

MEDICATIONS - - FREE FROM UNNECESSARY OR EXCESSIVE

THE LAW

Each patient shall..."Have a right to be **free from unnecessary or excessive medication** at any time. No medication may be administered to a patient except at the **written order of a physician**. The **attending physician** is responsible for all medication which is administered to a patient. A **record of the medication** which is administered to each patient shall be kept in his or her medical records. Medication may not be used as **punishment**, for the **convenience of staff**, as a **substitute for a treatment program**, or in quantities that **interfere** with a patient's **treatment program**..."

§ 51.61(1)(h), Wis. Stats. [Emphasis added.]

"(5) The treatment facility shall maintain a patient **treatment record** for each patient which shall **include**:

- (a) A specific statement of the **diagnosis** and an explicit description of the **behaviors** and **other signs or symptoms** exhibited by the patient;
- (b) **Documentation of the emergency** when emergency treatment is provided to the patient; and
- (c) Clear documentation of the **reasons and justifications** for the **initial use** of medications and for **any changes** in the prescribed medication regimen.

(6) A **physician** ordering or changing a patient's medication shall ensure that **other members of the patient's treatment staff are informed about the new medication** prescribed for the patient and the expected **benefits and potential adverse side effects** which may affect the patient's overall treatment.

(7) A **physician** ordering or changing a patient's medication shall routinely **review the patient's prescription medication**, including the beneficial or adverse effects of the medication and the need to continue or discontinue the medication, and shall **document that review** in the patient's treatment record."

DHS 94.09, Wis. Admin. Code [Emphasis added.]

"Each **inpatient and residential treatment facility** that administers medications shall have a **peer review committee or other medical oversight mechanism** reporting to the facility's **governing body** to ensure proper utilization of medications."

DHS 94.09(8), Wis. Admin. Code [Emphasis added.]

DECISIONS

1. Where a hospital patient complained about an **error in medication administration**, the State Grievance Examiner **referred** the matter to the **Bureau of Quality**

Assurance for investigation. [BQA subsequently issued the hospital a citation for violation of state and federal regulations.] (Level III referral in Case No. 00-SGE-07 on 4/17/00.)

2. A client was **deprived of one of her medications** just prior to taking a long trip, due to a series of **errors and omissions** on the service provider's part. This was a **violation** of her right to prompt and adequate treatment. (Level III decision in Case No. 00-SGE-02 on 6/17/00, upheld at Level IV.)
3. A mother complained that her **son's condition was worsening** since his medications were discontinued. Her son's **doctor was on maternity leave** and the service provider would not temporarily assign him to another doctor. She was instructed to call back the next month when the doctor was scheduled to return. The **desperate mother** put her son back on the discontinued medication, without any medical assistance. The service provider **violated** the son's right to prompt and adequate treatment. (Level III decision in Case No. 00-SGE-08 on 7/28/00, upheld at Level IV.)
4. A doctor filed a **late entry** in a patient's chart **clearing up some confusion** over when a specific medication was given to a patient. While this **entry was not timely**, it **did not** mean the original **records were falsified**. (Level IV decision in Case No. 01-SGE-01 on 5/25/01, upholding the Level III.)
5. A woman complained about her doctor, alleging that the **medications he prescribed** for her may have **caused an adverse heart reaction** leading to an emergency visit to the hospital. This allegation was reviewed by the **Bureau of Regulation and Licensing (BRL)**, which reviews medical allegations of malpractice or injury to others. BRL did not find that the heart reaction and emergency room visit were necessarily caused by the medication. The **grievance process defers to BRL's medical expertise** on such issues and thus there was **no finding** of any rights violation. (Level III decision in Case No. 00-SGE-03 on 9/12/01.)
6. A **PRN** ("as indicated") **order does not mean** the patient will receive the medication **upon demand**. A qualified medical professional, such as an RN, must make the **clinical decision** as to whether or not it is appropriate for the patient, based on an **assessment** of the **patient's condition** at the time. (Level IV decision in Case No. 99-SGE-05 on 3/29/02, upholding the Level III.)
7. An RN assessed a patient and denied his request for a **PRN for Xanax**, which he requested to help him sleep. The records indicate he **was asleep within an hour**, which supported the RN's decision. The patient, on appeal to Level IV, stated he was **faking being asleep**. However, the decision to deny him the medications was appropriately **based on the facts available** to them at the time. **No violation** of his rights was found. (Level IV decision in Case No. 99-SGE-05 on 3/29/02, upholding the Level III.)

