety experts inside and

outside their organizations. Thus, the purpose of the Patient Safety Act's privilege for PSWP is to encourage reporting to outside experts in patient safety. This is so organizations can obtain expert analysis and feedback on individual and collegial processes and systems, and therefore rapidly advance patient safety and health care quality.

Understanding the etiology of serious adverse events and the existence of risks is essential to mitigating harm. The Joint Commission thus embarked on a dialogue with Congress for the purposes of obtaining protective legislation to encourage health care organizations to uncover their own risks, report adverse events, and share this information with their accrediting body to find ways to reduce the likelihood of inevitable human error from reaching patients. The Joint Commission intended that such information be used to help individual organizations address their specific issues, to inform and reform its accreditation standards, and to share causal information among all healthcare organizations about risks and solutions in a de-identified manner.

Although the House of Representatives twice passed a provision that would have provided safe harbor protection for sensitive information shared with accrediting bodies, the legislation never passed both chambers. Instead, through the actions of a larger coalition of over 100 professional and patient advocacy groups, including The Joint Commission, the concepts were later broadened and

incorporated into the Patient Safety Act. Indeed, The Joint Commission's then President, Dennis O'Leary, testified at the hearings regarding this legislation, asking Congress to extend protection to the root cause analyses that providers perform as a requirement of Joint Commission accreditation. [Ans. Br. at 47] The impetus behind the broad array of stakeholders was a strong belief that, without a learning environment within which to surface information free from concerns over confidentiality and privilege, there would continue to be hesitancy for providers to thoroughly analyze serious events, perform prospective risk analyses to identify potential vulnerabilities, collect information related to systems and process failures, or otherwise delve deeply into sensitive information that could be used against an organization or individual practitioner in court.

The Joint Commission thus played a key role and strongly supported the Patient Safety Act from its inception. This effort included the establishment of PSWP privilege as that term is defined in the Act. Representatives of The Joint Commission were at the critical stakeholder meetings, participated in drafting language proposals, and responded to legislative language as it evolved. The Joint Commission staff continue to be very knowledgeable about the purpose and meaning of this legislation. For these reasons, The Joint Commission believes its understanding of the Patient Safety Act, as outlined in this brief, will assist this

Court's understanding of the Patient Safety Act, and help the Court to interpret its provisions as intended by Congress.⁵

II. JOINT COMMISSION ACCREDITATION STANDARDS DO NOT PREEMPT THE CONFIDENTIALITY AND PRIVILEGE OF PATIENT SAFETY WORK PRODUCT.

When a document satisfies the definition of PSWP, it should not be stripped of its federal protection just because there is a state law or accreditation requirement underlying or prompting its creation or maintenance. Such an interpretation would only discourage further efforts to refine and revise such standards and undermine the safety of patients and the advancement of patient safety efforts. As the First District Court of Appeal recognized, the trial court's order directing discovery of such information eviscerated the federal statute's intended force and defeated Congress's core purpose of improving the quality of health care nationally. *See Southern Baptist Hosp. of Fla. v. Charles*, 178 So. 3d 102, 110-11 (Fla. 1st DCA 2015).

The Patient Safety Act provides very broad confidentiality and privilege protections to certain data that has been properly collected in a special collection system called the PSE System, as defined by the Act. When that data has been properly collected in a PSE System, it is known as PSWP, and it is entitled to

⁵ As explained more fully in Baptist's Answer Brief, Appellants' position "finds no support in the language of the Act and turns the Supremacy Clause upside down." [AB 14-15, 21, 25 n.2, 27-29.]

confidentiality and privilege, when it is to be submitted, or it has been submitted, to a patient safety organization.⁶

Like PSOs, The Joint Commission is an expert patient safety resource, helping hospitals and other healthcare organizations develop systems and processes to enhance the safety of care, treatment, and services to patients. Historically, The Joint Commission's standards, and other requirements, were directly related to creating systems that promote patient safety. In 1995, The Joint Commission introduced its Sentinel Event Policy, which requires hospitals to conduct a "root cause analysis" after a sentinel event,⁷ to help prevent the recurrence of unexpected outcomes in care. The Joint Comm'n, *Comprehensive Accreditation Man. for Hosps.*, SE at 1-18 (Jan. 2015).

A root cause analysis is a process for identifying basic or causal factors underlying variation in performance, including the occurrence of a sentinel event. Indeed, the Patient Safety Act's very definition of PSWP includes the term "root cause analyses," because this type of analysis is just the kind of patient safety activity protected by the Patient Safety Act. 42 U.S.C. § 299b-21(7). The term "root cause analyses" is thought to have originated in the aerospace industry in the

⁶ This assumes the data should have been put into the PSE System in the first place.

⁷ A sentinel event is an unexpected occurrence involving death or serious physical or psychological injury, or any process variation for which a recurrence would carry a significant chance of a serious adverse outcome.

1950's, but has since been adopted by other industries, including the healthcare field. *See, e.g.,* Jens Rasmussen, Annelise M. Pejtersen, L.P. Goodstein, *Cognitive Systems Engineering* (1994).

The preparation of a root cause analysis, after the occurrence of an adverse patient safety event, became more prevalent in the healthcare industry only after The Joint Commission introduced its Sentinel Event Policy in 1995. Each accredited organization is strongly encouraged, but not required, to report sentinel events to The Joint Commission. *Comprehensive Accreditation Man. for Hosp., SE* at 6. Joint Commission accredited organizations are expected to identify and respond appropriately to all sentinel events occurring in the organization. An appropriate response includes a timely, thorough, and credible root cause analysis, the development of an action plan to reduce risk, implementation of the action plan, and the monitoring of its effectiveness. *Id.* at 8. A root cause analysis begins with data collection and reconstruction of a patient safety event through record review and participant interviews. A root cause analysis focuses primarily on systems and processes, not on individual performance. The ultimate goal is to prevent future harm by eliminating the latent problems that often underlie adverse events. The following example explains how root cause analyses work to improve patient safety:

[A] patient [] underwent a cardiac procedure intended for another, similarly named patient. A traditional analysis might have focused on

assigning individual blame, perhaps to the nurse who sent the patient for the procedure despite the lack of a consent form. However, the subsequent [root cause analysis] revealed 17 distinct errors ranging from organizational factors (the cardiology department used a homegrown, error-prone scheduling system that identified patients by name rather than by medical record number) to work environment factors (a neurosurgery resident who suspected the mistake did not challenge the cardiologists because the procedure was at a technically delicate juncture). This led the hospital to implement a series of systematic changes to reduce the likelihood of a similar error in the future.

U.S. Dep't of Health and Human Servs., Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Patient Safety Primers, *Root Cause Analyses*, psnet.ahrq.gov/primer.aspx?primerID=10 (last visited Apr. 28, 2016).

This example illustrates the patient safety activity Congress sought to encourage in the Patient Safety Act. By providing broad confidentiality and privilege protections to a root cause analyses, the Patient Safety Act can hasten the speed of improvements in healthcare. By providing this analysis to its PSO, a provider can help disseminate to other health care providers the need to implement systematic process changes to avoid similar errors.

By the definition of PSWP alone, it is clear Congress knew that The Joint Commission's accreditation requirement for a root cause analysis would be created and maintained by organizations in a PSE system as PSWP. There was never any intent to exclude The Joint Commission-required root cause analyses from the patient safety activities protected by the Patient Safety Act.

The Joint Commission knew when the Patient Safety Act was still a working draft, that if a root cause analysis was created and maintained as PSWP, the strong confidentiality and privilege protections of the Patient Safety Act would prevent The Joint Commission from reviewing an organization's root cause analysis. Therefore, The Joint Commission sought, and obtained from Congress, a permitted disclosure of confidential and privileged PSWP by health care organizations to accrediting bodies. The broad coalition of stakeholders supported this permitted disclosure because they appreciated The Joint Commission's use of that information in a non-regulatory capacity; that is, for the promotion of broad based learning and a diminution of adverse patient safety events.

Section 922(c)(2)(E) of the Patient Safety Act, states:

(2) Exceptions from confidentiality. Subsection (b) shall not apply to (and shall not be construed to prohibit) one or more of the following disclosures:

.....

(E) Voluntary disclosure of patient safety work product by a provider to an accrediting body that accredits that provider.

The title of this subsection, "*Exceptions from Confidentiality*," may be somewhat of a misnomer because PSWP maintains its confidentiality, and its privilege, even when it is disclosed in any one of the ten ways permitted by this subsection. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 299b-22(d)(1). The exception permits a disclosure of the information to The Joint Commission so the organization performance can be

assessed, and The Joint Commission can assist the entity in question. Voluntary disclosures to The Joint Commission of root cause analyses, created as PSWP, are still confidential and privileged under the Patient Safety Act for all other purposes—without exception. Appellants' interpretation guts this. Thus, when an organization chooses to prepare a root cause analysis in its PSE System for submission to a PSO, The Joint Commission considers the root cause analysis to be PSWP and protected under the Patient Safety Act.

