

An aerial photograph of a city, likely San Francisco, showing a large body of water (the bay) and a prominent bridge (the Golden Gate Bridge) crossing it. The city buildings are visible on the left side of the image.

Physician Practice Enhancement Program

ASSESSMENT STANDARDS

Medical Record for the Podiatrist in a Community-Based Office Setting

Regardless of setting, the use of technology, i.e. telemedicine or virtual care, does not alter the ethical, professional and legal requirements regarding appropriate medical care or records. In other words, medicine is medicine; the task of a podiatrist does not vary by interface.

Understanding the assessment standard

This document identifies those standards that are best practices in a medical record for a podiatrist in a community-based office setting. A podiatrist undergoing a quality improvement assessment is strongly encouraged to review this document in advance and to ensure they are familiar with the mandatory requirements prior to their on-site assessment.

An assessment standard consists of three components:

1. Standard – A goal statement of achievable levels of performance. An assessment standard is identified by a first level number, such as Z.1, Z.2, Z.3, etc.
2. Criterion – Activities or components of the standards that once implemented lead to the overall attainment of the standard. A criterion is identified by the first level number indicating the standard to which it is associated, and a second level number such as X.1, X.2, X.3, etc.
3. Criterion descriptors – Specific actions for each criterion. Criterion descriptors are identified by the first level standards number, the second level criterion number and a third level criterion number such as X.Y.1, X.Y.2, etc.

A criterion marked by an M indicates that the criterion is mandatory to the extent that it is relevant to the type of consultation being recorded. It is important to note the qualifying words within a criterion, such as **shall** or **must**.

A criterion that is marked by an O indicates that criterion is optional but considered best practice. A registrant should use their best judgement to determine whether the unique circumstances of their practice necessitate meeting each O criteria.

4. Guidance –

An interview and discussion conducted by a peer assessor

Guidance: This assessment standard does not apply for independent medical examinations (IMEs). Registrants conducting IMEs must refer to the [Independent Medical Examinations](#) practice standard. When assessing IMEs, a peer assessor will review the report and the expert's duty to court. The report is expected to include the facts and assumptions made to substantiate the opinions rendered by the expert.

This assessment standard was created in consultation with subject matter experts and input from the field, in addition to the references provided. Items are cross-referenced where applicable.

No.	Description	Reference
ADM 1.2.3		

References

1. College of Physicians and Surgeons of British Columbia. Bylaws [Internet]. Vancouver: College of Physicians and Surgeons of British Columbia; 2009. [revised 2017 Jan 9]. Part 3: records Åsection B - registrant records: requirements for medical practice records (3-5). [cited 2017 Jan 10]; p. 54-55. Available from: <https://www.cpsbc.ca/files/pdf/HPA-Bylaws.pdf>
2. College of Physicians and Surgeons of British Columbia. Medical Records, Data Stewardship and Confidentiality of Personal Health Information [Internet]. Vancouver: College of Physicians and Surgeons of British Columbia; 2014 [cited 2021 Jan 26]; 8 p. (Professional standards and guidelines). Available from: <https://www.cpsbc.ca/files/pdf/PSG-Medical-Records.pdf>
3. Canadian Medical Protective Association. Good practices guide [Internet]. Ottawa: Canadian Medical Protective Association; [2016]. Documentation. [cited 2019 May 01]; [1 screen]. Available from: <https://www.cmpa-acpm.ca/serve/docs/ela/goodpracticesguide/pages/communication/Documentation/documentation-e.html>
4. Government of British Columbia; Medical Services Commission. General preamble to the payment schedule [Internet]. Victoria: Medical Services Commission; 2014. Section C: Administrative items - C. 10 - Adequate medical records of a benefit under MSP; [cited 2017 Jan 10]. p. 1-11. Available from: <http://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/health/practitioner-pro/medical-services-plan/1-preamble.pdf>
5. Lewis J. Cumulative patient profile. Can Fam Physician [Internet]. 1989 Jun [cited 2017 Jan 10];35:1259Å61 Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2280411/pdf/canfamphys00160-0057.pdf>
6. College of Physicians and Surgeons of British Columbia. Referral-Consultation Process [Internet]. Vancouver: College of Physicians and Surgeons of British Columbia; 2008 [cited 2021 Jan 26]; 8 p. (Professional standards and guidelines). Available from: <https://www.cpsbc.ca/files/pdf/PSG-Referral-Consultation-Process.pdf>
7. College of Physicians and Surgeons of British Columbia. Complementary and Alternative Therapies [Internet]. Vancouver: College of Physicians and Surgeons of British Columbia; 1999 [cited 2021 Jan 26]; 8 p. (Professional standards and guidelines). Available from: <https://www.cpsbc.ca/files/pdf/PSG-Complementary-and-Alternative-Therapies.pdf>
8. College of Physicians and Surgeons of British Columbia. Safe Prescribing of Opioids and Sedatives [Internet]. Vancouver: College of Physicians and Surgeons of British Columbia; 2016 [cited 2021 Jan 26];

10. College of Physicians and Surgeons of British Columbia. Prescribing Practices, Countersigning Prescriptions and Internet Prescribing [Internet]. Vancouver: College of Physicians and Surgeons of British Columbia; 2002 [cited 2021 Jan 26]; 8 p. (Professional standards and guidelines). Available from: <https://www.cpsbc.ca/files/pdf/PSG-Prescribing-Practices-Countersigning-Prescriptions-Internet-Prescribing.pdf>
11. Cameron, S. and Turtle Song, I. (2002). Learning to Write Case Notes Using the SOAP format. *Journal of Counseling & Development*. 2002(80) pg. 286-292.