



DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Office of Healthcare Inspections

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

Comprehensive Healthcare
Inspection of the James A.
Haley Veterans' Hospital
Tampa, Florida



The mission of the Office of Inspector General is to serve veterans and the public by conducting effective oversight of the programs and operations of the Department of Veterans Affairs through independent audits, inspections, reviews, and investigations.

In addition to general privacy laws that govern release of medical information, disclosure of certain veteran health or other private information may be prohibited by various federal statutes including, but not limited to, 38 U.S.C. §§ 5701, 5705, and 7332, absent an exemption or other specified circumstances. As mandated by law, the OIG adheres to privacy and confidentiality laws and regulations protecting veteran health or other private information in this report.

**Report suspected wrongdoing in VA programs and operations
to the VA OIG Hotline:**

www.va.gov/oig/hotline

1-800-488-8244



Figure 1. James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital, Tampa, Florida
(Source: <https://vaww.va.gov/directory/guide/>, accessed on May 20, 2019)

Abbreviations

ADPCS	associate director for Patient Care Services
CHIP	Comprehensive Healthcare Inspection Program
CLC	community living center
EDIS	Emergency Department Integration Software
FPPE	focused professional practice evaluation
FY	fiscal year
LIP	licensed independent practitioner
MST	military sexual trauma
OIG	Office of Inspector General
OPPE	ongoing professional practice evaluation
QSV	quality, safety, and value
SAIL	Strategic Analytics for Improvement and Learning
TJC	The Joint Commission
UCC	urgent care center
UM	utilization management
VHA	Veterans Health Administration
VISN	Veterans Integrated Service Network



Report Overview

This Office of Inspector General (OIG) Comprehensive Healthcare Inspection Program (CHIP) provides a focused evaluation of the quality of care delivered in the inpatient and outpatient settings of the James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital (the facility). The inspection covers key clinical and administrative processes that are associated with promoting quality care.

CHIP inspections are one element of the OIG's overall efforts to ensure that the nation's veterans receive high-quality and timely VA healthcare services. The reviews are performed approximately every three years for each facility. The OIG selects and evaluates specific areas of focus each year.

The OIG team looks at leadership and organizational risks as well as areas affecting quality patient care. At the time of the review, the clinical areas of focus were

1. Quality, safety, and value;
2. Medical staff privileging;
3. Environment of care;
4. Medication management (specifically the controlled substances inspection program);
5. Mental health (focusing on military sexual trauma follow-up and staff training);
6. Geriatric care (spotlighting antidepressant use for elderly veterans);
7. Women's health (particularly abnormal cervical pathology result notification and follow-up); and
8. High-risk processes (specifically the emergency department and urgent care center operations and management).

This unannounced visit was conducted during the week of February 4, 2019. The OIG held interviews and reviewed clinical and administrative processes related to areas of focus that affect patient care outcomes. Although the OIG reviewed a broad spectrum of clinical and administrative processes, the sheer complexity of VA medical facilities limits inspectors' ability to assess all areas of clinical risk. The findings presented in this report are a snapshot of this facility's performance within the identified focus areas at the time of the OIG visit. Although it is difficult to quantify the risk of patient harm, the findings in this report may help this facility and other Veterans Health Administration (VHA) facilities to identify areas of vulnerability or conditions that, if properly addressed, could improve patient safety and healthcare quality.

Results and Inspection Impact

Leadership and Organizational Risks

At the time of the OIG's visit, the facility leadership team consisted of the director, acting deputy director, chief of staff, associate director for Patient Care Services (ADPCS), acting associate director, and assistant director. The chief of staff and ADPCS oversaw patient care, which required managing service directors and chiefs of programs and practices. Patient safety and care were monitored through the Quality Safety Value Board, which was responsible for tracking, identifying trends in, and monitoring quality of care and patient outcomes. The director and chief of Quality Management were co-chairs of the Quality Safety Value Board, which reported to the Governance Council.

The facility's leadership team had been working together for almost seven months, although several had served in their positions for years. The six executive leaders were all permanently assigned, with the assistant director being the most tenured at just over nine years, and the newest—the chief of staff—was in the position for about seven months.

Survey results indicated that facility leaders were engaged and promoted a culture of safety where employees feel safe bringing forward issues and concerns. Three of the four selected patient experience survey scores for facility leaders were similar or higher than the VHA average, and facility leaders had implemented processes and plans to maintain positive patient experiences.

Additionally, the OIG reviewed accreditation agency findings, sentinel events,¹ disclosures of adverse patient events, and patient safety indicator data and did not identify any substantial organizational risk factors.

The OIG recognizes that the Strategic Analytics for Improvement and Learning (SAIL) model has limitations for identifying all areas of clinical risk but is “a way to understand the similarities and differences between the top and bottom performers” within VHA.² Although the leadership team members were knowledgeable within their areas of responsibility about selected SAIL metrics and community living center (CLC) measures, the leaders should continue to take actions

¹ The definition of sentinel event can be found within VHA Directive 1190, *Peer Review for Quality Management*, November 21, 2018. A sentinel event is an incident or condition that results in patient “death, permanent harm, or severe temporary harm and intervention required to sustain life.”

² VHA's Office of Operational Analytics and Reporting developed a model for understanding a facility's performance in relation to nine quality domains and one efficiency domain. The domains within SAIL are made up of multiple composite measures, and the resulting scores permit comparison of facilities within a Veterans Integrated Service Network or across VHA. The SAIL model uses a “star rating” system to designate a facility's performance in individual measures, domains, and overall quality.

<http://vaww.vssc.med.va.gov/VSSCEnhancedProductManagement/DisplayDocument.aspx?DocumentID=8938>. (The website was accessed on March 7, 2019, but is not accessible by the public.)

to sustain and improve performance of the quality of care metrics and measures likely contributing to the facility's SAIL "4-star" and CLC "2-star" quality ratings.³

The OIG found deficiencies in five of the eight clinical areas reviewed and issued seven recommendations that are attributable to the director and chief of staff. These are briefly described below.

Medical Staff Privileging

The facility generally complied with requirements for privileging and focused professional practice evaluations. However, the OIG identified concerns with the service-specific criteria for ongoing professional practice evaluations and defining and sharing in advance the expectations, outcomes, and time limits for focused professional practice evaluations for cause.⁴

Medication Management

Overall, the facility complied with requirements for most of the performance indicators evaluated for medication management, including the controlled substances coordinator reports, pharmacy operations, requirements for controlled substances inspectors, and pharmacy inspections. However, the OIG identified noncompliance with completing the review of automatic dispensing cabinets' override reports.

Mental Health

The OIG team also found compliance with many of the mental health performance indicators, including the designation of a military sexual trauma (MST) coordinator, tracking of MST-related data, and provision of clinical care. The OIG noted a concern, however, with completion of the MST mandatory training requirement for mental health and primary care providers.

Geriatric Care

For geriatric patients, providers justified the reason for medication initiation. However, the OIG identified inadequate performance of patient and/or caregiver education as it related to newly

³ Based on fiscal year 2018, quarter 3 ratings at the time of the site visit.

⁴ The definitions of ongoing professional practice evaluation and focused professional practice evaluations can be found within Office of Safety and Risk Awareness, Office of Quality and Performance, *Provider Competency and Clinical Care Concerns Including: Focused Clinical Care Review and FPPE for Cause Guidance*, July 2016 (Revision 2). An ongoing professional practice evaluation is "the ongoing monitoring of privileged providers to confirm the quality of care delivered and ensures patient safety." A focused professional practice evaluation is a "time-limited process whereby the clinical leadership evaluates the privilege-specific competence of a provider who does not yet have documented evidence of competently performing the requested privilege(s) at the facility." A focused professional practice evaluation for cause is "a time-limited period during which the medical staff leadership assesses the provider's professional performance to determine if any action should be taken on the provider's privileges."

prescribed medications, evaluation of patient/caregiver understanding when education was provided, and medication reconciliation.

Women's Health

The OIG found the facility complied with indicators related to women's health, including requirements for a designated women veterans program manager and women's health medical director, tracking data related to cervical cancer screenings, communication of abnormal results to patients, and follow-up care when indicated. However, the OIG noted a concern that the Women Veterans Health Committee lacked pharmacy and Quality Management representation.

Summary

In reviewing key healthcare processes, the OIG issued seven recommendations for improvement directed to the facility director and chief of staff. The number of recommendations should not be used, however, as a gauge for the overall quality provided at this facility. The intent is for facility leaders to use these recommendations as a road map to help improve operations and clinical care. The recommendations address systems issues as well as other less-critical findings that, if left unattended, may eventually interfere with the delivery of quality health care.

Comments

The Veterans Integrated Service Network director and facility director agreed with the CHIP inspection findings and recommendations and provided acceptable improvement plans. (See Appendixes F and G, pages 66–67, and the responses within the body of the report for the full text of the directors' comments.) The OIG considers recommendation 3 closed. The OIG will follow up on the planned actions for the open recommendations until they are completed.



JOHN D. DAIGH, JR., M.D.
Assistant Inspector General
for Healthcare Inspections

Contents

Abbreviations	ii
Report Overview	iii
Results and Inspection Impact	iv
Purpose and Scope	1
Methodology	3
Results and Recommendations	4
Quality, Safety, and Value	24
Medical Staff Privileging	27
Recommendation 1	29
Recommendation 2	30
Environment of Care	31
Medication Management: Controlled Substances Inspections	34
Recommendation 3	36
Mental Health: Military Sexual Trauma Follow-Up and Staff Training	37
Recommendation 4	39
Geriatric Care: Antidepressant Use among the Elderly	40
Recommendation 5	42
Recommendation 6	42

Women’s Health: Abnormal Cervical Pathology Results Notification and Follow-Up	44
Recommendation 7.....	46
High-Risk Processes: Operations and Management of Emergency Departments and Urgent Care Centers	47
Appendix A: Summary Table of Comprehensive Healthcare Inspection Findings.....	50
Appendix B: Facility Profile and VA Outpatient Clinic Profiles	54
Facility Profile.....	54
VA Outpatient Clinic Profiles.....	56
Appendix C: Patient Aligned Care Team Compass Metrics	59
Appendix D: Strategic Analytics for Improvement and Learning (SAIL) Metric Definitions	61
Appendix E: Strategic Analytics for Improvement and Learning (SAIL) Community Living Center (CLC) Measure Definitions.....	65
Appendix F: VISN Director Comments	66
Appendix G: Facility Director Comments.....	67
OIG Contact and Staff Acknowledgments	68
Report Distribution	69



Purpose and Scope

The purpose of the Office of Inspector General (OIG) Comprehensive Healthcare Inspection Program (CHIP) is to provide oversight of healthcare services to veterans. This focused evaluation of the quality of care delivered in the inpatient and outpatient settings of the James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital (the facility) is accomplished by examining a broad overview of key clinical and administrative processes associated with quality care and positive patient outcomes. The OIG reports its findings to Veterans Integrated Service Network (VISN) and facility leaders so that informed decisions can be made on improving care.

Effective leaders manage organizational risks by establishing goals, strategies, and priorities to improve care; setting the quality agenda; and promoting a culture to sustain positive change.⁵ Investments in a culture of safety and quality improvement with robust communications and leadership significantly contribute to positive patient outcomes in healthcare organizations.⁶ Figure 2 shows the direct relationships between leadership and organizational risks and the processes used to deliver health care to veterans.

To examine risks to patients and the organization when core processes are not performed well, the OIG focused on the following nine areas of clinical and administrative operations that support quality care at the facility:

1. Leadership and organizational risks
2. Quality, safety, and value (QSV)
3. Medical staff privileging
4. Environment of care
5. Medication management (specifically the controlled substances inspection program)
6. Mental health (focusing on military sexual trauma follow-up and staff training)
7. Geriatric care (spotlighting antidepressant use for elderly veterans)
8. Women's health (particularly abnormal cervical pathology results notification and follow-up)

⁵ Anam Parand, Sue Dopson, Anna Renz, and Charles Vincent, "The role of hospital managers in quality and patient safety: a systematic review," *British Medical Journal*, 4, no. 9 (September 5, 2014): e005055. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4158193/>. (The website was accessed on January 24, 2019.)

⁶ Institute for Healthcare Improvement, "How risk management and patient safety intersect: Strategies to help make it happen," March 24, 2015. <http://www.npsf.org/blogpost/1158873/211982/How-Risk-Management-and-Patient-Safety-Intersect-Strategies-to-Help-Make-It-Happen>. (The website was accessed on January 24, 2019.)

9. High-risk processes (specifically the emergency department and urgent care center operations and management).⁷




Figure 2. Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 Comprehensive Healthcare Inspection of Operations and Services
Source: VA OIG

⁷ See Figure 2. CHIP inspections address these processes during FY 2019 (October 1, 2018, through September 30, 2019); they may differ from prior years' focus areas.

Methodology

To determine compliance with the Veterans Health Administration (VHA) requirements related to patient care quality, clinical functions, and the environment of care, the inspection team reviewed OIG-selected clinical records, administrative and performance measure data, and accreditation survey reports;⁸ physically inspected OIG-selected areas; and discussed processes and validated findings with managers and employees. The OIG also interviewed members of the executive leadership team.

The inspection period examined operations from January 16, 2016, through February 8, 2019, the last day of the unannounced week-long site visit.⁹ While on site, the OIG referred issues and concerns beyond the scope of the CHIP review to our Hotline management team for further evaluation.

This report's recommendations for improvement target problems that can influence the quality of patient care significantly enough to warrant OIG follow-up until the facility completes corrective actions. The facility director's comments submitted in response to the report recommendations appear within each topic area.

The OIG conducted the inspection in accordance with OIG standard operating procedures for CHIP reports and Quality Standards for Inspection and Evaluation published by the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency.

⁸ The OIG did not review VHA's internal survey results, instead focusing on OIG inspections and external surveys that affect facility accreditation status.

⁹ The range represents the time period from the last Combined Assessment Program review, which was performed prior to the comprehensive healthcare inspection, to the completion of the unannounced week-long CHIP site visit.

Results and Recommendations

Leadership and Organizational Risks

Stable and effective leadership is critical to improving care and sustaining meaningful change within a VA healthcare facility. Leadership and organizational risks can impact the facility's ability to provide care in all the selected clinical areas of focus.¹⁰ To assess the facility's risks, the OIG considered the following indicators:

1. Executive leadership position stability and engagement
2. Employee satisfaction
3. Patient experience
4. Accreditation and/or for-cause surveys and oversight inspections
5. Factors related to possible lapses in care
6. VHA performance data

Executive Leadership Position Stability and Engagement

Because each VA facility organizes its leadership structure to address the needs and expectations of the local veteran population it serves, organizational charts may differ across facilities. Figure 3 illustrates this facility's reported organizational structure. The facility has a leadership team consisting of the director, acting deputy director, chief of staff, associate director for Patient Care Services (ADPCS), acting associate director, and assistant director. The chief of staff and ADPCS oversee patient care, which requires managing service directors and chiefs of programs and practices.

¹⁰ L. Botwinick, M. Bisognano, and C. Haraden, "Leadership Guide to Patient Safety," *Institute for Healthcare Improvement*, Innovation Series White Paper. 2006. www.IHI.org. (The website was accessed on February 2, 2017.)




Figure 3. Facility Organizational Chart¹¹

Source: James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital (received February 4, 2019)

At the time of the OIG site visit, the executive leadership team had been working together for almost seven months, although several had served in their positions for years. All six executive leaders were permanently assigned with tenures ranging from approximately seven months (chief of staff) to over nine years (assistant director) (see Table 1). The team has faced challenges. The deputy director was permanently assigned January 10, 2016, but had been detailed to other facilities from May 7, 2018, through September 3, 2018, and from November 25, 2018, through March 24, 2019. The associate director was permanently assigned but was, in turn, detailed to the deputy director position during the deputy director details. Coverage for the associate director position was subsequently provided by the chief of facility management services from July 30, 2018, through November 26, 2018, and the human resource officer from December 23, 2018, through March 24, 2019.

¹¹ At this facility, the director is responsible for Compliance, Patient Safety Office, Quality Management, and Research Compliance.

Table 1. Executive Leader Assignments

Leadership Position	Assignment Date
Facility director	July 26, 2015
Deputy director	January 10, 2016
Chief of staff	July 8, 2018
Associate director for Patient Care Services	April 11, 2010
Associate director	July 24, 2016
Assistant director	November 9, 2008

Source: James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital acting chief of human resources (received February 4, 2019)

To help assess facility executive leaders' engagement, the OIG interviewed the director, acting deputy director, chief of staff, ADPCS, and acting associate director regarding their knowledge of various performance metrics and their involvement and support of actions to improve or sustain performance.

In individual interviews, these executive leadership team members, with the exception of the acting deputy director and acting associate director, generally were able to speak knowledgeably about actions taken during the previous 12 months to maintain or improve performance, as well as employee and patient survey results. In addition, the executive leaders were generally knowledgeable within their scope of responsibilities about selected Strategic Analytics for Improvement and Learning (SAIL) metrics and SAIL community living center (CLC) measures. These are discussed in greater detail below.

The director serves as the chairperson of the Governance Council, which oversees various working groups, such as the Clinical Executive Board, Patient Care Executive Board, Resource Management Board, and Patient Safety Program.

These leaders are also engaged in monitoring patient safety and care through the Quality Safety Value Board, for which the director and chief of Quality Management are co-chairs. The Quality Safety Value Board is responsible for tracking and identifying trends and monitoring quality of care and patient outcomes, and it reports to the Governance Council. See Figure 4.




Figure 4. Facility Committee Reporting Structure¹²
Source: James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital (February 4, 2019)

Employee Satisfaction

The All Employee Survey is an “annual, voluntary, census survey of VA workforce experiences. The data are anonymous and confidential.” Since 2001, the instrument has been refined several times in response to VA leaders’ inquiries on VA culture and organizational health. Although the OIG recognizes that employee satisfaction survey data are subjective, they can be a starting point for discussions, indicate areas for further inquiry, and be considered along with other information on facility leadership.

¹² The Governance Council oversees the Affiliation Partnership, Communications and Media, Compliance and Business Integrity, Management Advisory Council, Patient Safety Program, and Strategic Planning.

To assess employee attitudes toward facility leaders, the OIG reviewed employee satisfaction survey results that relate to the period of October 1, 2017, through September 30, 2018.¹³ Table 2 provides relevant survey results for VHA, the facility, and selected facility executive leaders. It summarizes employee attitudes toward these selected facility leaders as expressed in VHA's All Employee Survey. The OIG found the facility averages for the selected survey leadership questions were higher than the VHA averages.¹⁴ The same trend was noted for the members of the executive leadership team except for the deputy director and associate director, whose scores were similar to the VHA average. In all, employees appear generally satisfied with facility leaders.

**Table 2. Survey Results on Employee Attitudes toward Facility Leadership
(October 1, 2017, through September 30, 2018)**

Questions/ Survey Items	Scoring	VHA Average	Facility Average	Director Average	Chief of Staff Average	ADPCS Average	Deputy Director Average	Assoc. Director Average	Assistant Director Average
All Employee Survey: <i>Servant Leader Index Composite</i> ¹⁵	0–100 where HIGHER scores are more favorable	71.7	74.5	84.6	90.0	82.3	70.5	72.8	76.8
All Employee Survey: <i>In my organization, senior leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce.</i>	1 (Strongly Disagree) –5 (Strongly Agree)	3.3	3.6	4.1	4.5	4.3	3.3	3.3	3.7

¹³ Ratings are based on responses by employees who report to or are aligned under the director, chief of staff, ADPCS, deputy director, associate director, and assistant director.

¹⁴ The OIG makes no comment on the adequacy of the VHA average for each selected survey element. The VHA average is used for comparison purposes only.

¹⁵ According to the 2018 VA All Employee Survey Questions by Organizational Health Framework, Servant Leader Index “is a summary measure of the work environment being a place where organizational goals are achieved by empowering others. This includes focusing on collective goals, encouraging contribution from others, and then positively reinforcing others’ contributions. Servant Leadership occurs at all levels of the organization, where individuals (supervisors, staff) put others’ needs before their own.”

Questions/ Survey Items	Scoring	VHA Average	Facility Average	Director Average	Chief of Staff Average	ADPCS Average	Deputy Director Average	Assoc. Director Average	Assistant Director Average
All Employee Survey: <i>My organization's senior leaders maintain high standards of honesty and integrity.</i>	1 (Strongly Disagree) –5 (Strongly Agree)	3.5	3.7	4.2	4.8	4.2	3.4	3.5	3.8
All Employee Survey: <i>I have a high level of respect for my organization's senior leaders.</i>	1 (Strongly Disagree) –5 (Strongly Agree)	3.6	3.8	4.6	4.7	4.1	3.5	3.6	4.0

Source: VA All Employee Survey (accessed December 17, 2018)

Table 3 summarizes employee attitudes toward the workplace as expressed in VHA's All Employee Survey. Note that the facility and executive leadership team averages for the selected survey questions were generally similar to or better than the VHA average. Facility leaders appear to be maintaining an environment where employees feel safe bringing forth issues and concerns.

**Table 3. Survey Results on Employee Attitudes toward the Workplace
(October 1, 2017, through September 30, 2018)**

Questions/ Survey Items	Scoring	VHA Average	Facility Average	Director Average	Deputy Director Average	Chief of Staff Average	ADPCS Average	Assoc. Director Average	Assistant Director Average
All Employee Survey: <i>I can disclose a suspected violation of any law, rule, or regulation without fear of reprisal.</i>	1 (Strongly Disagree) –5 (Strongly Agree)	3.8	3.9	4.3	3.7	4.7	4.6	3.7	4.0

Questions/ Survey Items	Scoring	VHA Average	Facility Average	Director Average	Deputy Director Average	Chief of Staff Average	ADPCS Average	Assoc. Director Average	Assistant Director Average
All Employee Survey: <i>Employees in my workgroup do what is right even if they feel it puts them at risk (e.g., risk to reputation or promotion, shift reassignment, peer relationships, poor performance review, or risk of termination).</i>	1 (Strongly Disagree) – 5 (Strongly Agree)	3.7	3.7	3.9	3.6	4.5	4.3	3.5	3.5
All Employee Survey: <i>In the past year, how often did you experience moral distress at work (i.e., you were unsure about the right thing to do or could not carry out what you believed to be the right thing)?</i>	0 (Never) – 6 (Every Day)	1.5	1.4	1.7	1.5	0.7	1.2	1.6	1.3

Source: VA All Employee Survey (accessed December 17, 2018)

Patient Experience

To assess patient attitudes toward facility leaders, the OIG reviewed patient experience survey results that relate to the period of October 1, 2017, through August 30, 2018. VHA's Patient Experiences Survey Reports provide results from the Survey of Healthcare Experience of Patients (SHEP) program. VHA uses industry standard surveys from the Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems program to evaluate patients' experiences with their health care and to support benchmarking its performance against the private sector. Table 4 provides relevant survey results for facility leadership and compares the results to the overall VHA averages.¹⁶

¹⁶ Ratings are based on responses by patients who received care at this facility.

VHA collects SHEP survey data from Patient-Centered Medical Home, Specialty Care, and Inpatient Surveys. The OIG reviewed responses to four relevant survey questions that reflect patients' attitudes toward facility leaders (see Table 4). For this facility, three of the four selected patient survey question results reflected similar or better care ratings than the VHA average. Patients were generally satisfied with the leadership and care provided. Facility leaders expect the completion of the new tower building, which will provide private patient rooms, will increase patients' willingness to recommend the hospital.

**Table 4. Survey Results on Patient Attitudes toward Facility Leadership
(October 1, 2017, through August 30, 2018)**

Questions	Scoring	VHA Average	Facility Average
Survey of Healthcare Experiences of Patients (inpatient): <i>Would you recommend this hospital to your friends and family?</i>	The response average is the percent of "Definitely Yes" responses.	66.9	65.1
Survey of Healthcare Experiences of Patients (inpatient): <i>I felt like a valued customer.</i>	The response average is the percent of "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" responses.	84.3	85.7
Survey of Healthcare Experiences of Patients (outpatient Patient-Centered Medical Home): <i>I felt like a valued customer.</i>	The response average is the percent of "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" responses.	77.0	79.6
Survey of Healthcare Experiences of Patients (outpatient specialty care): <i>I felt like a valued customer.</i>	The response average is the percent of "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" responses.	76.4	77.6

Source: VHA Office of Reporting, Analytics, Performance, Improvement and Deployment (accessed December 17, 2018)

Accreditation Surveys and Oversight Inspections

To further assess leadership and organizational risks, the OIG reviewed recommendations from previous inspections and surveys, including those conducted for cause, by oversight and accrediting agencies to gauge how well leaders respond to identified problems.¹⁷ Table 5 summarizes the relevant facility inspections most recently performed by the OIG and The Joint Commission (TJC).¹⁸ Indicative of effective leadership, the facility has closed all recommendations for improvement.¹⁹

At the time of the site visit, the OIG also noted the facility's current accreditation status with the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities and the College of American Pathologists.²⁰ Additional results included the Long-Term Care Institute's inspection of the facility's CLC and the Paralyzed Veterans of America's inspection of the facility's spinal cord injury/disease unit and related services.^{21,22}

¹⁷ The Joint Commission (TJC) conducts for-cause unannounced surveys in response to serious incidents relating to the health and/or safety of patients or staff or other reported complaints. The outcomes of these types of activities may affect the accreditation status of an organization.

¹⁸ According to VHA Directive 1100.16, *Accreditation of Medical Facility and Ambulatory Programs*, May 9, 2017, TJC provides an "internationally accepted external validation that an organization has systems and processes in place to provide safe and quality-oriented health care." TJC "has been accrediting VA medical facilities for over 35 years." Compliance with TJC standards "facilitates risk reduction and performance improvement."

¹⁹ A closed status indicates that the facility has implemented corrective actions and improvements to address findings and recommendations, not by self-certification, but as determined by the accreditation organization or inspecting agency.

²⁰ According to VHA Directive 1170.01, *Accreditation of Veterans Health Administration Rehabilitation Programs*, May 9, 2017, the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities "provides an international, independent, peer review system of accreditation that is widely recognized by Federal agencies." VHA's commitment is supported through a system-wide, long-term joint collaboration with the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities to achieve and maintain national accreditation for all appropriate VHA rehabilitation programs; According to the College of American Pathologists, for 70 years it has "fostered excellence in laboratories and advanced the practice of pathology and laboratory science." College of American Pathologists. <https://www.cap.org/about-the-cap>. (The website was accessed on August 8, 2018.); In accordance with VHA Handbook 1106.01, *Pathology and Laboratory Medicine Service (P&LMS) Procedures*, January 29, 2016, VHA laboratories must meet the requirements of the College of American Pathologists.

²¹ The Long Term Care Institute states that it has been to over 4,000 healthcare facilities conducting quality reviews and over 1,145 external regulatory surveys since 1999. The Long Term Care Institute is "focused on long-term care quality and performance improvement, compliance program development, and review in long term care, hospice and other residential care settings." Long Term Care Institute. <http://www.ltcior.org/about-us/>. (The website was accessed on March 6, 2019.)

²² The Paralyzed Veterans of America inspection took place January 10–11, 2019. This veteran service organization review does not result in accreditation status.

Table 5. Office of Inspector General Inspections/The Joint Commission Survey

Accreditation or Inspecting Agency	Date of Visit	Number of Recommendations Issued	Number of Recommendations Remaining Open
OIG (<i>Combined Assessment Program Review of the James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital, Tampa, Florida, Report No. 15-04709-208, March 23, 2016</i>)	January 2016	6	0
OIG (<i>Review of Community Based Outpatient Clinics and Other Outpatient Clinics of James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital, Tampa, Florida, Report No. 16-00007-206, March 23, 2016</i>)	January 2016	9	0
OIG (<i>Healthcare Inspection – Patient Safety and Quality of Care Concerns in the Community Living Center, James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital, Tampa, Florida, Report No. 17-01491-112, March 1, 2018</i>)	January, February, and March 2017	6	0
TJC Hospital Accreditation	August 2016	24	0
TJC Nursing Care Center Accreditation		0	0
TJC Behavioral Health Care Accreditation		2	0
TJC Home Care Accreditation		1	0

Sources: OIG and TJC (Inspection/survey results verified with the director on February 5, 2019)

Factors Related to Possible Lapses in Care

Within the healthcare field, the primary organizational risk is the potential for patient harm. Many factors affect the risk for patient harm within a system, including hazardous environmental conditions; poor infection control practices; and patient, staff, and public safety. Leaders must be able to understand and implement plans to minimize patient risk through consistent and reliable data and reporting mechanisms. Table 6 lists the reported patient safety events from January 16, 2016 (the prior comprehensive OIG inspection), through February 8, 2019.²³

²³ It is difficult to quantify an acceptable number of adverse events affecting patients because even one is too many. Efforts should focus on prevention. Events resulting in death or harm and those that lead to disclosure can occur in either inpatient or outpatient settings and should be viewed within the context of the complexity of the facility. (Note that the James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital is the highest complexity (1a) facility as described in Appendix B.)

**Table 6. Summary of Selected Organizational Risk Factors
(January 16, 2016, through February 8, 2019)**

Factor	Number of Occurrences
Sentinel Events ²⁴	13
Institutional Disclosures ²⁵	14
Large-Scale Disclosures ²⁶	0

Source: Sentinel events, James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital acting chief of Quality Management (received February 4, 2019); institutional disclosures and large scale disclosures, VA Corporate Data Warehouse, reviewed with acting chief of Quality Management and chief of staff February 5, 2019)

The OIG also reviewed patient safety indicators developed by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. These provide information on potential in-hospital complications and adverse events following surgeries and procedures.²⁷ The rates presented are specifically applicable for this facility, and lower rates indicate lower risks. Table 7 summarizes patient safety indicator data from October 1, 2016, through September 30, 2018.

²⁴ The definition of sentinel event can be found within VHA Directive 1190, *Peer Review for Quality Management*, November 21, 2018. A sentinel event is an incident or condition that results in patient “death, permanent harm, or severe temporary harm and intervention required to sustain life.”

²⁵ According to VHA Directive 1004.08, *Disclosure of Adverse Events To Patients*, October 31, 2018, VHA defines an institutional disclosure of adverse events (sometimes referred to as an “administrative disclosure”) as “a formal process by which VA medical facility leader(s) together with clinicians and others, as appropriate, inform the patient or [his or her] personal representative that an adverse event has occurred during the patient’s care that resulted in, or is reasonably expected to result in, death or serious injury, and provide specific information about the patient’s rights and recourse.”

²⁶ According to VHA Directive 1004.08, VHA defines large-scale disclosures of adverse events (sometimes referred to as “notifications”) as “a formal process by which VHA officials assist with coordinating the notification to multiple patients, or their personal representatives, that they may have been affected by an adverse event resulting from a systems issue.”

²⁷ Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. <https://www.qualityindicators.ahrq.gov/>. (The website was accessed on December 11, 2017.)

**Table 7. Patient Safety Indicator Data
(October 1, 2016, through September 30, 2018)**

Indicators	Reported Rate per 1,000 Hospital Discharges		
	VHA	VISN 8	Facility
Pressure ulcer	0.74	0.60	0.63
Death among surgical inpatients with serious treatable conditions	113.42	173.25	185.57
Iatrogenic pneumothorax ²⁸	0.17	0.18	0.48
Central venous catheter-related bloodstream infection	0.16	0.30	0.31
In-hospital fall with hip fracture	0.09	0.06	0.19
Perioperative hemorrhage or hematoma	2.61	2.93	3.01
Postoperative acute kidney injury requiring dialysis	0.89	1.00	0.55
Postoperative respiratory failure	4.54	3.90	6.61
Perioperative pulmonary embolism or deep vein thrombosis	2.97	3.02	5.00
Postoperative sepsis	3.55	4.09	2.89
Postoperative wound dehiscence (rupture along incision)	0.82	0.18	0.00
Unrecognized abdominopelvic accidental puncture or laceration	1.00	0.97	1.65

Source: VHA Support Service Center

Note: The OIG did not assess VA's data for accuracy or completeness.

The patient safety indicator measure for pressure ulcers shows a higher reported rate than VISN 8. Eight patient safety indicator measures (death among surgical inpatients with serious treatable conditions, iatrogenic pneumothorax, central venous catheter-related bloodstream infection, in-hospital fall with hip fracture, perioperative hemorrhage or hematoma, postoperative respiratory failure, perioperative pulmonary embolism or deep vein thrombosis, and unrecognized abdominopelvic accidental puncture/laceration) show a higher reported rate than VISN 8 and VHA.

Seven patients developed a pressure ulcer. A wound care nurse and the assistant chief nursing for Excellence/Quality Improvement reviewed each individual ulcer. The aggregate data was

²⁸ According to Northwestern Memorial Hospital, "A Pneumothorax is a type of lung injury that allows air to leak into the area between the lungs and the chest wall, which causes mild to severe chest pain and shortness of breath. An Iatrogenic Pneumothorax is one which was caused by medical treatment, often as an incidental event during a procedure such as a pacemaker insertion." Northwestern Medicine. <http://www.nmh.org/nm/quality-lung-injury-due-to-medical-care>. (The website was accessed on March 6, 2019.)

presented at the Clinical Executive Board and Patient Care Executive Board where a trend was identified—heel boots were not being removed appropriately. The facility was in the process of hiring a third wound care nurse who would work in the spinal cord injury unit.

There were eighteen deaths among surgical inpatients with serious treatable conditions. All deaths were peer reviewed and presented for morbidity and mortality review. Surgeons performed a death audit to look for risk factors contributing to death, and the audit was reviewed with the chief, Surgical Service. No trends were identified.

Eight patients developed an iatrogenic pneumothorax. The patients who experienced a pneumothorax were individually reviewed by a surgeon, medical doctor, and interventional radiologist. After the group review, the patients were presented to the Operative/Invasive Procedures Committee. All eight patients were reviewed in aggregate, and again, no trends were identified.

Three patients experienced a central venous catheter-related bloodstream infection. The Consolidated Nursing Council reviewed the patients, and eight actions were implemented after a rapid improvement engagement. The actions included the development of a checklist, centralization of central line kit supplies, provision of education on materials to staff, observation of staff, development of a standardized central line order set, assignment of champions to monitor central lines, development of a central line tracking database, and increased documentation.

Three patients had an in-hospital fall with hip fracture. The patient safety manager reviewed all three patients, and no system issues or trends were identified. One patient was incorrectly coded as a fall, another left the unit and returned intoxicated, and the last patient fell when using the urinal, despite documented nursing advice. A workgroup is developing a protocol for working with patients who leave their inpatient rooms without an escort.

Nine patients experienced perioperative hemorrhage or hematoma. Each perioperative hemorrhage or hematoma was reviewed by surgical service providers and discussed during morbidity and mortality review. Nine patients developed postoperative respiratory failure. All nine patients were reviewed by surgical service, and multiple reasons for the respiratory failures were identified. The cases were also discussed during morbidity and mortality review. No trends were identified.

Sixteen patients had perioperative pulmonary embolism or deep vein thrombosis. The morbidity and mortality review discussed these patients, and they were deemed to be complicated patients. The venous thromboembolism workgroup had plans to begin efforts for pulmonary embolism prevention immediately following the OIG site visit.

Four patients experienced an unrecognized abdominopelvic accidental perforation or rupture. Coding errors were discovered for two patients, as they did not have perforations or ruptures.

The remaining patients were discussed with the surgical service and then at morbidity and mortality review. No trends were identified.

The OIG also reviewed patient safety indicator data for FY 2018, quarter 4 (the most recent data) and the previous four quarters to identify any potential trends that may impact patient safety or increase the risk for patient harm. It is important to note that although the data are collected and reported by quarter, each set of quarterly data represents potential complications or patient safety events over an eight-quarter or two-year period. Further, it is possible for a facility measure to exceed the VHA rate due to a single incident and for that measure to vary above or below the VHA rate over time due to differences in the number of patients treated. Figure 5 illustrates the time frames covered by the data reviewed.




Figure 5. Associated Time Frames for Quarterly Patient Safety Indicator Data

Source: VA OIG

FY18Q4 = fiscal year 2018, quarter 4

FY18Q3 = fiscal year 2018, quarter 3

FY18Q2 = fiscal year 2018, quarter 2

FY18Q1 = fiscal year 2018, quarter 1

FY17Q4 = fiscal year 2017, quarter 4

Table 8 summarizes patient safety indicator data for FY 2017, quarter 4 (FY17Q4) through FY 2018, quarter 4 (FY18Q4), which includes potential complications from October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2018.

**Table 8. Patient Safety Indicator Data Trending
(October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2018)**

Indicators	Site	Reported Rate per 1,000 Hospital Discharges				
		FY17Q4	FY18Q1	FY18Q2	FY18Q3	FY18Q4
Pressure ulcer	VHA	0.60	0.88	n/a ²⁹	0.76	0.74
	Facility	0.95	1.10	n/a	0.89	0.63
Death among surgical inpatients with serious treatable conditions	VHA	100.97	118.96	113.92	114.89	113.42
	Facility	151.52	194.44	187.50	185.57	185.57
Iatrogenic pneumothorax	VHA	0.19	0.19	0.17	0.15	0.17
	Facility	0.45	0.51	0.58	0.53	0.48
Central venous catheter-related bloodstream infection	VHA	0.15	0.14	0.15	0.16	0.16
	Facility	0.37	0.34	0.29	0.30	0.31
In-hospital fall with hip fracture	VHA	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.09
	Facility	0.07	0.06	0.00	0.19	0.19
Perioperative hemorrhage or hematoma	VHA	1.94	2.58	2.62	2.59	2.61
	Facility	3.19	3.20	2.54	2.93	3.01
Postoperative acute kidney injury requiring dialysis	VHA	0.88	0.80	0.65	0.96	0.89
	Facility	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.52	0.55
Postoperative respiratory failure	VHA	5.55	5.34	5.11	4.88	4.54
	Facility	7.60	6.86	6.05	5.60	6.61
Perioperative pulmonary embolism or deep vein thrombosis	VHA	3.29	3.26	3.09	3.05	2.97
	Facility	5.00	5.06	5.40	4.28	5.00
Postoperative sepsis	VHA	4.00	3.96	3.72	3.70	3.55
	Facility	2.41	2.61	1.57	1.66	2.89
Postoperative wound dehiscence (rupture along incision)	VHA	0.52	1.04	1.00	0.93	0.82
	Facility	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Unrecognized abdominopelvic accidental puncture or laceration	VHA	0.53	1.21	1.02	1.07	1.00
	Facility	1.50	2.55	2.14	2.04	1.65

Source: VHA Support Service Center

Note: The OIG did not assess VA's data for accuracy or completeness.

Eight measures (pressure ulcer, death among surgical inpatients with serious treatable conditions, iatrogenic pneumothorax, central venous catheter-related bloodstream infection, perioperative

²⁹ According to VHA's Inpatient Evaluation Center, pressure ulcer data are not available for the time frame of April 1, 2016, through March 31, 2018.

hemorrhage or hematoma, postoperative respiratory failure, perioperative pulmonary embolism or deep vein thrombosis, and unrecognized abdominopelvic accidental puncture or laceration) have generally trended above VHA averages. The facility is a high-complexity level 1a facility. The facility recently started to review Inpatient Evaluation Center (IPEC) data as presented by the OIG. In the past, the facility has benchmarked itself with like facilities, rather than against all VHA facilities as IPEC does. Pressure ulcer was the only indicator which the facility identified as a trend—because heel boots were not removed appropriately.

One measure (in-hospital fall with hip fracture) appears to have trended upward during the last two quarters of FY18. Three patients had falls within the last two quarters of FY18. Again, the patient safety manager reviewed all incidents, and no system issues or trends were identified.

Veterans Health Administration Performance Data

The VA Office of Operational Analytics and Reporting adapted the SAIL Value Model to help define performance expectations within VA. This model includes “measures on healthcare quality, employee satisfaction, access to care, and efficiency.” It does, however, have noted limitations for identifying all areas of clinical risk. The data are presented as one way to “understand the similarities and differences between the top and bottom performers” within VHA.³⁰

VA also uses a star-rating system where facilities with a “5-star” rating are performing within the top 10 percent of facilities and “1-star” facilities are performing within the bottom 10 percent of facilities. Figure 6 describes the distribution of facilities by star rating.³¹ As of June 30, 2018, the facility was rated as “4-star” for overall quality.

³⁰ VHA Support Service Center (VSSC), The Strategic Analytics for Improvement and Learning (SAIL) Value Model, <http://vaww.vssc.med.va.gov/VSSCEnhancedProductManagement/DisplayDocument.aspx?DocumentID=8938>. (The website was accessed on March 7, 2019, but is not accessible by the public.)

³¹ According to the methods established by the SAIL Model, this is based on normal distribution ranking of the quality domain for 130 VA Medical Centers.




Figure 6. Strategic Analytics for Improvement and Learning Star Rating Distribution (as of June 30, 2018)

Source: VA Office of Informatics and Analytics Office of Operational Analytics and Reporting (accessed December 17, 2018)

Figure 7 illustrates the facility's quality of care and efficiency metric rankings and performance compared with other VA facilities as of June 30, 2018. Of note, the figure uses blue and green data points to indicate high performance (for example, in the areas of registered nurse (RN) turnover, patient centered medical home (PCMH) same day appointment, adjusted length of stay (LOS), and complications).³² Metrics that need improvement are denoted in orange and red (for

³² For information on the acronyms in the SAIL metrics, please see Appendix D.

example, care transition, stress discussed, and rating (of) hospital).




Figure 7. Facility Quality of Care and Efficiency Metric Rankings (as of June 30, 2018)

Source: VHA Support Service Center

Note: The OIG did not assess VA's data for accuracy or completeness. Also see Appendix C for sample outpatient performance measures that feed into these data points (such as wait times, discharge contacts, and where patient care is received). Data definitions are provided in Appendix D.

The SAIL Value Model also includes “SAIL CLC,” which is a tool to summarize and compare the performance of CLCs in the VA. The SAIL model leverages much of the same data used in The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services’ (CMS) *Nursing Home Compare*.³³ The SAIL CLC provides a single resource to review quality measures and health inspection results. It

³³ According to the Center for Innovation and Analytics, *Strategic Analytics for Improvement and Learning (SAIL) for Community Living Centers (CLC)*, August 22, 2019 “In December 2008, The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) enhanced its *Nursing Home Compare* public reporting site to include a set of quality ratings for each nursing home that participates in Medicare or Medicaid. The ratings take the form of several “star” ratings for each nursing home. The primary goal of this rating system is to provide residents and their families with an easy way to understand assessment of nursing home quality; making meaningful distinctions between high and low performing nursing homes.”

includes star ratings for an unannounced survey, staffing, quality, and overall results.³⁴ Table 9 summarizes the rating results for the facility's CLC as of September 30, 2018. The facility has "2-star" quality and overall ratings.

**Table 9. Facility CLC Star Ratings
(as of September 30, 2018)**

Domain	Star Rating
Unannounced Survey	1
Staffing	5
Quality	2
Overall	2

Source: VHA Support Service Center

In exploring the reasons for the "2-star" quality rating, the OIG considered the radar diagram showing CLC performance relative to other CLCs for all 13 quality measures. Figure 8 illustrates the facility's CLC quality rankings and performance compared with other VA CLCs as of September 30, 2018. The figure uses blue and green data points to indicate high performance (for example, in the areas of falls with major injury—long stay (LS), ability to move independently worsened (LS), moderate-severe pain—short stay (SS) and help with activities of daily living (ADL) (LS)). Metrics that need improvement and were likely the reasons why the facility had a "2-star" for quality are denoted in orange and red (for example, urinary tract infection (LS), newly received antipsychotic medications (SS), and improvement in function (SS)).³⁵

³⁴ *Strategic Analytics for Improvement and Learning (SAIL) for Community Living Centers (CLC)*, Center for Innovation & Analytics (last updated August 22, 2019).
<http://vaww.vssc.med.va.gov/VSSCEnhancedProductManagement/DisplayDocument.aspx?DocumentID=7410>.
(The website was accessed on September 3, 2019, but is not accessible by the public.)

³⁵ For data definitions of acronyms in the SAIL CLC measures, please see Appendix E.




Figure 8. Facility CLC Quality Measure Rankings (as of September 30, 2018)

LS = Long-Stay Measure SS = Short-Stay Measure

Source: VHA Support Service Center

Note: The OIG did not assess VA's data for accuracy or completeness. For data definitions, see Appendix E.

Leadership and Organizational Risks Conclusion

The facility's executive leadership team appeared generally stable; however, two of six leaders had been detailed to other positions for several months prior to the OIG's on-site visit. Selected survey scores related to employee satisfaction with the facility's executive leaders were generally better than VHA averages. In the OIG's review of patient experience survey, data revealed that scores for three of four selected questions related to satisfaction with the facility were above VHA averages. The leaders appeared to support efforts to improve and maintain patient safety, quality care, and other positive outcomes (such as implementing processes to improve quality care and initiating plans to maintain positive perceptions of the facility through active stakeholder engagement). The OIG did not identify any substantial organizational risks. The leadership team, with the exception of the acting deputy director and acting associate director, was knowledgeable within their scope of responsibility about selected SAIL and CLC metrics but should continue to take actions to sustain and improve performance of measures contributing to the SAIL "4-star" and CLC "2-star" quality ratings.

Quality, Safety, and Value

VHA's goal is to serve as the nation's leader in delivering high-quality, safe, reliable, and veteran-centered care that involves coordinating care among members of the healthcare team. To meet this goal, VHA must foster a culture of integrity and accountability in which personnel are vigilant and mindful, proactively risk-aware, and committed to consistently providing quality care, while seeking continuous improvement.³⁶ VHA also strives to provide healthcare services that compare favorably to the best of the private sector in measured outcomes, value, and efficiency.³⁷ VHA requires that its facilities operate a quality, safety, and value (QSV) program to monitor the quality of patient care and performance improvement activities.³⁸

In determining whether the facility implemented and incorporated several OIG-selected key functions of VHA's Enterprise Framework for QSV into local activities, the inspection team evaluated protected peer reviews of clinical care,³⁹ utilization management (UM) reviews,⁴⁰ patient safety incident reporting with related root cause analyses,⁴¹ and cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) episode reviews.⁴²

When conducted systematically and credibly, protected peer reviews reveal areas for improvement (involving one or more providers' practices) and can result in both immediate and long-term improvements in patient care. Peer reviews are intended to promote confidential and

³⁶ VHA Directive 1026, *VHA Enterprise Framework for Quality, Safety, and Value*, August 2, 2013. (This VHA directive was scheduled for recertification on or before the last working day of August 2018 but was rescinded on October 24, 2019.)

³⁷ Department of Veterans Affairs, *Veterans Health Administration Blueprint for Excellence*, September 2014.

³⁸ VHA Directive 1026.

³⁹ The definition of a peer review can be found within VHA Directive 1190, *Peer Review for Quality Management*, November 21, 2018. A peer review is a critical review of care, performed by a peer, to evaluate care provided by a clinician for a specific episode of care, to identify learning opportunities for improvement, to provide confidential communication of the results back to the clinician, and to identify potential system or process improvements.

⁴⁰ The definition of utilization management can be found within VHA Directive 1117(1), *Utilization Management Program*, July 9, 2014 (amended January 18, 2018). Utilization management involves the "forward-looking evaluation of the appropriateness, medical need, and efficiency of healthcare services according to evidence-based criteria." The January 2018 version of the directive was in effect at the time of the February 2019 review. Subsequently, the directive was replaced by VHA Directive 1117(2), *Utilization Management Program*, July 9, 2014 (amended April 30, 2019), which expired on July 31, 2019. The utilization management definition remained consistent in both versions of the directive.

⁴¹ The definition of a root cause analysis can be found within VHA Handbook 1050.01, *VHA National Patient Safety Improvement Handbook*, March 4, 2011. (This VHA Handbook was scheduled for recertification on or before the last working date of March 2016 and has not been recertified.) A root cause analysis is "a process for identifying the basic or contributing causal factors that underlie variations in performance associated with adverse events or close calls."

⁴² VHA Directive 1177, *Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation*, August 28, 2018.

nonpunitive processes that consistently contribute to quality management efforts at the individual provider level.⁴³

The UM program, a key component of VHA's framework for quality, safety, and value, provides vital tools for managing the quality and the efficient use of resources. It strives to ensure that the right care occurs in the right setting, at the right time, and for the right reason using evidence-based practices and continuous measurement to guide improvements.⁴⁴

Among VHA's approaches for improving patient safety is the mandated reporting of patient safety incidents to its National Center for Patient Safety. Incident reporting helps VHA learn about system vulnerabilities and how to address them. Required root cause analyses help to more accurately identify and rapidly communicate potential and actual causes of harm to patients throughout the facility.⁴⁵

VHA has also issued guidance to support its strategic priority of providing personalized, proactive, patient-driven care and to ensure that the provision of life-sustaining treatments, including CPR, is aligned with patients' values, goals, and preferences. VHA requires that each facility establishes a CPR Committee or equivalent that fully reviews each episode of care in which resuscitation was attempted. The ongoing review and analysis of high-risk healthcare processes is essential for ensuring patient safety and the provision of high-quality care. VHA also has established requirements for basic life support and advanced cardiac life support training and certification for clinicians responsible for administering life-sustaining treatments.⁴⁶

The OIG interviewed senior managers and key QSV employees and evaluated meeting minutes, protected peer reviews, root cause analyses, the annual patient safety report, and other relevant documents. Specifically, OIG inspectors evaluated the following performance indicators:⁴⁷

- Protected peer reviews
 - Evaluation of aspects of care (for example, choice and timely ordering of diagnostic tests, prompt treatment, and appropriate documentation)
 - Implementation of improvement actions recommended by the Peer Review Committee
 - Completion of final reviews within 120 calendar days

⁴³ VHA Directive 1190.

⁴⁴ VHA Directive 1117(1).

⁴⁵ VHA Handbook 1050.01.

⁴⁶ VHA Directive 1177, VHA Handbook 1004.03, *Life-Sustaining Treatment Decisions: Eliciting, Documenting and Honoring Patients' Values, Goals and Preferences*, January 11, 2017.

⁴⁷ For CHIP reviews, the OIG selects performance indicators based on VHA or regulatory requirements or accreditation standards and evaluates these for compliance.

- Quarterly review of Peer Review Committee's summary analysis by the Medical Executive Committee
- Peer review of all applicable deaths within 24 hours of admission to the hospital
- Peer review of all completed suicides within seven days after discharge from an inpatient mental health unit⁴⁸
- UM
 - Completion of at least 75 percent of all required inpatient reviews
 - Documentation of at least 75 percent of physician UM advisors' decisions in the National UM Integration database
 - Interdisciplinary review of UM data
- Patient safety
 - Annual completion of a minimum of eight root cause analyses⁴⁹
 - Inclusion of required content in root cause analyses (generally)
 - Submission of completed root cause analyses to the National Center for Patient Safety within 45 days
 - Provision of feedback about root cause analysis actions to reporting employees
 - Submission of annual patient safety report to facility leaders
- Resuscitation episode review
 - Evidence of a committee responsible for reviewing resuscitation episodes
 - Confirmation of actions taken during resuscitative events being consistent with patients' wishes
 - Evidence of basic or advanced cardiac life support certification for code team responders
 - Evaluation of each resuscitation episode by the CPR Committee or equivalent

Quality, Safety, Value Conclusion

Generally, the facility achieved the performance indicators listed above. The OIG made no recommendations.

⁴⁸ VHA Directive 1190.

⁴⁹ According to VHA Handbook 1050.01, "the requirement for a total of eight [root cause analyses] and Aggregated Reviews is a minimum number, as the total number of [root cause analyses] is driven by the events that occur and the [Safety Assessment Code] SAC score assigned to them. At least four analysis per fiscal year must be individual [root cause analyses], with the balance being Aggregated Reviews or additional individual [root cause analyses]."

Medical Staff Privileging

VHA has defined procedures for the clinical privileging of “all healthcare professionals who are permitted by law and the facility to practice independently”—“without supervision or direction, within the scope of the individual’s license, and in accordance with individually granted clinical privileges.” These healthcare professionals are also referred to as licensed independent practitioners (LIPs).⁵⁰

Clinical privileges need to be specific, based on the individual’s clinical competence. They are recommended by service chiefs and the Executive Committee of the Medical Staff and approved by the director. Clinical privileges are granted for a period not to exceed two years, and LIPs must undergo re-privileging prior to their expiration.⁵¹

VHA defines the focused professional practice evaluation (FPPE) as “a time-limited period during which the medical staff leadership evaluates and determines the practitioner’s professional performance. The FPPE typically occurs at the time of initial appointment to the medical staff or the granting of new, additional privileges.” “The on-going monitoring of privileged practitioners, Ongoing Professional Practice Evaluations[s] (OPPEs), [are] essential to confirm the quality of care delivered.”⁵²

According to TJC, the “FPPE for Cause” should be used when a question arises regarding a privileged provider’s ability to deliver safe, high-quality patient care. The “FPPE for Cause” is limited to a particular time frame and customized to the specific provider and related clinical concerns.⁵³ Federal law requires VA facilities to report to the National Practitioner Data Bank when facilities take adverse clinical privileging actions, accept the surrender of clinical privileges, or restrict clinical privileges when the action is related to professional competence or professional conduct of LIPs.⁵⁴

To determine whether the facility complied with requirements for privileging, the OIG interviewed key managers and selected and reviewed the privileging folders of several medical staff members:

⁵⁰ VHA Handbook 1100.19, *Credentialing and Privileging*, October 15, 2012. (This VHA Handbook was scheduled for recertification on or before the last working date of October 2017 and has not been recertified.)

⁵¹ VHA Handbook 1100.19.

⁵² VHA Handbook 1100.19.

⁵³ Office of Safety and Risk Awareness, Office of Quality and Performance, *Provider Competency and Clinical Care Concerns Including: Focused Clinical Care Review and FPPE for Cause Guidance*, July 2016 (Revision 2).

⁵⁴ VHA Handbook 1100.17, *National Practitioner Data Bank (NPDB) Reports*, December 28, 2009. (This VHA Handbook was scheduled for recertification on or before the last working date of December 2014 and has not been recertified.)

- Three solo or few (less than two in a specialty) practitioners hired within 18 months before the site visit or were privileged within the prior 12 months⁵⁵
- Ten LIPs hired within 18 months before the site visit
- Twenty LIPs re-privileged within 12 months before the visit
- Two providers who underwent a FPPE for cause within 12 months prior to the visit.

The OIG evaluated the following performance indicators:

- Privileging
 - Privileges requested by the provider
 - Facility-specific
 - Service-specific
 - Provider-specific⁵⁶
 - Approval of privileges for a period of less than, or equal to, two years
- Focused professional practice evaluations
 - Criteria defined in advance
 - Use of required criteria in FPPEs for selected specialty LIPs
 - Results and time frames clearly documented
 - Evaluation by another provider with similar training and privileges
 - Executive Committee of the Medical Staff's consideration of FPPE results in its decision to recommend continuing the initially granted privileges
- Ongoing professional practice evaluations
 - Criteria specific to the service or section
 - Use of required criteria in OPPEs for selected specialty LIPs

⁵⁵ The 18-month period was from August 4, 2017, through February 4, 2019. The 12-month review period covered February 4, 2018, through February 4, 2019. VHA Memorandum, *Requirements for Peer Review of Solo Practitioners*, August 29, 2016, refers to a solo practitioner as being one provider in the facility that is privileged in a particular specialty. The OIG considers "few practitioners" as being fewer than three providers in the facility that are privileged in a particular specialty.

⁵⁶ According to VHA Handbook 1100.19, facility-specific means that privileges are granted only for procedures and types of services performed at the facility; service-specific refers to privileges being granted in a specific clinical service, such as neurology; and provider-specific means that the privileges should be granted to the individual provider based on their clinical competence and capabilities.

- Service chief's determination to recommend continuation of current privileges was based in part on the results of OPPE activities
- Evaluation by another provider with similar training and privileges
- Executive Committee of the Medical Staff's decision to recommend continuing privileges based on OPPE results
- Focused professional practice evaluations for cause
 - Clearly defined expectations/outcomes
 - Time-limited
 - Provider's ability to practice independently not limited for more than 30 days
 - Shared with the provider in advance
- Reporting of privileging actions to National Practitioner Data Bank

Medical Staff Privileging Conclusion

The facility generally complied with requirements for privileging and focused professional practice evaluations. However, the OIG identified concerns with the service-specific criteria for OPPEs and defining and sharing the expectations, outcomes, and time limits for FPPEs for cause in advance with providers.

VHA requires "ongoing reviews conducted by Service Chiefs must be comprised of activities with defined criteria that emphasize the facility's performance improvement plan, appropriateness of care, patient safety, and desired outcomes." The OPPE process "is essential to confirm the quality of care delivered...[and] allows the facility to identify professional practice trends that impact the quality of care and patient safety."⁵⁷ For 6 of 20 applicable provider profiles, the OIG found no evidence of service-specific criteria. As a result, providers continued to delivered care without a thorough evaluation of their practice. The chief of staff admitted that not all service chiefs had developed specific criteria for practitioner reviews.

Recommendation 1

1. The chief of staff ensures that service chiefs include service-specific criteria for ongoing professional practice evaluations and monitors service chiefs' compliance.

⁵⁷ VHA Handbook 1100.19.

Facility concurred.

Target date for completion: February 3, 2020

Facility response: The Associate Chief of Staff for Performance Improvement held Ongoing Professional Practice Evaluations group meetings as well as individual sessions with Service Chiefs from December 2018 to March 2019 for review of Service-specific criteria. A tool was created to document audits. The Associate Chief of Staff for Performance Improvement will conduct 70 random audits for six months, to ensure 90% compliance with implementation of service-specific criteria. Compliance will be documented in the Professional Standards Board minutes, which is chaired by the Chief of Staff.

Despite VHA requiring FPPEs for cause to have clearly defined expectations, outcomes, and time limits that are to be shared with the provider in advance of the evaluation, the OIG found that one of two completed FPPEs for cause did not have clearly defined expectations, outcomes, and time limits and were not shared with the provider in advance of the evaluation.⁵⁸ Failure to clearly define expectations can hinder the evaluation of the provider. The chief of administrative medicine reported not understanding the FPPE for cause process and not communicating clearly defined expectations and time limits to the provider.

Recommendation 2

2. The chief of staff ensures that service chiefs clearly define and share in advance the expectations, outcomes, and time limits for focused professional practice evaluations for cause with providers and monitors service chiefs' compliance.

Facility concurred.

