LANGUAGE ACCESS IN HEALTH CARE: STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

Editor’s Note: Earlier this spring, the SGIM Council agreed as an organization to support the principles outlined in this document. The position statement regarding language access in health care is provided here for your review.

Nearly 47 million people—18% of the U.S. population—speak a language other than English at home. The 2000 census documented that over 28% of all Spanish speakers, 22.5% of Asian and Pacific Island language speakers, and 13% of Indo-European language speakers speak English “not well” or “not at all.” Estimates of the number of people with limited English proficiency (LEP) range from a low of about 11 million, or 4.2% of the U.S. population—who speak English “not well” or “not at all”—to over 21 million people, or 8.1% of the U.S. population—if one includes those who speak English less than “very well.”

As demographic trends continue to evolve, the prevalence, composition and geographic distribution of languages spoken will continue to be fluid and necessitate the ongoing assessment of language needs. Multilingualism is spreading rapidly, in rural states and counties as well as urban environments. Between 1990 and 2000, fifteen states experienced more than 100% growth in their LEP populations—Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah and Washington. As the number of non-English speaking residents continues to increase, so does the demand for English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) classes. This heightened demand has led to long waiting lists for ESL classes in many parts of the country. For example, in New York State, one million immigrants need ESL classes, but there are seats for only 50,000, while in Massachusetts less than half of those who applied for English classes were able to enroll.

Research documents how the lack of language services creates a barrier to and diminishes the quality of health care for limited English proficient individuals. Over one quarter of LEP patients who needed, but did not get, an interpreter reported they did not understand their medication instructions, compared with only 2% of those who did not need an interpreter and those who needed and received one. Language barriers also impact access to care—non-English speaking patients are less likely to use primary and preventive care and public health services and are more likely to use emergency rooms. Once at the emergency room, they receive far fewer services than do English speaking patients. Language access is one aspect of cultural competence that is essential to quality care for LEP populations.

Health care providers from across the...
Reflections on the Similarities Between Marriage and Computers in Health Care

Thuy Bui, MD

To my husband,

As I was researching for my journal club presentation, I realized that I was reflecting on our relationship and our marriage as a whole. On some subconscious level, I picked computerized physician order entry and medication errors. The story of the computer scientist and the doctor mirrors the rise and "slow down" of computer technology in health care. What I am about to say comes directly from the words of Drs. Koppel, Wears and Berg.

Most computer scientists, medical informaticians and perhaps you, my love, view life and marriage (permit me to use marriage interchangeably with clinical work) as a series of technical challenges requiring technical solutions. I envisioned your coming into my life (the introduction of computer technology) as a process of experimentation and mutual learning rather than one of planning, command and control. The biggest challenge in our relationship (a sociotechnical system) is the misconceptions about the nature of marriage (clinical work). There is quite a large mismatch between the implicit theories and the real world of marriage (clinical work).

Marriage (clinical work especially in hospitals) is fundamentally interpretative, interruptive, multitasking, collaborative, distributed, opportunistic, and reactive. In contrast, your mind and your theories (computerized physician order entry/ CPOE systems and decision support systems) are based on a different model of work: one that is objective, rationalized, linear, normative, localized, solitary, and single-minded.

I am not implying that I am so complicated or irrational that we can’t work out the best technosocial system because as I see it, you (computer technology) are here to stay, but you see my clinical decisions only become apparent in retrospect and that tools like clinical decision analysis are seldom used by real clinicians to make real decisions about specific patients because the task they support does not match the clinicians’ task. So my love, let’s concentrate on our interface flaws, the technology itself that the lack of connectivity between it and other systems so that both of us (human and computers) can cure the ills of our marriage (the health care industry). Dr. Koppel said: “All systems are going to create changes and require extraordinary integration of technology and workflow. No matter how good the system (our marriage), constant vigilance, constant analysis and constant tweaking are required to make them function effectively.”

Dr. Adubofour said: “We need to look at CPOE (marriage) as a journey—not a destination.” Let’s continue on our journey a bit wiser and older….

Love, T.
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I’m writing this last President’s Column with decidedly mixed emotions. It’s been a great year, and the annual meeting in New Orleans promises to let us finish in great style. Yet for me, it feels like I’ve just learned enough about the organization, its members, and its external challenges to make a halfway-decent president—if I could do it all over again! Oh, well. And I fear the U.S. health care system is just as chaotic and dysfunctional as when the year started. But SGIM and its members are tackling the problem, and I am optimistic about the future. I will leave readers of this column with a dozen lessons I have become convinced we must learn to make a difference in improving American health care, in no particular order.

