Quality Improvement Assessment Questions
Vascular: Peripheral Venous 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Given the clinical indication, is the examination appropriate?</th>
<th>○ Appropriate/usually appropriate</th>
<th>○ May be appropriate</th>
<th>○ Rarely appropriate/usually not appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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, 4.7B ○ Yes ○ No
5. Is appropriate sample volume placement demonstrated? Part B, 4.4.1.6B ○ 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 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]

Comments: