

## Quality Improvement Assessment Questions

### Vascular: Visceral Vascular Testing

Answer the questions below by reviewing the images and final report for a given case study. It is recommended that any discrepancies noted in the assessment be reviewed and shared with medical and technical staff members. The assessment is provided to assist the facility in furthering its ongoing Quality Improvement (QI) process.

For the purposes of Quality Improvement (QI), annual case study self-assessment must be sufficient to ensure the achievement of continuous actions that lead to measurable improvement in the imaging examinations performed in the facility. To attain maximum benefit to the facility, a minimum of 30 case assessments is strongly recommended. However, for facilities with lower procedure volumes, 5% of the facility's testing volume is encouraged.

*Note: Although the case may be in compliance with the IAC Standards based on your assessment, there may be opportunity for improvement.*

#### I. Test appropriateness

Given the clinical indication, is the examination appropriate?

- Appropriate/usually appropriate  
 May be appropriate  
 Rarely appropriate/usually not appropriate

Comments:

#### II. Technical quality review

1. Is this a complete examination?  Yes  No
2. Are the Doppler waveform(s) of diagnostic quality?  Yes  No
3. Are the ultrasound images of diagnostic quality?  Yes  No
4. Does the case study demonstrate all the required images and documentation per the Standards? [Part B, 5.7B](#)  Yes  No
5. Is appropriate angle correction and sample volume placement demonstrated? [Part B, 5.6.1B](#)  Yes  No
6. Was the examination of diagnostic quality?  Yes  No

Could the technical quality of this case have been improved?

- Yes  No

Comments:

#### III. Interpretive quality review

1. Does the facility use published, validated diagnostic criteria? [Part A, 3.4A](#)  Yes  No
2. Does the final report adhere to the diagnostic criteria?  Yes  No
3. Does the interpretation appear accurate?  Yes  No

Could the interpretive quality of this case have been improved?

- Yes  No

Comments:

#### IV. Report completeness and timeliness

1. Are all the required demographics documented as required by the Standards? [Part A, 3.2A](#)  Yes  No
  2. Is there a description of the examination performed? [Part A, 3.2.6.4A](#)  Yes  No
  3. Does the report document pertinent positive and negative findings? [Part A, 3.2.6.5A](#)  Yes  No
  4. Is there a summary (impression/conclusion) of the examination findings? [Part A, 3.2.6.9A](#)  Yes  No
  5. Is the final report signed and dated by a member of the interpreting physician? [Part A, 3.2.6.11A](#) and [Part A, 3.2.6.12A](#)  Yes  No
  6. Is the interpretation completed within two business days and the final report completed within four business days? [Part A, 3.2.7A](#)  Yes  No
- Could the report completeness and timeliness of this case have been improved?  Yes  No

Comments:

#### V. Case review

- Was this case reviewed with any appropriate imaging modality, surgical findings, clinical outcome or other comparison? [Part C, 2.1.5C](#)  Yes  No

Comments: