

**INDEPENDENT REVIEW**  
**of**  
**CONTRACTED (INSURED) SURGICAL SERVICES**

**Alberta Health and Wellness**

**Proposal Assessment Process**  
**(Stage 3.2.2)**

Independent Third Party

**John F. Stockton**

Vancouver, B.C.  
Canada

**(604) 230-2254**

This report is the sole and confidential property of Alberta Health & Wellness. It is not to be distributed or replicated without their expressed permission. The information contained within this report, while drawn from sources believed to be reliable, is not guaranteed as to accuracy or completeness.

**THE DATE OF THIS REPORT IS SEPTEMBER 28, 2000**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	2
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b> .....	3
1.1 Overview of Project.....	3
1.2 Role & Responsibilities.....	3
1.3 Scope of Work .....	4
<b>2.0 INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS</b> .....	5
<b>3.0 VALIDATION</b> .....	6
3.1 <u>Capital Health Authority</u> .....	6
3.11 Ophthalmology (7 agreements).....	6
3.12 Dermatology (1 agreement) .....	6
3.13 Pregnancy Termination (1 agreement) .....	7
3.14 Plastic Surgery (2 agreements).....	7
3.2 <u>Calgary Regional Health Authority</u> .....	9
3.21 Ophthalmology (5 agreements).....	9
3.22 Pregnancy Termination (1 Agreement).....	9
3.3 <u>Headwaters Health Authority</u> .....	10
3.31 Plastic Surgery (1 agreement).....	10
<b>4.0 CONCLUSION</b> .....	11

## 1.0 Introduction

### 1.1 Overview of Project

The recent legislative passing of the Health Care Protection Act (HCPA) requires those services that come under the ambit of the act to submit proposals to the Ministry for review. Health Authorities that wish to enter into an agreement with the operator of a surgical facility for the purpose of providing insured surgical services are required to provide the Minister with a proposal package for review. They must be able to demonstrate compliance with Section 8 (3) (a) to (g) for the Minister to consider approval.

To evaluate and ensure an objective, transparent and balanced proposal assessment process the Ministry has developed a robust set of assessment criteria pertinent to the described Section 8 (3)(a) to (g) of the HCPA. Balanced decision making processes for assessing the proposed agreements have been developed to ensure objective and unbiased rationales.

Integral, but at the same time independent to these processes the Ministry has appropriately highlighted the need for an independent review and validation of the rationales used. Using best judgement, an external independent reviewer validates the rationales used in deriving the conclusions and recommendations by either confirming, or not confirming the rationales. Any relevant qualifications and comments will be clearly documented for each case.

### 1.2 Role & Responsibilities

- The external reviewer is an independent contractor and accountable to Alberta Health & Wellness through the designated Minister's Representative Mr. Rai Batra, Assistant Deputy Minister, Finance & Health Plan Administration.
- The primary role of the reviewer is to provide the Ministry an independent validation of the rationale(s) used in the decision making related to the surgical services proposal assessments.
- The reviewer will be responsible to:
  - ✓ independently review the proposals as available;
  - ✓ develop an effective validation process that will meet the timing and content requirements of the overall project;
  - ✓ remain independent to the decision making processes and contact the Chair of the Proposal Assessment Team for any requested information & clarification;
  - ✓ provide a succinct, unambiguous and clear minded draft report to the Executive Team for review;

- ✓ work effectively with the Executive Team to resolve differences in recommendations prior to release of the final report.

### 1.3 Scope of Work

The scope of the work is to independently review the provided proposals against the Ministry's Assessment Criteria and determine whether the proposal content meets, or does not meet the legislated requirements (Section 8(3)(a) to (g) of the Health Care Protection Act; thus determining an acceptable or unacceptable level of compliance with the act.

The rationales used to determine the recommendation(s) provided by the Proposal Assessment Team will be reviewed using best judgment. The rationales will be validated to either confirm, or not confirm the conclusion(s) & recommendations. Any necessary qualification or comment will be provided and specific to each proposal.

The following proposals have been reviewed and validated:

- **Capital Health Authority**
  - Ophthalmology (7 agreements)
  - Dermatology (1 agreement)
  - Pregnancy Termination (1 agreement)
  - Plastic Surgery (2 agreements)
- **Calgary Regional Health Authority**
  - Ophthalmology (5 agreements)
  - Pregnancy Termination (1 agreement)
- **Headwaters Health Authority**
  - Plastic Surgery (1 agreement)

A summary statement and conclusion is provided to ensure the validation process is viewed in the appropriate context.

## **2.0 Independent Review Process**

### **1. Request for Proposal**

- ✓ RFP reviewed
- ✓ Interview and presentation at Alberta Health
- ✓ Contract signed

### **2. External Proposal (s) Reviewed**

- ✓ Preliminary review of proposals
- ✓ Clarification request to PAT leader

### **3. Independent Validation Process**

- ✓ Recommendations & rationales reviewed
- ✓ Independent adjudication process
- ✓ Documentation and draft report generation

### **4. Report Communication & Delivery**

- ✓ Draft report to executive team
- ✓ Review of draft report by executive team
- ✓ Clearance by executive team for release of final report

## 3.0 Validation

### 3.1 Capital Health Authority

#### 3.11 OPHTHALMOLOGY (7 agreements)

- BUSKI EYE CENTRE AND SURGICAL SUITE
- CORONATION DAY SURGERY CENTRE LTD.
- DAVID B. CLIMENHAGA PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
- GIMBEL EYE CENTRE : EDMONTON
- SURGICAL CENTRES INC.
- DR. ROYCE JOHNSON
- ALBERTA EYE INSTITUTE

The decision rationales of the ophthalmology proposal have been independently reviewed, adjudicated and validated using best judgement against the proposal assessment criteria provided in the document: *Consensus and Recommendations of the Proposal Assessment Team(PAT)*.

Based on the available information the general finding is the:

- PAT rationales are: **Confirmed**

#### **Qualification(s) & Comment:**

On balance, there is sufficient evidence to concur that the proposal assessment criteria have been met to determine an acceptable level of compliance with the legislated requirements contained in Section 8 (3) (a) to (g) of the Health Care Protection Act.

#### 3.12 DERMATOLOGY (1 AGREEMENT)

- DON GROOT PROFESSIONAL CORP/ DERMASURGERY CENTRE

The decision rationales of the dermatology proposal have been independently reviewed, adjudicated and validated using best judgement against the assessment criteria of the information provided in the document: *Consensus and Recommendations of the Proposal Assessment Team (PAT)*.

Based on the available information the general finding is the:

- PAT rationales are: **Confirmed**

**Qualification(s) & Comment:**

On balance, there is sufficient evidence to concur that the proposal assessment criteria have been met to determine an acceptable level of compliance with the legislated requirements contained in Section 8 (3) (a) to (g) of the Health Care Protection Act.

---

**3.13 PREGNANCY TERMINATION (1 AGREEMENT)**

- MORGENTALER CLINIC

The decision rationales of the therapeutic abortion proposal have been independently reviewed, adjudicated and validated using best judgement against the proposal assessment criteria of the information provided in the document: Consensus and Recommendations of the Proposal Assessment Team (PAT).

Based on the available information the general finding is the:

- PAT rationales are: **Confirmed**

**Qualification(s) & Comment:**

On balance, there is sufficient evidence to concur that the proposal assessment criteria have been met to determine an acceptable level of compliance with the legislated requirements contained in Section 8 (3) (a) to (g) of the Health Care Protection Act.

---

**3.14 PLASTIC SURGERY (2 AGREEMENTS)**

- PLASTIC & COSMETIC LASER SURGICAL CENTRE
- SURGICAL CENTRE INC.

The decision rationales of the plastic surgery proposal have been independently reviewed, adjudicated and validated using best judgement against the proposal assessment criteria provided in the document: *Consensus and Recommendations of the Proposal Assessment Team (PAT)*.

