

# AR-1

## Accountability Review Findings

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

Office Reviewed: Denver District Office

Reviewing Office: 2015 Cleveland Accountability Review

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

---

<b>Standard:</b>	Category #: 1	Category Name: Part B Initial Claims
------------------	---------------	--------------------------------------

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	368
Number of cases reviewed:	46
Number of errors in element:	53
Acceptable rating:	85%
Rating for review:	89%

### **Describe Findings:**

The Denver District Office exceeded the acceptable rating for Part B initial claims and the review should showed that the district office conducted initial and follow up development in a timely manner.

In terms of deficiencies, the most number of errors were linked to criteria/standards not sufficiently explained in the EOF and a failure to explain how findings were made. Deficiencies regarding missing development steps in the SOC; repetitive information in the SOC and EOF, and recommendations in the cover letter differing from those in the introductory paragraph, SOC and COL were also noted.

### **Improvements Since Last Accountability Review:**

### **Other Significant Findings:**

<b>REVIEWER(s):</b>	<b>DATE:</b>

# AR-1

## Accountability Review Findings

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

Office Reviewed: Denver District Office

Reviewing Office: 2015 Cleveland Accountability Review

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

---

<b>Standard:</b>	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:	21
Acceptable rating:	85%
Rating for review:	86%

### **Describe Findings:**

The Denver District Office met the acceptable rating for Part E causation claims.

In terms of deficiencies, the most number of errors were linked to SOAFs not included in OIS; premature toxic exposure development without there first being a verified diagnosis, and referrals to a CMC requesting medical diagnosis of CBD, COPD when a diagnosis already existed in the case file. Additional deficiencies regarding Part E causation criteria missing from EOF, insufficient explanation in the EOF regarding why a claim was denied; and claims denied for causation when they should have been denied for insufficient/no medical evidence were also noted.

### **Improvements Since Last Accountability Review:**

### **Other Significant Findings:**

<b>REVIEWER(s):</b>	<b>DATE:</b>

# AR-1

## Accountability Review Findings

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

Office Reviewed: Denver District Office

Reviewing Office: 2015 Cleveland Accountability Review

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

---

<b>Standard:</b>	Category #: 3	Category Name: Payment Processing
------------------	---------------	-----------------------------------

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	357
Number of cases reviewed:	51
Number of errors in element:	8
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	97%

### **Describe Findings:**

The Denver District Office exceeded the acceptable rating for payment processing.

In terms of deficiencies, the most number of errors were linked to PTF missing “Authorization DD print name”.

### **Improvements Since Last Accountability Review:**

### **Other Significant Findings:**

<b>REVIEWER(s):</b>	<b>DATE:</b>

# AR-1

## Accountability Review Findings

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

Office Reviewed: Denver District Office

Reviewing Office: 2015 Seattle Accountability Review

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

---

<b>Standard:</b>	Category #: 4	Category Name: Impairment Claims
------------------	---------------	----------------------------------

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	169
Number of cases reviewed:	48
Number of errors in element:	17
Acceptable rating:	85%
Rating for review:	96%

### **Describe Findings:**

Overall the Denver District Office performed satisfactorily in the development of Impairment claims as well as the Impairment RD Outcome and Written Quality. It should be noted that the District Office performed with 96% accuracy in these categories.

In terms of deficiencies, the most number of errors were linked to the initial development requesting evidence of impairment.

Errors were also linked to the Statement of the Case in the RD's that included irrelevant details, essentially rehashing all previous actions pertaining to case history.

**Improvements Since Last Accountability Review:**

**Other Significant Findings:**

<b>REVIEWER(s):</b>	<b>DATE:</b>
	09/23/15

# AR-1

## Accountability Review Findings

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

Office Reviewed: Denver District Office

Reviewing Office: 2015 Seattle Accountability Review

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

---

<b>Standard:</b>	Category #: 5	Category Name: Wage Loss
------------------	---------------	--------------------------

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	169
Number of cases reviewed:	38
Number of errors in element:	11
Acceptable rating:	85%
Rating for review:	96%

### **Describe Findings:**

Overall the Denver District Office performed satisfactorily in the development of Wage Loss claims as well as the Wage loss RD Outcome and Written Quality. It should be noted that the District Office performed with 96% accuracy in these categories.

In terms of deficiencies, the most number of errors were linked to the wage loss calculator being completed in ECS, but not bronzed into OIS.

During the review it was noted that wage loss RDs were well-written.

**Improvements Since Last Accountability Review:**

**Other Significant Findings:**

<b>REVIEWER(s):</b>	<b>DATE:</b>
	09/23/15

# AR-1

## Accountability Review Findings

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

Office Reviewed: Denver District Office

Reviewing Office: 2015 Seattle Accountability Review

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

---

<b>Standard:</b>	Category #: 6	Category Name: Consequential Illnesses/Acceptances
------------------	---------------	--

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	169
Number of cases reviewed:	40
Number of errors in element:	18
Acceptable rating:	85%
Rating for review:	86%

### **Describe Findings:**

Overall the Denver District Office performed satisfactorily in the development of consequential illnesses/acceptances claims as well as the consequential illnesses/acceptance letters. The district office received an 86% accuracy in this category.

In terms of deficiencies, the most number of errors were linked to medical evidence for the consequential illnesses lacking rationale.

Errors were also linked to the consequential illnesses/acceptance letters being accepted in only one part of the Act, when the condition should have been accepted under Part B and Part E. In addition, the effective date of the medical benefits for the consequential condition was not noted in the consequential illnesses/acceptance letters.

**Improvements Since Last Accountability Review:**

**Other Significant Findings:**

<b>REVIEWER(s):</b>	<b>DATE:</b>
	09/23/15

# AR-1

## Accountability Review Findings

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

Office Reviewed: Denver District Office

Reviewing Office: 2015 Seattle Accountability Review

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

---

<b>Standard:</b>	Category #: 7	Category Name: Home Health Care (HHC) Request
------------------	---------------	---

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	169
Number of cases reviewed:	53
Number of errors in element:	12
Acceptable rating:	85%
Rating for review:	93%

### **Describe Findings:**

Overall the Denver District Office performed satisfactorily in the development of HHC requests. It should be noted that the District Office performed with 93% accuracy in this category.

In terms of deficiencies, the most number of errors were linked to the HHC request being denied based on insufficient medical evidence, without any development.

Errors were also linked to HHC requests being approved; however, no supporting evidence was bronzed into OIS.

**Improvements Since Last Accountability Review:**

**Other Significant Findings:**

<b>REVIEWER(s):</b>	<b>DATE:</b>
	09/23/15