



**Department of Veterans Affairs
Office of Inspector General**

Office of Healthcare Inspections

Report No. 12-03852-110

**Community Based
Outpatient Clinic Reviews at
Alaska VA Healthcare System
Anchorage, AK**

February 14, 2013

Washington, DC 20420

Why We Did This Review

The VA OIG is undertaking a systematic review of the VHA's CBOCs to assess whether CBOCs are operated in a manner that provides veterans with consistent, safe, high-quality health care.

The Veterans' Health Care Eligibility Reform Act of 1996 was enacted to equip VA with ways to provide veterans with medically needed care in a more equitable and cost-effective manner. As a result, VHA expanded the Ambulatory and Primary Care Services to include CBOCs located throughout the United States. CBOCs were established to provide more convenient access to care for currently enrolled users and to improve access opportunities within existing resources for eligible veterans not currently served.

Veterans are required to receive one standard of care at all VHA health care facilities. Care at CBOCs needs to be consistent, safe, and of high quality, regardless of model (VA-staffed or contract). CBOCs are expected to comply with all relevant VA policies and procedures, including those related to quality, patient safety, and performance.

To Report Suspected Wrongdoing in VA Programs and Operations

Telephone: 1-800-488-8244

E-Mail: vaoighotline@va.gov

(Hotline Information: <http://www.va.gov/oig/hotline/default.asp>)

Glossary

C&P	credentialing and privileging
CBOC	community based outpatient clinic
CDC	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
EHR	electronic health record
EOC	environment of care
FPPE	Focused Professional Practice Evaluation
FY	fiscal year
HCS	Health Care System
LCSW	licensed clinical social worker
MH	mental health
NC	noncompliant
NCP	National Center for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention
OIG	Office of Inspector General
PCP	primary care provider
VHA	Veterans Health Administration
VISN	Veterans Integrated Service Network
WH	women's health

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	i
Objectives and Scope	1
Objectives	1
Scope	1
CBOC Profiles	3
WH and Vaccination EHR Reviews – Results and Recommendations	4
WH	4
Vaccinations	4
Onsite Reviews – Results and Recommendations	7
CBOC Characteristics	7
C&P	8
EOC and Emergency Management	9
Appendixes	
A. VISN 20 Director Comments	12
B. Alaska VA HCS Director Comments	13
C. OIG Contact and Staff Acknowledgments	15
D. Report Distribution	16

Executive Summary

Purpose: We evaluated select activities to assess whether the CBOCs operated in a manner that provides veterans with consistent, safe, high-quality health care.

For the EHR review component of the WH and vaccinations topic areas, patients were randomly selected from all CBOCs assigned to the respective parent facilities.

The C&P, EOC, and emergency management onsite inspections were only conducted at the randomly selected CBOCs. We conducted an onsite inspection of the CBOCs during the week of November 5, 2012 (see Table 1).

VISN	Facility	CBOC Name	Location
20	Alaska VA HCS	Kenai	Kenai, AK
		Mat-Su	Wasilla, AK
Table 1. Sites Inspected			

Review Results: The review covered the following topic areas.

- WH
- Vaccinations
- C&P
- EOC
- Emergency Management

We made recommendations in two review areas.

Recommendations: The VISN and Facility Directors, in conjunction with the respective CBOC managers, should take appropriate actions to:

- Ensure that clinicians administer pneumococcal vaccinations when indicated.
- Ensure that clinicians document all required tetanus and pneumococcal vaccination administration elements and that compliance is monitored.
- Ensure fire and life safety inspections are conducted annually at the Kenai and Mat-Su CBOCs.

Comments

The Veterans Integrated Service Network and Facility Directors agreed with the CBOC review findings and recommendations and provided acceptable improvement plans. (See Appendixes A and B, pages 12–14, for the full text of the Directors' comments.) We will follow up on the planned actions until they are completed.



JOHN D. DAIGH, JR., M.D.
Assistant Inspector General for
Healthcare Inspections

Objectives and Scope

Objectives

- Evaluate whether CBOCs comply with selected VHA requirements regarding the provision of cervical cancer screening, results reporting, and WH liaisons.
- Evaluate whether CBOCs properly provided selected vaccinations to veterans according to CDC guidelines and VHA recommendations.
- Determine whether CBOC providers are appropriately credentialed and privileged in accordance with VHA Handbook 1100.19.¹
- Determine whether CBOCs are in compliance with standards of operations according to VHA policy in the areas of environmental safety and emergency planning.²

Scope and Methodology

Scope

We reviewed selected clinical and administrative activities to evaluate compliance with requirements related to patient care quality and the EOC. In performing the reviews, we assessed clinical and administrative records as well as completed onsite inspections at randomly selected sites. Additionally, we interviewed managers and employees. The review covered the following five activities:

- WH
- Vaccinations
- C&P
- EOC
- Emergency Management

Methodology

To evaluate the quality of care provided to veterans at CBOCs, we conducted EHR reviews for the WH and vaccinations topic areas. For WH, the EHR reviews consisted of a random sample of 50 women veterans (23–64 years of age). For vaccinations, the EHR reviews consisted of random samples of 75 veterans (65 and older) and 75 additional veterans (all ages), unless fewer patients were available, for tetanus and

¹ VHA Handbook 1100.19, *Credentialing and Privileging*, November 14, 2008.

² VHA Handbook 1006.1, *Planning and Activating Community-Based Outpatient Clinics*, May 19, 2004.

pneumococcal, respectively. The study populations consisted of patients from all CBOCs assigned to the parent facility.³

The C&P, EOC, and emergency management onsite inspections were only conducted at the randomly selected CBOCs. Two CBOCs were randomly selected from the 56 sampled parent facilities, with sampling probabilities proportional to the numbers of CBOCs eligible to be inspected within each of the parent facilities.⁴

In this report, we make recommendations for improvement. Recommendations pertain to issues that are significant enough to be monitored by the OIG until corrective actions are implemented.

This report is available at <http://www.va.gov/oig/publications/default.asp>.

We conducted the inspection in accordance with *Quality Standards for Inspection and Evaluation* published by the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency.

³ Includes all CBOCs in operation before October 1, 2011.

⁴ Includes 96 CBOCs in operation before October 1, 2011, that had 500 or more unique enrollees.

CBOC Profiles

To evaluate the quality of care provided to veterans at CBOCs, we designed reviews with an EHR component to capture data for patients enrolled at all of the CBOCs under the parent facility's oversight.⁵ The table below provides information relative to each of the CBOCs under the oversight of the respective parent facility.

VISN	Parent Facility	CBOC Name	Locality ⁶	Uniques, FY 2012 ⁷	Visits, FY 2012 ⁸	CBOC Size ⁹
20	Alaska VA HCS	Fairbanks	Urban	2,396	19,803	Mid-Size
		Kenai	Highly Rural	1,452	8,323	Small
		Mat-Su	Highly Rural	1,632	8,546	Mid-Size

Table 2. CBOC Profiles

⁵ Includes all CBOCs in operation before October 1, 2011.

⁶ <http://vaww.pssg.med.va.gov/>

⁷ <http://vssc.med.va.gov>

⁸ <http://vssc.med.va.gov>

⁹ Based on the number of unique patients seen as defined by VHA Handbook 1160.01, *Uniform Mental Health Services in VA Medical Centers and Clinics*, September 11, 2008, the size of the CBOC facility is categorized as very large (> 10,000), large (5,000-10,000), mid-size (1,500-5,000), or small (< 1,500).

WH and Vaccination EHR Reviews Results and Recommendations

WH

Cervical cancer is the second most common cancer in women worldwide.¹⁰ Each year, approximately 12,000 women in the United States are diagnosed with cervical cancer.¹¹ The first step of care is screening women for cervical cancer with the Papanicolaou test or “Pap” test. With timely screening, diagnosis, notification, and treatment, the cancer is highly preventable and associated with long survival and good quality of life.

VHA policy outlines specific requirements that must be met by facilities that provide services for women veterans.¹² We reviewed EHRs, meeting minutes and other relevant documents, and interviewed key WH employees. Table 3 shows the areas reviewed for this topic. The review elements marked as noncompliant needed improvement.

NC	Areas Reviewed
	Cervical cancer screening results were entered into the patient’s EHR.
	The ordering VHA provider or surrogate was notified of results within the defined timeframe.
	Patients were notified of results within the defined timeframe.
	Each CBOC has an appointed WH Liaison.
	There is evidence that the CBOC has processes in place to ensure that WH care needs are addressed.
Table 3. WH	

There were 19 patients who received a cervical cancer screening at the Alaska VA HCS CBOCs.

Generally, the CBOCs assigned to the Alaska VA HCS were compliant with the review areas; therefore, we made no recommendations.

Vaccinations

The VHA NCP was established in 1995. The NCP establishes and monitors the clinical preventive services offered to veterans, which includes the administration of vaccinations.¹³ The NCP provides best practices guidance on the administration of vaccinations for veterans. The CDC states that although vaccine-preventable disease

¹⁰ World Health Organization. Cancer of the cervix. Retrieved from: <http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/topics/cancer>.

¹¹ U.S. Cancer Statistics Working Group. *United States Cancer Statistics: 1999-2008 Incidence and Mortality Web-based report*.

¹² VHA Handbook 1330.01, *Health Care Services for Women Veterans*, May 21, 2010.

¹³ VHA Handbook 1120.05, *Coordination and Development of Clinical Preventive Services*, October 13, 2009.

levels are at or near record lows, many adults are under-immunized, missing opportunities to protect themselves against diseases such as tetanus and pneumococcal.

Adults should receive a tetanus vaccine every 10 years. At the age of 65, individuals that have never had a pneumococcal vaccination should receive one. For individuals 65 and older who have received a prior pneumococcal vaccination, one-time revaccination is recommended if they were vaccinated 5 or more years previously and were less than 65 years of age at the time of the first vaccination.

We reviewed documentation of selected vaccine administrations and interviewed key personnel. Table 4 shows the areas reviewed for this topic. The review elements marked as noncompliant needed improvement.

NC	Areas Reviewed
	Staff screened patients for the tetanus vaccination.
	Staff screened patients for the pneumococcal vaccination.
X	Staff properly documented vaccine administration.
	Managers developed a prioritization plan for the potential occurrence of vaccine shortages.
Table 4. Vaccinations	

Pneumococcal Vaccination Administration. The CDC recommends that at the age of 65, individuals that have never had a pneumococcal vaccination should receive one.¹⁴ For individuals 65 and older who have received a prior pneumococcal vaccination, a one-time revaccination is recommended if they were vaccinated 5 or more years previously and were less than 65 years of age at the time of the first vaccination. We reviewed 21 EHRs for patients with pre-existing conditions who received their first vaccine prior to the age of 65. In 16 of the 21 patients' EHRs we did not find documentation indicating that both vaccinations had been administered.

Documentation of Vaccinations. Federal Law requires that documentation for administered vaccinations includes specific elements, such as the vaccine manufacturer and lot number of the vaccine used.¹⁵ We reviewed the EHRs of six patients who received a tetanus vaccine in the prior 24 months. We reviewed the EHRs of 35 patients who received a pneumococcal vaccine administration at the parent facility or its associated CBOCs. None of the EHRs contained the required documentation elements.

Recommendations

1. We recommended that managers ensure that clinicians administer pneumococcal vaccinations when indicated.

¹⁴ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, <http://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/vpd-vac/>.

¹⁵ Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986 (PL 99 660) sub part C.

2. We recommended that managers ensure that clinicians document all required tetanus and pneumococcal vaccination administration elements and that compliance is monitored.

Onsite Reviews Results and Recommendations

CBOC Characteristics

We formulated a list of CBOC characteristics that includes identifiers and descriptive information for the randomly selected CBOCs (see Table 5).

	Kenai	Mat-Su
VISN	20	20
Parent Facility	Alaska VA HCS	Alaska VA HCS
Types of Providers	LCSW Nurse Practitioner PCP	LCSW Nurse Practitioner PCP
Number of MH Uniques, FY 2012	246	369
Number of MH Visits, FY 2012	709	1,924
MH Services Onsite	Yes	Yes
Specialty Care Services Onsite	Orthopedics Audiology	None
Ancillary Services Provided Onsite	Electrocardiogram Laboratory	Electrocardiogram Laboratory
Tele-Health Services	Dermatology MH Retinal Imaging	Dermatology Retinal Imaging
Table 5. Characteristics		

C&P

We reviewed C&P folders, scopes of practice, meeting minutes, and VetPro information and interviewed senior managers to determine whether facilities had consistent processes to ensure that providers complied with applicable requirements as defined by VHA policy.¹⁶ Table 6 shows the areas reviewed for this topic.

NC	Areas Reviewed
	Each provider's license was unrestricted.
New Provider	
	Efforts were made to obtain verification of clinical privileges currently or most recently held at other institutions.
	FPPE was initiated.
	Timeframe for the FPPE was clearly documented.
	The FPPE outlined the criteria monitored.
	The FPPE was implemented on first clinical start day.
	The FPPE results were reported to the medical staff's Executive Committee.
Additional New Privilege	
	Prior to the start of a new privilege, criteria for the FPPE were developed.
	There was evidence that the provider was educated about FPPE prior to its initiation.
	FPPE results were reported to the medical staff's Executive Committee.
FPPE for Performance	
	The FPPE included criteria developed for evaluation of the practitioners when issues affecting the provision of safe, high-quality care were identified.
	A timeframe for the FPPE was clearly documented.
	There was evidence that the provider was educated about FPPE prior to its initiation.
	FPPE results were reported to the medical staff's Executive Committee.
Privileges and Scopes of Practice	
	The Service Chief, Credentialing Board, and/or medical staff's Executive Committee list documents reviewed and the rationale for conclusions reached for granting licensed independent practitioner privileges.
	Privileges granted to providers were setting, service, and provider specific.

¹⁶ VHA Handbook 1100.19.

NC	Areas Reviewed (continued)
	The determination to continue current privileges were based in part on results of Ongoing Professional Practice Evaluation activities.
	The Ongoing Professional Practice Evaluation and reappraisal process included consideration of such factors as clinical pertinence reviews and/or performance measure compliance.
Table 6. C&P	

All CBOCs were compliant with the review areas; therefore, we made no recommendations.

EOC and Emergency Management

EOC

To evaluate the EOC, we inspected patient care areas for cleanliness, safety, infection control, and general maintenance. We reviewed relevant documents and interviewed key employees and managers. Table 7 shows the areas reviewed for this topic. The CBOC identified as noncompliant needed improvement. Details regarding the findings follow the table.

NC	Areas Reviewed
	The CBOC was Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant, including: parking, ramps, door widths, door hardware, restrooms, and counters.
	The CBOC was well maintained (e.g., ceiling tiles clean and in good repair, walls without holes, etc.).
	The CBOC was clean (walls, floors, and equipment are clean).
	Material safety data sheets were readily available to staff.
	The patient care area was safe.
	Access to fire alarms and fire extinguishers was unobstructed.
	Fire extinguishers were visually inspected monthly.
	Exit signs were visible from any direction.
	There was evidence of fire drills occurring at least annually.
	Fire extinguishers were easily identifiable.
Kenai Mat-Su	There was evidence of an annual fire and life safety inspection.
	There was an alarm system or panic button installed in high-risk areas as identified by the vulnerability risk assessment.
	The CBOC had a process to identify expired medications.
	Medications were secured from unauthorized access.
	Privacy was maintained.
	Patients' personally identifiable information was secured and protected

NC	Areas Reviewed (continued)
	Laboratory specimens were transported securely to prevent unauthorized access.
	Staff used two patient identifiers for blood drawing procedures.
	IT security rules were adhered to.
	There was alcohol hand wash or a soap dispenser and sink available in each examination room.
	Sharps containers were less than 3/4 full.
	Safety needle devices were available for staff use (e.g., lancets, injection needles, phlebotomy needles)
	The CBOC was included in facility-wide EOC activities.
Table 7. EOC	

Fire and Life Safety. The Joint Commission requires that fire safety equipment and fire safety building features are maintained and inspected in order to identify conditions that do not meet the National Fire Protection Agency Life Safety Code 101.¹⁷ We did not find evidence of annual fire and life safety inspections at the Kenai and Mat-Su CBOCs. Management acknowledged the inspections had not been conducted as required.

Recommendation

3. We recommended that fire and life safety inspections are conducted annually at the Kenai and Mat-Su CBOCs.

Emergency Management

VHA policy requires each CBOC to have a local policy or standard operating procedure defining how medical emergencies, including MH, are handled.¹⁸ Table 8 shows the areas reviewed for this topic.

