MEMORANDUM

MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
99 WASHINGTON AVENUE, SUITE 408, ALBANY, NY 12210
518-465-8085 • Fax: 518-465-0976 • E-mail: albany@mssny.org

October 14, 2015

TO: MSSNY COUNCIL
FROM: MSSNY INFECTIOUS DISEASES COMMITTEE
SUBJECT: CHILDHOOD VACCINATION RESOLUTION
SUBMITTED BY MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE COUNTY OF QUEENS

The following resolution was submitted to the MSSNY Council by the Medical Society of the County of Queens and referred to the MSSNY’s Infectious Diseases Committee for review and subsequent recommendation for MSSNY Council.

RESOLVED, That the Medical Society of the State of New York support the repeal of subdivision 9 of section 2164 of New York State Public Health Law, which would eliminate all non-medical exemptions for childhood vaccinations prior to attending school.

MSSNY Infectious Diseases Committee met on October 1, 2015 and reviewed this resolution. Attending the meeting representing the Medical Society of the County of Queens was Dr. Carlos Zapata, MSSNY Councilor. Dr. Zapata discussed with the committee the need to change the state law in regards to non-medical exemptions for childhood vaccinations prior to attending school. Dr. Zapata spoke of the recent measles outbreak in California and how important it was to have a high percentage of the population immunized to create herd immunity. Dr. Zapata also indicated that there is legislation within the NYS Legislature that calls for the repeal of non-medical exemptions and that this legislation will come up in the 2016 Legislative Session. Therefore, it was important for MSSNY to articulate a position on this matter prior to the 2016 House of Delegates.

Committee members reviewed the references that Dr. Zapata provided to the committee and also references from committee Chair, Dr. William Valenti. Information from these materials indicated that consistent, high coverage rates are needed to provide community immunity (herd immunity) and protect children from disease outbreaks like measles. The CDC recommends that all children be vaccinated according to the recommended schedule. According to the CDC article “Measles United States January 4-April 2, 2015. Mob Mortal Wkly Rep. April 17, 2015 / 64(14);373-376, “A total of 159 cases were reported in the United States during this period. Over 80% of the cases occurred among persons who were unvaccinated or had unknown vaccination status. Four outbreaks have occurred, with one accounting for 70% of all measles cases in the United States this year. The continued risk for importation of measles into the United States and occurrence of measles cases and outbreaks in communities with high proportions of unvaccinated persons highlight the need for sustained, high vaccination coverage across the country.”

Discussion ensued and all committee members expressed strong support for this resolution as there was significant scientific and medical evidence that immunization is effective in preventing infectious diseases and that more and more non-medical exemptions are being used by the public. It was noted that since the measles outbreak in California, that the state (June 30, 2015) eliminated all non-medical exemptions, including religious and philosophical exceptions. There are two other states, Missouri (2014) and West Virginia (2015) that no longer allow for religious or personal exemptions. Currently, 28 states (including New York) and the
District of Columbia allow for a religious and medical exemption and 18 states allow for a religious, personal and medical exemption. The NYS Department of Health estimated that there were about 25,000 students that were not vaccinated or fully vaccinated in 2013-14. It was noted further that with declining vaccination rates under 90%, so-called “herd immunity” is no longer effective.

It was suggested that the reference to the section of New York State law be eliminated as these sections of laws can change over a period of time. Dr. Zapata agreed with this “friendly amendment”. The MSSNY Infectious Diseases Committee unanimously supported this resolution and recommends that the MSSNY Council adopt the following substitute resolution:

RESOLVED, That the Medical Society of the State of New York support the repeal to eliminate all non-medical exemptions for childhood vaccinations prior to attending school in New York State.

(FOR MSSNY COUNCIL ACTION)
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US Supreme Court lets stand NY State law on school based immunizations

Whereas, in December 2014 to February 2015 there was an outbreak of measles in the Western United States that was largely attributed to low vaccination rates.

Whereas, the American College of Pediatrics, the American Academy of Family Physicians, and the American College of Obstetrics & Gynecology all recommend that all children get vaccinated against hepatitis A, hepatitis B, rotavirus, diphtheria, tetanus, pertussis, *Haemophilus influenza* type b, poliomyelitis, influenza, pneumococcus, measles, mumps, rubella, varicella, meningococcus, and HPV.

Whereas, herd immunity can provide protection from measles, mumps, rubella, pertussis, diphtheria, poliomyelitis, influenza, and meningococcus for individuals who are unable to be vaccinated, if a sufficiently high percentage of the population is immunized.

Whereas, allowing non-medical exemptions to immunization decreases population herd immunity, which puts children too young to be vaccinated and those who have medical contraindications to vaccination at risk and increasing the odds of an outbreak of preventable diseases.

Whereas, section 2164 of New York State Public Health Law mandates that to attend school in NY State children must be vaccinated against poliomyelitis, measles, mumps, rubella, diphtheria, hepatitis B, *Haemophilus influenza* type b, and varicella, but section 9 of the aforementioned law provides an exemption for children whose parent or guardian has beliefs contrary to the practice of immunization; therefore be it.

RESOLVED, That the Medical Society of the State of New York support the repeal of subdivision 9 of section 2164 of New York State Public Health Law, which would eliminate all non-medical exemptions for childhood vaccinations prior to attending school.

References:


REPORT 1 OF THE COUNCIL ON SCIENCE AND PUBLIC HEALTH (I-15)
Non-medical Exemptions to Immunization
(Reference Committee K)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Objective: The very success of immunization programs over time has resulted in a situation in which many individuals, including physicians, have no memory of the devastating effects of infectious diseases such as poliomyelitis, measles, and pertussis against which to appreciate the benefits of immunization. The reemergence of various vaccine-preventable diseases argues for assessment of the use of non-medical exemptions to immunization mandates. Existing AMA policy on this topic is not consistent and warrants review as well.

Results: Requirements for exemptions from vaccine mandates vary from state to state. For school entry, all states allow medical exemptions to immunization and 48 states currently allow a religious exemption; 19 states also currently allow a personal belief exemption. Nationwide, about 1.7% of kindergarten-age children have had religious or philosophic exemptions to mandatory immunization claimed on their behalf. Research supports a relationship between rates of non-medical exemptions and the process in place for obtaining them; the easier the process, the higher the rate of exemptions. Moreover, exemption rates are higher in states that permit non-medical exemptions for personal and philosophical, rather than solely religious, reasons. Social influences are evident in the persistence of the anti-immunization movement in the United States and the geographical clustering of families with similar attitudes and beliefs about immunizations. Research indicates that where immunization rates are low, especially where children are under-immunized or not immunized at all, outbreaks of vaccine-preventable disease are more frequent.

Conclusion: Maintaining public confidence in immunizations is critical for preventing a decline in immunization rates that can result in outbreaks of disease. Where immunization exemption rates are high, herd immunity may be compromised and the number of unimmunized individuals might become sufficient to permit transmission of vaccine-preventable diseases, if introduced. When people decide not to be immunized, they put others at risk as well as themselves. Protection of community health requires that individuals not be permitted to opt out of immunization solely as a matter of personal preference or convenience. To maximize the benefits of immunization, all adults, including physicians and other health professionals, and children should be immunized according to the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP)-recommended schedule, unless there is a documented medical contraindication to immunization.

Physicians have a responsibility to help educate patients and parents about the risks of vaccine-preventable disease and the safety and effectiveness of vaccines. In their own practices and public presentations and through their state and professional medical societies, physicians also have a responsibility to provide scientifically well-grounded information about vaccines and vaccine-preventable diseases and to rebut non-scientifically based positions on this topic.
Policy D-440.936, "Immunization Exemptions," directs our American Medical Association (AMA) to review and address existing inconsistencies in its policies regarding immunization exemptions. While current AMA policy allows for immunization exemption for medical contraindications, AMA policy is not uniform regarding non-medical exemptions. Some policies (excluding ethical opinions) recognize only non-medical exemptions based on religious beliefs, while others recognize non-medical exemptions based on both religious and philosophical objections (Appendix A).

In an attempt to implement Policy D-440.936, the Council on Science and Public Health (CSAPH) and Council on Ethical and Judicial Affairs (CEJA) submitted a joint report at A-15 that was referred by the House of Delegates (HOD). Several policies were adopted at A-15 in support of eliminating non-medical exemptions (Appendix A). This report updates the scientific literature on this topic and recommends consolidation and revisions to existing AMA policy on vaccines and immunizations, while maintaining strong support for the elimination of non-medical exemptions, in order to best protect public health.

