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Background

State laws targeting abortion facilities for regulation are promoted as safeguarding women’s health. However, they are not supported by evidence of a patient safety problem or evidence showing that additional regulations would improve abortion patient safety.

As other procedures have transitioned from hospitals to outpatient settings, providers in varied medical specialties have faced questions of how best to ensure safety, and have witnessed a proliferation of facility standards.

This study examined how standards have been developed for procedures commonly performed in outpatient settings. It sought to identify lessons learned from the development of standards in less politicized areas of medicine.

Methods

In-depth interviews (N=20) were conducted with experts involved in facility standards development across medical specialties about:

- Motivations for standards development
- Processes used to establish standards
- Types of evidence reviewed
- Decision-making in the absence of evidence

Data were analyzed using an iterative coding process and identification of thematic patterns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of Facility Standards (as defined by study)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical plant requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency response arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other facility procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent sample (N=20)

Facility standards have been developed and implemented across medical specialties that provide procedures in outpatient settings. The push to develop standards is due in part to questions of how to ensure quality care when procedures transition out of hospitals.

Results

- Facility standards are typically developed by accreditation organizations or professional associations that bring together multidisciplinary experts to participate in a consensus process. Standards committees may seek input from other experts, review research evidence, incorporate public comment, and rely on their professional expertise.

- These committees aim to ensure that facility standards reflect current practice, respond to the needs of practicing clinicians, and are not more burdensome than the procedure requires.

- Across specialties, the primary motivation voiced in favor of facility standards is protection of patient safety. While complications are rare for outpatient procedures, standards are often put into place to prevent and respond to uncommon events.

A secondary motivation is addressing public concerns about the safety of procedures in outpatient settings. Standards are often initiated in response to adverse events that become public.

"It came about in the interest of patient care, promoting patient care, developing standards to try to ensure the highest level of care for the patient." (plastic surgery)

Facility standards are developed to respond to uncommon events.

"There should be common sense in terms of the onerousness of the standards and the actual procedure being performed." (endoscopy)

Facility standards are developed to respond to uncommon events.

Facility standards are typically developed by accreditation organizations or professional associations that bring together multidisciplinary experts to participate in a consensus process. Standards committees may seek input from other experts, review research evidence, incorporate public comment, and rely on their professional expertise.

These committees aim to ensure that facility standards reflect current practice, respond to the needs of practicing clinicians, and are not more burdensome than the procedure requires.

In concept, there is strong support for evidence-based facility standards. It is uncommon for committees to systematically review external research, which may reflect a lack of relevant studies on the impact of facility factors on patient outcomes. Some accreditation organizations review internal quality assurance data, including mandatory reports of adverse events and random case reviews.

"That’s generally how we try to approach things: Be reasonable, keep a focus on the patient’s safety, and... study the data as much as we can." (accreditation org.)

"Where there is science, then we try to use the evidence available to use to justify the change. If there isn’t evidence, then it’s by consensus, based off people’s own clinical expertise." (oral surgery/dentistry)

Conclusions

The processes used to develop facility standards across other medical specialties contrast with approaches that have been used for abortion in that: 1) professionals who provide the procedures play a central role in developing standards and 2) in the absence of clear research evidence, the expertise and needs of clinicians play a central role.

Given the larger trend of professional associations’ developing reasonable facility standards for procedures in outpatient settings, professionals who provide abortion care may want to consider defining reasonable facility standards as well.