1. SGIM must collaborate with groups with similar goals for maximum effect. The various organizations representing internal medicine finally seem to be coming together, and that’s good news. Working with other organizations on important projects requires patience and respect. While SGIM might find it easier and faster to work alone, collaboration will almost always have a bigger impact.

2. Carefully and forcefully address variations in health care to separate desirable from undesirable sources of variation. Desirable variation reflects differences in patients’ values and preferences, while undesirable variation reflects differences related to other factors, including race, income, and geography. Keep clear the distinction between disparities in health care and disparities in health, and further define how the two relate. Don’t assume that more health care is always better!

3. Involve patients at every step in health system redesign. While they may not be experts in the technical quality of medical care, they are experts in judging how they are being treated, and how their treatment makes them feel. Make sure they are part of setting the agenda at every office visit!

4. Avoid the temptation to blame external forces entirely for the problematic state of our health care system. There are indeed many pernicious external forces at work making it hard to “do the right thing”, but there is much that physicians can and should do themselves to improve the care they deliver. Rome may not have fallen to the barbarian hordes if it had been stronger within.

5. Think about the evidence base of daily practice. While we teach evidence-based medicine, we often practice tradition-based medicine. We need to get rid of outdated and inefficient practices to make way for continued on page 8

“Time is the fire in which we learn, Time is the fire in which we burn.”
—Delmore Schwartz, For Rhoda

“So Long, and Thanks for all the Fish.”
—Douglas Adams, 4th volume in the Hitchiker’s Trilogy
Research Funding Corner

Joseph Conigliaro, MD, MPH

Developmental Research on Elder Mistreatment (RFA-AG-05-009)

Release Date: March 23, 2005
Letters of Intent Receipt Date: June 1, 2005
Application Receipt Date: June 23, 2005
Expiration Date: June 24, 2005

The National Institute on Aging (NIA) and the Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research (OBSSR) is soliciting for proposals that will provide the scientific basis for understanding, preventing, and treating elder mistreatment. Broadly defined elder mistreatment is viewed as “intentional actions that cause harm or create a serious risk of harm, whether or not intended, to a vulnerable elder by a caregiver or other person who stands in a trust relationship to the elder or failure by a caregiver to satisfy the elder’s basic needs or to protect the elder from harm”. The NIA expects to award approximately $1,700,000 annually to fund six to eight awards using the exploratory/developmental award (R21) mechanism. Priority areas include: (1) innovative methods for estimating incidence; (2) standardization of definitions and measurement; (3) elaboration of risk factors; (4) methods of clinical and psychosocial identification of Elder Mistreatment; and (5) identification of Elder Mistreatment in institutional settings. The solicitation focuses on initial steps discussed as research priorities in Elder Mistreatment: Abuse, Neglect, and Exploitation in an Aging America (National Research Council, 2003). There was particular emphasis on a community-wide approach to designing and fielding prevalence and incidence studies of elder mistreatment that can be replicated at the national level. The complete RFA can be found at: http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/rfa-files/RFA-AG-05-009.html
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Summer Institute Program to Increase Diversity in Health-Related Research (RFA-HL-04-035)

Letters Of Intent Receipt Date: August 14, 2005
Application Receipt Dates: September 14, 2005
Earliest Anticipated Start Date: August 1, 2006
Expiration Date: September 15, 2005

To promote diversity in the biomedical, behavioral, clinical and social sciences research workforce the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI) is seeking to fund five to six awards totaling up to $4.860 million using the R25 mechanism over four-years for summer institutes to enable faculty and scientists from underrepresented racial and ethnic groups and faculty and scientists with disabilities to further develop their research skills and knowledge, enhancing their career development as faculty members or scientists. In addition to increase and diversify the recruitment of talented researchers the NHLBI also expects these efforts to lead to an improved capacity to address and eliminate health disparities.

The primary goal of the Summer Institute Program for Increasing Diversity (SIPID) awards is to encourage the development of research skills and experience relevant to heart, lung, blood, and sleep (HLBS) disorders to promote the competition for external funding in the biomedical and behavioral sciences. The RFA also invites senior faculty, established researchers, and experienced mentors to apply to be Program Directors and Co-Directors for the program. Detailed information can be found at: http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/rfa-files/RFA-HL-04-035.html

Please contact joseph.conigliaro@med.va.gov for any comments, suggestions, or contributions to this column. SGIM
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QUALITY ENHANCEMENT RESEARCH INITIATIVES: HEART FAILURE JOINS THE LIST

Paul Heidenreich, MD and Barry Massie, MD

Chronic heart failure is associated with a high mortality, poor quality of life, and is the number one reason for discharge from the VA medical service. The Veterans Health Administration has recently added a Chronic Heart Failure Center to their Quality Enhancement Research Initiative (CHF-QUERI). This Center will be based at the VA Palo Alto Health Care System (Research Coordinator, Paul Heidenreich MD) and the San Francisco VA Medical Center (Clinical Coordinator, Barry Massie MD). In addition to the Research and Clinical Coordinators, the Center will hire a full time implementation coordinator who will design and evaluate strategies for implementing successful health services interventions. The CHF-QUERI center is charged with 1) determining best practice for heart failure; 2) evaluating current performance; and 3) selecting and possibly designing health services interventions to improve performance, and then leading the effort to implement these interventions system wide.