Target date for completion: February 3, 2020

Facility response: The Associate Chief of Staff for Performance Improvement held Focused Professional Practice Evaluation for cause group meetings as well as individual sessions with Service Chiefs for review of process. A checklist was developed to include expectations, outcomes, and time limit requirements. The Associate Chief of Staff for Performance Improvement will conduct monthly audits until 90% compliance is maintained for six consecutive months. Results from the audits will be documented in the Professional Standards Board, which is chaired by the Chief of Staff.

⁵⁸ Office of Quality and Performance, July 2016 (Revision 2).

Environment of Care

Any facility, regardless of its size or location, faces vulnerabilities in the healthcare environment. VHA requires managers to conduct environment of care inspection rounds and resolve issues in a timely manner. The goal of the environment of care program is to reduce and control environmental hazards and risks; prevent accidents and injuries; and maintain safe conditions for patients, visitors, and staff. The physical environment of a healthcare organization must not only be functional but should also promote healing.⁵⁹

The purpose of this facet of the OIG inspection was to determine whether the facility maintained a clean and safe healthcare environment in accordance with applicable requirements. The OIG examined whether the facility met requirements in selected areas that are often associated with higher risks of harm to patients, such as in the locked inpatient mental health unit. The inspection team also looked at facility compliance with emergency management processes.⁶⁰

VHA requires its facilities to have the “capacity for [providing] mental health services for veterans with acute and severe emotional and/or behavioral symptoms causing a safety risk to self or others, and/or resulting in severely compromised functional status. This level of care is typically provided in an inpatient setting;” however, for facilities that do not have inpatient mental health services, that “capacity” could mean facilitating care at a nearby VA or non-VA facility.⁶¹

VHA requires managers to establish a comprehensive emergency management program to ensure the continuity of patient care and hospital operations in the event of a natural disaster or other emergency. This includes conducting a hazard vulnerability analysis and developing an emergency operations plan. These requirements are meant to support facilities’ efforts to identify and minimize harm from potential hazards, threats, incidents, and events related to healthcare and other essential services.⁶² Managers must also develop utility management plans to increase reliability and reduce failures of electrical power distribution systems in accordance with TJC,⁶³

⁵⁹ VHA Directive 1608, *Comprehensive Environment of Care, (CEOC Program)*, February 1, 2016.

⁶⁰ Applicable requirements for high-risk areas and emergency management include those detailed in or by various VHA Directives, Joint Commission hospital accreditation standards, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, American National Standards Institute (ANSI)/Association for the Advancement of Medical Instrumentation (AAMI), and National Fire Protection Association (NFPA).

⁶¹ VHA Handbook 1160.06, *Inpatient Mental Health Services*, September 16, 2013. (This VHA Handbook was scheduled for recertification on or before the last working date of September 2018 and has not been recertified.)

⁶² VHA Directive 0320.01, *Veterans Health Administration Comprehensive Emergency Management Program (CEMP) Procedures*, April 6, 2017.

⁶³ VHA Directive 1028, *Electrical Power Distribution Systems*, July 25, 2014. (This VHA Directive was scheduled for recertification on or before the last working date of July 2019 and has not been recertified.)

Occupational Safety and Health Administration,⁶⁴ and National Fire Protection Association standards.⁶⁵ The provision of sustained electrical power during disasters or emergencies is critical to healthcare facility operations.⁶⁶

In all, the OIG team inspected seven inpatient units—post-anesthesia care, surgical intensive care, medical intensive care, cardiac care, acute recovery care, 5N-medical/surgical, 6S-medical/surgical—in addition to selected outpatient areas, which included the emergency department, the community living center, the women’s health, and the Foxtrot Primary Care Clinic. The team also reviewed the emergency management program and inspected the Lakeland VA Clinic in Tampa, Florida. The inspection team reviewed relevant documents and interviewed key employees and managers. The OIG evaluated the following location-specific performance indicators:

- Parent facility
 - General safety
 - Environmental cleanliness and infection prevention
 - General privacy
 - Women veterans program
 - Availability of medical equipment and supplies
- Community based outpatient clinic
 - General safety
 - Environmental cleanliness and infection prevention
 - General privacy
 - Women veterans program
 - Availability of medical equipment and supplies
- Locked inpatient mental health unit
 - Mental health environment of care rounds
 - Nursing station security

⁶⁴ The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) is part of the US Department of Labor. OSHA’s Mission is to assure safe and healthy working conditions “by setting and enforcing standards and by providing training, outreach, education, and assistance.” <https://www.osha.gov/about.html>. (This website was accessed on June 28, 2018.)

⁶⁵ The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) is a global nonprofit organization “devoted to eliminating death, injury, property, and economic loss due to fire, electrical, and related hazards.” <https://www.nfpa.org/About-NFPA>. (This website was accessed on June 28, 2018.)

⁶⁶ TJC. Environment of Care standard EC.02.05.07.

- Public area and general unit safety
- Patient room safety
- Infection prevention
- Availability of medical equipment and supplies
- Emergency management
 - Hazard vulnerability analysis (HVA)
 - Emergency operations plan (EOP)
 - Emergency power testing and availability

Environment of Care Conclusion

Generally, the facility achieved the performance indicators listed above. The OIG did not note any issues with the availability of medical equipment and supplies. The OIG made no recommendations.

Medication Management: Controlled Substances Inspections

The Controlled Substances Act divides controlled drugs into five categories based on whether they have an accepted medical treatment use in the United States, their relative potential for abuse, and the likelihood of causing dependence if abused.⁶⁷ Diversion of controlled substances by healthcare workers—the transfer of legally prescribed controlled substances from the prescribed individual to others for illicit use—remains a serious problem that can increase patient safety issues and elevate the liability risk to healthcare facilities.⁶⁸

VHA requires that facility managers implement and maintain a controlled substances inspection program to minimize the risk for loss and diversion and to enhance patient safety. Requirements include the appointment of controlled substances coordinator(s) and controlled substances inspectors, implementation of procedures for inventory control, and inspections of the pharmacy and clinical areas with controlled substances.⁶⁹

To determine whether the facility complied with requirements related to controlled substances security and inspections, the OIG team interviewed key managers and reviewed inspection reports; monthly summaries of findings, including discrepancies, provided to the facility director; inspection quarterly trend reports for the prior two completed quarters;⁷⁰ and other relevant documents. The OIG evaluated the following performance indicators:

- Controlled substances coordinator reports
 - Monthly summary of findings to the director
 - Quarterly trend reports to the director
 - Quality Management Committee's review of monthly and quarterly trend reports
 - Actions taken to resolve identified problems
- Pharmacy operations
 - Staff restrictions for monthly review of balance adjustments⁷¹
- Requirements for controlled substances inspectors

⁶⁷ Drug Enforcement Agency Controlled Substance Schedules. <https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/schedules/>. (The website was accessed on March 7, 2019.)

⁶⁸ American Society of Health-System Pharmacists, "ASHP Guidelines on Preventing Diversion of Controlled Substances," *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacists* 74, no. 5 (March 1, 2017): 325-348.

⁶⁹ VHA Directive 1108.02(1), *Inspection of Controlled Substances*, November 28, 2016 (amended March 6, 2017).

⁷⁰ The two quarters were from July 1, 2018, through December 30, 2018.

⁷¹ Controlled substances balance adjustment reports list transactions in which the pharmacy vault inventory balance was manually adjusted.

- No conflicts of interest
- Appointed in writing by the director for a term not to exceed three years
- Hiatus of one year between any reappointment
- Completion of required annual competency assessment
- Controlled substances area inspections
 - Completion of monthly inspections
 - Rotations of controlled substances inspectors
 - Patterns of inspections
 - Completion of inspections on day initiated
 - Reconciliation of dispensing between pharmacy and each dispensing area
 - Verification of controlled substances orders
 - Performance of routine controlled substances inspections
- Pharmacy inspections
 - Monthly physical counts of the controlled substances in the pharmacy
 - Completion of inspections on day initiated
 - Security and verification of drugs held for destruction⁷²
 - Accountability for all prescription pads in pharmacy
 - Verification of hard copy-controlled substances prescriptions
 - Verification of 72-hour inventories of the main vault
 - Quarterly inspections of emergency drugs
 - Monthly checks of locks and verification of lock numbers
- Facility review of override reports⁷³

Medication Management Conclusion

The OIG found general compliance with requirements for most of the performance indicators evaluated, including the controlled substances coordinator reports, pharmacy operations,

⁷² According to VHA Directive 1108.02(1), the Destructions File Holding Report “lists all drugs awaiting local destruction or turn-over to a reverse distributor.” Controlled substances inspectors “must verify there is a corresponding sealed evidence bag containing drug(s) for each destruction holding number on the report.”

⁷³ When automated dispensing cabinets are used, nursing staff can override and remove medications prior to the pharmacists’ review of medications ordered by the providers.

requirements for controlled substances inspectors, controlled substances area inspections, and pharmacy inspections. However, the OIG identified noncompliance with completing the review of automatic dispensing cabinets' override reports that warranted a recommendation.

Specifically, TJC requires that when automatic dispensing cabinets are used, the hospital has "a policy which describes the types of medication overrides that will be reviewed for appropriateness and the frequency of the reviews."⁷⁴

The OIG found that the facility did not have a formal process to review override reports. Failure to perform reviews of the automatic dispensing cabinets' overrides can potentially lead to a loss and diversion of controlled substances medications and risk patient safety.⁷⁵ The controlled substances coordinator reported the process to document and review override reports was not implemented until January 2019.

Recommendation 3

3. The facility director makes certain that the pharmacy or nursing staff complete the review of automatic dispensing cabinets' override reports and monitors the program staff compliance.⁷⁶

Facility concurred.

Target date for completion: Closed.

Facility response: In January 2019, during an annual self-assessment the facility identified a deficiency in systematically reviewing the override reports and monitoring compliance. A corrective action plan was developed at this time. The Controlled Substance Coordinator collaborated with Pharmacy services to obtain monthly override reports. All unresolved overrides are provided to responsible parties for resolution. Controlled Substance Coordinator monitors all unresolved overrides until closure. The "Controlled Substance Inspection Program Monthly Report" itemizes all unresolved overrides and is reported to Executive Leadership, Chief/Quality Management, Patient Safety Manager, Pharmacy, and Police Services. In addition, override discrepancies have been added to the monthly "James A. Haley Controlled Substance Scorecard" which is reported to the facility Quality, Safety, Value, Board on a quarterly basis. The Quality, Safety, Value, Board is co-chaired by the Medical Center Director. The Quality, Safety, Value, Board records and documents minutes that reflect the Controlled Substance Coordinator's report.

⁷⁴ The Joint Commission Medication Management Update for 2018.

⁷⁵ VHA Directive 1108.02(1).

⁷⁶ The OIG reviewed evidence sufficient to demonstrate that the facility had completed improvement actions and therefore closed the recommendation before the report's release.

Mental Health: Military Sexual Trauma Follow-Up and Staff Training

The Department of Veterans Affairs uses the term “military sexual trauma” (MST) to refer to a “psychological trauma, which in the judgment of a mental health professional employed by the Department [of Veterans Affairs], resulted from a physical assault of a sexual nature, battery of a sexual nature, or sexual harassment which occurred while the Veteran was serving on active duty, active duty for training, or inactive duty training.”⁷⁷ “MST is an experience, not a diagnosis or a mental health condition.” Although posttraumatic stress disorder is commonly associated with MST, other frequently associated diagnoses include depression and substance use disorders.⁷⁸

VHA requires that the facility director designates an MST coordinator to support national and VISN-level policies related to MST-related care and serve as a source of information; establish and monitor MST-related staff training and informational outreach; and communicate MST-related issues, services, and initiatives with leadership.⁷⁹ Additionally, the facility director is responsible for ensuring that MST-related data are tracked and monitored.⁸⁰

VHA requires that all veterans and potentially eligible individuals seen in VHA facilities be screened for experiences of MST with the required MST clinical reminder in the computerized patient record system.⁸¹ Those who screen positive must have access to appropriate MST-related care.⁸² VHA also requires that evidence-based mental health care be available to all veterans with mental health conditions related to MST. Patients requesting or referred for mental health services must receive an initial evaluation within 24 hours of the referral to identify urgent care needs and a more comprehensive diagnostic evaluation within 30 days.⁸³

The MST coordinator may provide clinical care to individuals experiencing MST and is thus subject to the same mandatory training requirements as mental health and primary care providers.⁸⁴ All mental health and primary care providers must complete MST mandatory

⁷⁷ VHA Directive 1115, *Military Sexual Trauma (MST) Program*, May 8, 2018.

⁷⁸ Military Sexual Trauma. https://www.mentalhealth.va.gov/docs/mst_general_factsheet.pdf. (The website was accessed on November 17, 2017.)

⁷⁹ VHA Directive 1115.

⁸⁰ VHA Handbook 1160.01, *Uniform Mental Health Services in VA Medical Centers and Clinics*, September 11, 2008 (amended November 16, 2015). (This VHA Handbook was scheduled for recertification on or before the last working date of September 2013 and has not been recertified.)

⁸¹ VHA Directive 1115 states that “MST-related care is not subject to the minimum active duty service requirement set forth in 38 U.S.C. 5303A; Veterans may therefore be able to receive MST-related care even if they are not eligible for VA health care under other treatment authorities.”

⁸² VHA Directive 1115.

⁸³ VHA Handbook 1160.01.

⁸⁴ VHA Directive 1115.

training; for those hired after July 1, 2012, this training must be completed no later than 90 days after assuming their position.⁸⁵

To determine whether the facility complied with the requirements related to MST follow-up and training, the OIG inspection team reviewed relevant documents and staff training records and interviewed key employees. The team also reviewed the electronic health records of 50 outpatients who had a positive MST screen from July 1, 2017, through June 30, 2018. The OIG evaluated the following performance indicators:

- Designated facility MST coordinator
 - Establishes and monitors MST-related staff training
 - Establishes and monitors informational outreach
 - Communicates MST-related issues, services, and initiatives with local leaders
- Evidence of tracking MST-related data
- Provision of clinical care
 - Referral for MST-related care to patients with positive MST screens
 - Initial evaluation within 24 hours of referral for mental health services
 - Comprehensive diagnostic and treatment planning evaluation within 30 days of referral for mental health services
- Completion of MST mandatory training requirement for mental health and primary care providers

Mental Health Conclusion

Generally, the OIG found compliance with many of the performance indicators, including the designation of an MST coordinator, tracking of MST-related data, and provision of clinical care. There was a concern noted, however, with completion of MST mandatory training for mental health and primary care providers that warranted a recommendation for improvement.

