Economic credentialing defines a health care professional’s qualifications based solely on economic factors which are unrelated to the individual’s ability to make medical review or direct clinical care decisions consistent with the applicable standard of care. It involves the use of economic criteria by a health care organization as the only factor which determines a physician’s or other health care professional’s qualifications for initiation, continuation, or revocation of medical care or peer review privileges. As such, economic credentialing impedes the professional’s role as the patient’s advocate, represents an inappropriate basis for credentialing, and should be considered professionally unacceptable.

Credentialing must be the exclusive product of qualified and objective peer review, utilizing criteria directly related to the quality of patient care in which neither over- nor under-utilization of medical resources is accepted. The decision-making process of peer review must be objective and unbiased, consistent with the standard of care in medical decision-making, and not unreasonable, capricious or arbitrary; it must have dated, detailed documentation and be legally and clinically justifiable, performed in good faith and equally applied to all. In cases of adverse peer review decisions, avenues of appeals utilizing due process and the inclusion of recorded fair hearings before a panel of objective peers must be available to all physicians or health care professionals being credentialed.

References:
California Business and Professions Code § 809.1-5.
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