

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION HOUSE OF DELEGATES

Resolution: 1
(A-19)

Introduced by: International Medical Graduates Section

Subject: Grandfathering Qualified Applicants Practicing in U.S. Institutions with
Restricted Medical Licensure

Referred to: Reference Committee _____
(_____, Chair)

1 Whereas, IMGs in the past were permitted to work in academic institutions, either for their
2 specific skills or a need due to fill unmet patient care needs in certain physician specialties or
3 geographical areas; and
4

5 Whereas, Physicians were allowed to work with an institutional or faculty temporary license
6 granted by their local state medical board without having completed the USMLE examination, or
7 without being American Board certified or eligible in their specialty; and
8

9 Whereas, These physicians completed medical school and specialty training abroad were often
10 excellent candidates with strong curricula and their titles were recognized equivalent to the ones
11 received in the U.S. by the receiving academic institution to allow them to work; and
12

13 Whereas, In recent years, these physicians faced the problem that many academic and non-
14 academic institutions created rules to have only American Board certified physicians among
15 their faculty/staff and were unwilling to grant institutional licenses any longer which creates a
16 dramatic situation for these physicians who have practiced and trained U.S. medical students,
17 residents and physicians in the U.S. for many years; and
18

19 Whereas, These IMGs admitted to work in the U.S. to fill a void and a need are now faced with
20 losing their jobs without the ability to practice anywhere in the U.S.; and
21

22 Whereas, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, an IMG or graduate of unaccredited medical
23 college may have their unmet qualifications waived by the Board if the applicant is determined
24 to possess the educational background and technical skills and the waiver is considered to be
25 beneficial to patients and the community; therefore be it
26

27 RESOLVED, That the American Medical Association work with the Federation of State Medical
28 Boards, the Organized Medical Staff Section and other stakeholders to advocate for state
29 medical boards to support the licensure to practice of medicine by physicians who have
30 demonstrated they possess the educational background and technical skills and who have
31 practiced at least 10 years in the U.S. Healthcare system. (Directive to Take Action)

RELEVANT AMA POLICY

Medical Specialty Board Certification Standards H-275.926

Our AMA:

1. Opposes any action, regardless of intent, that appears likely to confuse the public about the unique credentials of American Board of Medical Specialties (ABMS) or American Osteopathic Association Bureau of Osteopathic Specialists (AOA-BOS) board-certified physicians in any medical specialty, or take advantage of the prestige of any medical specialty for purposes contrary to the public good and safety.
2. Continues to work with other medical organizations to educate the profession and the public about the ABMS and AOA-BOS board certification process. It is AMA policy that when the equivalency of board certification must be determined, accepted standards, such as those adopted by state medical boards or the Essentials for Approval of Examining Boards in Medical Specialties, be utilized for that determination.
3. Opposes discrimination against physicians based solely on lack of ABMS or equivalent AOA-BOS board certification, or where board certification is one of the criteria considered for purposes of measuring quality of care, determining eligibility to contract with managed care entities, eligibility to receive hospital staff or other clinical privileges, ascertaining competence to practice medicine, or for other purposes. Our AMA also opposes discrimination that may occur against physicians involved in the board certification process, including those who are in a clinical practice period for the specified minimum period of time that must be completed prior to taking the board certifying examination.
4. Advocates for nomenclature to better distinguish those physicians who are in the board certification pathway from those who are not.
5. Encourages member boards of the ABMS to adopt measures aimed at mitigating the financial burden on residents related to specialty board fees and fee procedures, including shorter preregistration periods, lower fees and easier payment terms.

Maintenance of Certification H-275.924

AMA Principles on Maintenance of Certification (MOC)

1. Changes in specialty-board certification requirements for MOC programs should be longitudinally stable in structure, although flexible in content.
2. Implementation of changes in MOC must be reasonable and take into consideration the time needed to develop the proper MOC structures as well as to educate physician diplomates about the requirements for participation.
3. Any changes to the MOC process for a given medical specialty board should occur no more frequently than the intervals used by that specialty board for MOC.
4. Any changes in the MOC process should not result in significantly increased cost or burden to physician participants (such as systems that mandate continuous documentation or require annual milestones).
5. MOC requirements should not reduce the capacity of the overall physician workforce. It is important to retain a structure of MOC programs that permits physicians to complete modules with temporal flexibility, compatible with their practice responsibilities.

