



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

Office of Healthcare Inspections

Report No. 13-00026-251

**Community Based Outpatient
Clinic Reviews
at
Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital
Hines, IL**

July 22, 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
MH	mental health
NC	noncompliant
NCP	National Center for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention
OIG	Office of Inspector General
PM	preventive maintenance
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 and Methodology	1
CBOC Profiles	3
WH and Vaccination EHR Reviews – Results and Recommendations	4
WH	4
Vaccinations	5
Onsite Reviews – Results and Recommendations	7
CBOC Characteristics	7
C&P	8
EOC and Emergency Management	9
Appendixes	
A. VISN 12 Director Comments	11
B. Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital Director Comments	12
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.

We conducted an onsite inspection of the CBOCs during the week of April 9, 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 respective parent facilities. The C&P, EOC, and emergency management onsite inspections were only conducted at the randomly selected CBOCs (see Table 1).

VISN	Facility	CBOC Name	Location
12	Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital	Kankakee	Bourbonnais, IL
		Oak Lawn	Oak Lawn, IL
Table 1. Sites Inspected			

Review Results: We made recommendations in four review areas.

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

- Ensure that the ordering provider or surrogate is notified of normal and abnormal cervical cancer screening results within the required timeframe and that notification is documented in the EHR.
- Ensure that patients with normal and abnormal cervical cancer screening results are notified of results within the required timeframe and that notification is documented in the EHR.
- Ensure that clinicians administer pneumococcal vaccinations when indicated.
- Ensure that all specified medical equipment receive PM according to local policy at the Kankakee CBOC.

Comments

The VISN and Facility Directors agreed with the CBOC review findings and recommendations and provided acceptable improvement plans. (See Appendixes A–B, pages 11–14, 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 (all ages) and 75 additional veterans (65 and older), unless fewer patients were available, for the 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 reviews, 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.

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.

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 facilities' 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
12	Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital	Aurora (North Aurora, IL)	Urban	4,086	16,915	Mid-Size
		Elgin (Elgin, IL)	Urban	3,641	16,372	Mid-Size
		Joliet (Joliet, IL)	Urban	5,109	25,390	Large
		Kankakee (Bourbonnais, IL)	Rural	2,833	13,613	Mid-Size
		Lasalle (Peru, IL)	Rural	3,352	25,123	Mid-Size
		Oak Lawn (Oak Lawn, IL)	Urban	5,564	21,592	Large
Table 2. 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. Details regarding the findings follow the table.

NC	Areas Reviewed
	Cervical cancer screening results were entered into the patient's EHR.
X	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.
Table 3. WH	

There were 34 patients who received a cervical cancer screening at the Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital's CBOCs.

Provider Notification of Normal and Abnormal Cervical Cancer Screening Results. VHA requires that normal cervical cancer screening results must be reported to the ordering provider or surrogate within 30 calendar days of the report being issued. Abnormal cervical cancer screening results must also be reported to the ordering provider or surrogate within 5 business days. These notifications must be documented in the EHR.¹³ We reviewed the EHRs of 27 patients who had normal screening results and did not find documentation in 9 records that the ordering provider or surrogate was notified within 30 calendar days. We also reviewed the EHRs of seven patients with

¹⁰ World Health Organization. *Comprehensive Cervical Cancer Prevention and Control: A Healthier Future for Girls and Women*, Retrieved (4/25/2013): <http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/topics/cancers/en/index.html>

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 1330.01.

abnormal results and did not find documentation in two of the records that the interpreting physicians notified the ordering provider or surrogate within 5 business days.

Patient Notification of Normal and Abnormal Cervical Cancer Screening Results. VHA requires that normal cervical cancer screening results must be communicated to the patient in terms easily understood by a layperson within 14 days and from the date of the pathology report becoming available. Abnormal results must also be communicated to the patient within 5 business days. These notifications must be documented in the EHR.¹⁴ We reviewed the EHRs of 27 patients who had normal cervical screening results and determined that 10 patients were not notified within the required 14 days from the date the pathology report became available. We also reviewed the EHRs of seven patients who had abnormal cervical screening results and determined that four patients were not notified within the 5 business days as required.

Recommendations

1. We recommended that a process is established to ensure that the ordering provider or surrogate is notified of normal and abnormal cervical cancer screening results within the required timeframe and that notification is documented in the EHR.
2. We recommended that managers ensure that patients with normal and abnormal cervical cancer screening results are notified within the required 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.¹⁵ 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 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 element marked as noncompliant needed improvement. Details regarding the finding follow the table.

¹⁴ VHA Handbook 1330.01.

¹⁵ VHA Handbook 1120.05, *Coordination and Development of Clinical Preventive Services*, October 13, 2009.

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

Pneumococcal Vaccination Administration for Patients with Pre-Existing Conditions. The CDC recommends that at the age of 65, individuals that have never had a pneumococcal vaccination should receive one.¹⁶ 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 the EHRs of two patients with pre-existing conditions who received their first vaccine prior to the age of 65. We did not find documentation in any of the EHRs indicating that their second vaccinations had been administered.

Recommendation

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

¹⁶ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, <http://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/vpd-vac/>

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).

