

Crisis Standards of Care: Legal Decision Factors (as of Sept. 3, 2021)

Throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, health care providers have experienced series of patient surges and corresponding resource shortages leading to implementation of [crisis standards of care](#) (CSC). CSC is defined by the National Academy of Medicine (NAM) as a “substantial change in usual health care operations and the level of care it is possible to deliver” in emergencies. Avoiding CSC through advance, preventive measures is key. However, when critical decisions need to be made about allocations of care or services involving specific patients, health care providers must consider an array of medical, ethical, social, and legal factors. Profound confusion exists over which factors can – *and cannot* – be used legally to render CSC decisions. While specific legal bases for critical decisions directly impacting patient outcomes may vary across jurisdictions, this memo identifies (1) factors or criteria generally interpreted or viewed as “unlawful” for purposes of CSC decision-making; and (2) remaining lawful bases for which CSC decisions may be made.

1. Factors/Criteria Interpreted or Viewed as Unlawful for CSC Decisions Impacting Specific Patients:

- [Race/color](#)
- [Ethnicity](#)
- [National Origin](#)
- [Sex](#)
- [Gender](#)
- [Age](#)
- [Veteran Status](#)
- [Marital Status](#)
- [Religion/Exercise of Conscience](#)
- [Limited English Proficiency](#)
- [Long-term Mortality or Life Expectancy](#)
- [Assumptions of Perceived Health Status](#)
- [Disability - Physical or Mental](#)
- [Quality of Life](#)
- [Individual’s Relative Worth](#)
- [Inequitable Clinical Assessment Scores](#)
- [Resource Intensity Due to Disability/Age](#)
- [Duration of Need Due to Disability/Age](#)
- [Income](#)
- [Ability to Pay](#)
- [Advanced Planning/Steering Decisions](#)
- [Categorical Exclusions](#)
- [Blanket Applications](#)
- [Stereotypes](#)

2. Factors/Criteria Which May Lawfully Be Used for CSC Decision-making Impacting Specific Patients:

- Specific Resource Limitations
- Current Medical/Public Health Information
- Individualized Patient Assessments
- Objective Medical Evidence
- Equitable Clinical Assessment Scores
- Short-term Survival
- Suitability of Available Resources
- Patient/Surrogate Consent and Choices
- Health Care Worker Status
- Reasonable Modifications to Assure Equal Access for Disabled or Aged Patients
- Appeals

This document was developed by **James G. Hodge, Jr., J.D., L.L.M.**, Director, and **Jennifer L. Piatt, JD**, Deputy Director, with input/assistance from **Nora Wells**, JD Candidate (2022), Senior Legal Researcher, Network for Public Health Law – Western Region Office, Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law, Arizona State University (ASU). Support for the Network is provided by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The views expressed in this document do not necessarily reflect the views of the Foundation.

Legal information provided in this document does not constitute legal advice or legal representation. For legal advice, please consult specific legal counsel in your state.