6. Patient satisfaction programs such as The Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (CAHPS) patient survey are neither appropriate nor effective survey tools to assess physician competence in many specialties.
7. Careful consideration should be given to the importance of retaining flexibility in pathways for MOC for physicians with careers that combine clinical patient care with significant leadership, administrative, research and teaching responsibilities.
8. Legal ramifications must be examined, and conflicts resolved, prior to data collection and/or displaying any information collected in the process of MOC. Specifically, careful consideration must be given to the types and format of physician-specific data to be publicly released in conjunction with MOC participation.
9. Our AMA affirms the current language regarding continuing medical education (CME): "Each Member Board will document that diplomats are meeting the CME and Self-Assessment requirements for MOC Part II. The content of CME and self-assessment programs receiving credit for MOC will be relevant to advances within the diplomate's scope of practice, and free of commercial bias and direct support from pharmaceutical and device industries. Each diplomate will be required to complete CME credits (AMA PRA Category 1 Credit™, American Academy of Family Physicians Prescribed, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, and/or American Osteopathic Association Category 1A)."
10. In relation to MOC Part II, our AMA continues to support and promote the AMA Physician's Recognition Award (PRA) Credit system as one of the three major credit systems that comprise the foundation for continuing medical education in the U.S., including the Performance Improvement CME (PICME) format; and continues to develop relationships and agreements that may lead to standards accepted by all U.S. licensing boards, specialty boards, hospital credentialing bodies and other entities requiring evidence of physician CME.
11. MOC is but one component to promote patient safety and quality. Health care is a team effort, and changes to MOC should not create an unrealistic expectation that lapses in patient safety are primarily failures of individual physicians.
12. MOC should be based on evidence and designed to identify performance gaps and unmet needs, providing direction and guidance for improvement in physician performance and delivery of care.
13. The MOC process should be evaluated periodically to measure physician satisfaction, knowledge uptake and intent to maintain or change practice.
14. MOC should be used as a tool for continuous improvement.
15. The MOC program should not be a mandated requirement for licensure, credentialing, re-credentialing, privileging, reimbursement, network participation, employment, or insurance panel participation.
16. Actively practicing physicians should be well-represented on specialty boards developing MOC.
17. Our AMA will include early career physicians when nominating individuals to the Boards of Directors for ABMS member boards.
18. MOC activities and measurement should be relevant to clinical practice.
19. The MOC process should be reflective of and consistent with the cost of development and administration of the MOC components, ensure a fair fee structure, and not present a barrier to patient care.

20. Any assessment should be used to guide physicians' self-directed study.
21. Specific content-based feedback after any assessment tests should be provided to physicians in a timely manner.
22. There should be multiple options for how an assessment could be structured to accommodate different learning styles.
23. Physicians with lifetime board certification should not be required to seek recertification.
24. No qualifiers or restrictions should be placed on diplomates with lifetime board certification recognized by the ABMS related to their participation in MOC.
25. Members of our House of Delegates are encouraged to increase their awareness of and participation in the proposed changes to physician self-regulation through their specialty organizations and other professional membership groups.
26. The initial certification status of time-limited diplomates shall be listed and publicly available on all American Board of Medical Specialties (ABMS) and ABMS Member Boards' websites and physician certification databases. The names and initial certification status of time-limited diplomates shall not be removed from ABMS and ABMS Member Boards' websites or physician certification databases even if the diplomate chooses not to participate in MOC.
27. Our AMA will continue to work with the national medical specialty societies to advocate for the physicians of America to receive value in the services they purchase for Maintenance of Certification from their specialty boards. The value in MOC should include cost-effectiveness with full financial transparency, respect for physicians' time and their patient care commitments, alignment of MOC requirements with other regulator and payer requirements, and adherence to an evidence basis for both MOC content and proc