	Kankakee	Oak Lawn
VISN	12	12
Parent Facility	Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital	Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital
Types of Providers	Licensed Clinical Social Worker Nurse Practitioner Psychologist	Licensed Clinical Social Worker Nurse Practitioner Psychologist
Number of MH Uniques, FY 2012	449	574
Number of MH Visits, FY 2012	2,459	2,556
MH Services Onsite	Yes	Yes
Specialty Care Services Onsite	None	None
Ancillary Services Provided Onsite	Electrocardiogram Laboratory	Electrocardiogram Laboratory
Tele-Health Services	Care Coordination Home Telehealth MH MOVE ¹⁷ Retinal Imaging	Care Coordination Home Telehealth MH MOVE Retinal Imaging
Table 5. Characteristics		

¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ 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.
	The determination to continue current privileges was based in part on results of Ongoing Professional Practice Evaluation activities.
Table 6. C&P	

¹⁸ VHA Handbook 1100.19.

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 finding 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.
	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.

NC	Areas Reviewed (continued)
Kankakee	Medical equipment checked according to local policy.
Table 7. EOC	

Medical Equipment. Local policy requires that specified non-life support equipment receive scheduled PM.¹⁹ During our inspection of the Kankakee CBOC, we found equipment items, such as examination tables and electronic thermometers that had not received PM according to policy.

Recommendation

4. We recommended that managers ensure that all specified medical equipment receive PM according to local policy at the Kankakee CBOC.

Emergency Management

VHA policy requires each CBOC to have a local policy or standard operating procedure defining how medical and MH emergencies are handled.²⁰ 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	

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

¹⁹ Hines VA Hospital Policy Memorandum 578-08-138A-048 (R-5), *Preventive Maintenance Program*, May 4, 2012.

²⁰ VHA Handbook 1006.1.

VISN 12 Director Comments

Department of
Veterans Affairs

Memorandum

Date: June 25, 2013
From: Director, VISN 12 (10N12)
Subject: **CBOC Reviews at Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital**
To: Director, Chicago Healthcare Inspections Division (54CH)
Acting Director, Management Review Service (VHA 10AR
MRS OIG CAP CBOC)

1. Attached please find the CBOC Review draft response from the Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital.
2. I have reviewed the draft report for the Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital and concur with the finding and recommendations.
3. I appreciate the Office of Inspector General's efforts to ensure high quality of care to veterans at the Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital.



For and in the absence of
Jeffrey A. Murawsky, MD

Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital Director Comments

**Department of
Veterans Affairs**

Memorandum

Date: June 25, 2013

From: Director, Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital (578/00)

Subject: **CBOC Reviews at Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital**

To: Director, VISN 12 (10N12)

1. I have reviewed the draft report for the Hines VA Medical Center and concur with the findings and recommendations.
2. I appreciate the opportunity for this review as it provides for a continual process to improve the care to our veterans.

(original signed by:
Joan M. Ricard, 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 a process is established to ensure that the ordering provider or surrogate is notified of normal and abnormal cervical cancer screening results within the required timeframe and that notification is documented in the EHR.

Concur

Target date for completion: August 31, 2013

View Alert for normal and abnormal cervical cancer screening is a mandatory alert. The process was revised to save all view alert receipt notifications to providers from 90 days to 3 years to obtain the historical record. Provider notification receipt will be monitored to ensure that 90% compliance is achieved and sustained.

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

Concur

Target date for completion: July 31, 2013

Facility policy has been updated to include abnormal ASCUS HPV within 5 days versus 14 days. Training and education of staff on the policy update was completed on June 18, 2013. Monthly tracking of normal and abnormal results was implemented on December 1, 2012 with routine EHR auditing. Quarterly reporting of abnormal and normal cervical cancer screening results is a new agenda item for Women's Health Committee starting July 15, 2013. Actions will be documented when target of 90% is not obtained.

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

Concur

Target date for completion: August 31, 2013

The vaccination clinical reminders will be updated to ensure pneumococcal vaccinations are administered according to CDC guidelines for age and diagnosis. Medical record audits will be conducted to ensure compliance of administration of pneumococcal vaccinations until 90% compliance is achieved and sustained.

4. We recommended that managers ensure that all specified medical equipment receive PM according to local policy at the Kankakee CBOC.

Concur

Target date for completion: June 25, 2013

The manufacturer guidelines for non-life support equipment was reviewed, and the Hospital Safety Management Committee decided to exclude battery operated devices in the preventative maintenance program. The hospital policy was updated to indicate battery operated devices do not require preventative maintenance.

OIG Contact and Staff Acknowledgments

Contact	For more information about this report, please contact the OIG at (202) 461-4720.
Onsite Contributors	Wachita Haywood, RN, Team Leader Sheila Cooley, MSN, RN LaNora Hernandez, MSN-Edu, RN Laura Spottiswood, MPH
Other Contributors	Debra Boyd-Seale, PhD Judy Brown, Program Support Assistant Shirley Carlile, BA Lin Clegg, PhD Marnette Dhooghe, MS Matt Frazier, MPH Jennifer Reed, RN, MSHI Victor Rhee, MHS Patrick Smith, M. Stat Marilyn Stones, BS Mary Toy, RN, MSN Jarvis Yu, MS

Report Distribution

VA Distribution

Office of the Secretary
Veterans Health Administration
Assistant Secretaries
General Counsel
Director, VISN 12 (10N12)
Director, Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital (578/00)

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: Daniel Coats, Joe Donnelly, Richard J. Durbin, Mark Kirk
U.S. House of Representatives: Danny K. Davis, Robin Kelly, Bobby L. Rush,
Peter J. Visclosky

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