



**Quality Assurance Committee Meeting
SNMMI Annual Meeting, Vancouver, Canada
Friday, June 7, 2013 12:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.**

Attendees: Kent Friedman, MD, (Chair); Sue Abreu, MD, JK, FACNM; Keith Brigham; Paul Christian, CNMT, BS, PET, FSNMT; Lorraine Fig, MD, FACNM; Leonie Gordon, MD, FACNM; Bennett Greenspan, MD, FACNM, FACR; Jonathan Nye, PhD; Eric Novak (staff); Ali Michalak (staff)

I. Welcome and Call to Order

Dr. Kent Friedman called the meeting to order at 12:15.

II. Approval of meeting minutes

Minutes from the Quality Assurance 2013 Spring meeting were approved.

III. Approval of agenda

Agenda for the Quality Assurance 2013 Annual meeting were approved.

IV. New Membership Discussion

The committee suggested adding two new members to the Quality Assurance Committee in order to help analyze the Packet. The committee would prefer adding one MD and one technologist. Candidates should be technically oriented, highly motivated and willing to do work. They should possess an interest in education and the ability to articulate this interest. The candidates should have knowledge of Microsoft Excel and be able to attend both the Mid-Winter and Annual Meetings.

Methods to find new members include: contacting other Chairs, using the Young Professionals list, looking into the YPC newsgroup, and contacting Scott Holbrook.

Action: Jonathon Nye should be added to the member list and Adam Alessio should be deleted.

V. Individual Sale of Phantoms

Another site wants to buy the phantom to use for their Annual Accreditation. There was discussion as to what needs to be submitted for ICANL accreditation. Most of the answers can be found in the email Dr. Friedman sent to Mary Beth. There is currently no online test, but there can be CME credit. Possible self-grading. With regards to ICANL: every site does Quality Assurance and the phantom can be done for both MDs and technical QA.

A policy should be introduced regarding grading. Either a site buys the phantom and pays us for analysis, or does its own internal review with our answers. A site's internal review with our answers

could comprise 1)tech review, 2)comparison of physician reads, or 3)suggestions of how they should do the process. Statements about how to use the phantom and grading for MOC IV should be given. A template of various ways of how to use the phantom should be given. An article should be sent to ICANL newsletter, JNMT or SNMMI news-online spreading the word regarding how to do the QA phantom.

What should individual site receive when we send out the phantom?

- Do we send them answers as well?
- Can we possibly give them the group data as well?
- Can we give participating sites the answers with percent correct?
- Should we give them the answers based on performance rather than answers based on correct (some could be wrong, but they also want to know what other people are doing)?

STEPS:

1. Write Guideline for Phantom Exercise Applications for Disseminate this information...Need to describe process of how answers and teaching points will be distributed.
2. For now send them this distribution of answers, also key points from VA Critiques and answers.
3. Send them a survey about the data and how useful it was. Ask them to optionally tell us how they used the phantom and if it was useful.
4. Follow up with G. Segall to see the current state of the big picture. Move towards model of sending answers directly to Program Director ***Separately***

Possible Action: Change the “Submit” information in the Packet. There shouldn’t be a “Submit” anymore; they should have all the information in the end. When they order the Phantom, Ask them WHO should we send the answers to, in a separate, private packet?

VI. Introduction of online submission of results process

Matt Dickens (SNMMI Staff) is working with the Tiger Team to develop an online submission results process. The new method will not be finished by October 1 for the next Phantom, but it will be implemented in 2014 with testing beginning in October 2013. Tiger Team is a Third party payer and is introducing a wireframe for the design.

Online results have many benefits. IT will make the design easily manageable for future editions; this diminishes our use of relying on a developer. Data will be placed in an excel format and collected in a methodological manner.

Dr. Friedman suggests coming up with a core group of questions, but allow for things to evolve. We can use a “battleships grid” for questions requiring drawing an image. Test takers will not have to upload any software (Java, Shockwave, etc.).

Member or nonmember status could be a possible issue when signing up. Technologists change every year at the VA. However, non-membership is free and just places you in our database; once in the database, one can register.

Action: Make sure the packet is changed to reflect the new changes occurring with the online submission. Talk to LMS and CeCity about any of the CDs that go in.

VII. Principal discussion

Parathyroid 2013

Lines 49 and 50 from site #650 both failed.

Most of the Technologist section of the 2012 Parathyroid Critique Combined looked good. The Table numbers should be adjusted and references to the SNMMI Guidelines and other documents should be stated. Example images of how the image should properly look like should be added to the Conclusion and Teaching Points sections. Unfortunately, Siemens changes parameters every time, but we must resolve these issues and follow their process.

Action: Eric will send out the Fail, Pass, and High pass letters, and the Warning sites will receive Pass letters. Lorraine Fig will write the technologist Warnings. Eric will notify Dr. Fig when the letters are going out.

Bone Packet

The 20 and the 30mm both went down to 19mm. Page 9, Will move Section 3 up under Section 2.5 and shift things down based on renumbering. For 5.4 number 1, the answers might be mixed. The VA facilities aren't doing their own imaging. In order to learn about incorrect answers, the Committee feels that it would be better if people received the answers. Can SNMMI provide answers for the CME questions?

Action: Eric will contact SNMMI Education Department and implement the timeline for final approval, determine the CME/VOICE credit amounts, check the website addresses, and check the references.

Gall Bladder 2015

Keith Bigham stated that the gall bladder phantom prototype has not been designed. Similar to the gastric phantom, different plates would be used. The two types that can be used must be dynamic and involve the technologists. In order to reach a certain level, Keith Bigham should draw off the gall bladder; however, nothing comes out except air, and there is room for a lot of error.

The committee suggested that the SNMMI Guideline should be referenced and that the phantom be varied in size. A possible histogram of the liver should be taken. Patient preparation is of importance in this phantom.

VIII. Adjournment

(4:00pm)