The mission of our CHF-QUERI is to improve survival and quality of life for all veterans with heart failure by implementing best practices. We believe the best way to achieve this mission is through the increased use of care known to prolong survival while maintaining or improving quality of life, and through improved recognition of heart failure. Thus, the goals of our QUERI center will be to implement interventions to increase the use of life-prolonging heart failure treatments and to implement methods to improve the identification of patients with heart failure.

The successful implementation of this mission will require partnerships with other VA organizations, thus we will make collaboration with VA’s Patient Care Services, the Office of Quality and Performance, the Office of Care Coordination, and other QUERI groups such as Ischemic Heart Disease (IHD), Stroke, and Diabetes a top priority. Our success also depends on our affiliated investigators and advisors. CHF-QUERI is in the process of recruiting a talented and diverse Executive Committee that includes expertise in health services research, heart failure management, and implementation of disease management programs.

VA heart failure care is an ideal candidate for the QUERI program. Heart failure is associated with high mortality, poor quality of life, and is the number one reason for discharge from the VA medical service. Furthermore, there have been multiple large randomized trials that have identified several therapies that improve survival in these patients. These life-prolonging treatments include angiotensin converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors, beta-blockers, spironolactone, and intracardiac defibrillators (ICDs). Accordingly, heart failure guidelines both within and outside the VA recommend these treatments. Furthermore, there have been multiple large randomized trials that have identified several therapies that improve survival in these patients. These life-prolonging treatments include angiotensin converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors, beta-blockers, spironolactone, and intracardiac defibrillators (ICDs). Accordingly, heart failure guidelines both within and outside the VA recommend these treatments. Further, studies have indicated that these treatments are not used as frequently as they should be both within and outside the VA healthcare system.

Although guideline compliance for some treatments (ACE inhibitors) is likely to be near goal within the VA, vulnerable populations and those with comorbidities are likely to be undertreated. CHF-QUERI’s first goal will be to increase life-prolonging treatment of recognized heart failure. Of the life-prolonging medical treatments, we will focus on beta-blockers given the fact that their use is suboptimal and a large number of patients are candidates for therapy (ACE inhibitors are already used at high levels for VA patients with heart failure). The appropriate use of ICDs is also important for several reasons. ICDs are highly effective at preventing sudden death, but they are an expensive treatment. Second, rates of appropriate use of procedures in general (e.g. coronary angiography) have often been lower in the VA than in the community. Third, our CHF-QUERI will be well positioned to investigate the use of ICDs because of the VA National ICD Surveillance Center located at the San Francisco VA Medical Center. A related focus of our Center will be to improve care for patients who historically have been undertreated. Specifically, we will examine the impact of mental illness and renal insufficiency on the treatment of heart failure.

A second goal is the reduction in hospitalization rates for patients with heart failure.
country have reported language difficulties and inadequate funding of language services to be major barriers to LEP individuals’ access to health care and a serious threat to the quality of the care they receive. The increasing diversity of the country only amplifies the challenge for health care providers, who must determine which language services are most appropriate based on their setting, type and size; the frequency of contact with LEP patients; and the variety of languages encountered. But without adequate attention and resources being applied to address the problem, the health care system cannot hope to meet the challenge of affording LEP individuals appropriate access to quality health care.

