

Statement of Deficiencies	(X1) Provider/Supplier/CLIA Identification Number 34D0916100	(X3) Date Survey Completed 03/11/2021
Name of Provider or Supplier Piedmont Cosmetic Surgery & Dermatology Center, Pa	Street Address, City, State 765 Highland Oaks Drive, Suite 100, Winston-Salem, NC	
For information on the provider's plan to correct this deficiency, please contact the provider or the state survey agency.		

(X4) ID Prefix Tag	Summary Statement of Deficiencies
D5215	<p>EVALUATION OF PROFICIENCY TESTING PERFORMANCE CFR(s): 493.1236(b)(2)</p> <p>The laboratory must verify the accuracy of any analyte, specialty or subspecialty assigned a proficiency testing score that does not reflect laboratory test performance (that is, when the proficiency testing program does not obtain the agreement required for scoring as specified in subpart I of this part, or the laboratory receives a zero score for nonparticipation, or late return or results).</p> <p>This STANDARD is not met as evidenced by: Based on review of 2019 and 2020 WSLH (Wisconsin State Laboratory of Hygiene) proficiency testing records and interview with TP (testing personnel) 3/11/21, the laboratory failed to verify the accuracy of the ungraded DTM (dermatophyte test medium) fungal culture samples for 2 of 3 events in 2019 and 1 of 3 events in 2020. Findings: Review of 2019 and 2020 WSLH proficiency testing records revealed: 1. On the 2019 SPMicro - B1 test event, the laboratory failed to verify the accuracy of sample DM-1 which was ungraded. The expected result for sample DM-1 was positive, and the laboratory's response was negative. There was no documentation that the laboratory recognized the result was unacceptable and there was no corrective action documented. 2. On the 2019 SPMicro - B3 test event, the laboratory failed to verify the accuracy of sample DM-13 which was ungraded. The expected result for sample DM-1 was positive, and the laboratory's response was negative. There was no documentation that the laboratory recognized the result was unacceptable and there was no corrective action documented. 3. On the 2020 SPMicro - B3 test event, the laboratory failed to verify the accuracy of sample DM-13 which was ungraded. The expected result for sample DM-13 was positive, and the laboratory's response was negative. There was no documentation that the laboratory recognized the result was unacceptable and there was no corrective action documented. During interview 3/11/21 at approximately 9:15 a.m., TP #1 stated that he thought it was a bad sample if the</p>

proficiency testing company did not have the consensus needed to grade it. He stated that he did not realize corrective action was supposed to be documented for ungraded samples.