BACKGROUND

Immunization benefits both the individuals who receive vaccines and the wider community. When people are immunized, they not only build up their own immune systems, they also help prevent the spread of disease to others who have not been immunized, for whom the vaccine has failed to provide protection, or for whom the vaccine is medically contraindicated. Herd immunity—high immunization rates that help minimize the transmission of disease through a population—protects unimmunized and under-immunized individuals and those who are at highest risk for severe infection, including pregnant women, infants, immunocompromised individuals, and patients with chronic disease.

Law and policy throughout the United States require immunizations or other documentation of immunity as a condition of public school attendance and, in some cases, as a condition of employment.1 The U.S. Supreme Court has held that states can mandate immunizations to protect public health, but, if they do, they also must allow medical exemptions. Courts have further held that the exemption process must not violate individuals' constitutional rights. Most states also provide for non-medical exemptions to accommodate the religious beliefs of some individuals who oppose immunization. Some states also have expanded non-medical exemptions for certain individuals who oppose immunization based on broader personal or philosophical reasons.
Many states also have laws providing for mandatory immunizations during a public health emergency or large-scale outbreak of a communicable disease. Generally, the power to order such action resides with the governor of the state or with a state health officer. While exemptions may currently be permitted for medical, religious, or philosophical reasons, governments have the authority to quarantine unimmunized individuals during a public health emergency.

**VACCINE MANDATES & EXEMPTIONS**

Immunization programs in the United States, supported by state legal requirements and federal funding/oversight, are among the most cost-effective and widely used public health interventions, having controlled or eliminated the spread of epidemic diseases including smallpox, measles, mumps, rubella, diphtheria, and polio.²³

Medical exemptions from immunization are intended to prevent harm to individuals who are at increased risk of adverse events from the vaccine because of underlying conditions. Vaccines are medically contraindicated for individuals who have histories of severe allergic reactions from prior doses of vaccine. Many underlying conditions also place individuals at increased risk of complications from certain vaccines, as well as from the diseases they prevent. For example, individuals who are severely immunocompromised should not be inoculated with vaccines containing live attenuated viruses, such as the varicella zoster (chicken pox or shingles) or measles, mumps, and rubella (MMR) vaccines.⁴ Individuals for whom vaccines are medically contraindicated are protected from exposure to vaccine-preventable diseases through herd immunity, i.e., high rates of vaccination among the rest of the population that minimize transmission throughout the population.

Non-medical exemptions recognize the role of individual and, for childhood immunizations, parental autonomy, in making decisions about immunization.⁵ These exemptions are variously defined across the country, encompassing religious exemptions and exemptions for “personal belief,” which may include philosophical or other strongly held non-medical reasons for objecting to immunization that are not associated with specific religious beliefs.

**Childcare & School Entry Mandates**

Every state and the District of Columbia (DC) has laws requiring documentation of immunizations for entry into licensed childcare, Head Start, and school.⁶ Various states also mandate immunizations for incoming college and university students. The CDC maintains a continuously updated online database of state laws pertaining to immunization requirements for childcare, kindergarten, middle school, and university/college attendance.⁷ Institutions, such as colleges and private schools, may establish additional immunization policies for attendance or residence on campus. School entry coverage for most states is at or near national Healthy People 2020 targets of maintaining 95% immunization coverage levels for all recommended vaccines.⁴⁹

Requirements for exemptions from childcare and school entry vaccine mandates vary from state to state with regard to the child’s age, school grades covered, the vaccines included, the processes and authority used to add or remove vaccines from school entry mandates, reasons for exemptions (medical reasons, religious reasons, philosophical or personal beliefs), and the procedures for granting exemptions.¹⁰⁻¹² All states allow exemptions when there is a medical contraindication such as immune deficiency or an allergic reaction.¹³ As of July 2015, 48 states allow a religious exemption (West Virginia and Mississippi are the only exceptions); 19 states also allow a “personal belief” exemption.¹⁴ In June 2015, the governor of California signed a bill that prohibits personal and religious belief exemptions. The law will go into effect on July 1, 2016.¹⁵
It has been observed in several studies that allowing non-medical exemptions is correlated with decreased vaccination coverage. Additionally, in states that allow philosophical exemptions, such exemptions often dominate the majority of all exemptions. For the 2013-2014 school year, an estimated 90,666 exemptions were reported nationally among a total estimated population of 3,902,571 kindergarten-age children. Exemption rates were less than 1% for eight states and greater than 4% for 11 states (range: less than 0.1% in Mississippi to 7.1% in Oregon; median 1.8%). During the 2014-2015 school year, approximately 94% of children attending kindergarten received two doses of measles, mumps, and rubella (MMR) vaccine, and met the local requirements for diphtheria, tetanus, and acellular pertussis (Dtap) vaccine. The median percentage of any exemptions was 1.7%, with pockets of low and high exemption rates by state. The recent measles outbreak that began with exposure at a California amusement park not only helped initiate the non-medical exemption legislation in California, but lawmakers in 7 additional states are currently considering measures to either eliminate or restrict vaccine exemptions or expand vaccine mandates as well.

All states permit a medical exemption to immunization for children entering childcare and school. In states that report medical exemptions separately from non-medical exemptions, the median medical exemption rate for kindergarten-age children in the 2013-2014 school year was 0.2% (range: less than 0.1% in eight states to 1.2% in Alaska and Washington).

Over the past two decades, the number of non-medical exemptions from school immunization requirements in the United States has increased considerably, from a state median of 0.98% in 1991 to 1.7% in 2014, primarily among states that recognize exemptions based on personal or philosophical beliefs in addition to religious exemptions. In states that report medical exemptions separately from non-medical exemption rates, for the 2013-2014 school year, the median percentage of kindergarten-age children with non-medical exemptions was 1.7% (range: 0.4% in Virginia to 7.0% in Oregon); 11 states had non-medical exemptions levels of 4.0% or greater.

**Immunization of Health Care Personnel**

The CDC recommends that all health care personnel be immunized appropriately. A number of states require employees of certain health care facilities, such as hospitals and nursing homes, to be immunized against diseases such as measles, mumps, rubella, varicella zoster, hepatitis B, and influenza. Such laws, which vary widely, generally contain opt-out provisions for vaccines that are medically contraindicated or contrary to the individual’s religious or philosophical beliefs.

As of July 2015, three states (Alabama, Colorado, and New Hampshire) mandated influenza immunizations for health care personnel. Even without a state mandate, hospitals and health care systems in 45 states have implemented institutional policies mandating influenza immunization, although these policies vary in their requirements and penalties. As of 2014, approximately 30% of health care personnel reported that their employers required influenza immunization as a condition of employment. Evidence from the literature suggests that vaccine mandates among health care personnel are directly associated with increased vaccination rates.

For the 2013-2014 influenza season, 82% of health care personnel overall reported having had an influenza immunization, which is below the Healthy People 2020 annual goal of 90% influenza vaccine coverage for this group. However, this rate varied considerably by state. Immunization coverage also varied according to occupation. For the 2013-2014 season, immunization coverage was 92% among physicians, 90.5% among nurses, 90% among nurse practitioners and physician assistants, 87% among other clinical personnel, and 69% among nonclinical personnel.
Immunization coverage was 90% among health care personnel working in hospitals and 63% among those working in long-term care facilities.\textsuperscript{27}

IMMUNIZATION STATUS & THE RESURGENCE OF VACCINE-PREVENTABLE DISEASES

A growing number of parents are seeking non-medical exemptions to delay or refuse some or all vaccines for their children.\textsuperscript{27-29, 32-34} The ease of obtaining non-medical exemptions is associated with higher rates of exemptions,\textsuperscript{12,23,35} and there is reason to believe that parents may use non-medical exemptions out of convenience rather than deeply held belief.\textsuperscript{12,23,35} A study of non-medical exemptions permitted between 1991 to 2004 found that the increase in exemption rates was not uniform.\textsuperscript{23} Exemption rates for states that allowed only religious exemptions remained at approximately 1% during this time period; however, in states that allowed exemptions for philosophical or personal beliefs, the mean exemption rate increased from 1% to 2.5%. Additional studies suggest that states that allow philosophical exemptions for school-age children have significantly higher rates of unimmunized children.\textsuperscript{8,10,21-24,35,36}

Overall, about 90% of all non-medical exemptions for states that permit both religious and philosophical exemptions for school entry were philosophical exemptions.\textsuperscript{8} Some states require membership in a recognized religion in order for a parent to invoke a religious exemption to vaccination of a student, whereas others merely require an affirmation of religious or philosophical opposition. States in which individuals can obtain vaccine exemptions for non-religious philosophical reasons generally have the highest immunization opt-out rates in the nation.\textsuperscript{8,24,36} Washington State, for example, has seen decreases in immunization rates among kindergarteners. In particular, the percentage of kindergarteners vaccinated against polio has dropped from 95.4% in 1998 to 88.4% in 2015,\textsuperscript{37} well below the Healthy People 2020 goal of 95%.\textsuperscript{9} Moreover, in 2015, the polio immunization rate among kindergarteners in Seattle was even lower than the state average, at 81.4%. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), this rate is lower than polio immunization rates in countries such as Algeria, El Salvador, Guyana, Iran, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Rwanda, Sudan, Yemen, and Zimbabwe, among others.\textsuperscript{37}

Where immunization rates are low, especially where children are under-immunized or not immunized at all, outbreaks of vaccine-preventable disease are more frequent.\textsuperscript{38-43} Studies have shown an increase in the local risk of vaccine-preventable diseases (notably pertussis, measles, and mumps) when individuals who refuse immunization cluster geographically within school districts, communities, and counties.\textsuperscript{23,24,41-48} In Colorado, for example, the county-level incidence of measles in immunized children from 1987 through 1998 was associated with the frequency of exemptions in that county.\textsuperscript{41} Vaccine-exempt children were 22 times more likely to acquire measles and 6 times more likely to acquire pertussis than immunized children. At least 11% of vaccinated children who acquired measles were infected through contact with an exempt child. The mean exemption rate among schools with pertussis outbreaks was 4.3% compared with 1.5% for schools that did not have an outbreak.

From January 1, 2014 to August 21, 2015, the United States has experienced a dramatic increase in the number of measles cases. During this time, the CDC confirmed 856 measles cases. In 2014, there were 668 cases in 27 states stemming from 23 outbreaks. Many of these outbreaks began with unimmunized individuals who were exposed to the virus while abroad, particularly those who travelled to the Philippines, which experienced a large measles outbreak. One large outbreak included 383 cases in unimmunized Amish communities in Ohio. As of August 2015, 188 cases of measles have been confirmed in 24 states and the District of Columbia. These cases have grown out of 5 major outbreaks,\textsuperscript{49} with 125 cases from a large multi-state outbreak linked to transmission
at an amusement park in California, of which 55% of cases were unimmunized. The majority of cases (88%) were residents of California; of those individuals who were unvaccinated but eligible for vaccination, 37 (76%) were unvaccinated due to personal beliefs. In addition, the majority of the cases that have occurred in the U.S. thus far have been among persons who were unimmunized.

VACCINE REFUSAL

While the vast majority of parents in the United States have their children immunized in accordance with the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP)-recommended vaccine schedule, it has been estimated that almost 1 in 8 parents (12%) have refused at least one vaccine recommended by their child’s physician. Studies indicate that under-immunized children are likely to have missed some immunizations because of factors related to the health care system or socioeconomic characteristics, whereas children who are not immunized at all are likely to belong to families that intentionally refuse vaccines.

Decisions about immunization are influenced by the individual’s perception of health, beliefs about and experience of childhood diseases, and perceptions about the risks of diseases, as well as perceptions about vaccine safety and effectiveness, vaccine components, and level of trust in institutions. Even when they do not reject immunization outright, many parents have become “vaccine hesitant.” Having had little or no experience with most of the vaccine-preventable diseases because the prevalence of those diseases is very low (or nonexistent), parents’ concerns that a vaccine will adversely affect their child can often outweigh their concerns about disease risk. Additionally, lack of understanding about how vaccines work combined with the fear of being injected with a disease agent contribute to reluctance to undergo immunization. In past surveys, parents consistently cited vaccine safety, including concerns about autism, as the most frequent reason for not vaccinating their children. More recently, the primary reasons for parents’ failure to vaccinate their children include issues related to lack of perceived need of vaccination, vaccine safety, lack of trust in the government or their health care provider, and perceived lack of involvement in the decision-making process for their children. In addition, the perceived link between vaccines and autism still remains a large concern of parents seeking exemptions for immunization. The evidence that originally purported to show a link between autism and immunization was proven to be fraudulent and was retracted and its author censured.

An extensive body of credible scientific evidence continues to support the safety and effectiveness of vaccines.

Parents who refuse immunization for their children may also rely more on guidance from family, friends, and their broader social network, including popular media, than on physicians’ recommendations. The influence of such social guidance is evident in the persistence of the antivaccination movement in the United States, and the geographical clustering of families with similar attitudes and beliefs about immunizations.