Those endorsing this document view it as an inseparable whole that cannot legitimately be divided into individual parts. Each of the principles articulated here derives its vitality from its context among the others, and any effort to single out one or another would therefore undercut the structural integrity of the entire framework. The principles are as follows:

1. Effective communication between health care providers and patients is essential to facilitating access to care, reducing health disparities and medical errors, and assuring a patient’s ability to adhere to treatment plans.
2. Competent health care language services are essential elements of an effective public health and health care delivery system in a pluralistic society.
3. The responsibility to fund language services for LEP individuals in health care settings is a societal one that cannot fairly be visited upon any one segment of the public health or health care community.
4. Federal, state and local governments and health care insurers should establish and fund mechanisms through which appropriate language services are available where and when they are needed.
5. Because it is important for providing all patients the environment most conducive to positive health outcomes, linguistic diversity in the health care workforce should be encouraged, especially for individuals in direct patient contact positions.
6. All members of the health care community should continue to educate their staff and constituents about LEP issues and help them identify resources to improve access to quality care for LEP patients.
7. Access to English as a Second Language instruction is an additional mechanism for eliminating the language barriers that impede access to health care and should be made available on a timely basis to meet the needs of LEP individuals, including LEP health care workers.
8. Quality improvement processes should assess the adequacy of language services provided when evaluating the care of LEP patients, particularly with respect to outcome disparities and medical errors.
9. Mechanisms should be developed to establish the competency of those providing language services, including interpreters, translators and bilingual staff/c临床icians.
10. Continued efforts to improve primary language data collection are essential to enhance both services for, and research identifying the needs of, the LEP population.
11. Language services in health care settings must be available as a matter of course, and all stakeholders—including government agencies that fund, administer or oversee health care programs—must be accountable for providing or facilitating the provision of those services.
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Embrace current efforts at quality measurement, but develop more global measures of quality for the future.

new things that have better evidence of an impact on outcomes. Think about how much gratuitous lung listening and guaiac testing of stool from office digital rectal exams doctors do in patients with no respiratory or GI complaints!

6. Embrace current efforts at quality measurement, but develop more global measures of quality for the future. These days quality measures focus primarily on the delivery of effective care, which is very important. However, we must also measure the patient’s view of their care, the nondelivery of ineffective care, and decision quality. And quality measurement without serious efforts at quality improvement is wasted energy.

7. Involve our students, residents, and fellows in our efforts to revitalize general internal medicine. Although fewer people are being attracted to the primary care specialties right now, the ones that are, despite the environment, are fabulous, and they are our future!

8. Continue to work toward adequate health insurance for all. In my own mind, that will eventually require a single-payer system. Although at times it may seem like we’ll never get there, remember what Winston Churchill said, “The Americans will always do the right thing... after they’ve exhausted all the alternatives.”

9. Keep general internal medicine a “big tent.” There is room for many different people in GIM, whether their interests are in primary care, hospital medicine, geriatrics...or even prostate diseases (like me)! Yet we must remember that what we do as “core business” is care for complex, chronically ill people in the context of their families and their society.

10. Remember general internal medicine is international; we have much to learn from our colleagues in other countries, and can share many problems and potential solutions with each other.

Continue to diversify the health care work force in the United States so it is more reflective of the great and increasing diversity of the general population.

11. Continue to diversify the health care work force in the United States so it is more reflective of the great and increasing diversity of the general population. This job is for everyone, whether in the majority or minority, and our progress on his front has been much too slow.

12. Remember that medical education and medical research, which SGIM members do so well, are not ends themselves. They are means to the end of better patient care. And not just better patient care at academic medical centers, but everywhere. Just publishing a paper about an innovation, no matter how satisfying it can sometimes be, seldom changes the world. We need to implement and advocate!

I finish the year immensely grateful to all SGIM’s members who have volunteered their time to make the organization stronger and more effective, as well as to our dedicated and hardworking staff in the Washington office. I’ll look forward to working with you all again in the future!

I’d also like to thank all those friends and colleagues who read and commented on drafts of these columns this year, including Al Mulley, Tim Ferris, Mary McNaughton Collins, Elliott Fisher, Gene Rich, David Karlson, Bob Centor, Gregg Meyer, the Concrete Lady, Susan Edgman Levitan, and Jean Barry (who is more than a friend and colleague). Nevertheless, responsibility for all errors, misquotes, lame pop culture references, and sloppy syntax are mine alone! And bless everyone who read a column, and especially those who emailed me, whether with brickbats or kudos.

Good luck, be careful out there, and if the opportunity to serve SGIM comes your way, I advise you to seize it!
Administration staff, and the media solely to raise awareness of this issue and to support policies consonant with these principles. However, endorsement of these principles by an organization should not be interpreted as indicating its support for, or opposition to, any particular legislation or administrative proposal that may emerge.

