PT Workgroup Update

4/16/2020

Attendance (both meetings were WebEx based)

3/31

- Sara Sekerak, Ryan Zboralski, and Alyssa Peter-Ecology
  - Jessica Archer from Ecology also joined the meeting briefly
- Steve LaCroix-DOH
- Qing Gu-Dept. of Ag
- Nick Poolman-LCB
- Jay Burns-Treeline
- Steve Loague-Integrity
- Bonnie Luntzel-Praxis
- Kyle Shelton-Medicine Creek

4/14

- Alyssa Peter, Sara Sekerak-Ecology
- Steve LaCroix-DOH
- Qing Gu-Dept. of Ag
- Nick Poolman-LCB
- Jay Burns-Treelin
- Steve Loague-Integrity
- Bonnie Luntzel-Praxis
- Kyle Shelton-Medicine Creek

3/31 Highlights

- Data-mining exercise
  - Wording
  - Defined time-frame
  - Response time
- PT Frequency
  - Some labs lump all their PTs in a short period of time
  - Others sprinkle them throughout the year
- Possible trial study with Phenova prior to identify logistical flaws among others) in the system that we cannot foresee
  - Group agreed that this was a fantastic idea
  - Ryan will reach out to necessary parties for information
  - We'll return to this topic later…

4/14 Highlights

- Review of the data mining
  - 5 participating labs
  - Will be an excellent aid in guiding recommendations
- Worked on the grading sheet used by the laboratories to review the trial study
  - More on that later…

Trial Study

- Why would a trial be necessary?
  - Typical PT importance in accreditation
    - What doesn't exist in the current system that is needed?
  - Proof-of-Concept
  - **NOT** a focus on Potency results
- Does NOT commit us to Ty and Phenova

Trial Study

- Survey to the labs was needed to maximize involvement
  - Especially the non-represented labs
  - Maximum involvement is desired
  - See handout
- Oregon's model
  - Phenova typically charges labs directly
  - Uses a participating lab to generate study material, *then* ORELAP assumes custody
    - Storage
    - Distribution
    - Workgroup feels this would not work in our state; bad optics

Trial Study

- Lab's grading sheet
  - Used a vendor review form from a participating lab as a template
  - Used by participating labs & submitted to workgroup
  - Grade sheets will remain anonymous to the workgroup
  - Following items are graded on a scale of 1(unacceptable)-5(Excellent) as well as having an importance scale of N/A, Not Important, Important, and Very Important.
    - Quality of Supplies
    - Quality of Services
    - Pricing
    - Responsiveness to Inquiries
    - Delivery Times
    - Terms of invoices
    - Professionalism
  - Average score
  - Space for comments
  - Some wording about the possibility of follow-up conversations from the workgroup

Remaining Challenges

- Location
  - Confirm a neutral site
  - What exactly is the host lab responsible for
- Gaining Maximum Participation
  - Intent of survey
- Time-table
  - Highly dependent on choreography of overcoming other challenges
  - Regardless of hashing-out other challenges, there's still the COVID-19 elephant in the room.
- Any specific metrics that aren't covered by what we have so far?
- Licensing needs

Questions?