This permitted disclosure is critical in light of the sanctions imposed by Congress under the Patient Safety Act to ensure organizations do not make unauthorized disclosures of protected information. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 299b-22(f). Under Appellants' view (without the permitted disclosure), an organization could be fined for violating the confidentiality provisions of the Patient Safety Act if it submitted a root cause analysis to The Joint Commission (created as PSWP)—even though that root cause analysis was conducted in the same way recommended for accreditation by The Joint Commission. The Patient Safety Act protects voluntary disclosures of PSWP to The Joint Commission and to other accrediting bodies precisely to encourage the adoption of powerful analytic techniques like the root cause analysis. Thus, organizations do not violate the confidentiality provisions, nor strip information of the privilege, when they voluntarily share root cause analyses with their accrediting bodies. 42 U.S.C. § 299b-22(c)(2)(E).

Moreover, without this permitted disclosure provision in the Act, if an organization informed The Joint Commission that its root cause analysis had been created, and was maintained, in the organization's PSE System for reporting to a patient safety organization, The Joint Commission could not view the root cause analysis. The organization had created the root cause analysis in compliance with the Sentinel Event Policy, and it did so in its PSE System for submission to a patient safety organization. The fact that this PSWP contained information about a Joint Commission-required root cause analysis would change nothing about its status as PSWP, nor would it strip the confidentiality or the privilege protections afforded that root cause analysis by the Patient Safety Act. The same treatment for privilege would apply to information and documents created and maintained for other obligations, when they are properly created as PSWP.

The First District Court of Appeal's decision comports with other Florida decisions. For example, Florida has recognized, similar to this case, that opinions and deliberations arising from a health care provider's internal risk management program can remain confidential even if the resulting investigative report itself is not. In *Bayfront Medical Center, Inc. v. Florida Agency for Healthcare Administration*, 741 So. 2d 1226 (Fla. 2d DCA 1999), the court rejected the argument that one subsection of Florida's peer review statute overrode another. In doing so, the court emphasized the distinction between risk management and

professional competency in finding some documents remained confidential—the purpose being to protect the integrity of the "peer review" process. Following *Bayfront*, the Florida Supreme Court in *Brandon Regional Hospital v. Murray*, 957 So. 2d 590 (Fla. 2007), reaffirmed the distinction at issue there, going even further by finding that the documents sought by the state agency in *Bayfront* could not be disclosed in civil litigation.

As in *Bayfront*, this Court should recognize the distinctions between the PSWP privileged information provided under the Patient Safety Act that are confidential and other information that is not. Each serve completely different purposes, and the confidentiality afforded PSWP is essential to the integrity of the Patient Safety Act's purposes.

The distinctions here are analogous to the distinctions between attorney fact work product (which is generally not protected) versus attorney opinion work product (which is generally protected). *See, e.g., Fla. Eye Clinic, P.A. v. Gmach*, 14 So. 3d 1044, 1049 (Fla. 5th DCA 2009) (citing *Upjohn Co. v. United States*, 449 U.S. 383, 399-401 (1981) (distinguishing fact work product pertaining to a client's case and prepared and gathered in connection therewith, from opinion work product consisting of an attorney's mental impressions, conclusions, opinions or theories concerning a client's case—to allow parties to predict with some degree of certainty whether certain discussions will be protected)). In preparing root cause

analyses, as with attorney opinion work product, there is a solicitation and collection of opinions and efforts to find systemic errors and, under the Patient Safety Act, these must be protected from discovery and litigation. This protection does not include discoverable facts.

III. THE PATIENT SAFETY ACT ALLOWS PATIENT SAFETY WORK PRODUCT TO CONTAIN INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR OTHER OBLIGATIONS AND PROVIDES A MECHANISM FOR MEETING THOSE OBLIGATIONS.

The Joint Commission was keenly aware of the careful balance Congress sought to strike between protecting PSWP and meeting state licensure and other obligations. The Patient Safety Act does not supplant or interfere with state required incident reports or the patient's right to know, but it distinguishes these obligations from each other and declares they are separate and apart. Once information is collected and maintained within a PSE System, it is considered PSWP. The information may be extracted from the PSE System by the provider before the information is reported to the PSO, but once it is reported to the PSO, the PSWP cannot be used to meet other obligations. In the words of the Department of Health and Human Services:

Providers need not maintain duplicate systems to separate information to be reported to a PSO from information that may be required to fulfill state reporting obligations. All of this information, collected in one patient safety evaluation system, is protected as patient safety work product unless the provider determines that certain information must be removed from the patient safety evaluation system for reporting to the state. Once removed from

the patient safety evaluation system, this information is no longer patient safety work product.

73 Fed. Reg. 70742 (Nov. 21, 2008) (emphasis added).

Thus, the confidentiality and privilege of PSWP is not changed when an organization fails to separately collect the information to comply with external obligations, such as root cause analyses for accreditation and incident reports for state regulations. To produce the additional requested information, the organization would have to create separate reports concerning the same events, reviving concerns that providers would have to maintain duplicate systems to separate information, which might discourage participation in the Patient Safety Act's reporting system due to costs and burdens.

CONCLUSION

The Joint Commission's support of a broad privilege for patient safety work product is intended solely to improve patient healthcare and patient safety across the country. Its support reflects Congressional intent as to its goals for the Patient Safety Act. Based on The Joint Commission's extensive knowledge of the field, if the trial court's orders stand, the Patient Safety Act's goal of improvements in patient safety will be severely compromised. This Court should affirm the First District's opinion.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Katherine E. Giddings

KATHERINE E. GIDDINGS, BCS (949396)

katherine.giddings@akerman.com

KRISTEN M. FIORE (25766)

kristen.fiore@akerman.com

elisa.miller@akerman.com

michele.rowe@akerman.com

Akerman LLP

106 East College Avenue, Suite 1200

Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Telephone: (850) 224-9634

Telecopier: (850) 222-0103

KIRK S. DAVIS, BCS (362220)

kirk.davis@akerman.com

lisa.schindler@akerman.com

Akerman LLP

401 E. Jackson Street, Suite 1700

Tampa, Florida 33602

Telephone: (813) 223-7333

Telecopier: (813) 223-2837

KATHLEEN T. PANKAU

Senior Legal Counsel

kpankau@jointcommission.org

The Joint Commission

One Renaissance Boulevard

Oakbrook Terrace, Illinois 60181

Telephone: (630)792-5675

**Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

Attorneys for *Amicus Curiae* The Joint Commission

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been electronically uploaded to the Supreme Court of Florida's e-Portal and further certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was furnished by E-Mail to counsel for the parties listed below this 29th day of April 2016.

George N. Meros, Jr.

George.Meros@gray-robinson.com

Andy Bardos

andy.bardos@gray-robinson.com

charlene.roberts@gray-robinson.com

mwilkinson@gray-robinson.com

GrayRobinson, P.A.

301 South Bronough Street, Suite 600

Tallahassee, FL 32301

Attorneys for Appellee Southern Baptist Hospital of Florida, Inc.

Michael H. Harmon

mharmon@smithhulsey.com

William E. Kuntz

wkuntz@smithhulsey.com

Earl E. Googe, Jr.

egooge@smithhulsey.com

sjohnson@smithhulsey.com

khettinger@smithhulsey.com

Smith, Hulsey & Busey, P.A.

225 Water Street, Suite 1800

Jacksonville, FL 32202

Attorneys for Appellee Southern Baptist Hospital of Florida, Inc.

Bryan S. Gowdy

bgowdy@appellate-firm.com

filings@appellate-firm.com

Creed & Gowdy, P.A.

865 May Street

Jacksonville, FL 32204

Attorney for Appellants Jean Charles, Jr., etc. and Pervin Alston

Thomas S. Edwards, Jr.

service@edwardsragatz.com

tse@edwardsragatz.com

kah@edwardsragatz.com

Edwards & Ragatz, P.A.

501 Riverside Avenue, Suite 601

Jacksonville, FL 32202

Attorney for Appellants Jean Charles, Jr., etc. and Pervin Alston

Jack E. Holt, III

jeholtiii@growerketcham.com

ngallagher@growerketcham.com

enotice@growerketcham.com

Grower, Ketcham, Rutherford,

Bronson, Eide & Telan, P.A.

Post Office Box 538065

Orlando, Florida 32853-8065

Telephone: 407-423-9545

Attorneys for Appellee Southern Baptist Hospital of Florida, Inc.