A majority of states do not specifically define what constitutes a religious or personal exemption; when they do, how strictly the exemption is defined does not appear to determine how strictly the exemption is applied. In some states, a parent can claim personal exemption simply by signing a prewritten statement on the school immunization form. Often this is perceived as easier than completing a school immunization form that requires a health care professional to provide details of immunization from the child’s medical record. Some states that offer religious or personal belief exemptions have additional administrative requirements, such as requiring a signature from a local health department official, annual renewal, notarization, or a personally written letter from the parents explaining the reasons for vaccine refusal. Research supports a relationship between rates
of non-medical exemptions and the process in place for obtaining them: the easier the process, the higher the rate of exemptions. Moreover, exemption rates are higher in states that permit non-medical exemptions for personal and philosophical, rather than solely religious, reasons.

In light of recent measles outbreaks, views regarding non-medical exemptions appear to be shifting among parents in the U.S. A 2015 national poll on children’s health, conducted by the University of Michigan C.S. Mott Children’s Hospital, asked parents if their views about vaccination had changed since the prior year. Compared to their views a year ago, 25% of parents surveyed believed vaccination to be safer, 34% thought vaccines are more beneficial, and 35% are more supportive of vaccine requirements for schools and daycare facilities.

PHYSICIAN ROLE IN IMMUNIZATION

Physicians can play an important role in engaging and supporting vaccine-hesitant parents to understand and address their concerns. Physicians have long-recognized obligations to promote health and prevent disease for the well-being of individual patients and the community at large. Physicians likewise have an obligation not to put patients at undue risk of harm. As trusted sources of information and guidance, physicians can play a significant role in shaping their patients’ perspectives about vaccines and the decisions patients make about immunizing themselves and their families. Physicians have a responsibility to educate parents/guardians about the long-term preventive benefits of childhood immunizations.

Physicians’ responsibility to protect patients’ well-being extends to ensuring that they and all staff in their own practices are immunized, absent medical contraindication. Parents/guardians of minor patients who continue to refuse immunization for their children, as well as adult patients who refuse immunization for themselves, pose a health risk to others. Because physicians have an obligation to protect the health of the other patients in the practice and the practice staff, physicians must take action to protect those who will come in contact with unimmunized individuals in the office, clinic, or other health care setting.

CONCLUSION

The reemergence of various vaccine-preventable diseases argues for the removal of non-medical exemptions to immunization mandates. Where exemption rates are high, herd immunity may be compromised and the number of unimmunized individuals might become sufficient to permit transmission of vaccine-preventable diseases, if introduced. When people decide not to be immunized, they put others at risk as well as themselves. Protecting community health requires that individuals not be permitted to opt out of immunization solely as a matter of convenience or misinformation. To protect public health and limit the resurgence of vaccine preventable diseases, all children and adults, including physicians and health professionals, should be immunized according to the recommended Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) schedule, unless medically contraindicated. Two states already prohibit non-medical exemptions to mandatory vaccination; another recently adopted legislation to do the same. This is wise public health policy and is the policy that should be adopted in all U.S. jurisdictions.

Physicians have an important role to play in protecting individual patients and the health of communities. They have a responsibility to help educate patients and parents about the risks of vaccine-preventable diseases and the safety and effectiveness of vaccines. Physicians who administer vaccines also need to stay up-to-date on the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices for themselves and their patients.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The Council on Science and Public Health recommends that the following statements be adopted and the remainder of the report be filed:

1. That Policy H-440.970, Religious Exemptions from Immunizations, be amended by substitution to read as follows:

   Nonmedical Exemptions from Immunizations
   Our American Medical Association (AMA) believes that nonmedical (religious, philosophic, or personal belief) exemptions from immunizations endanger the health of the unvaccinated individual and the health of those in his or her group and the community at large. Therefore, our AMA (1) supports the immunization recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) for all individuals without medical contraindications; (2) supports legislation eliminating nonmedical exemptions from immunization; (3) encourages state medical associations to seek removal of nonmedical exemptions in statutes requiring mandatory immunizations, including for childcare and school attendance; (4) encourages physicians to grant vaccine exemption requests only when medical contraindications are present; (5) encourages state and local medical associations to work with public health officials to develop contingency plans for controlling outbreaks in medically-exempt populations and to intensify efforts to achieve high immunization rates in communities where nonmedical exemptions are common; and (6) recommends that states have in place: (a) an established mechanism, which includes the involvement of qualified public health physicians, of determining which vaccines will be mandatory for admission to school and other identified public venues (based upon the recommendations of the ACIP); and (b) policies that permit immunization exemptions for medical reasons only. (Modify Current HOD Policy)

