

QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE PLAN (QASP)

Apheresis Services

The contractor will be evaluated in accordance with the following:

1. PURPOSE

This Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) provides a systematic method to evaluate performance for the stated contract. This QASP explains the following:

- What will be monitored?
- How monitoring will take place.
- Who will conduct the monitoring?
- How monitoring efforts and results will be documented.

This QASP does not detail how the contractor accomplishes the work. Rather, the QASP is created with the premise that the contractor is responsible for management and quality control actions to meet the terms of the contract. It is the Government's responsibility to be objective, fair, and consistent in evaluating performance.

This QASP is a "living document" and the Government may review and revise it on a regular basis. However, the Government shall coordinate changes with the contractor through contract modification. Copies of the original QASP and revisions shall be provided to the contractor and Government officials implementing surveillance activities.

2. GOVERNMENT ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The following personnel shall oversee and coordinate surveillance activities.

a. Contracting Officer (CO) – The CO shall ensure performance of all necessary actions for effective contracting, ensure compliance with the contract terms, and shall safeguard the interests of the United States in the contractual relationship. The CO shall also assure that the contractor receives impartial, fair, and equitable treatment under this contract. The CO is ultimately responsible for the final determination of the adequacy of the contractor's performance.

Assigned CO: Galila Whitmarsh

Organization or Agency: National Contracting Office (NCO)

b. Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) – The COR is responsible for technical administration of the contract and shall assure proper Government surveillance of the contractor's performance. The COR shall keep a quality assurance file. The COR is not empowered to make any contractual commitments or to authorize any contractual changes on the Government's behalf.

Assigned COR: Son Nguyen, Health Science Specialist

Organization or Agency: VA Palo Alto Health Care System

3. CONTRACTOR REPRESENTATIVES

The following employee(s) of the contractor serve as the contractor's program manager(s) for this contract.

Primary:

Alternate:

4. PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

The contractor is responsible for performance of ALL terms and conditions of the contract. CORs will provide contract progress reports quarterly to the CO reflecting performance on this plan and all other aspects of the resultant contract. The performance standards outlined in this QASP shall be used to determine the level of contractor performance in the elements defined. Performance standards define desired services. The Government performs surveillance to determine the level of Contractor performance to these standards.

The Performance Requirements are listed below in Performance Measures section below. The Government shall use these standards to determine contractor performance and shall compare contractor performance to the standard and assign a rating. At the end of the performance period, these ratings will be used, in part, to establish the past performance of the contractor on the contract.

5. INCENTIVES/DEDUCTS

The Government shall use past performance as incentives. Incentives shall be based on ratings received on the performance standards.

6. METHODS OF QA SURVEILLANCE

Various methods exist to monitor performance. The COR shall use the surveillance methods listed below in the administration of this QASP.

a. DIRECT OBSERVATION. 100% surveillance of services performed. Surveillance will be conducted by the COR.

b. PERIODIC INSPECTION. Inspections scheduled and reported quarterly per COR delegation or as needed. Five (5) randomly selected patient files in CPRS will be reviewed per quarter. All inspections and reports will be conducted in compliance with VA Privacy and Information security standards. If less than 5 cases were provided under the contract within a single quarter, all patient files for services rendered will be reviewed. Random inspections may also occur when requested by the COR or CO.

c. VALIDATED USER/CUSTOMER COMPLAINTS. Customer complaint data will be reviewed as an issue arises and is escalated to the level of the facility Patient Advocate or Director. Complaint will be reviewed by the COR, Section Chief, and Service Chief. Any validated complaints against a Contractor that are not resolved within the required seven day period will be further investigated and may require administrative action.

d. VERIFICATION AND/OR DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED BY CONTRACTOR. All documentation required for the contract will be sent to the COR via email or fax. The COR will validate all documentation submitted using CPRS, facility personnel, and other resources available. Any matters that the COR cannot validate will be presented to the CO for review.

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure	PWS Reference	Performance Requirement	Standard	Acceptable Quality Level	Surveillance Method	Incentive	Disincentive
Key Personnel	3.1 – 3.4	Provide required personnel as specified in the requirements.	Qualified personnel are available and on-site as needed to properly perform tasks as specified.	100%	Documentation provided by Contractor; Direct observation; Periodic inspection	Favorable contractor performance evaluation	Unfavorable contractor performance evaluation
Documentation	4.3, 4.5	Submit documentation of services provided in order to update patient's electronic medical record in CPRS.	Services provided will be documented in CPRS as required by VAPAHCS policy.	100%	Periodic inspection; Upon request	Favorable contractor performance evaluations	Unfavorable contractor performance evaluation
Patient Safety	2.7, 4.5.4	Patient safety incidents must be reported within 24 hours of discovery	All incidents are reported,, investigated, confirmed and resolved	100%	Direct Observation	Favorable contactor performance evaluation	Unfavorable contractor performance evaluation
Patient complaints	4.7.2	All patient complaints must be reported within 24 hours of discovery	All patient complaints are reported to COR and CO for resolution	100%	User survey, Upon request, and random inspection	Favorable contractor performance evaluation	Unfavorable contractor performance evaluation
Licensing Registration, and Certifications (as applicable)	2.1 2.6, 4.4.4	Updated licensing, registration and certifications will be provided as they are renewed.	Licensing and registration information kept current.	Contract Provider records will be kept 100% up-to-date	Documentation provided by Contractor; Periodic Inspection; request	Favorable contactor performance evaluation	Unfavorable contractor performance evaluation

7. RATINGS

Metrics and methods are designed to determine rating for a given standard and acceptable quality level. The following ratings shall be used:

<p>EXCEPTIONAL:</p>	<p>Performance meets contractual requirements (AQL) and exceeds many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective. Note: To justify an Exceptional rating, you should identify <i>multiple</i> significant events in each category and state how it was a benefit to the GOVERNMENT. However a singular event could be of such magnitude that it alone constitutes an Exceptional rating. Also there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.</p>
<p>VERY GOOD:</p>	<p>Performance meets contractual requirements (AQL) and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective. Note: To justify a Very Good rating, you should identify a significant event in each category and state how it was a benefit to the GOVERNMENT. Also there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.</p>
<p>SATISFACTORY: (Acceptable Quality Level)</p>	<p>Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory. Note: To justify a Satisfactory rating, there should have been only minor problems, or major problems the contractor recovered from without impact to the contract. Also there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.</p>
<p>MARGINAL:</p>	<p>Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented. Note: To justify Marginal performance, you should identify a significant event in each category that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the GOVERNMENT. A Marginal rating should be supported by referencing the management tool that notified the contractor of the contractual deficiency (e.g. Management, Quality, Safety or Environmental Deficiency Report or letter).</p>
<p>UNSATISFACTORY:</p>	<p>Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective. Note: To justify an Unsatisfactory rating, you should identify multiple significant events in each category that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the GOVERNMENT. However, a singular problem could be of such serious magnitude that it alone constitutes an unsatisfactory rating. An Unsatisfactory rating should be supported by referencing the management tools used to notify the contractor of the contractual deficiencies (e.g. Management, Quality, Safety or Environmental Deficiency Reports, or letters).</p>

