

# AR-1

## Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: June 20, 2016 – June 24, 2016

Office Reviewed: Denver District Office

Review Period: May 1, 2015 – April 30, 2016

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

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	1488
Number of cases reviewed:	45
Number of errors in element:	22
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	94%

### **Describe Findings:**

The Denver District Office performed satisfactorily in the Part B Initial Claims Category. It should be noted that the District Office performed well in the development of the claims and in documenting the case files with the appropriate supporting information. NIOSH development and processing was satisfactory.

In terms of deficiencies, the majority of the errors were related to the Statement of the Case (SOC). There was one particular case that did not contain a SOC at all (totally excluded from the RD). Other errors noted, included irrelevant information being discussed (SEM mentioned in Part B only claim; mention of a cancer that has not been claimed). In addition, one RD had no statement about spouse's death to support eligibility of a child.

### **Other Significant Findings:**

Cancer being denied for no medical evidence, but case has a death certificate (DC) signed by an M.D. Death certificate could be used as sufficient medical evidence if all other means have been exhausted.

<b>REVIEWER(s):</b>	<b>DATE:</b>
Darius Radvila, Joel M. Geran	06/23/2016

# AR-1

## Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: June 20, 2016 – June 24, 2016

Office Reviewed: Denver District Office

Review Period: May 1, 2015 – April 30, 2016

---

<b>Standard:</b>	Category: 2 Part E Causation and Development
------------------	--

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	2418
Number of cases reviewed:	40
Number of errors in element:	52
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	89%

### **Describe Findings:**

The Denver District Office fell slightly below the acceptable standard for Part E – Causation and Development. In terms of the office's deficiencies, the majority of errors were linked to inadequate explanations, in the Statement of the Case, with regard to development actions taken in the adjudication of the case. Additional findings involved recommended decisions that did not effectively explain how decisions were reached, or how the relevant law was applied to the evidence in the case.

<b>REVIEWER(s):</b>	<b>DATE:</b>
Don Davis, Michelle Taylor, Susan Prothero	06/23/16

# AR-1

## Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: June 20, 2016 – June 24, 2016

Office Reviewed: Denver District Office

Review Period: May 1, 2015 – April 30, 2016

---

<b>Standard:</b>	Category: Payment Processing
------------------	------------------------------

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	1302
Number of cases reviewed:	49
Number of errors in element:	1
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	99%

### **Describe Findings:**

The Denver District Office performed very well in this category. There was only one deficiency found out of the forty nine cases reviewed.

The reviewer noted that the EN-20 sent had the first and last name of the payee reversed as issued by FAB. The CE had resent the EN-20 to the Payee without correcting the error. There is not a memo or phone call explaining the error or why it was not corrected. The EN-20 was processed with the original error. The PTF was completed correctly and the payment was processed.

<b>REVIEWER(s):</b>	<b>DATE:</b>
Amy Zenobi	06/23/16
Gregory Nelson	

# AR-1

## Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: June 20, 2016 – June 24, 2016

Office Reviewed: Denver District Office

Review Period: May 1, 2015 – April 30, 2016

---

<b>Standard:</b>	Category: ECS Coding
------------------	----------------------

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	930
Number of cases reviewed:	52
Number of errors in element:	6
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	93%

### **Describe Findings:**

This category reviews the accuracy of ECS coding for recommended decisions issued by the district office.

The Denver district office easily exceeded the acceptable rating for this category with a 93% rating. No common trends were noted in this category; however, errors in this category included conditions that were deferred in the written decision not being coded as deferred in ECS and the denial reason in ECS not matching the denial reason in the written decision.

<b>REVIEWER(s):</b>	<b>DATE:</b>
Curtis Johnson & Katina Johnson	June 24, 2016

# AR-1

## Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: July 11, 2016 – July 15, 2016

Office Reviewed: Denver District Office

Review Period: May 1, 2015 – April 30, 2016

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

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	204
Number of cases reviewed:	17
Number of errors in element:	8
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	95%

### **Describe Findings:**

Overall the Denver District Office performed exceptionally well in the Wage-Loss Claims category. The District Office performed with 95% accuracy in this category.

In terms of decisional writing, four errors were found. These focused on lack of medical evidence establishing the causal relationship between the accepted condition and the period of wage-loss and/or omission of key elements in the Statement of Case and Explanation of Findings. There were two errors for the use of Findings of Fact instead of Explanation of Findings in the Recommended Decision.

Two errors involve missing development actions and/or insufficient development taken to obtain medical evidence to establish that the period of wage-loss claimed is causally related to the employee's covered illness.

### **Other Significant Findings:**

None

<b>REVIEWER(s):</b>	<b>DATE:</b>
Shannon Green, Krista Kozlowski, Andrew Peters	July 15, 2016

# AR-1

## Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: July 11, 2016 – July 15, 2016

Office Reviewed: Denver District Office

Review Period: May 1, 2015 – April 30, 2016

---

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

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	170
Number of cases reviewed:	34
Number of errors in element:	3
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	97%

### **Describe Findings:**

Overall, the Denver District Office performed exceptionally well in this category. The few errors found (3) were for various reasons and there was no deficiency pattern or trends noted.

### **Other Significant Findings:**

None

<b>REVIEWER(s):</b>	<b>DATE:</b>
Theresa Apple, Catherine Carter	July 15, 2016

# AR-1

## Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: July 11, 2016 – July 15, 2016

Office Reviewed: Denver District Office

Review Period: May 1, 2015 – April 30, 2016

---

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

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	200
Number of cases reviewed:	49
Number of errors in element:	7
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	96%

### **Describe Findings:**

Overall the Denver District Office performed satisfactorily in the development of HHC requests. It should be noted that the Denver District Office performed with 96% accuracy in this category, which is 3% improvement over last year's findings.

In terms of deficiencies, the review showed a few cases in which the HHC authorization was not bronzed into OIS, discrepancies regarding the extent and duration of care, and instances in which the authorized care was greater than the care requested by the treating physician. Finally, one case was reviewed in which description of authorization was unclear.

### **Other Significant Findings:**

A 3% improvement was achieved from the last accountability review.

<b>REVIEWER(s):</b>	<b>DATE:</b>
Debbie Dorrance	July 15, 2016

# AR-1

## Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: July 11, 2016 – July 15, 2016

Office Reviewed: Denver District Office

Review Period: May 1, 2015 – April 30, 2016

---

<b>Standard:</b>	Category # 8 : Reopening Requests – District Office Response
------------------	--

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	246
Number of cases reviewed:	41
Number of errors in element:	2
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	99%

### **Describe Findings:**

Overall the Denver District Office excelled in the Reopening category. It should be noted that the District office performed with 99% accuracy in this category.

In terms of deficiencies, there were only two errors. The first error resulted from the letter not being correctly identified as a reconsideration. The second error resulted from the lack of development done prior to issuing a denial of reopening request.

### **Other Significant Findings:**

None

<b>REVIEWER(s):</b>	<b>DATE:</b>
Kristina Green	July 15, 2016