

Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP)

VA CENTRAL IOWA HEALTH CARE SYSTEM, DES MOINES SITE

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: CHARA COLLINS

Organization or Agency: DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

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: RHONDA LAMKE

Organization or Agency: CENTRAL IOWA HEALTH CARE SYSTEMS, VA DES MOINES, IOWA

3. CONTRACTOR REPRESENTATIVES

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

PRIMARY: DR. GREGORY CHOWANEC, DIRECTOR MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE LINE

ALTERNATE: MELISSA STEENHOVEN, CLINICAL COORDINATOR

Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP)

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 Section 6. 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. (Inclusion of any monetary incentives requires approval through the Department's Senior Procurement Executive (SPE).

Not Applicable

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: (if this method is used, define how surveillance will be accomplished.)
– This method not used.
- b. PERIODIC INSPECTION. Inspections scheduled and reported quarterly per COR delegation or as needed
Encounters and Uniques will be pulled by report per month
Peer reviews will be pulled quarterly and completion reports tracked.
Time sheets for attendance to be kept and tracked for payment and timely invoicing
TMS tracking for mandatory trainings

All inspections and reports will be conducted in compliance with VA Privacy and Information security standards.)

- c. VALIDATED USER/CUSTOMER COMPLAINTS.
Reports from staff working in the area and PATS reports will be pulled or polled quarterly and reviewed by CBOC Coordinator. CBOC Coordinator will investigate any complaint and determine if valid.
- d. RANDOM SAMPLING. Not applicable.
- e. Verification and/or documentation provided by Contractor. Not applicable.

Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP)

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measures	PWS Reference	Performance Requirement	Standard	Acceptable Quality Level	Surveillance Method	Incentive	Disincentive/Deduct
1 Key Personnel	2.7, 2.8 and 2.9 Key personnel and personnel substitutions	Contractor's physician (s) shall provide required psychiatric services as specified and in accordance with PWS requirements.	<i>Qualified personnel are available and in location as needed to properly perform tasks as specified</i>	95%	Time and Attendance Sheets; staff observation	Favorable contractor performance evaluation.	Unfavorable contractor performance evaluation.
2 Quality Assurance Documentation	4.4; 4.4.7; 4.4.7.1; 4.5.2.1.1; 4.5.2.1.2.1 – 4.5.2.1.2-6	Reviewable records of device quality assurance shall be maintained	<i>Encounters and Uniques 6-13 patients per an 8 hour tour</i>	90%	Monthly VA workload reports	Favorable contractor performance evaluation.	Unfavorable contractor performance evaluation.
3. Quality Assurance Documentation	4.5.3.1.1 and 4.6.2.3	Peer Reviews	<i>At least 2 peer reviews per month to be completed</i>	95%	Peer Review tracking reports	Favorable contractor performance evaluation.	Unfavorable contractor performance evaluation
4 - Mandatory Training	2.1.6; 2.1.6.1; 2.1.6.2; 2.1.6.3; 2.1.6.4; 2.1.6.5	Contract completed all mandatory required training	Contractor will complete all required training per VAMC policy	95%	Contractor to provide documented evidence re TMS reports	Favorable contractor performance evaluation.	Unfavorable contractor performance evaluation
5. Timely Invoicing	6.2; 6.2.1.	Within 30 days of the end of each month, services were provided as described above, the vendor shall provide itemized invoicing.	<i>All itemized invoices provided within 30 days of the end of each month services delivered</i>	95%	Inspection	Favorable contractor performance evaluation.	Unfavorable contractor performance evaluation

Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP)

The table below is a sample that can be tailored – note that the table must identify where in the PWS the standards are found for monitoring performance. Check the MSO Customer Resource Center for approved mandatory QASPs.

7. RATINGS

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

EXCEPTIONAL: Performance meets contractual requirements 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 multiple 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.*

VERY GOOD: Performance meets contractual requirements 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.*

SATISFACTORY: 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.*

MARGINAL: 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).*

UNSATISFACTORY: 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).*

Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP)

8. DOCUMENTING PERFORMANCE

a. The Government shall document positive and/or negative performance. Any report may become a part of the supporting documentation for any contractual action and preparing annual past performance using CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT REPORT (CPAR).

b. If contractor performance does not meet the Acceptable Quality level, the CO shall inform the contractor. This will normally be in writing unless circumstances necessitate verbal communication. In any case the CO shall document the discussion and place it in the contract file. When the COR and the CO determines formal written communication is required, the COR shall prepare a Contract Discrepancy Report (CDR), and present it to CO. The CO will in turn review and will present to the contractor's program manager for corrective action.

The contractor shall acknowledge receipt of the CDR in writing. The CDR will specify if the contractor is required to prepare a corrective action plan to document how the contractor shall correct the unacceptable performance and avoid a recurrence. The CDR will also state how long after receipt the contractor has to present this corrective action plan to the CO. The Government shall review the contractor's corrective action plan to determine acceptability. The CO shall also assure that the contractor receives impartial, fair, and equitable treatment. The CO is ultimately responsible for the final determination of the adequacy of the contractor's performance and the acceptability of the Contractor's corrective action plan.

Any CDRs may become a part of the supporting documentation for any contractual action deemed necessary by the CO. See Sample CDR below.

Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP)

CONTRACT DISCREPANCY REPORT				
1. CONTRACT NUMBER		2. REPORT NUMBER FOR THIS DISCREPANCY		
3. TO: <i>(Contracting Officer)</i>		4. FROM: <i>(Name of COR)</i>		
5. DATES				
a. CDR PREPARED		b. RETURNED BY CONTRACTOR:		c. ACTION COMPLETE
6. DISCREPANCY OR PROBLEM <i>(Describe in detail. Include reference to PWS Directive; attach continuation sheet if necessary.)</i>				
7. SIGNATURE OF COR				Date:
8. SIGNATURE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER				Date:
9a. TO <i>(Contracting Officer)</i>		9a. FROM <i>(Contractor)</i>		
10. CONTRACTOR RESPONSE AS TO CAUSE, CORRECTIVE ACTION AND ACTIONS TO PREVENT RECURRENCE. <i>(Cite applicable quality control program procedures or new procedures. Attach continuation sheet(s) if necessary.)</i>				
11. SIGNATURE OF CONTRACTOR REPRESENTATIVE				Date:
12. GOVERNMENT EVALUATION. <i>(Acceptance, partial acceptance, reflection. Attach continuation sheet(s) if necessary.)</i>				
13. GOVERNMENT ACTIONS <i>(Acceptance, partial acceptance, reflection. Attach continuation sheet(s) if necessary.)</i>				
14. CLOSE OUT				
	NAME	TITLE	SIGNATURE	DATE
CONTRACTOR NOTIFIED				
COR				
CONTRACTING OFFICER				