Specifically, VHA requires that all mental health and primary care providers complete MST mandatory training; for those hired after July 1, 2012, this training must be completed no later

⁸⁵ VHA Directive 1115.01, *Military Sexual Trauma (MST) Mandatory Training and Reporting Requirements for VHA Mental Health and Primary Care Providers*, April 14, 2017; Acting Deputy Under Secretary for Health for Operations and Management, *Compliance with Military Sexual Trauma (MST) Mandatory Training for Mental Health and Primary Care Providers*, February 2, 2016.

than 90 days after assuming their position.⁸⁶ The OIG found that 7 of 11 providers hired after July 1, 2012, did not complete the required training within 90 days. This could potentially result in clinicians providing counseling, care, and service without the required MST training. The MST coordinator cited an ineffective monitoring process as the reason for noncompliance.

Recommendation 4

4. The facility director confirms providers complete military sexual trauma mandatory training no later than 90 days after assuming their position and monitors providers' compliance.

Facility concurred.

Target date for completion: February 3, 2020

Facility response: Military Sexual Trauma Coordinator, Mental Health Program/Management Analysis and Talent Management System Domain Manager will coordinate an audit of all new employees, assessing documentation of new employee Military Sexual Trauma training no later than 90 days after assuming their position. Compliance standard is 90% compliance maintained for six consecutive months. The Mental Health Program/Management Analysis will report compliance monthly to the Accreditation Committee. The Accreditation Committee reports to Quality, Safety, Value, Board which is Co-chaired by the Medical Center Director.

⁸⁶ VHA Directive 1115.01; Acting Deputy Under Secretary for Health for Operations and Management Memorandum, *Compliance with Military Sexual Trauma (MST) Mandatory Training for Mental Health and Primary Care Providers* (VAIQ 7663786), February 2, 2016.

Geriatric Care: Antidepressant Use among the Elderly

VA's National Registry for Depression reported that "11 [percent] of veterans aged 65 years and older have a diagnosis of major depressive disorder."⁸⁷ The VA/DoD Clinical Practice Guideline (CPG) describes depression as "a common mental disorder that presents with depressed mood, loss of interest or pleasure in regular activities, decreased energy, feelings of guilt or low self-worth, disturbed sleep or appetite, and poor concentration." This can lead to poor quality of life, decreased productivity, and increased mortality from suicide.⁸⁸

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, older adults are at increased risk for experiencing depression because "80 [percent] of older adults have at least one chronic health condition and 50 [percent] have two or more." Further, "most older adults see an improvement in [their] symptoms when treated with antidepressant drugs, psychotherapy, or a combination of both."⁸⁹

The American Geriatrics Society revised the Beers Criteria in 2015 to include lists of potentially inappropriate medications to be avoided. Potentially inappropriate medication use in older adults continues to be associated with confusion, falls, and mortality.⁹⁰ The criteria provide guidelines that help to improve the safety of prescribing certain medications including antidepressants for older adults.

TJC requires clinicians to educate patients and families about the "safe and effective use of medications."⁹¹ In 2015, VHA outlined essential medical information "necessary for review, management, and communication of medication information" with patients, caregivers, and their healthcare teams.⁹² Further, TJC requires clinicians to perform medication reconciliation by comparing the medication a patient is actually taking to the new medications that are ordered for the patient and resolving any discrepancies.⁹³ The CPG recommends that clinicians monitor patients monthly after therapy initiation or a change in treatment until the patient achieves

⁸⁷ Hans Peterson, "Late Life Depression," *U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs*, Mental Health Featured Article, March 1, 2011. https://www.mentalhealth.va.gov/featureArticle_Mar11LateLife.asp. (The website was accessed on March 8, 2019.)

⁸⁸ *VA/DoD Clinical Practice Guideline for the Management of Major Depressive Disorder*, April 2016. <https://www.healthquality.va.gov/guidelines/MH/mdd/VADoDMDDCPGFINAL82916.pdf>. (The website was accessed November 20, 2018.)

⁸⁹ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, "Depression is Not a Normal Part of Growing Older," January 31, 2017. <https://www.cdc.gov/aging/mentalhealth/depression.htm>. (The website was accessed on March 8, 2019.)

⁹⁰ American Geriatrics Society 2015 Beers Criteria Update Expert Panel, "American Geriatrics Society 2015 Updated Beers Criteria for Potentially Inappropriate Medication Use in Older Adults." http://www.sgot.org/allegato_docs/1057_Beers-Criteria.pdf. (The website was accessed on March 22, 2018.)

⁹¹ TJC. Provision of Care, Treatment, and Services standard PC.02.03.01.

⁹² VHA Directive 1164, *Essential Medication Information Standards*, June 26, 2015.

⁹³ TJC. National Patient Safety Goal standard NPSG.03.06.01.

remission. Monitoring includes assessment of symptoms, adherence to medication and psychotherapy, and any adverse effects. The CPG also recommends that treatment planning includes patient education about treatment options, including risks and benefits.⁹⁴

To determine whether the facility complied with requirements concerning use of antidepressants among the elderly, the OIG inspection team interviewed key employees and managers. The team also reviewed the electronic health records of 43 randomly selected patients, ages 65 and older, who were newly prescribed one of seven selected antidepressant medications from July 1, 2017, through June 30, 2018.⁹⁵ The OIG evaluated the following performance indicators:

- Justification for medication initiation
- Evidence of patient and/or caregiver education specific to the medication prescribed
- Clinician evaluation of patient and/or caregiver understanding of the education provided
- Medication reconciliation

Geriatric Care Conclusion

Generally, the OIG found compliance with providers justifying the reason for medication initiation. However, the OIG identified inadequate performance of patient and/or caregiver education as it related to newly prescribed medications, evaluation of patient/caregiver understanding when education was provided, and medication reconciliation, which warranted recommendations for improvement.

Specifically, TJC requires that clinicians educate patients and families about safe and effective use of medications.⁹⁶ The OIG estimated that clinicians provided this education to 70 percent of the patients at the facility, based on the electronic health records reviewed.⁹⁷ In addition, OIG estimated that clinicians assessed understanding of education provided to 60 percent of facility patients, based on records reviewed.⁹⁸ Providing medication education and assessing for understanding of education provided are critical to ensuring that patients or their caregivers have the information they need to manage their health at home. Service chiefs reported providers were providing education but could not demonstrate evidence that this was done. Additionally, the

⁹⁴ VA/DoD Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Management of Major Depressive Disorder.

⁹⁵ The seven selected antidepressant medications are Amitriptyline, Clomipramine, Desipramine, Doxepin (>6mg/day), Imipramine, Nortriptyline, and Paroxetine.

⁹⁶ TJC. Provision of Care standard PC.02.03.01 EP10.

⁹⁷ The OIG is 95 percent confident that the true compliance rate is somewhere between 55.6 and 83.3 percent, which is statistically significantly below the 90 percent benchmark.

⁹⁸ The OIG is 95 percent confident that the true compliance rate is somewhere between 42.0 and 77.5 percent, which is statistically significantly below the 90 percent benchmark.

service chiefs cited the current clinical reminder did not have pre-populated education language and is currently being revised.

Recommendation 5

5. The chief of staff ensures that clinicians provide and document patient/caregiver education about the safe and effective use of newly prescribed medications and assess understanding of the education provided and monitors clinicians' compliance.

Facility concurred.

Target date for completion: July 31, 2020

Facility response: The facility implemented a new process: All the tricyclic antidepressants and paroxetine are prescribed through use of a progress note template and order-set combination. This order set leads the provider through a decision tree that forces the provider to address risk and benefit, patient education and understanding. The decision tree will also monitor effectiveness of patient education and assures follow-up appointments are placed within 30 days of the first prescribing. The decision tree also requires the provider to perform medication reconciliation during the initial prescribing session. Pharmacy Service will conduct random monthly audits until 90% compliance is maintained for six consecutive months. The Chief of Pharmacy or designee will report monthly compliance to the Clinical Executive Board. The Clinical Executive Board is chaired by the Chief of Staff.

According to TJC, "In medication reconciliation, a clinician compares the medications a patient should be using (and is actually using) to the new medications that are ordered for the patient and resolves any discrepancies."⁹⁹ The OIG estimated that medication reconciliation was performed for 72 percent of facility patients, based on the electronic health records reviewed.¹⁰⁰ Failure to maintain and communicate accurate patient medication information and reconcile medications increases the risk for duplications, omissions, and interactions in the patient's actual drug regimen. Service chiefs reported that specialty clinic providers and resident staff had not consistently used the medication reconciliation template. Additionally, service chiefs informed the OIG that a national clinical reminder was under development.

Recommendation 6

6. The chief of staff ensures clinicians reconcile medication information and maintain and communicate accurate patient medication information in patients' electronic health records and monitors the clinicians' compliance.

⁹⁹ TJC. National Patient Safety Goal standard NPSG.03.06.01.

¹⁰⁰ The OIG is 95 percent confident that the true compliance rate is somewhere between 58.2 and 85.1 percent, which is statistically significantly below the 90 percent benchmark.

Facility concurred.

Target date for completion: July 31, 2020

Facility response: The facility implemented a new process: All the tricyclic antidepressants and paroxetine are prescribed through use of a progress note template and order-set combination. This order set leads the provider through a decision tree that forces the provider to address risk and benefit, patient education and understanding. The decision tree will also monitor effectiveness of patient education and assures follow-up appointments are placed within 30 days of the first prescribing. The decision tree also requires the provider to perform medication reconciliation during the initial prescribing session. Pharmacy Service will conduct random monthly audits until 90% compliance is maintained for six consecutive months. The Chief of Pharmacy or designee will report monthly compliance to the Clinical Executive Board. The Clinical Executive Board is chaired by the Chief of Staff.

Women's Health: Abnormal Cervical Pathology Results Notification and Follow-Up

Each year, about 12,000 women in the United States are diagnosed with cervical cancer.¹⁰¹ Human papillomavirus (HPV) can be transmitted during sexual contact and is the main cause of cervical cancer.¹⁰² In addition to HPV infection, other risk factors for cervical cancer include smoking, human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection, use of oral contraceptives for five or more years, and having given birth to three or more children.¹⁰³ Cervical cancer is highly preventable through diligent screening and vaccination efforts. With early detection, it is very treatable and associated with optimal patient outcomes.¹⁰⁴

VA is authorized to provide “gender-specific services, such as Papanicolaou tests (Pap smears),” to eligible women veterans. Further, VHA requires that all eligible and enrolled women veterans have access to appropriate services and preventative care. That care would include age-appropriate screening for cervical cancer.¹⁰⁵

VHA requires that each facility have a “full-time Women Veterans Program Manager (WVPM) to execute comprehensive planning for women’s health care.” VHA also requires a medical director or clinical champion to be responsible for the clinical oversight of the women’s health program. Each facility must also have a “Women Veterans Health Committee (WVHC) comprised of appropriate facility leadership and program directors, which develops and implements a Women’s Health Program strategic plan.” The Women Veterans Health Committee must meet at least quarterly and report to the executive leaders. The facility must also have a process to ensure the collecting and tracking of data related to cervical cancer screenings.¹⁰⁶

VHA has established time frames for notifying patients of abnormal cervical pathology results. Abnormal cervical pathology results must be communicated to patients within seven calendar days from the date the results are available to the ordering provider. Communication of the

¹⁰¹ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. “Cervical Cancer” *Inside Knowledge* fact sheet, December 2016. https://www.cdc.gov/cancer/cervical/pdf/cervical_facts.pdf. (The website was accessed on February 28, 2018.)

¹⁰² Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Basic Information About Cervical Cancer*. February 13, 2017. https://www.cdc.gov/cancer/cervical/basic_info/index.htm. (The website was accessed on March 8, 2019.)

¹⁰³ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *What Are the Risk Factors for Cervical Cancer?* February 13, 2017. https://www.cdc.gov/cancer/cervical/basic_info/risk_factors.htm. (The website was accessed on March 8, 2019.)

¹⁰⁴ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Basic Information About Cervical Cancer*. February 13, 2017. https://www.cdc.gov/cancer/cervical/basic_info/index.htm. (The website was accessed on March 8, 2019.)

¹⁰⁵ VHA Directive 1330.01(2), *Health Care Services for Women Veterans*, February 15, 2017 (amended July 24, 2018).

¹⁰⁶ VHA Directive 1330.01(2).

results to patients must be documented. The facility must ensure that appropriate follow-up care is provided to patients with abnormal results.¹⁰⁷

To determine whether the facility complied with selected VHA requirements for the notification and follow-up care of abnormal cervical pathology results, the OIG inspection team reviewed relevant documents and interviewed selected employees and managers. The team also reviewed the electronic health records of 64 women veteran patients, between ages 21 and 65, who had an abnormal pap smear or test from July 1, 2017, through June 30, 2018. The OIG evaluated the following performance indicators:

- Appointment of a women veterans program manager
- Appointment of a women's health medical director or clinical champion
- Facility Women Veterans Health Committee
 - Core membership
 - Quarterly meetings
 - Reports to clinical executive leaders
- Collection and tracking of cervical cancer screening data
 - Notification of patients due for screening
 - Completed screenings
 - Results reporting
 - Follow-up care
- Communication of abnormal results to patients within required time frame
- Provision of follow-up care for abnormal cervical pathology results, if indicated

Women's Health Conclusion

Generally, the facility met requirements with most of the above performance indicators. However, the OIG noted a concern that the Women Veterans Health Committee lacked pharmacy and Quality Management representation.

Specifically, VHA requires that the core membership of the Women Veterans Health Committee includes a women veterans program manager, a women's health medical director, "representatives from primary care, mental health, medical and/or surgical subspecialties, gynecology, pharmacy, social work and care management, nursing, ED [emergency department],

¹⁰⁷ VHA Directive 1330.01(2).

radiology, laboratory, quality management, business office/Non-VA Medical Care, and a member from executive leadership.¹⁰⁸ For the August, October, and December 2018 Women Veterans Health Committee meetings, the committee lacked pharmacy and Quality Management representation. This resulted in a lack of expertise in the review and analysis of data as the committee planned and carried out improvements for quality and equitable care for women veterans.¹⁰⁹ The women veterans program manager reported the general reason for noncompliance was due to scheduling conflicts which resulted in a lack of representation.

Recommendation 7

7. The facility director confirms that the Women Veterans Health Committee includes required core members and monitors committee's compliance.

Facility concurred.

Target date for completion: July 31, 2020

Facility response: The Women Veterans' Health Committee Charter has been updated to reflect the exact wording of 1330.01 requirements for core members as indicated in Veteran Health Administration (VHA) Directive 1330.01, "VHA Services for Women Veterans."

The Women Veterans' Program Manager will report The Women Veterans' Health Committee minutes, including attendance lists, to the Council of Chiefs Committee. Monitoring of required core committee member attendance will occur for six consecutive months, with a compliance rate of 90%. Deficiencies in attendance will be addressed at the Council of Chiefs Committee and reported to the Director in Governance Council.

¹⁰⁸ VHA Directive 1330.01(2).

¹⁰⁹ VHA Directive 1330.01(2).

