

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: July 13, 2015-July 17, 2015

Office Reviewed: Cleveland District Office

Reviewing Office: Cleveland Accountability Review

Review Period: April 1, 2014-March 31, 2015

Standard:	Category #: 1	Category Name: Part B Initial Claims
------------------	---------------	--------------------------------------

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	384
Number of cases reviewed:	48
Number of errors in element:	29
Acceptable rating:	85%
Rating for review:	92%

Describe Findings:

The Cleveland District Office performed satisfactorily in the Part B Causation Development Element. There was only one Recommended Decision that was reviewed which reached the wrong ultimate conclusion. Development was consistently timely and identified the correct evidence needed for adjudication of the claim. There were no errors found when reviewing the Statement of Case section of the Recommended Decision for readability and conveying information in a chronological and logical manner.

In terms of deficiencies, the most number of errors were found in identifying the adjudicated or deferred conditions in the Recommended Decision cover letter or introductory paragraph. In this area, there were a few instances where there was no clear indication of what conditions were being accepted or denied. In the Statement of the Case, there were a few instances when irrelevant information was included or relevant information was left out. In the Explanation of Findings, some cases did not explain what the program standards were and did not adjudicate all facets of the case, to include eligible survivorship and covered employment determinations. Some Conclusions of Law

sections did not clearly articulate what conditions were being accepted or denied or did not address conditions accepted or denied in the body of the Recommended Decision.

Improvements Since Last Accountability Review:

Other Significant Findings:

REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
Eric Christeson	7/16/15
Willard Moses	7/16/15

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: July 13, 2015 – July 17, 2015

Office Reviewed: Cleveland District Office

Reviewing Office: Cleveland Accountability Review

Review Period: April 1, 2014 – March 31, 2015

Standard:	Category #: 2	Category Name: Part E - Causation Claims
------------------	---------------	--

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	533
Number of cases reviewed:	41
Number of errors in element:	50
Acceptable rating:	85%
Rating for review:	89%

Describe Findings:

Overall, the Cleveland District Office performed adequately in this Element, especially within the Causation elements. Most cases were developed correctly and IH and CMC referrals, while rare, were completed accurately. The results of the AR show that no reviewed Recommended Decision reached the wrong ultimate conclusion. The Statement of the Case section of the Recommended Decision was consistent in properly describing the development steps taken in each case.

The majority of deficiencies were found in the Statement of the Case and Explanation of Findings sections of the Recommended Decision. Within the Statement of the Case section, some cases were to verbose, containing irrelevant information, degrading their readability. Others left out key evidentiary information crucial to the adjudication of the claim. In the Explanation of Findings section, some cases did not describe the program standards or make findings on all relevant section of the claim, e.g. survivorship eligibility. In the Conclusions of Law a few cases identified the wrong medical benefits date; others failed to identify the accepted or denied conditions.

Improvements Since Last Accountability Review:

Other Significant Findings:

REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
Eric Christeson	7/16/15
Willard Moses	7/16/15

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: July 13, 2015- July 17, 2015

Office Reviewed: Cleveland District Office

Reviewing Office: Cleveland Accountability Review

Review Period: April 1, 2014 – March 31, 2015

Standard:	Category #: 3	Category Name: Payment Processing
------------------	---------------	-----------------------------------

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	350
Number of cases reviewed:	50
Number of errors in element:	5
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	98%

Describe Findings:

Overall, the Cleveland District Office performed outstanding in this element. There were only 5 errors identified in the payment processing and those errors were only across two of the seven elements. The District Office was at 100% in completing accurate Payment Transaction Forms and making phone calls to verify claimant's account information with their respective financial institutions. The Cleveland District Office excelled in ensuring the EN-20s contained an original claimant signature or a valid Power of Attorney.

The majority of the deficiencies in this element related to missing date stamps on the completed EN-20s. Additionally, two EN-20s were reviewed which did not contain all the required claimant information for processing.

Improvements Since Last Accountability Review:

Other Significant Findings:

REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
Eric Christeson	7/16/15
Willard Moses	7/16/15

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: August 17, 2015 – August 21, 2015

Office Reviewed: Cleveland District Office

Reviewing Office: 2015 Seattle Accountability Review

Review Period: 4/1/2014 through 3/31/2015

Standard:	Category #: 4	Category Name: Impairment
------------------	---------------	---------------------------

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	144
Number of cases reviewed:	50
Number of errors in element:	25
Acceptable rating:	85%
Rating for review:	95%

Describe Findings:

Overall the Cleveland District Office performed satisfactorily in the Impairment Development, Medical Evidence, and Physician Selection Assessment. It should be noted the District Office performed with 95% accuracy in the Impairment categories.

Deficiencies were found in the RD Outcome and Written Quality Assessment. A common finding is that CEs are not fully explaining the development taken in the Statement of the Case in the RD. Another common finding is that the RD had no discussion about the Tort/SWC questions. It was also noted that the Explanation of Findings did not include the computations for the impairment ratings.

Improvements Since Last Accountability Review:

Other Significant Findings:

REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
	09/23/15

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: August 17, 2015 – August 21, 2015

Office Reviewed: Cleveland District Office

Reviewing Office: 2015 Seattle Accountability Review

Review Period: 4/1/2014 through 3/31/2015

Standard:	Category #: 5	Category Name: Wage Loss
------------------	---------------	--------------------------

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	144
Number of cases reviewed:	41
Number of errors in element:	39
Acceptable rating:	85%
Rating for review:	90%

Describe Findings:

Overall the Cleveland District Office performed satisfactorily in the Wage Loss RD Outcome and Written Quality Assessment. It should be noted the District Office performed with 90% accuracy in the Wage Loss categories.

Deficiencies in the Development and Wage Loss Calculations Assessment included - The wage loss calculator was not bronzed in OIS. The medical evidence was insufficient to establish that the employee's continued wage loss was related to an accepted condition and that a CMC's opinion should have been requested.

A deficiency found in the Wage Loss RD Outcome and Written Quality Assessment is that CEs are not fully explaining the development taken in the Statement of the Case in the RD.

Improvements Since Last Accountability Review:

Other Significant Findings:

REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
	08/20/15

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: August 17, 2015 – August 21, 2015

Office Reviewed: Cleveland District Office

Reviewing Office: 2015 Seattle Accountability Review

Review Period: 4/1/2014 through 3/31/2015

Standard:	Category #: 6	Category Name: Consequential
------------------	---------------	------------------------------

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	144
Number of cases reviewed:	41
Number of errors in element:	14
Acceptable rating:	85%
Rating for review:	91%

Describe Findings:

The Cleveland District Office performed below the satisfactory rating in the Consequential Assessment categories.

Deficiencies were found in the Development Assessment. A common finding is that there was a lack of rationale in the medical records to accept a consequential condition and that no development was taken with the treating physician or a CMC to seek a causation opinion

Deficiencies found in the Letter Decision Outcome and Written Quality Assessment Included – The consequential acceptance citing incorrect medical eligibility dates. Finally, a new EN16 was not always requested and received prior to accepting the consequential condition.

Improvements Since Last Accountability Review:

Other Significant Findings:

REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
	09/23/15

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: August 17, 2015 – August 21, 2015

Office Reviewed: Cleveland District Office

Reviewing Office: 2015 Seattle Accountability Review

Review Period: 4/1/2014 through 3/31/2015

Standard:	Category #: 7	Category Name: Home Health Care
------------------	---------------	---------------------------------

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	144
Number of cases reviewed:	49
Number of errors in element:	0
Acceptable rating:	85%
Rating for review:	100%

Describe Findings:

Overall the Cleveland District Office performed satisfactorily in the Home Health Care Assessment. It should be noted that the District Office performed with 100% accuracy in this category.

Improvements Since Last Accountability Review:

Other Significant Findings:

REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
	09/22/15