8. Where a patient received medications in dosages that made her **over-sedated** and caused her **blood pressure and pulse rate to drop** substantially, her right to be free from unnecessary or excessive medication was **violated**. However, the facility **mitigated** this violation by **recognizing the over sedation** and **taking steps** to reduce her medications. (Level IV decision in Case No. 01-SGE-08 on 8/27/02.)
9. There must be **sufficient evidence** to show it was **more probable than not** that a doctor **departed from professional judgment** in his prescribing medication to a patient **after a phone call** with her. Such evidence would have to come in the form of a **second opinion** from a **professional of equal or greater standing** than the doctor. Where there was no such evidence presented during the Level III review, the **finding of a rights violation** will be **overturned**. (Level IV decision in Case No. 02-SGE-04 on 9/19/03, overturning the Level III.)
10. In a situation where a **suicidal patient** has been **put on a new medication**, then **cancel her next appointment** with the doctor, the **clinic has a duty** to at least have someone **review** the situation to **see if follow-up contact** with the patient is necessary. There was **no evidence** that this was done here. While it could be assumed that, as a voluntary patient, she was exercising her right to discontinue treatment, there should have been **some determination** made as to whether or not to contact her. The **clinic** thus **violated the patient's right** to prompt and adequate treatment by not making that determination. (Level IV decision in Case No. 02-SGE-04 on 9/19/03.)
11. Patients have the **right** to have their **care and treatment coordinated** with **other treatment staff** who are involved in their care and treatment. A **doctor** ordering a change in a patient's medication **must ensure** that other members of the patient's **treatment team** are **informed** about the **new medication** and the **expected benefits** and **potential adverse side effects** which may affect the patient's overall treatment. (Level IV decision in Case No. 02-SGE-04 on 9/19/03.)
12. Where a **doctor knew** or should have known that his patient was seeing other professionals involved in her care, the doctor has a **duty** to at least **attempt to inform** the **other therapist** involved of a **change in medication**. If the patient's consent is required, the doctor should ask for it. Where no such attempt was made here, the doctor violated the patient's rights. (Level IV decision in Case No. 02-SGE-04 on 9/19/03.)
13. A **court decision** to **order medications cannot be challenged** in the **grievance process**. (Level III decision in Case No. 03-SGE-10 on 10/23/03.)
14. A **service provider** where the individual picked up his medications has **inadequate parking**, making it inconvenient for him at times. The service provider attempted to resolve this by offering him alternative times in which he could pick up his medication when the parking lot would be less crowded. These accommodations included: a) suggesting he pick up his medication on a Friday when the parking lot is

less busy; b) picking up his medication in the afternoon when the staff parking lot is less full; or c) speaking with his case manager to arrange picking up his medication at a different time than the set times. They were also willing to arrange for him to pick up his medication when he meets with his psychiatrist every three months for his psychiatric medication check up, thus saving him four trips a year. These **accommodations were reasonable and sufficient**. (Level III Decision in Case No. 03-SGE-08 on 7/14/04.)

15. The service recipient wanted to **receive his medications** in the **exact form** the pharmaceutical company sends it and as soon as they send it. However, his service provider had the **need to double-check all medications** being given to patients through a Patient Assistance Program (PAP). They do so through a local pharmacy. When they receive medications from any drug company they immediately send it to the pharmacy where it is checked, repackaged and dispensed. The pharmacy does not mix lot numbers or expiration dates, therefore each patient receives the same medication (with regards to freshness and lot number) as was sent from the drug company. The individual's desire to receive his medication just as it was sent from the drug company is understandable; however, so is the service provider's liability to make sure that he is getting exactly what medication he was prescribed from the drug company. The service provider agreed to have their professional staff open the medication, check its content, and dispense the medication as prescribed by his psychiatrist in order to avoid his medications having to go through the pharmacy, as requested. This **resolved** his complaint. (Level III Decision in Case No. 03-SGE-08 on 7/14/04.)
16. The service provider was concerned that a patient did not have a strong family/friend support network that would report unusual behavior. So they **required** him to come in to **pick up his medications** every **28 days**. This was required **in order to assess** him for abnormal psychiatric symptoms, adverse side effects, and the effectiveness of the medications he was receiving. While this assessment may seem very basic or even inadequate to the recipient, the **nurse** who dispenses the medication is **qualified** to be conducting this assessment and, if unusual behavior were present, they would extend the assessment. Since he was clear and present when he came to pick up his medications, the assessment was very brief. However, if he were not well, the assessment would be much more thorough and he would be asked to come into another room to speak privately with nursing staff for a more thorough interview. This issue was **referred to his psychiatric**. His psychiatrist can decide if they have developed a reliable history with him, sufficient to extend the amount of medication given to him at one time and thus lengthen the time between pick-ups. (Level III Decision in Case No. 03-SGE-08 on 7/14/04.)
17. The **psychiatrist prescribing** the medications has the **ultimate authority** to make **individualized decisions** for each patient. Individualized decision-making is a key element for providing prompt and adequate treatment services appropriate to each individual patient's condition. While the majority of patients may not be suitable for a full disbursement of their medications, psychiatrists and treatment providers need to

recognize individuals who are stable and consistent with their treatment programs and accommodate their request for dispensing increased amounts of medications at one time accordingly. (Level III Decision in Case No. 03-SGE-08 on 7/14/04.)