Borden R. Hallowes
bhallowes@bellsouth.net
cshallowes@gmail.com
545 Oglethorpe Avenue, Suite 202
St. Simons Island, GA 31522
*Trial Counsel for
Plaintiffs/ Respondents*

P. Scott Mitchell
smitchell@fmhslaw.com
Kathryn L. Hood
khood@fmhslaw.com
cmcrae@fmhslaw.com
Fuller, Mitchell, Hood &
Stephens, LLC
2565 Barrington Circle
Tallahassee, FL 32308
*Trial Counsel for
Defendants/ Respondents/Appellees
Yuval Z. Naot, M.D., Safer A.
Ashraf, M.D., and
Integrated Community
Oncology Network, LLC*

Andrew S. Bolin
asb@law-fla.com
Beytin, McLaughlin, McLaughlin,
O'Hara, Bocchino & Bolin, P.A.
201 N. Franklin Street, Suite 2000
Tampa, FL 33602
*Attorney for Amicus Curiae
Patient Safety Organization of
Florida and ECRI Institute PSO*

John J. Schickel
JJS@cokerlaw.com
Howard C. Coker
HCC@cokerlaw.com
Charles A. Sorenson
CAS@cokerlaw.com
Aaron Sprague
EAS@cokerlaw.com
RMS@cokerlaw.com
Coker, Schickel, Sorenson,
Posgay, Camerlengo & Iracki
136 East Bay Street
Jacksonville, FL 32202
*Trial Counsel for Plaintiffs/
Respondents*

William D. Thompson
billdefthompson@yahoo.com
58 Sea Winds Lane East
Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082
*Trial Counsel for
Plaintiffs/Respondents*

W. Douglas Childs
dchilds@childslegalgroup.com
Linda M. Hester
lhester@childslegalgroup.com
pcreech@childslegalgroup.com
mowens@childslegalgroup.com
1551 Atlantic Boulevard
Jacksonville, FL 32207
*Trial Counsel for Defendant/
Respondent/Appellee Gregory J.
Sengstock, M.D.*

George A. Vaka
Nancy A. Lauten
Richard N. Asfar
gvaka@vakalaw.com
nlauten@vakalaw.com
rasfar@vakalaw.com
Vaka Law Group, P.L.
777 S. Harbour Island Blvd., Ste. 300
Tampa, FL 33602
Attorneys for Amicus Curiae, AARP Inc.

Philip M. Burlington
pmb@FLAppellateLaw.com
lab@FLAppellateLaw.com
Burlington & Rockenbach, P.A.
444 W. Railroad Avenue, Ste. 430
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
Attorney for Amicus Curiae, Florida Justice Association

Joshua P. Welsh
jwelsh@bushross.com
sseals@bushross.com
Bush Ross, P.A.
P.O. Box 3913
Tampa, FL 33601-3913
Attorney for Amici Curiae, The American Medical Association and the Florida Medical Association

Maame Gyamfi
mgyamfi@aarp.org
AARP Foundation
601 E. Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20049
**Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

Jesse F. Suber
mmeservice@henryblaw.com
cdulay@henryblaw.com
Henry, Buchanan, Hudson, Suber & Carter, P.A.
2508 Barrington Circle
Tallahassee, FL 32308
Trial Counsel for Defendant/ Respondent/Appellee Andrew Namen, M.D.

Christopher V. Carlyle
served@appellatelawfirm.com
ccarlyle@appellatelawfirm.com
The Carlyle Appellate Law Firm
The Carlyle Building
1950 Laurel Manor Drive, Suite 130
The Villages, FL 32162
Attorneys for Amicus Curiae, Florida Consumer Action Network

John R. Saalfield
Duke Regan
Saalfield.filings@saalfieldlaw.com
Saalfield, Shad, Stokes, Inclan, Stoudemire & Stone, P.A.
245 Riverside Avenue, Suite 400
Jacksonville, FL 32202
Trial Counsel for Defendant/Respondent/Appellee John D. Pennington, M.D.

Elizabeth J. Campbell
ECampbell@lockelord.com
Locke Lord LLP
525 Okeechobee Blvd., Ste. 1600
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
*Attorneys for Amicus Curiae, Alliance
for Quality Improvement and Patient
Safety*

Michael R. Callahan
Michael.Callahan@kattenlaw.com
Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP
525 W. Monroe Street
Chicago, IL 60661-3693
**Admitted Pro Hac Vice
Attorney for Amici Curiae, The
American Medical Association and the
Florida Medical Association*

/s/ Katherine E. Giddings
KATHERINE E. GIDDINGS, B.C.S.

CERTIFICATE OF FONT SIZE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the font used in this brief is the Times New Roman 14-point font and that the brief complies with the font requirements of Rule 9.210(a)(2).

/s/ Katherine E. Giddings
KATHERINE E. GIDDINGS, BCS