Endorsing Organizations
American Civil Liberties Union
American College of Physicians
American Counseling Association
American Hospital Association
American Medical Student Association
Asian Pacific Islander American Health Forum
American Psychological Association
Association of Asian Pacific Community Health Organizations
Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now
Association of Language Companies
Association of University Centers on Disabilities
Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law
California Healthcare Association
California Healthcare Interpreting Association
Catholic Charities USA
Catholic Health Association
Children’s Defense Fund
Center on Budget and Policy Priorities
Cuban American National Council
District of Columbia Language Access Coalition
District of Columbia Primary Care Association
Families USA
Family Voices
HIV Medicine Association
Institute for Reproductive Health Access
Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Health Care
La Clinica del Pueblo
Latino Coalition for a Healthy California
Medicare Rights Center
Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund
Migrant Legal Action Program
National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium
National Association of Community Health Centers
National Association of Mental Health Planning and Advisory Councils
National Association of Public Hospitals and Health Systems
National Association of Social Workers
National Council of La Raza
National Council on Interpreting in Health Care
National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Association
National Health Law Program
National Immigration Law Center
National Hispanic Medical Association
National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health
National Mental Health Association
National Partnership for Women and Families
National Respite Coalition
National Senior Citizens Law Center
National Women’s Law Center
Northern Virginia Area Health Education Center
Physicians for Human Rights
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)
Washington Office
Summit Health Institute for Research and Education
USAAction
Welfare Law Center

Positions Available and Announcements are $50 per 50 words for SGIM members and $100 per 50 words for nonmembers. These fees cover one month’s appearance in the Forum and appearance on the SGIM Website at http://www.sgim.org. Send your ad, along with the name of the SGIM member sponsor, to ForumAds@sgim.org. It is assumed that all ads are placed by equal opportunity employers.

HOSPITALIST. The Division of General Internal Medicine, Department of Medicine at the University of Pittsburgh is building a large academic hospitalist program. The positions provide exciting opportunities for long term careers in patient care or a combination of patient care, teaching and research. Starting salary of $150,000 or higher depending on qualifications/experience. Send letter of interest and CV to Wishwa Kapoor, MD, 200 Lothrop Street, 933 West MUH, Pittsburgh, PA 15213 (fax 412-692-4823) or e-mail Noskoka@upmc.edu. The University of Pittsburgh is an Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity Employer.

HOSPITALIST-EDUCATOR: Residency Program is recruiting ABIM board certified Hospitalist-trained M.D., as an Instructor of Medicine, and a tenured-earning position. Responsibilities include inpatient care and resident teaching with additional opportunities for clinical investigation and academic pursuits. UAB is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer. Send CV & names of 3 references to W. J. Many, Jr., Program Director, UAB MIMRP, 4371 Narrow Lane Rd, Ste 200, Montgomery, AL 36116 or to hope@uabmontgomery.com. Inquiries accepted until position is filled. No phone calls please.

MASSACHUSETTS. UMass Memorial Health Care has openings for a General Primary Care physician at two of our well-established practices in Worcester County. Provide quality patient care in an office-based independent private practice setting, but enjoy the benefits of being a hospital-based employee. Work in collegial surroundings where clinical care and education are valued and multiple career opportunities exist! Academic appointment at UMass Medical School, commensurate with experience. Excellent benefits and compensation package. Send CV or contact: William Corbett, M.D., Physician Recruitment, UMass Memorial Health Care, 15 Belmont Street-Morgan Bldg., Worcester, MA 01605, 508-334-8755, danshirh@ummhcs.org, fax (508)-334-5054.
hospitalization rates for patients with heart failure. Most of the interventions that prolong survival also have been shown to reduce hospitalization, thus our first two goals will likely be achieved in tandem. There are additional interventions, often part of disease management programs such as home monitoring, that primarily reduce hospitalizations. We will collaborate with the VA's Office of Care Coordination to evaluate and standardize the different VISN approaches to home monitoring for patients with heart failure.

A third goal is the prevention of symptomatic heart failure by identifying patients in the asymptomatic stage of the disease (reduced left ventricular ejection fraction), or with risk factors for development of heart failure.
Clinic Medical Director

Full time position available for an internist or family physician as Site Medical Director for a large, University affiliated, substance abuse treatment clinic in the Bronx, NY. This dynamic opioid pharmacotherapy site provides on-site primary medical care, including HIV care, integrated with substance abuse treatment and psychiatric services. Relationship to Montefiore Medical Center and academic departments within Albert Einstein College of Medicine are very well established.

This position requires direct patient care along with a clinical administrative role, including quality improvement, medical staff oversight, and opportunities for teaching and research. Experience in ambulatory care is essential. Experience in substance abuse treatment and HIV care preferred. Clinical administration is also a plus. Board eligibility required.

Please send CV and cover memo to: Roy Cohen, MD, Medical Director, AECOM/Division of Substance Abuse, 1500 Waters Place, Betty Parker Bldg, 6th Floor, Ward 20, Bronx, NY 10461, (718) 409-9450, Email: rcohen@dosa.aecom.yu.edu

EOE