18. A client objected to the **medications she was given** during an **Emergency Detention**. Patients have a **right to refuse** medications in most situations. There is an **exception**, however, that **allows medications to be administered in an “emergency”** situation without the patient’s consent. The hospital was relying on that exception when they gave her medications without her consent. (Level IV decision in Case No. 06-SGE-10 on 3/20/07)
19. It was **not a patient rights violation** to have an **internal medicine specialist** rather than a psychiatrist **provide a patient her prescriptions**, particularly since a psychiatrist initially evaluated her and provided a diagnosis and prescription recommendations. (Level III decision in Case No. 11-SGE-01 on 6/28/11)
20. A patient alleged a violation of her right to refuse medication. This claim was **unsubstantiated with any evidence** other than her word. Even if what she alleged was true, it would not amount to a rights violation. **The nurse did not request the medication nor did she force the client to take it.** Therefore, **her right to refuse medication was respected.** (Level III decision in Case No. Case No. 11-SGE-07 on 06/22/12)
21. A patient alleged being **prescribed an improper medication dosage**. However, she **had the right to refuse** the prescribed medications and **to request a second opinion** within her provider. Therefore, her right to adequate treatment was not violated. (Level III decision in Case No. Case No. 11-SGE-07 on 06/22/12)
22. A patient experienced unwanted sexual side effects from a medication. The patient alleged that his doctor laughed and said the side effects were in his head when he reported sexual side effects of eight weeks duration to his doctor. The patient was weaned off of the medication and the side effects dissipated. There must be sufficient evidence to show that it was more probable than not that a doctor departed from professional judgement in prescribing medication to a patient to show that a patient was given unnecessary or excessive medication. Such evidence could come in the form of a second opinion from a professional of equal or greater standing than the doctor. **A second doctor recommending medication changes does not in and of itself demonstrate that the first doctor departed from professional judgement. Here, no evidence showed that it was more probable than not that the patient’s doctor departed from professional judgement** when he prescribed the medications or when he discontinued them. In the present case the grievant’s side effects were not initially reported to be significant; the doctor did discuss the case with staff; the dose was, at its highest, half that of the maximum recommended dosage and the doctor discontinued the medication within a reasonable amount of time. No violation was found. (Level IV decision in 14-SGE-0001 decided on 12/22/2014)

23. A patient alleged that the facility violated her right to be free from unnecessary or excessive medication by increasing her dosage of Tegretol from 1000 mg to 1200 mg per day. It was concluded that the grievant's right to be free from excessive medication was not violated because her treatment record reflected careful weighing of medication adjustments to meet the grievant's needs; because the grievant did not provide sufficient evidence showing that the medication change could have reasonably been anticipated to cause the problems she had as a result of the increase; and because prior case law requires a second opinion to show that her doctor departed from professional judgment. No second opinion was obtained in this case. (Level III Decision, Case No. 17-SGE-05)
24. A patient complained to Conditional Release when his psychotropic medication regimen changed while he was residing in the county jail. Conditional Release is responsible for coordinating services and communicating with all parties involved what the treatment plan is, but the treatment decisions are left to those that are qualified to make the treatment decision. There was no evidence to suggest that the treatment decisions made on behalf of the grievant necessitated intervention from Conditional Release. The grievant's rights were not violated. (Level III grievance decision in Case No. 20-SGE-04).
25. A patient complained when the doctors decided to discontinue Modafinil, as the patient felt she needed to take it to treat her Multiple Sclerosis. Modafinil is a stimulant medication, and the patient's doctors determined that it was increasing her mental health symptoms. The doctors communicated with the patient's neurologist who agreed to discontinue the medication until the patient was psychiatrically stable. The grievance process gives due deference to professionals making treatment decisions. Here there was no reason to believe that the doctors were outside professional standards when making the determination to discontinue the patient's medication. (Level III grievance decision in Case No. 20-SGE-09)
26. A patient complained that she should not be receiving Haldol. The patient was on a six month mental health commitment under Chapter 51 with an Order to Treat. It was noted in the patient's treatment record that the Haldol was improving the patient's mental health status, but the patient was still experiencing symptoms. Other medications were discussed with the patient, however, the patient refused other alternatives. Haldol was determined to be a better medication to administer involuntarily compared to the other alternatives, therefore, the doctors continued to prescribe Haldol. The doctors were not outside professional standards when they continued to give the patient Haldol injections. (Level III grievance decision in Case No. 20-SGE-09)

[See: "Introduction to Digest-Date Last Updated" page]