Appendix 11

LABORATORY QUALITY SYSTEMS ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Select one or more sections under a system periodically and evaluate components or processes for compliance. Write "Y" for Yes or "N" for No by an item to indicate the outcome of the assessed item.
□ Write "N/A" if item is not applicable at the time of evaluation.
In the "Comments" area, explain <u>how</u> the assessment was done. Were charts reviewed, requisitions examined, for what period of time? <u>List</u> all significant findings.
Summarize overall findings in the "Discussion" area on the last page. Were the findings satisfactory or unsatisfactory?
GENERAL LABORATORY
PATIENT CONFIDENTIALITY:
Patient information was kept confidential throughout all phases of testing under the laboratory's control. Does the laboratory staff view the contents of the patient's records at any point?
Comments:
DATES VICTORIA DE DATES DE LA CONTROL DE LA
PATIENT IDENTIFICATION & SPECIMEN INTEGRITY: Were specimens collected by non-laboratory personnel labeled legibly and correctly?
Was proper paperwork submitted for the specimens received? Were specimen rejection policies followed?
Were submitters notified when discrepancies were found?
Did the lab maintain optimum integrity of each specimen through completion of testing?
Comments:
COMPLAINT INVESTIGATIONS:
Have complaints been documented (on the Problem Log) and investigated according to policy? If a complaint was investigated, was the problem and resolution documented?
Was the resolution followed up to ensure corrective action was appropriate?
Were policy and/or procedure revisions necessary to prevent reoccurrence of the complaint?
Comments:
COMMUNICATIONS:
Internal: Did the lab manager share information received from administration with other lab personnel?
Did the lab manager share information received from the Technical Consultant with other lab personnel?
External:
Were emails and/or voicemail from the Technical Consultant responded to in an appropriate amount of time or by the deadline?
Was the Technical Consultant contacted immediately when there was an unresolved instrument or QC failure? Were changes in lab testing or paperwork relayed appropriately to clinic personnel?
Comments:

PERSON	NEL COMPETENCY ASSESSMENT:
·	_ Has orientation and training been documented for all testing personnel?
	_ Has proof of minimum education been provided to the lab manager for all testing personnel?
	_ Has proof of education been forwarded to the Technical Consultant for new testing personnel?
-	_ Has the Lab Director reviewed and signed off on the assigned duties for testing personnel performing non-
	waived tests?
	_ Has the Technical Consultant reviewed and signed off on the assigned duties for testing personnel performing
	only waived tests?
	Have all testers performed QC on all approved tests at least once per quarter?
	Did all testing personnel complete required annual continuing education in the previous calendar year?
	Were all appropriate competency assessment sets performed by qualifying personnel?
	Were competency assessment results reviewed with appropriate personnel?
	Were competency assessment failures investigated by the Technical Consultant and follow up shared with the
	lab manager?
	Was competency assessed for personnel performing blood collections?
Comments	
PROFICI	ENCY TESTING:
Only for l	aboratories that are performing at least one module of proficiency testing.
	_ Was proficiency testing rotated among testing personnel, if applicable?
	_ was proficiency testing rotated among testing personner, if applicable: _ Were proficiency samples processed in a manner similar to patient samples?
	_ Was the Proficiency Testing (PT) Performance form completed for each PT event?
	_ Were copies of all submitted proficiency results retained?
	Were incorrect results (graded and ungraded) investigated and corrective action taken?
Comments	:
SAFETY:	
	Was the Technical Consultant notified of any situation that could affect the lab's performance or the safety of
	employees?
	Has the Safety Manual been updated in the last 5 years?
	Have lab personnel received annual safety training?
	Have lab personnel documented annual review of safety manuals?
	Has a sharps evaluation been done this calendar year? The previous calendar year?
Comments	•
PREANA	ALYTIC SYSTEMS
TEST REC	QUISITION:
	_ Did the lab have electronic requests for all tests performed?
	_ Did test requisitions contain all necessary information as stated in the lab's policy?
	_ Was "received time" documented for all laboratory specimens tested?
	_ Is there a "back-up" system in place for receiving test requests when an electronic system is unavailable?
Comments	:

Address
POLICY MANUAL:
Have lab personnel documented annual review of policies? Are policies current?
Have normal and panic values been reviewed and approved by the Clinical Consultant this calendar year
Is there a policy describing how to enter results in an electronic health record?
is there a point, describing now to once results in an electronic results
Comments:
ANALYTIC SYSTEMS
ANALTHOSTSTEMS
PROCEDURE MANUAL:
Are lab procedures current and complete?
Are all procedures current and complete: Are all procedures saved electronically?
Are current package inserts in place with the corresponding procedure?
Have lab personnel documented annual review of procedures?
Has the Technical Consultant documented annual review of procedures?
Are discontinued procedures dated and kept for a two-year minimum?
Community
Comments:
QUALITY CONTROL:
Were environmental controls (temperature, humidity, etc.) recorded and within acceptable limits prior
testing?
Were only in-date reagents, controls, kits, media, etc., used?
Were new lots of QC reagents (hemoglobin, glucose, urinalysis, hgb A1c) verified before the current lot expired? Before being put into use?
Was new lot verification documented at the time of testing on the appropriate form?
Was new lot verification documented at the time of testing on the appropriate form: ———— Was procedural QC performed, documented, and within acceptable limits before patient test results were
reported?
Was QC performed at the required frequency (per CLIA Contract description)?
Were appropriate Levy-Jennings charts plotted each day of testing and evaluated for trends or shifts?
Were QC failures (i.e., out-of-range results) documented, along with corrective action?
Was performance of QC rotated among testing personnel?
Comments:
Comments.
MAINTENIANCE O EVINCENON CHECKO
MAINTENANCE & FUNCTION CHECKS: Was scheduled instrument/equipment maintenance properly performed and documented?
was scheduled histrument/equipment maintenance property performed and documented:
Comments:
COMPARISON OF TEST RESULTS:
Were instrument comparisons, when applicable, conducted twice a year?
Was parallel testing documented twice each year by all testing personnel performing wet mounts?

Comments:

TEST RECORDS: Were records of testing, including worksheets and instrument printouts, re	etained and complete?
Was the identity of testing personnel documented for each intermediate st	
Comments:	
POSTANALYTIC SYSTEMS	
TEST REPORT: (This section should be applied to electronic health records	s.)
Were test results present? Is the tester readily identified in an electronic report?	
Are reference values on the test report or readily accessible? Were panic values reported and documented according to lab policy?	
Were corrected/amended reports issued according to lab policy?	
Comments:	
DATA STORAGE & RETRIEVAL: Were exact copies of in-house test reports maintained and accessible? Are	copies of lab results accessible and
retained for a minimum of two years? Was lab documentation (i.e., QC records, worksheets, package inserts, and	instrument printouts) retained for
a minimum of two years?	inistrament printouts) retained for
Comments:	
DISCUSSION : Describe the outcome of the assessment. Were all areas evaluated sati describe the corrective action plan. Will a QA Study be initiated as a re	
COMPLETED BY:	DATE:
I AD MANACED DEVIEW.	DATE.
LAB MANAGER REVIEW:	DAIE;
TECHNICAL CONSULTANT REVIEW:	DATE: