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Background

• 2009 Maintenance of Certification Part IV program started
• 2012 Designed a combined application with our internal Quality Academy
• 2015 Initiated a project to update or replace our current system
Getting started on our project

• Team of staff from what is now called our MOC Portfolio Program staff and Quality Academy
• Began reviewing process and defining requirements
• Needing more information to make informed decisions we decided to gather feedback
Stakeholder Identification - QA Project VOC

- Identifying and prioritizing the wrong stakeholders
  - An incomplete picture
    - Those around us
    - Looking at the issue through our eyes
    - Informal information gathering
  - Voice of the customer survey
    - Limited to QA customer base only
    - Survey was not comprehensive
    - Decision - survey all customers including QRB and QFP submitters and reviewers.
Stakeholder Identification

- Stakeholder definition and identification
  - Who is it that may have a vested interest in the project?
    1. MDs, PHDs, PIs – MOC/CME eligible QIP Team Members
    2. Quality Academy (QA) Customers – QIP Team Members
    3. Quality Review Board (QRB) Customers - QRB/QA leadership
    4. QIP Editors/Submitters
    5. QIP Reviewers
    6. QA/QRB Admin staff
Internal VOC feedback

- QRB Reviewers/staff
  - Several iterations of this project
  - Build vs Purchase
  - Vended solution
    - Participated in review of 4 options; Frevvo, Kissflow, Integrify, ServiceNow.
    - All stakeholders Provided feedback on each option
    - Pro/Con of ServiceNow provided by administrative staff
    - ServiceNow not a viable option
    - On to phase 2
Internal VOC feedback

- Continuous Feedback
  - Internally built solution
    - Ability to build to specifications
    - Stakeholders engaged and proving feedback along the way.
VOC Data Collection

Electronic Survey

MEP QIP User Survey 2017

Decomposed Response Grouping (Example): Understanding criteria
- Format variation
- Vendor selection
- Issue resolution
- Reporting criteria
- Application not user-friendly

Narrative Response Question Groupings Pareto Tables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Stands Out?</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revision on short notice</td>
<td>Tedious</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well laid out</td>
<td>Smooth</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing subjective</td>
<td>Poor Communication</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevent not anonymous</td>
<td>Good Communication</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to follow team clerk</td>
<td>Confusing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Smoothest Part?

| Writing after criteria understood | Submission Process | 41 | 59%
| Plan formulation                  | Other             | 14 | 20%
| The grading process              | Communication     | 9  | 13%
| Experienced coach                 | Team Support      | 5  | 7%

Most Difficult (Painful) Part of the Process

| Understanding criteria          | Confusing Criteria | 12  | 23.1%
| Spell Check not in application | Other             | 10  | 18.2%
| QA email contact nameless       | Communication     | 10  | 18.2%

TAT Interval Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAT (weeks)</th>
<th>TAT Interval Counts</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TAT Interval Counts Graph
VOC Data Collection

Phone Interviews

MEP Workflow Improvement Team - Interviewee Questionnaire [Final] 1/18/2017

Did the time between submitting the project and receiving the final determination meet expectations?

- 63% Yes
- 37% No

Interviewee Selection Logic:

Thank you for your willingness to help us collect the VOC data. Editors and/or Team Leads - Sit.

Elevator Speech:

This interview will be recorded via Level 3, so we don’t miss anything. Responses will be summarized for focus on main themes, and interviewee will be kept anonymous. (As a reminder, the platform you used for submission of the...)

Structured application
- Good DMAIC instructions
- Easy to do
- Able to attach files
- Workbook allows copy/paste into application

What stands out to you about the QIP submission and approval process?

- Face education or training
- First time was fixed
- Online application was complicated
- Hard to find MEP
- Lengthy submission process
- Copy and paste were troublesome for images
- Application & duplication of effort

How would you describe the communication between the project team and the review and approval group(s)?

- Thorough communication
- Responded quickly
- Good communication

“Needs Revision” reviewer email good communication
“Needs Revision” personal contact helpful
## Scoring & Prioritizing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOC - Interviews &quot;Top 10&quot; Needs List</th>
<th>VOC - Surveys &quot;Top 10&quot; Needs List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Need way to answer questions about QI (search for help)</td>
<td>Instructions need to be easy to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Establish requirements to be a submitter (take the test first)</td>
<td>Clear reviewer comments (needs revision)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Need to understand the submission process</td>
<td>Teams need capability to enter into application, save and return to edit, as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Need specifics on what is wanted in the application</td>
<td>Application needs to be able to accept embedded items (charts and graphs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Application needs to simplified</td>
<td>Needs a standardized Attachment Template that can be added to any place in the application and when revising for needs revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Need to clarify what is Quality Improvement upfront</td>
<td>Maintaining clear, easily accessible instructions with terms explained and examples given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Better wayfinding to the QIP application (marketing and change mgt.)</td>
<td>Ensuring Data Entry flexibility (tedious; multiple submitters).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Need quick reference guide and frequently asked questions</td>
<td>Criteria needs to be understood by submitter and team members prior to starting a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Need to maintain those things identified as good</td>
<td>Need ability to check application status at any time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Need better linkage to scoring logic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Action items

• Using this information to inform the project
  • Make sure the system is built with status viewing
  • Fill in the blanks and shorter answer questions
  • Scoring inside the system for reviewers
Q & A