

Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP)

Community Based Outpatient Clinic

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: Billy Morris

Agency: Department of Veterans Affairs, Network Contracting Office 16

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: Kristin Richardson

3. CONTRACTOR REPRESENTATIVES

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

3. CONTRACTOR REPRESENTATIVES

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

Primary: Kristin Richardson

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 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. 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.
- b. PERIODIC INSPECTION/MONTHLY REVIEW. Inspections scheduled and reported quarterly per COR delegation or as needed.
- c. VALIDATED USER/CUSTOMER COMPLAINTS.
- d. RANDOM SAMPLING.
- e. Verification and/or documentation provided by Contractor.

PACT PERFORMANCE

| TASK | PWS Para | Indicator | Standard | Acceptable Quality Level | Method of Surveillance |
|--|----------|--|---|--|---|
| PC 14: New PC Patient Wait Time | 4.6.2 | VHA Access % New patient wait times 30 days from create date | VHA Strategic Analytics for Improvement & Learning (SAIL) | 99.7% monthly; New PC Appointments completed no later than 30 days | VHA SAIL Report http://report.s2.vssc.med.va.gov/reports/erver?%2fMgmtReports%2fVATR%2fSAIL Prod52fSAIL&rs:Command=Render |
| PCMH SHEP Access Composite | 4.6.13 | Composite % Based on 2 Questions 1. Get an urgent care appointment as soon as needed 2. Get a routine care appointment as soon as needed | At least 55% | 53.8% | VHA SAIL Report http://report.s2.vssc.med.va.gov/reports/erver?%2fMgmtReports%2fVATR%2fSAIL Prod52fSAIL&rs:Command=Render |
| PACT 7 Same-Day Appts w/ PCP | 4.6.4 | Same Day Appts w/ Primary Care Provide | 70% completion of same day primary care appointments with PCP | 48% completion of same day primary care appointments with PCP | PACT Compass & Dashboard https://secure-reports2.vssc.med.va.gov/ReportServer/ReportViewer.aspx?%2fPC%2fPC+Medical+Home%2fMainMenu&rs%3aCommand=Render |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|--|--|--|---|
| PACT 8: PCP Continuity | 4.6.15 | Primary Care Provider Continuity | 77% of Appointments provided with assigned PCP | 65% of Appointments provided with assigned PCP | PACT Compass & Dashboard https://secure reports2.vssc. med.va.gov/R eportServer/P ages/ReportV iewer.aspx?% 2fPC%2fPC+ Medical+Ho me%2fMain Menu&rs%3a Command=R ender |
| PACT 13: PACT Patients enrolled in HT | 4.6.8 | % Primary Care Patients enrolled in HT The aggregate percentage of all VISN PACT Patients enrolled in Home Telehealth (HT) will exceed 1.6%. | Contractor to maintain 1.6% of required vested patients in HT | 1.2% of required vested patients enrolled in HT | VHA Performance Measure Report & PACT Dashboard |
| PACT 15: PCMHI Penetration that uses patients assigned to a PACT team as the cohort (instead of core uniques with a primary care encounter) | 4.6.9 | % Primary Care Patients in Mental Health Integration | Contractor to maintain 6% of required vested patients in PCMHI. | Contractor to maintain 4% of required vested patients in PCMHI. | VHA Performance Measure Report & PACT Dashboard |
| PACT 16: Ratio of Non- Traditional Encounters | 4.6.10 | This is the sum of all PC Telephone encounters added to the sum of all PC Group Encounters | Contractor shall maintain at least 20% in the appropriate ratio of non- traditional encounters | Contractor shall maintain at least 12% in the appropriate ratio of non- traditional encounters | VHA Performance Measure Report & PACT Dashboard |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|--|---|---|---|
| | | added to the sum of all incoming and outgoing secure messages as the numerator. | | | |
| PACT 17: Post Discharge Contact by PACT Team | 4.6.11 | Number of discharges with follow-up contact by a member of the assigned PACT Team within two business days of discharge. | PACT Improvement Data on Compass & Dashboard | Contractor assigned PACT Team member shall contact at least 40% of patients within two business days of discharge. | VHA Performance Measure Report & PACT Dashboard |
| PACT 18: PACT Staffing Ratio | 4.6.12 | Percent of Divisions Meeting Staffing Ratio of 3:1 - (instead of the avg. ratio of staff per PC provider) | Contractor shall meet PACT Division Staffing Ratio of 3:1 - (instead of the avg. ratio of staff per PC provider) at least 75% of the time | Contractor shall meet PACT Division Staffing Ratio of 3:1 - (instead of the avg. ratio of staff per PC provider) at least 50% of the time | VHA Performance Measure Report & PACT Dashboard |

7. Ratings:

Metrics and methods are designed to determine if performance exceeds, meets, or does not meet a given standard and acceptable quality level. A rating scale shall be used to determine a positive, neutral, or negative outcome. The following ratings shall be used:

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

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| EXCEPTIONAL: | <p>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.</p> <p>Note: To justify an Exceptional rating, you should identify <u>multiple</u> 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> |
| VERY GOOD: | <p>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.</p> <p>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> |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| SATISFACTORY: | <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.</p> <p>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> |
| MARGINAL: | <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.</p> <p>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> |
| UNSATISFACTORY: | <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.</p> <p>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> |

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.

9. FREQUENCY OF MEASUREMENT

a. Frequency of Measurement.

The frequency of measurement is defined in the contract or otherwise in this document. The government (COR or CO) will periodically analyze whether the negotiated frequency of surveillance is appropriate for the work being performed.

b. Frequency of Performance Reporting.

The COR shall communicate with the Contractor and will provide written reports to the Contracting Officer quarterly (or as outlined in the contract or COR delegation) to review Contractor performance.

10. COR AND CONTRACTOR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF QASP

| | |
|-------|-------|
| _____ | _____ |
| COR | DATE |

| | |
|-----------------------|-------|
| _____ | _____ |
| CONTRACTOR NAME/TITLE | DATE |