Based on this information the general finding is the:

- PAT rationales are: **Confirmed**

**Qualification(s) & Comment:**

On balance, there is sufficient evidence to concur that the proposal assessment criteria have been met to determine an acceptable level of compliance with the legislated requirements contained in Section 8 (3) (a) to (g) of the Health Care Protection Act.



## **3.2 Calgary Regional Health Authority**

### **3.21 OPHTHALMOLOGY (5 AGREEMENTS)**

- GIMBEL EYE CENTRE
- HOLY CROSS SURGICAL SERVICES
- MITCHELL EYE CENTRE
- ROCKY MOUNTAIN SURGICAL CENTRE
- SURGICAL CENTRES INC.

The decision rationales of the ophthalmology proposal have been independently reviewed, adjudicated and validated using best judgement against the proposal assessment criteria provided in the document: *Consensus and Recommendations of the Proposal Assessment Team (PAT)*.

Based on this information the general finding is the:

- PAT rationales are: **Confirmed**

#### **Qualification(s) & Comment:**

On balance, there is sufficient evidence to concur that the proposal assessment criteria have been met to determine an acceptable level of compliance with the legislated requirements contained in Section 8 (3) (a) to (g) of the Health Care Protection Act.

### **3.22 PREGNANCY TERMINATION (1 AGREEMENT)**

- KENSINGTON CLINIC

The decision rationales of the pregnancy termination proposal have been independently reviewed, adjudicated and validated using best judgement against the proposal assessment criteria of the information provided in the document: *Consensus and Recommendations of the Proposal Assessment Team (PAT)*.

Based on this information the general finding is the:

- PAT rationales are: **Confirmed**

#### **Qualification(s) & Comment:**

On balance, there is sufficient evidence to concur that the proposal assessment criteria have been met to determine an acceptable level of

compliance with the legislated requirements contained in Section 8 (3) (a) to (g) of the Health Care Protection Act.

---

### **3.3 Headwaters Health Authority**

#### **3.31 PLASTIC SURGERY (1 AGREEMENT)**

- BANFF OUTPATIENT SURGERY CENTRE

The decision rationales of the plastic surgery proposal have been independently reviewed, adjudicated and validated using best judgement against the proposal assessment criteria provided in the document: *Consensus and Recommendations of the Proposal Assessment Team (PAT)*.

Based on this information the general finding is the:

- PAT rationales are: **Confirmed**

#### **Qualification(s) & Comment:**

On balance, there is sufficient evidence to concur that the proposal assessment criteria have been met to determine an acceptable level of compliance with the legislated requirements contained in Section 8 (3) (a) to (g) of the Health Care Protection Act.

## 4.0 Conclusion

### **PROPOSAL REVIEW:**

The proposals provided by the Proposal Assessment Team (PAT) were available for preliminary review prior to the independent validation process. Any content deficiencies were appropriately and accurately identified by the proposal assessment team. The identified information deficiencies were addressed and clarified with the regions. The importance of obtaining the information requested was highlighted to ensure full external confidence and effective risk management for Alberta Health and Wellness, the regions and contractors. The quality of information reviewed was sufficient to reach a confidence level that was capable of establishing clear correlations against the legislated Proposal Assessment Criteria. The stringency of these correlations, and in turn the power of the compliance relationship could be strengthened in the future if the assessment criteria are refined to more effectively reflect the operational and clinical realities in the regions.

### **VALIDATION:**

The rationales contained in consensus and recommendation documents were sufficiently explicit and clear minded to independently adjudicate within an acceptable level of confidence. Again, with minor refinement to Proposal Assessment Criteria the level of confidence in the validation process could be increased. Regardless, in their current form they did not create an undue level of risk that would compromise or limit the findings of the validation process in any manner.

### **COMPLIANCE :**

The seven proposals (18 agreements) which have been reviewed and validated demonstrate an acceptable level of compliance with the legislated requirements Section 8 (3) (a) to (g) of the Health Care Protection Act.