2. That Policy H-440.831, Protecting Patients and the Public by Immunizing Physicians, be amended by substitution to read as follows:

   Protecting Patients and the Public through Physician, Health Care Worker, and Caregiver Immunization
   1. American Medical Association (AMA) policy is that, in the context of a highly transmissible disease that poses significant medical risk for vulnerable patients or colleagues or threatens the availability of the health care workforce, particularly a disease that has the potential to become epidemic or pandemic, including influenza, and for which there is an available, safe, and effective vaccine, physicians, health care workers (HCWs), and family caregivers who have direct patient care responsibilities or potential direct exposure have an obligation to accept immunization unless there is a recognized medical reason to not be immunized. In scenarios in which there is a documented medical contraindication to immunization of a physician or HCW, appropriate protective measures should be taken. 2. Our AMA (a) encourages hospitals, health care systems, and health care providers to provide immunizations to HCWs against influenza and other highly transmissible diseases, at no cost to the employee, both for their own protection and to reduce the risk of infectious disease transmission to others; and (b) encourages health care institutions to develop mechanisms to maximize the rate of influenza immunization for HCWs, including the option of making immunization a condition of employment. (Modify Current HOD Policy)
3. That Policy H-440.830, Parent to Parent Education on Child Vaccination, be amended by substitution to read as follows:

   Education on Vaccine Safety and Efficacy

   Our American Medical Association (1) encourages the development of educational materials that can be distributed to patients and their families clearly articulating the benefits of immunizations and highlighting the exemplary safety record of vaccines; (2) supports the development and evaluation, in collaboration with health care providers, of evidence-based educational resources to assist parents in educating and encouraging other parents who may be reluctant to vaccinate their children; (3) encourages physicians and state and local medical associations to work with public health officials to inform those who object to immunizations about the benefits of vaccinations and the risks to their own health and that of the general public if they refuse to accept them; (4) will promote the safety and efficacy of vaccines while rejecting claims that have no foundation in science; and (5) will continue its ongoing efforts with other immunization advocacy organizations to assist physicians and other health care professionals in effectively communicating to patients, parents, policy makers, and the media that vaccines do not cause autism and that decreasing immunization rates have resulted in a resurgence of vaccine-preventable diseases and deaths. (Modify Current HOD Policy)

4. That Policies H-440.850, Recommendations for Healthcare Worker and Patient Influenza Immunizations; D-440.936, Immunization Exemptions; D-440.947, Support for Immunizations; H-440.829, Ending Non-Medical Exemptions for Immunization; H-440.832, Vaccination Requirements to Protect All Children; and H-440.853, Increasing Public Awareness of the Lack of a Vaccine-Autism Link be rescinded since they have been implemented or accomplished (in the case of D-440.936 and H-440.853), or have been rendered duplicative by the recommendations in this report (in the case of D-440.850, D-440.947, and H-440.829). (Rescind HOD Policy)

Fiscal Note: Less than $500
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Appendix

Current Vaccine Exemption Policies

H-440.832 Vaccination Requirements to Protect All Children
1. Our American Medical Association supports the dissemination of materials on vaccine efficacy to states, and encourages them to eliminate philosophical and religious exemptions from state immunization requirements. 2. Our AMA recommends that states have in place: (a) an established decision mechanism that involves qualified public health physicians to determine which vaccines will be mandatory for admission to school and other identified public venues (based upon the recommendations of ACIP and AAP); and (b) exemptions to these immunization mandates only for medical reasons, because disease exposures, importations, infections, and outbreaks may occur without warning in any community. (Res. 7, A-15)

H-440.831 Protecting Patients and the Public by Immunizing Physicians
American Medical Association policy is that in the context of a highly transmissible disease that poses significant medical risk for vulnerable patients or colleagues, or threatens the availability of the health care workforce, particularly a disease that has potential to become epidemic or pandemic, and for which there is an available, safe, and effective vaccine, physicians and health care workers who have direct patient care responsibilities or potential direct exposure have an obligation to accept immunization unless there is a recognized medical reason to not be immunized. In such scenarios, appropriate protective measures should be taken. (Res. 8, A-15)

H-440.830 Parent to Parent Education on Child Vaccination
In order to increase child vaccination rates, our American Medical Association supports the development and evaluation of educational efforts, based on scientific evidence and in collaboration with health care providers, that support parents who want to help educate and encourage parents reluctant to vaccinate their children. (Res. 9, A-15)

H-440.829 Ending Non-Medical Exemptions for Immunization
1. Our American Medical Association supports legislation eliminating non-medical exemptions from immunization for participation in federally funded educational programs for children including Head Start. 2. Our AMA supports state medical society efforts to eliminate non-medical exemptions from immunization for childcare and school attendance in state statutes. (Res. 10, A-15)

D-440.931 Encourage Autism Society to Support Vaccinations
Our American Medical Association will work jointly with the American College of Physicians, American Academy of Pediatrics and American Academy of Family Physicians to encourage the Autism Society of America to display on its website that based on current scientific evidence, autism is not caused by vaccinations, and encourage vaccinations to promote better health for all our population. (Res. 12, A-15)

H-440.970 Religious Exemptions from Immunizations
Since religious/philosophic exemptions from immunizations endanger not only the health of the unvaccinated individual, but also the health of those in his or her group and the community at large, the AMA (1) encourages state medical associations to seek removal of such exemptions in statutes requiring mandatory immunizations; (2) encourages physicians and state and local medical associations to work with public health officials to inform religious groups and others who object to immunizations of the benefits of vaccinations and the risk to their own health and that of the general public if they refuse to accept them; and (3) encourages state and local medical associations to work with public health officials to develop contingency plans for controlling outbreaks in exempt populations and to intensify efforts to achieve high immunization rates in communities where groups having religious exemptions from immunizations reside. (CSA Rep. B, A-87; Reaffirmed: Sunset Report, 1-97; Reaffirmed: CSAPH Rep. 3, A-07)

H-440.850 Recommendations for Healthcare Worker and Patient Influenza Immunizations
1. Our AMA (A) reaffirms its support for universal influenza vaccination of health care workers (HCWs) and supports universal immunization of HCWs against seasonal and pandemic influenza through vaccination programs undertaken by health care institutions in conjunction with medical staff leadership; (B) encourages
all hospitals, health care systems, and health care providers to immunize providers and appropriate patients as defined by the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices guidelines against both influenza and pertussis, as a priority, both for their own protection and to reduce the risk of transmission to others; and (C) will work to ensure that hospitals and skilled nursing facilities have a system for measuring and maximizing the rate of influenza immunization for health care workers. 2. Our AMA: (A) supports a mandatory annual influenza vaccination for every long term care health care worker who has direct patient contact unless a medical contraindication or religious objection exists; (B) recommends that medical directors and other practitioners encourage caregivers (both professional health care workers and family caregivers) to obtain these vaccinations; and (C) recommends vaccinations be made available and offered at no cost to staff working in long-term care settings. (CSAPH Rep. 5, I-12; Res. 916, I-12)

D-440.947 Support for Immunizations
1. Our AMA will provide materials on vaccine safety and efficacy to states and encourage them to enact more stringent requirements for parents/legal guardians to obtain personal belief exemptions from state immunization requirements. 2. Our AMA, in collaboration with the Immunization Alliance, will develop educational materials that can be distributed to patients and their families clearly articulating the benefits of immunizations and highlighting the exemplary safety record of vaccines. 3. Our AMA will communicate and work with other concerned organizations about effective ways to continue to support immunizations while rejecting claims that have no foundation in science. 4. Our AMA will continue its ongoing efforts with other immunization advocacy organizations to assist physicians and other health care professionals to effectively communicate to patients, parents, policy makers, and the media that vaccines do not cause autism and that decreasing immunization rates have resulted in a resurgence of vaccine-preventable diseases and deaths; and will continue to support ongoing research into the etiology and treatment of autism. 5. Our AMA will actively oppose any vaccine legislation that would deviate from evidence-based recommendations and guidelines of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, the American Academy of Family Physicians, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. 6. Our AMA encourages physicians to follow medical contraindications to vaccines when parents seek a note for a medical exemption from vaccines to attend school. (Res. 922, I-08; Reaffirmed: Res. 501, A-09; Appended and Reaffirmed: Res. 501, A-09; Reaffirmed and Appended: Res. 911, I-09; Appended: Res. 505, A-13)

D-440.936 Immunization Exemptions
Our AMA will review and address existing inconsistencies in its policies regarding immunization exemptions. (Res. 506, A-13)

H-440.853 Increasing Public Awareness of the Lack of a Vaccine-Autism Link
Our AMA will ask the Office of the Surgeon General to offer a definitive repudiation of the link between either thimerosal-containing vaccines or the MMR vaccine and developmental disorders, such as autism. (Res. 413, A-10)