High-Risk Processes: Operations and Management of Emergency Departments and Urgent Care Centers

VHA defines an emergency department as a “unit in a VA medical facility that has acute care medical and/or surgical inpatient beds and whose primary responsibility is to provide resuscitative therapy and stabilization in life-threatening situations.” An urgent care center (UCC) “provides acute medical care for patients without a scheduled appointment who are in need of immediate attention for an acute medical or mental health illness and/or minor injuries.”¹¹⁰ A variety of emergency services may exist, dependent on “capability, capacity, and function of the local VA medical facility;” however, emergency care must be uniformly available in all VHA emergency departments and UCCs.¹¹¹

Because the emergency department or UCC is often the first point of contact for patients seeking treatment of unexpected medical issues, a care delivery system with appropriate resources and services must be available to deliver prompt, safe, and appropriate care. VHA requires that each emergency department provide “unrestricted access to appropriate and timely emergency medical and nursing care 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.” VHA UCCs are also required to provide access and timely care during established operational hours. VHA also requires that “evaluation, management, and treatment [are] provided by qualified personnel with the knowledge and skills appropriate to treat those seeking emergency care.”¹¹²

TJC noted that patient flow problems pose a persistent risk to quality and safety and established standards for the management of the flow of patients in the emergency department and the rest of the hospital. Managing the flow of patients prevents overcrowding, which can “undermine the timeliness of care and, ultimately, patient safety.” Effective management processes that “support patient flow [in the emergency department or UCC settings] (such as admitting, assessment and treatment, patient transfer, and discharge) can minimize delays in the delivery of care.”¹¹³

The VHA national director of Emergency Medicine developed the Emergency Medicine Improvement initiative to improve the quality of emergent and urgent care provided through VA emergency departments and UCCs. As part of this initiative, all VA emergency departments and UCCs must use the Emergency Department Integration Software (EDIS) tracking program to document and manage the flow of patients.¹¹⁴

¹¹⁰ VHA Directive 1101.05(2), *Emergency Medicine*, September 2, 2016 (amended March 7, 2017).

¹¹¹ VHA Directive 1101.05(2).

¹¹² VHA Directive 1101.05(2).

¹¹³ TJC. Leadership standard LD.04.03.11.

¹¹⁴ VHA Directive 1101.05(2); The Emergency Medicine Management Tool (EMMT) uses data collected from EDIS to generate productivity metrics. The use of EDIS and EMMT are key tools in accomplishing Emergency Medicine Improvement initiative goals.

VA emergency departments and UCCs must also be designed to promote a safe environment of care.¹¹⁵ Managers must ensure medications are securely stored,¹¹⁶ a psychiatric intervention room is available,¹¹⁷ and equipment and supplies are readily accessible to provide gynecologic and resuscitation services. VHA also requires emergency departments to have communication systems available to accept requests by local emergency medical services for transporting unstable patients to VA emergency departments.¹¹⁸

The OIG examined the clinical risks of the emergency department/UCC areas by evaluating the staffing; the provision of care, including selected aspects of mental health and women's health; and the reduction of patient safety risks to optimize quality care and outcomes in those areas. In addition to conducting manager and staff interviews, the OIG team reviewed emergency department staffing schedules, committee minutes, and other relevant documents. The OIG evaluated the following performance indicators:

- General
 - Presence of an emergency department or UCC
 - Availability of acute care medical and/or surgical inpatient beds in facilities with emergency departments
 - Emergency department/UCC operating hours
 - Workload capture process
- Staffing for emergency department/UCC
 - Dedicated medical director
 - At least one licensed physician privileged to staff the department at all times
 - Minimum of two registered nurses on duty during all hours of operation
 - Backup call schedules for providers
- Support services for emergency department/UCC
 - Access during regular hours, off hours, weekends, and holidays
 - On-call list for staff required to respond
 - Licensed independent mental health provider available as required for the facility's complexity level

¹¹⁵ VHA Directive 1101.05(2).

¹¹⁶ TJC. Medication Management standard MM.03.01.01.

¹¹⁷ A psychiatric intervention room is where individuals experiencing a behavioral health crisis, including serious disturbances, agitation, or intoxication may be taken immediately on arrival.

¹¹⁸ VHA Directive 1101.05(2).

- Telephone message system during non-operational hours
- Inpatient provider available for patients requiring admission
- Patient flow
 - EDIS tracking program
 - Emergency department patient flow evaluation
 - Diversion policy
 - Designated bed flow coordinator
- General safety
 - Directional signage to after-hours emergency care
 - Fast tracks¹¹⁹
- Medication security and labeling
- Management of patients with mental health disorders
- Emergency department participation in local/regional emergency medical services (EMS) system, if applicable
- Women veteran services
 - Capability and equipment for gynecologic examinations
- Life support equipment

High-Risk Processes Conclusion

Generally, the facility complied with the above performance indicators. The OIG made no recommendations.

¹¹⁹ The emergency department fast track is a designated care area within the emergency department domain where lower acuity patients are assessed and treated.

Appendix A: Summary Table of Comprehensive Healthcare Inspection Findings

The intent is for facility leaders to use these recommendations as a road map to help improve operations and clinical care. The recommendations address systems issues as well as other less-critical findings that, if left unattended, may potentially interfere with the delivery of quality health care.

Healthcare Processes	Performance Indicators	Conclusion
Leadership and Organizational Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive leadership position stability and engagement Employee satisfaction Patient experience Accreditation and/or for-cause surveys and oversight inspections Factors related to possible lapses in care VHA performance data 	Seven OIG recommendations ranging from documentation concerns to noncompliance that can lead to patient and staff safety issues or adverse events are attributable to the director and chief of staff. See details below.

Healthcare Processes	Performance Indicators	Critical Recommendations for Improvement	Recommendations for Improvement
Quality, Safety, and Value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protected peer reviews UM reviews Patient safety Resuscitation episode review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
Medical Staff Privileging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Privileging FPPEs OPPEs FPPEs for cause Reporting of privileging actions to National Practitioner Data Bank 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service chiefs include service-specific criteria for ongoing professional practice evaluations. Service chiefs clearly define and share in advance the expectations, outcomes, and time limits for focused professional practice evaluations for cause with providers.

Healthcare Processes	Performance Indicators	Critical Recommendations for Improvement	Recommendations for Improvement
Environment of Care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parent facility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ General safety ○ Environmental cleanliness and infection prevention ○ General privacy ○ Women veterans program ○ Availability of medical equipment and supplies • Community based outpatient clinic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ General safety ○ Environmental cleanliness and infection prevention ○ General privacy ○ Women veterans program ○ Availability of medical equipment and supplies • Locked inpatient mental health unit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mental health environment of care rounds ○ Nursing station security ○ Public area and general unit safety ○ Patient room safety ○ Infection prevention ○ Availability of medical equipment and supplies • Emergency management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Hazard vulnerability analysis (HVA) ○ Emergency operations Plan (EOP) ○ Emergency power testing and availability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None

Healthcare Processes	Performance Indicators	Critical Recommendations for Improvement	Recommendations for Improvement
Medication Management: Controlled Substances Inspections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Controlled substances coordinator reports Pharmacy operations Controlled substances inspector requirements Controlled substances area inspections Pharmacy inspections Facility review of override reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pharmacy or nursing staff complete the review of automatic dispensing cabinets' override reports.
Mental Health: Military Sexual Trauma (MST) Follow-Up and Staff Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated facility MST coordinator Evidence of tracking MST-related data Provision of clinical care Completion of MST mandatory training requirement for mental health and primary care providers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providers complete MST mandatory training requirements no later than 90 days after assuming their position.
Geriatric Care: Antidepressant Use among the Elderly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Justification for medication initiation Evidence of patient and/or caregiver education specific to the medication prescribed Clinician evaluation of patient and/or caregiver understanding of the education provided Medication reconciliation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clinicians provide and document patient/caregiver education about the safe and effective use of newly prescribed medications and assess understanding of education provided. Clinicians reconcile medication information and maintain and communicate accurate patient medication information in patients' electronic health records.
Women's Health: Abnormal Cervical Pathology Results Notification and Follow-Up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appointment of a women veterans program manager Appointment of a women's health medical director or clinical champion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Women Veterans Health Committee includes required core members.

Healthcare Processes	Performance Indicators	Critical Recommendations for Improvement	Recommendations for Improvement
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facility Women Veterans Health Committee • Collection and tracking of cervical cancer screening data • Communication of abnormal results to patients within required time frame • Provision of follow-up care for abnormal cervical pathology results, if indicated 		
High-Risk Processes: Operations and Management of Emergency Departments and UCCs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General • Staffing for emergency department/UCC • Support services for emergency department/UCC • Patient flow • General safety • Medication security and labeling • Management of patients with mental health disorders • Emergency department participation in local/regional EMS system • Women veteran services • Life support equipment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None

Appendix B: Facility Profile and VA Outpatient Clinic Profiles

Facility Profile

The table below provides general background information for this highest complexity (1a) affiliated¹²⁰ facility reporting to VISN 8.¹²¹

**Table B.1. Facility Profile for James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital (673)
(October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2018)**

Profile Element	Facility Data FY 2016 ¹²²	Facility Data FY 2017 ¹²³	Facility Data FY 2018 ¹²⁴
Total medical care budget dollars	\$935,802,950	\$976,244,333	\$1,032,304,203
Number of:			
• Unique patients	93,460	94,839	97,045
• Outpatient visits	1,288,849	1,330,542	1,424,039
• Unique employees ¹²⁵	4,309	4,414	4,573
Type and number of operating beds:			
• Community living center	64	64	64
• Domiciliary	33	33	33
• Medicine	134	134	134
• Mental health	40	40	40
• Neurology	2	2	2
• Rehabilitation medicine	66	66	66
• Spinal cord injury	100	100	100
• Surgery	60	60	60
Average daily census:			
• Community living center	54	60	54

¹²⁰ Associated with a medical residency program.

¹²¹ The VHA medical centers are classified according to a facility complexity model; a designation of “1a” indicates a facility with “high volume, high risk patients, most complex clinical programs, and large research and teaching programs.”

¹²² October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2016.

¹²³ October 1, 2016, through September 30, 2017.

¹²⁴ October 1, 2017, through September 30, 2018.

¹²⁵ Unique employees involved in direct medical care (cost center 8200).

Profile Element	Facility Data FY 2016 ¹²²	Facility Data FY 2017 ¹²³	Facility Data FY 2018 ¹²⁴
• Domiciliary	28	24	23
• Medicine	100	98	104
• Mental health	29	34	34
• Neurology	2	3	3
• Rehabilitation medicine	49	52	52
• Spinal cord injury	81	91	88
• Surgery	33	28	25

Source: VHA Support Service Center, and VA Corporate Data Warehouse

Note: The OIG did not assess VA's data for accuracy or completeness.

VA Outpatient Clinic Profiles¹²⁶

The VA outpatient clinics in communities within the catchment area of the facility provide primary care integrated with women's health, mental health, and telehealth services. Some also provide specialty care, diagnostic, and ancillary services. Table B.2. provides information relative to each of the clinics.

Table B.2. VA Outpatient Clinic Workload/Encounters and Specialty Care, Diagnostic, and Ancillary Services Provided (October 1, 2017, through September 30, 2018)¹²⁷

Location	Station No.	Primary Care Workload/ Encounters	Mental Health Workload/ Encounters	Specialty Care Services ¹²⁸ Provided	Diagnostic Services ¹²⁹ Provided	Ancillary Services ¹³⁰ Provided
Brooksville, FL	673GC	13,581	6,336	Dermatology Endocrinology Gastroenterology Infectious disease Nephrology Podiatry Vascular	EKG	Pharmacy Prosthetics Social work Weight management Nutrition

¹²⁶ Includes all outpatient clinics in the community that were in operation as of August 15, 2018. The OIG omitted Deer Park, FL (673QD); Highway Nineteen, FL (673QE); and Bruce B. Downs Boulevard, FL (673QH), as no data were reported.

¹²⁷ The definition of an "encounter" can be found in VHA Directive 2010-049, *Encounter and Workload Capture for Therapeutic and Supported Employment Services Vocational Programs*, October 14, 2010. (This directive expired on October 31, 2015, and has not been updated.) An encounter is a "professional contact between a patient and a practitioner vested with responsibility for diagnosing, evaluating, and treating the patient's condition."

¹²⁸ Specialty care services refer to non-primary care and non-mental health services provided by a physician.

¹²⁹ Diagnostic services include electrocardiogram (EKG), electromyography (EMG), laboratory, nuclear medicine, radiology, and vascular lab services.

¹³⁰ Ancillary services include chiropractic, dental, nutrition, pharmacy, prosthetic, social work, and weight management services.

Location	Station No.	Primary Care Workload/ Encounters	Mental Health Workload/ Encounters	Specialty Care Services ¹²⁸ Provided	Diagnostic Services ¹²⁹ Provided	Ancillary Services ¹³⁰ Provided
New Port Richey, FL	673BZ	35,425	9,920	Cardiology Dermatology Endocrinology Gastroenterology Infectious disease Nephrology Pulmonary/ Respiratory disease Poly-trauma Plastic Podiatry	EKG Laboratory & pathology Radiology	Pharmacy Prosthetics Social work Weight management Nutrition
Lakeland, FL	673GB	18,442	5	Rheumatology	EKG	Nutrition Pharmacy Weight management
Zephyrhills, FL	673GF	6,811	n/a	Dermatology Endocrinology Vascular	EKG	Pharmacy Weight management
Tampa, FL	673QA	n/a	1,904	Eye	n/a	Dental
Tampa, FL	673QB	n/a	48,923	Eye	n/a	Pharmacy
Lakeland, FL	673QC	n/a	11,292	Dermatology Endocrinology Infectious disease Nephrology Plastic Podiatry Vascular	Radiology	Nutrition Prosthetics Weight management


Location	Station No.	Primary Care Workload/ Encounters	Mental Health Workload/ Encounters	Specialty Care Services ¹²⁸ Provided	Diagnostic Services ¹²⁹ Provided	Ancillary Services ¹³⁰ Provided
Tampa, FL	673QF	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
New Port Richey, FL	673QG	n/a	4,824	n/a	n/a	n/a
Zephyrhills, FL	673QI	80	3,092	n/a	n/a	Nutrition
Tampa, FL	673QJ	48,615	10,309	Dermatology General surgery GYN Podiatry	EKG	Nutrition Pharmacy Prosthetics Social work Weight management Dental

Source: VHA Support Service Center and VA Corporate Data Warehouse

Note: The OIG did not assess VA's data for accuracy or completeness.

n/a = not applicable

Appendix C: Patient Aligned Care Team Compass Metrics¹³¹




Source: VHA Support Service Center

Note: The OIG did not assess VA's data for accuracy or completeness. The OIG omitted Forty Sixth Street North, FL (673QA); Forty Sixth Street South, FL (673QB); West Lakeland, FL (673QC); Deer Park, FL (673QD); Highway Nineteen, FL (673QE); Winners Circle, FL (673QF); Little Road, FL (673QG); Bruce B. Downs Boulevard, FL (673QH); and Medical View Lane, FL (673QI), as no data were reported.

