Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to explain the protocol for a Local Health Department (LHD) to present new and/or corrected evidence for consideration when an accreditation site visit team has recommended conditional accreditation status for a LHD.

Background Notes

A LHD may present new evidence to address activities deemed ‘not met’ by a site visit team (SVT) when the ‘not met’ activities result in a recommendation of conditional accreditation. The original SVT will review new evidence and render an opinion to the NORTH CAROLINA LOCAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT ACCREDITATION BOARD (hereafter referred to as the Board). New evidence and the SVT recommendation then become an addendum to the SVT report. Based on new evidence, the Board may find that a LHD has now ‘met’ the conditions required for accreditation.

This protocol allows the submission of new documentation at one point following a site visit: as a part of the LHD response to the site visitor’s report. Documentation already in existence at the time of the site visit may be presented as evidence at any time including during the site visit, as a part of the LHD’s response to the site visit report and during the 21 day extension period. LHDs are not permitted to create new documentation or new evidence during a site visit or during the 21 day extension.

Protocol

1. A LHD receives a recommendation for conditional accreditation by the SVT.

Review Period

2. The LHD may submit a written response to the site visit report and/or submit corrections and revisions to documentation during the 10 days following receipt of the site visit report.

3. Once new documentation is received by North Carolina Local Health Department Accreditation (NCLHD) staff, the Board Chair and Appeals Committee Chair are notified of the receipt of new documentation and the corrected documentation is forwarded to the SVT for review:
   - The SVT reviews the documentation in light of the original evidence and the Suggestions for Quality Improvement made at the time of the site visit, rescores each “not met” in light of new evidence and forwards their findings and recommendations to the NCLHDA staff.
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• This finding, including the evidence submitted, becomes addenda to the site visit report and is forwarded to the Board, the Appeals Committee Chair and the LHD.
• In collaboration with the NCLHDA staff, the Board Chair and the Appeals Committee Chair review the new evidence and the site visit team report. If conditional accreditation remains the recommendation to the board, the Appeals Committee is convened to review the findings.

4. The SVT report, addendum and Appeals Committee report (if indicated) are presented at the next regularly scheduled Board meeting.

Extension Period

5. If the Board deems that conditional accreditation status is appropriate, the LHD director may request a 21 day extension and present additional written evidence as allowed by 10A NCAC 48A .0203. The written evidence cannot be newly created documentation. It may be any documentation that was in place as of the beginning of the site visit.
   a) If an extension is requested by the LHD, the board defers a vote on the recommendation.
   b) If the extension is not requested, the board may vote on the recommendation or request more information from the LHD.

6. If the extension is requested, the board has up to 90 days to issue a decision in writing to the LHD. (Note: the 90 days period commences on the day that the request for the extension is made). To be considered, written evidence must be received by the board within 21 days of the Board meeting.

7. The written evidence is forwarded to the Appeals Committee. After receipt by the Appeals Committee, it is also forwarded to the SVT for review.

8. The site visit team scores each activity for which written evidence is submitted, compares the evidence to the original evidence reviewed during the site visit and to the Suggestions for Quality Improvement, and provides a written report of their findings to the Appeals Committee. Upon receipt of the written report from the SVT, the Appeals Committee reviews the report. The Appeals Committee may also review the written documentation in accordance with the interpretation guidelines and score the activities based upon the guidelines and the recommendations of the SVT. The Committee has the option of requesting additional information from the SVT or the LHD.

9. The Appeals Committee recommendation is forwarded to the Board for adjudication. The Appeals Committee may meet in person or by conference call.

10. Upon receipt of the report of the Appeals Committee, the Board Chair convenes the Board (by conference call or in person) for a vote on the accreditation status for the LHD. The Board may choose to vote on accreditation status at the next regularly scheduled board meeting. If the next regularly scheduled meeting is after the 90 day period, a response will be sent to the LHD detailing the actions of the Board. If the Board confers conditional accreditation status, a report of the evaluation of the evidence will be provided to the LHD.
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