NC	Areas Reviewed
	There was a local medical emergency management plan for this CBOC.
	The staff articulated the procedural steps of the medical emergency plan.
	The CBOC had an automated external defibrillator onsite for cardiac emergencies.
	There was a local MH emergency management plan for this CBOC.
	The staff articulated the procedural steps of the MH emergency plan.
Table 8. Emergency Management	

¹⁷ Joint Commission Standard EC 02.03.05.

¹⁸ VHA Handbook 1006.1.

All CBOCs were compliant with the review areas; therefore, we made no recommendations.

VISN 20 Director Comments**Department of
Veterans Affairs****Memorandum**

Date: January 23, 2013

From: Director, VISN 20 (10N20)

Subject: **CBOC Reviews at Alaska VA HCS**

To: Director, 54SE Healthcare Inspections Division (54SE)
Director, Management Review (VHA 10AR MRS OIG CAP
CBOC)

1. Thank you for the opportunity to provide a status report on the draft findings from the Community Based Outpatient Clinic Reviews, Anchorage, Alaska.
2. Attached please find the facility concurrences and responses to each of the findings from the reviews.
3. If you have additional questions or need further information, please contact Susan Gilbert, Survey Coordinator, VISN 20 at (360) 567-4678.

(original signed by:)
Lawrence H. Carroll

Alaska VA HCS Director Comments

**Department of
Veterans Affairs**

Memorandum

Date: January 23, 2013
From: Acting Director, Alaska VA HCS (00/463)
Subject: **CBOC Reviews at Alaska VA HCS**
To: Director, VISN 20 (10N20)

1. I would like to express our appreciation to the Office of Inspector General (OIG) Survey Team for their professional and consultative manner during the review.
2. Attached please find our concurrences and responses to each of the findings from the review.
3. If you have additional questions or need further information, please contact John Dee, Chief Quality Management at (907) 257-5445.

(original signed by:)

William G. Puckett, MHA, FACHE

Comments to OIG's Report

The following Director's comments are submitted in response to the recommendations in the OIG report:

OIG Recommendations

1. We recommended that managers ensure that clinicians administer pneumococcal vaccinations when indicated.

Concur

Target date for completion: Completed on November 28, 2012

Facility Response: Clinical Informatics developed a new taxonomy of diagnostic & procedural codes to include those conditions which are considered to place a patient at a high risk for pneumonia as recommended by the CDC. This taxonomy was added to the cohort logic of the Clinical Reminder that identifies patients for which the pneumococcal vaccination is appropriate.

2. We recommended that managers ensure that clinicians document all required tetanus and pneumococcal vaccination administration elements and that compliance is monitored.

Concur

Target date for completion: Completed on October 30, 2012

Facility Response: Clinical Informatics added an instructional/reminder statement for the staff member who is processing the template to provide the patient with a copy of the CDC Tetanus-Diphtheria, Tetanus-Diphtheria-Pertussis or Pneumococcal Polysaccharide Vaccine Information Statement (VIS) and a hyperlink to the CDC VIS was embedded within the template. When selected, the progress note text reflects the title and date of the VIS that was provided to the patient. Mandatory template fields were added to identify the vaccine manufacturer, lot number and expiration date.

3. We recommended that fire and life safety inspections are conducted annually at the Kenai and Mat-Su CBOCs.

Concur

Target date for completion: March 31, 2013

Facility Response: The Alaska VA Healthcare System will ensure that annual fire and life safety inspections are conducted and documented for all sites of care.

OIG Contact and Staff Acknowledgments

Contact	For more information about this report, please contact the OIG at (202) 461-4720.
Contributors	Sarah Lutter, RN, JD, Team Leader Karen A. Moore, RNC, MSHA Susan Tostenrude, MS Marc Lainhart, BS

Report Distribution

VA Distribution

Office of the Secretary
Veterans Health Administration
Assistant Secretaries
General Counsel
Director, VISN 20 (10N20)
Director, Alaska VA HCS (463/00)

Non-VA Distribution

House Committee on Veterans' Affairs
House Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and
Related Agencies
House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform
Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs
Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and
Related Agencies
Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
National Veterans Service Organizations
Government Accountability Office
Office of Management and Budget
U.S. Senate: Mark Begich, Lisa Murkowski
U.S. House of Representatives: Don Young

This report is available at www.va.gov/oig.