Data Definition: "The average number of calendar days between a New Patient's Primary Care completed appointment (clinic stops 322, 323, and 350, excluding [Compensation and Pension] appointments) and the earliest of [three] possible preferred (desired) dates (Electronic Wait List (EWL), Cancelled by Clinic Appointment, Completed Appointment) from the completed appointment date." Note that prior to FY15, this metric was calculated using the earliest possible create date." The absence of reported data are indicated by "n/a."

¹³¹ Department of Veterans Affairs, "Patient Aligned Care Teams Compass Data Definitions," accessed September 13, 2018.

Quarterly Established Primary Care Patient Average Wait Time in Days



	VHA Total	(673) Tampa, FL (James A. Haley)	(673BZ) New Port Richey, FL	(673GB) Lakeland, FL	(673GC) Brooksville, FL	(673GF) Zephyrhills, FL	(673QI) Medical View Lane, FL	(673QJ) Hidden River, FL
JAN-FY18	4.4	2.0	2.0	3.4	2.8	2.5	0.1	3.4
FEB-FY18	4.0	2.2	1.3	2.4	2.0	1.6	0.0	2.6
MAR-FY18	4.2	2.4	1.3	3.0	2.6	3.5	0.0	2.9
APR-FY18	4.3	2.7	1.8	3.8	2.5	1.1	0.0	2.5
MAY-FY18	4.3	2.7	1.5	2.4	2.3	2.4	0.0	2.3
JUN-FY18	4.4	3.5	2.0	2.3	8.6	2.9	0.0	2.5
JUL-FY18	4.7	2.8	1.8	3.0	3.3	3.4	n/a	3.3
AUG-FY18	4.6	3.1	1.8	4.8	7.8	3.0	n/a	3.7
SEP-FY18	4.4	3.4	1.9	3.3	2.7	2.9	n/a	3.6
OCT-FY19	4.0	3.3	2.7	2.7	2.3	3.2	n/a	3.3
NOV-FY19	4.4	3.8	2.6	3.4	3.1	1.8	n/a	3.2
DEC-FY19	4.4	3.7	2.2	3.5	4.3	2.0	n/a	3.7

Source: VHA Support Service Center

Note: The OIG did not assess VA's data for accuracy or completeness. The OIG omitted Forty Sixth Street North, FL (673QA); Forty Sixth Street South, FL (673QB); West Lakeland, FL (673QC); Deer Park, FL (673QD); Highway Nineteen, FL (673QE); Winners Circle, FL (673QF); Little Road, FL (673QG); and Bruce B. Downs Boulevard, FL (673QH), as no data was reported.

Data Definition: "The average number of calendar days between an Established Patient's Primary Care completed appointment (clinic stops 322, 323, and 350, excluding [Compensation and Pension] appointments) and the earliest of [three] possible preferred (desired) dates (Electronic Wait List (EWL), Cancelled by Clinic Appointment, Completed Appointment) from the completed appointment date." The absence of reported data are indicated by "n/a."

Appendix D: Strategic Analytics for Improvement and Learning (SAIL) Metric Definitions¹³²

Measure	Definition	Desired Direction
ACSC Hospitalization	Ambulatory Care Sensitive Conditions Hospitalizations	A lower value is better than a higher value
Adjusted LOS	Acute care risk adjusted length of stay	A lower value is better than a higher value
Admit Reviews Met	Percent acute Admission Reviews that meet InterQual criteria	A higher value is better than a lower value
APP Capacity	Advanced Practice Provider Capacity	A lower value is better than a higher value
Best Place to Work	All Employee Survey Best Places to Work score	A higher value is better than a lower value
Call Responsiveness	Call center speed in picking up calls and telephone abandonment rate	A lower value is better than a higher value
Care Transition	Care Transition (Inpatient)	A higher value is better than a lower value
Complications	Acute care risk adjusted complication ratio (observed to expected ratio)	A lower value is better than a higher value
Comprehensiveness	Comprehensiveness (PCMH)	A higher value is better than a lower value
Cont Stay Reviews Met	Percent acute Continued Stay reviews that meet InterQual criteria	A higher value is better than a lower value
Efficiency	Overall efficiency measured as 1 divided by SFA (Stochastic Frontier Analysis)	A higher value is better than a lower value
Efficiency/Capacity	Efficiency and Physician Capacity	A higher value is better than a lower value
Employee Satisfaction	Overall satisfaction with job	A higher value is better than a lower value
HC Assoc Infections	Health care associated infections	A lower value is better than a higher value

¹³² VHA Support Service Center (VSSC), *Strategic Analytics for Improvement and Learning (SAIL)* (last updated December 26, 2018). <http://vaww.vssc.med.va.gov/VSSCEnhancedProductManagement/DisplayDocument.aspx?DocumentID=8938>. (The website was accessed on March 7, 2019, but is not accessible by the public.)

Measure	Definition	Desired Direction
HEDIS Like	Outpatient performance measure (HEDIS)	A higher value is better than a lower value
HEDIS Like – HED90_1	HEDIS-EPRP Based PRV TOB BHS	A higher value is better than a lower value
HEDIS Like – HED90_ec	HEDIS-eOM Based DM IHD	A higher value is better than a lower value
MH Wait Time	Mental health care wait time for new patient completed appointments within 30 days of preferred date	A higher value is better than a lower value
MH Continuity Care	Mental health continuity of care (FY14Q3 and later)	A higher value is better than a lower value
MH Exp of Care	Mental health experience of care (FY14Q3 and later)	A higher value is better than a lower value
MH Popu Coverage	Mental health population coverage (FY14Q3 and later)	A higher value is better than a lower value
Oryx	ORYX	A higher value is better than a lower value
PC Routine Care Appt	Timeliness in getting a PC routine care appointment (PCMH)	A higher value is better than a lower value
PC Urgent Care Appt	Timeliness in getting a PC urgent care appointment (PCMH)	A higher value is better than a lower value
PCMH Care Coordination	PCMH Care Coordination	A higher value is better than a lower value
PCMH Same Day Appt	Days waited for appointment when needed care right away (PCMH)	A higher value is better than a lower value
PCMH Survey Access	Timely Appointment, care and information (PCMH)	A higher value is better than a lower value
Physician Capacity	Physician Capacity	A lower value is better than a higher value
PC Wait Time	PC wait time for new patient completed appointments within 30 days of preferred date	A higher value is better than a lower value
PSI	Patient safety indicator (observed to expected ratio)	A lower value is better than a higher value
Rating Hospital	Overall rating of hospital stays (inpatient only)	A higher value is better than a lower value

Measure	Definition	Desired Direction
Rating PC Provider	Rating of PC providers (PCMH)	A higher value is better than a lower value
Rating SC Provider	Rating of specialty care providers (Specialty Care)	A higher value is better than a lower value
RN Turnover	Registered nurse turnover rate	A lower value is better than a higher value
RSMR-AMI	30-day risk standardized mortality rate for acute myocardial infarction	A lower value is better than a higher value
RSMR-CHF	30-day risk standardized mortality rate for congestive heart failure	A lower value is better than a higher value
RSMR-COPD	30-day risk standardized mortality rate for COPD	A lower value is better than a higher value
RSMR-Pneumonia	30-day risk standardized mortality rate for pneumonia	A lower value is better than a higher value
RSRR-AMI	30-day risk standardized readmission rate for acute myocardial infarction	A lower value is better than a higher value
RSRR-Cardio	30-day risk standardized readmission rate for cardiorespiratory patient cohort	A lower value is better than a higher value
RSRR-CHF	30-day risk standardized readmission rate for congestive heart failure	A lower value is better than a higher value
RSRR-COPD	30-day risk standardized readmission rate for COPD	A lower value is better than a higher value
RSRR-CV	30-day risk standardized readmission rate for cardiovascular patient cohort	A lower value is better than a higher value
RSRR-HWR	Hospital wide readmission	A lower value is better than a higher value
RSRR-Med	30-day risk standardized readmission rate for medicine patient cohort	A lower value is better than a higher value
RSRR-Neuro	30-day risk standardized readmission rate for neurology patient cohort	A lower value is better than a higher value
RSRR-Pneumonia	30-day risk standardized readmission rate for pneumonia	A lower value is better than a higher value
RSRR-Surg	30-day risk standardized readmission rate for surgery patient cohort	A lower value is better than a higher value
SC Care Coordination	SC (specialty care) Care Coordination	A higher value is better than a lower value

Measure	Definition	Desired Direction
SC Routine Care Appt	Timeliness in getting a SC routine care appointment (Specialty Care)	A higher value is better than a lower value
SC Survey Access	Timely Appointment, care and information (Specialty Care)	A higher value is better than a lower value
SC Urgent Care Appt	Timeliness in getting a SC urgent care appointment (Specialty Care)	A higher value is better than a lower value
Seconds Pick Up Calls	Average speed of call center responded to calls in seconds	A lower value is better than a higher value
SMR	Acute care in-hospital standardized mortality ratio	A lower value is better than a higher value
SMR30	Acute care 30-day standardized mortality ratio	A lower value is better than a higher value
Specialty Care Wait Time	Specialty care wait time for new patient completed appointments within 30 days of preferred date	A higher value is better than a lower value
Stress Discussed	Stress Discussed (PCMH Q40)	A higher value is better than a lower value
Telephone Abandonment Rate	Telephone abandonment rate	A lower value is better than a higher value

Source: VHA Support Service Center

Appendix E: Strategic Analytics for Improvement and Learning (SAIL) Community Living Center (CLC) Measure Definitions¹³³

Measure	Definition
Ability to move independently worsened (LS)	Long-stay measure: percentage of residents whose ability to move independently worsened.
Catheter in bladder (LS)	Long-stay measure: percent of residents who have/had a catheter inserted and left in their bladder.
Falls with major injury (LS)	Long-stay measure: percent of residents experiencing one or more falls with major injury.
Help with ADL (LS)	Long-stay measure: percent of residents whose need for help with activities of daily living has increased.
High risk PU (LS)	Long-stay measure: percent of high-risk residents with pressure ulcers.
Improvement in function (SS)	Short-stay measure: percentage of residents whose physical function improves from admission to discharge.
Moderate-severe pain (LS)	Long-stay measure: percent of residents who self-report moderate to severe pain.
Moderate-severe pain (SS)	Short-stay measure: percent of residents who self-report moderate to severe pain.
New or worse PU (SS)	Short-stay measure: percent of residents with pressure ulcers that are new or worsened.
Newly received antipsych meds (SS)	Short-stay measure: percent of residents who newly received an antipsychotic medication.
Physical restraints (LS)	Long-stay measure: percent of residents who were physically restrained.
Receive antipsych meds (LS)	Long-stay measure: percent of residents who received an antipsychotic medication.
UTI (LS)	Long-stay measure: percent of residents with a urinary tract infection.

¹³³ *Strategic Analytics for Improvement and Learning (SAIL) for Community Living Centers (CLC)*, Center for Innovation & Analytics (last updated August 22, 2019.) <http://vaww.vssc.med.va.gov/VSSCEnhancedProductManagement/DisplayDocument.aspx?DocumentID=7410>. (The website was accessed on September 3, 2019, but is not accessible by the public.)

Appendix F: VISN Director Comments

Department of Veterans Affairs Memorandum

Date: October 25, 2019

From: Network Director, VA Sunshine Healthcare Network (10N08)

Subj: Comprehensive Healthcare Inspection of the James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital,
Tampa, FL

To: Director, Chicago Office of Healthcare Inspections (54CH02)

Director, GAO/OIG Accountability Liaison (VHA 10EG GOAL Action)

1. I have reviewed the VA OIG's draft report of their Comprehensive Healthcare Inspection Program (CHIP) conducted in February 2019, of the Tampa VA Healthcare System/James A. Haley Veterans Hospital. I concur with the findings and subsequent recommendations.
2. Additionally, I have reviewed the Healthcare System Director's response, action plan and timelines and concur. VISN 8 will assist in completing all actions timely.
3. I appreciate the OIG's partnership in ensuring we are a continuously improving organization.

(Original signed by:)

Miguel H. LaPuz, M.D., MBA

*For accessibility, the original format of this appendix has been modified
to comply with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended.*

Appendix G: Facility Director Comments

Department of Veterans Affairs Memorandum

Date: October 25, 2019

From: Director, James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital (673/00)

Subj: Comprehensive Healthcare Inspection of the James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital,
Tampa, FL

To: Network Director, VA Sunshine Healthcare Network (10N08)

1. I have reviewed the VA OIG's draft report of the CHIP review conducted at the James A. Haley Veterans Hospital of Tampa, Florida. I concur with the OIG's recommendations.
2. I am submitting my plan to comply with the recommendations to include timeline for completion and sustainment of improvements.
3. I appreciate the OIG's partnership in our continuous improvement efforts.

(Original signed by:)

David J. VanMeter
Deputy Director

for

Joe D. Battle
Director

<p><i>For accessibility, the original format of this appendix has been modified to comply with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended.</i></p>

OIG Contact and Staff Acknowledgments

Contact	For more information about this report, please contact the Office of Inspector General at (202) 461-4720.
----------------	---

Inspection Team	Bruce Barnes, Team Leader Carrie Jeffries, DNP, FACHE Sheila Cooley, MSN, GNP Renay Montalbano, MSN, RN Schzelle Spiller-Harris, MSN, RN Valerie Zaleski, BSN, RN
------------------------	--

Other Contributors	Elizabeth Bullock Judy Brown Limin Clegg, PhD Justin Hanlon, BS LaFonda Henry, MSN, RN-BC Gayle Karamanos, MS, PA-C Yoonhee Kim, PharmD Susan Lott, MSA, RN Scott McGrath, BS Larry Ross, Jr., MS Marilyn Stones, BS Erin Stott, MSN, RN Mary Toy, MSN, RN Robert Wallace, ScD, MPH
---------------------------	--

Report Distribution

VA Distribution

Office of the Secretary
Veterans Benefits Administration
Veterans Health Administration
National Cemetery Administration
Assistant Secretaries
Office of General Counsel
Office of Acquisition, Logistics, and Construction
Board of Veterans' Appeals
Director, VISN 8: VA Sunshine Healthcare Network
Director, James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital (673/00)

Non-VA Distribution

House Committee on Veterans' Affairs
House Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and
Related Agencies
House Committee on Oversight and 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: Marco Rubio, Rick Scott
U.S. House of Representatives: Gus M. Bilirakis, Kathy Castor, Charlie Crist, Darren Soto,
Ross Spano, Daniel Webster

OIG reports are available at www.va.gov/oig.