



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

**Office of Healthcare Inspections**

**Report No. 13-00026-185**

**Community Based Outpatient  
Clinic Reviews  
at  
Manchester VA Medical Center  
Manchester, NH**

**May 2, 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](mailto: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
MH	Mental Health
NCP	National Center for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention
NC	noncompliant
OIG	Office of Inspector General
VAMC	VA Medical Center
VHA	Veterans Health Administration
VISN	Veterans Integrated Service Network
WH	women's health

**Table of Contents**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	i
<b>Objectives and Scope</b> .....	1
Objectives .....	1
Scope .....	1
<b>CBOC Profiles</b> .....	3
<b>WH and Vaccination EHR Reviews – Results and Recommendations</b> .....	4
WH .....	4
Vaccinations .....	5
<b>Onsite Reviews – Results and Recommendations</b> .....	6
CBOC Characteristics .....	6
C&P .....	7
EOC and Emergency Management .....	8
<b>Appendixes</b>	
A. VISN 1 Director Comments .....	10
B. Manchester VAMC Acting Director Comments .....	11
C. OIG Contact and Staff Acknowledgments .....	13
D. Report Distribution .....	14

## 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.

We conducted an onsite inspection of the CBOC during the week of March 11, 2013.

The review covered the following topic areas:

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

For the WH and vaccinations topics, EHR reviews were performed for patients who were randomly selected from all CBOCs assigned to the parent facility. The C&P, EOC, and emergency management onsite inspections were only conducted at the randomly selected CBOC (see Table 1).

VISN	Facility	CBOC Name	Location
1	Manchester VAMC	Tilton	Tilton, NH

**Table 1. Sites Inspected**

**Review Results:** We made a recommendation in one review area.

**Recommendation:** The VISN and Acting Facility Director, in conjunction with the respective CBOC managers, should take appropriate actions to:

- Ensure that patients with normal cervical cancer screening results are notified of results within the defined timeframe and that notification is documented in the EHR.

## Comments

The VISN and Facility Directors agreed with the CBOC review finding and recommendation and provided an acceptable improvement plan. (See Appendixes A and B, pages 10–12, 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.<sup>1</sup>
- Determine whether CBOCs are in compliance with standards of operations according to VHA policy in the areas of environmental safety and emergency planning.<sup>2</sup>

### 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 an onsite inspection at a randomly selected site. 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

<sup>1</sup> VHA Handbook 1100.19, *Credentialing and Privileging*, November 14, 2008.

<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

The C&P, EOC, and emergency management onsite inspections were only conducted at the randomly selected CBOCs. One CBOC was 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.<sup>4</sup>

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

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

---

<sup>3</sup> Includes all CBOCs in operation before October 1, 2011.

<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> 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 <sup>6</sup>	Uniques FY 2012 <sup>7</sup>	Visits FY 2012 <sup>7</sup>	CBOC Size <sup>8</sup>
1	Manchester VAMC	Conway (Conway, NH)	Rural	984	4,888	Small
		Portsmouth (Portsmouth, NH)	Urban	1,854	7,634	Mid-Size
		Somersworth (Somersworth, NH)	Urban	2,432	8,977	Mid-Size
		Tilton (Tilton, NH)	Rural	1,771	8,176	Mid-Size
<b>Table 2. Profiles</b>						

<sup>5</sup> Includes all CBOCs in operation before October 1, 2011.

<sup>6</sup> <http://vaww.pssg.med.va.gov/>

<sup>7</sup> <http://vssc.med.va.gov>

<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> Each year, approximately 12,000 women in the United States are diagnosed with cervical cancer.<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> 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 element 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.
X	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.
<b>Table 3. WH</b>	

There were 25 patients who received a cervical cancer screening at the Manchester VAMC's CBOCs.

Patient Notification of Normal Cervical Cancer Screening Results. We reviewed 25 EHRs of patients who had normal cervical cancer screening results and determined that 4 patients were not notified within the required 14 days from the date the pathology report became available.

<sup>9</sup> World Health Organization. Cancer of the cervix. Retrieved from: <http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/topics/cancers/en/index.html>.

<sup>10</sup> U.S. Cancer Statistics Working Group, United States Cancer Statistics: 1999-2008 Incidence and Mortality Web-based report.

<sup>11</sup> VHA Handbook 1330.01, *Health Care Services for Women Veterans*, May 21, 2010.

## Recommendation

1. We recommended that managers ensure that patients with normal cervical cancer screening results are notified of results within the defined timeframe and that notification is documented in the EHR.

## 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.<sup>12</sup> The NCP provides best practices guidance on the administration of vaccinations for veterans. The CDC states that although vaccine-preventable disease levels are at or near record lows, many adults are under-immunized, missing opportunities to protect themselves against diseases such as tetanus and pneumococcal infections.

Adults should receive a tetanus vaccine every 10 years. At the age of 65, individuals who 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.

NC	Areas Reviewed
	Staff screened patients for the tetanus vaccination.
	Staff administered the tetanus vaccination when indicated.
	Staff screened patients for the pneumococcal vaccination.
	Staff administered the pneumococcal vaccination when indicated.
	Staff properly documented vaccine administration.
	Managers developed a prioritization plan for the potential occurrence of vaccine shortages.
<b>Table 4. Vaccinations</b>	

Documentation of Vaccinations. Federal Law requires that documentation for administered vaccinations include specific elements, such as the vaccine manufacturer and lot number of the vaccine used.<sup>13</sup> We reviewed the EHRs of 26 patients who were administered a pneumococcal vaccine at the parent facility or its associated CBOCs. We did not find documentation of all the required information related to pneumococcal vaccine administration in six of the EHRs where the vaccine was given before 2005. However, in late 2004, a template recommended by the VISN was introduced at the facility to correct the documentation. Records of vaccines received after 2005 contained all required elements. We made no recommendations.

<sup>12</sup> VHA Handbook 1120.05, *Coordination and Development of Clinical Preventive Services*, October 13, 2009.

<sup>13</sup> Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986 (PL 99 660) sub part C, November 16, 2010.

## Onsite Reviews Results and Recommendations

### CBOC Characteristics

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

	Tilton
<b>VISN</b>	1
<b>Parent Facility</b>	Manchester VAMC
<b>Types of Providers</b>	Nurse Practitioner Primary Care Physician
<b>Number of MH Uniques, FY 2012</b>	232
<b>Number of MH Visits, FY 2012</b>	747
<b>MH Services Onsite</b>	Yes
<b>Specialty Care Services Onsite</b>	WH
<b>Ancillary Services Provided Onsite</b>	Electrocardiogram Laboratory
<b>Tele-Health Services</b>	Retinal Imaging MOVE <sup>14</sup>
<b>Table 5. Characteristics</b>	

<sup>14</sup> VHA Handbook 1120.01, *MOVE! Weight Management Program for Veterans*, March 31, 2011.

## 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.<sup>15</sup> Table 6 shows the areas reviewed for this topic.

NC	Areas Reviewed
	Each provider's license was unrestricted.
<b>New Provider</b>	
	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.
<b>Additional New Privilege</b>	
	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.
<b>FPPE for Performance</b>	
	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.
<b>Privileges and Scopes of Practice</b>	
	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.
	The determination to continue current privileges was based in part on results of Ongoing Professional Practice Evaluation activities.
<b>Table 6. C&amp;P</b>	

<sup>15</sup> VHA Handbook 1100.19.

The CBOC was 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.

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.
	There was evidence of an annual fire and 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.
	Laboratory specimens were transported securely to prevent unauthorized access.
	Staff used two patient identifiers for blood drawing procedures.
	Information Technology 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.
<b>Table 7. EOC</b>	

The CBOC was compliant with the review areas; therefore, we made no recommendations.

Emergency Management

VHA policy requires each CBOC to have a local policy or standard operating procedure defining how medical and MH emergencies are handled.<sup>16</sup> 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.
<b>Table 8. Emergency Management</b>	

The CBOC was compliant with the review areas; therefore, we made no recommendations.

<sup>16</sup> VHA Handbook 1006.1.

## VISN 1 Director Comments

Department of  
Veterans Affairs

Memorandum

**Date:** April 12, 2013  
**From:** Director, VISN 1 (10N1)  
**Subject:** **CBOC Reviews at Manchester VAMC, Manchester, NH**  
**To:** Director, Bedford Regional Office of Healthcare Inspections  
(54BN)  
  
Acting Director, Management Review Service (VHA 10AR  
MRS OIG CAP CBOC)

I have reviewed and concur with the action plans regarding the Community Based Outpatient Clinic review at Manchester VA Medical Center.

*(original signed by:)*

Glen Gechlik, MD  
Acting Deputy Network Director



## Manchester VAMC Acting Director Comments

Department of  
Veterans Affairs

Memorandum

**Date:** April 12, 2013  
**From:** Acting Director, Manchester VAMC (608/00)  
**Subject:** **CBOC Reviews at Manchester VAMC**  
**To:** Director, VISN 1 (10N1)

I have reviewed and concur with the action plans regarding the Community Based Outpatient Clinic review at Manchester VA Medical Center.

*(original signed by:)*

Susan A. MacKenzie, PhD  
Acting Facility Director

## **Comments to OIG's Report**

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

### **OIG Recommendation**

1. We recommended that managers ensure that patients with normal cervical cancer screening results are notified of results within the defined timeframe and that notification is documented in the EHR.

Concur

Target date for completion: June 30, 2013

Action Plan: Test results of patients with normal cervical cancer screenings are communicated no later than 14 calendar days from the date on which the test results are available to the ordering practitioner. The notification is documented in the Electronic Health Record (EHR).

Monitor: The Women Veterans Program Manager will review the documentation in the EHR of 30% of normal cervical cancer screenings test results to assure that communication was provided to the patient. The monitoring results will be reported to the Primary Care Management Board and to the Quality Executive Board, quarterly.

---

## OIG Contact and Staff Acknowledgments

---

**Contact** For more information about this report, please contact the OIG at (202) 461-4720.

---

**Contributors** Elaine Kahigian, RN, JD, Team Leader  
Annette Acosta, RN, MN  
Frank Keslof, EMT, MHA,  
Jeanne Martin, PharmD  
Claire McDonald, MPA  
Clarissa Reynolds, CNHA, MBA  
Jeffrey Joppie, BS, Program Analyst

## Report Distribution

### VA Distribution

Office of the Secretary  
Veterans Health Administration  
Assistant Secretaries  
General Counsel  
Director, VISN 1 (10N1)  
Acting Director, Manchester VAMC (608/00)

### 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: Kelly Ayotte, Jeanne Shaheen  
U.S. House of Representatives: Ann Kuster, Carol Shea-Porter

This report is available at [www.va.gov/oig](http://www.va.gov/oig).