

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

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

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

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

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

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	1520
Number of cases reviewed:	44
Number of errors in element:	17
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	95%

Describe Findings:

The Jacksonville District Office performed satisfactorily in the Part B Initial Claims Category. The district office performed well in the development of the claims and documenting the case files with the appropriate supporting documentation. NIOSH development and processing was excellent. Overall, the recommended decision outcome and written quality was excellent.

In terms of deficiencies, the most errors were linked to the cover letters, introductory paragraphs of the Recommended Decision and Conclusions of Law not identifying the same medical condition, Part type and acceptance or denial recommended by the district office.

Other Significant Findings:

None

REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
Joel M. Geran, Darius Radvila	June 23, 2016

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

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

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

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

Standard:	Category: 2 Part E Causation and Development
------------------	--

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	2470
Number of cases reviewed:	46
Number of errors in element:	25
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	95%

Describe Findings:

The Jacksonville District Office's rating exceeded the acceptable rating for Part E – Causation and Development. Under this category, Part E case development was a strong point. The AR results showed this office was nearly perfect in this category. Of note, the office's development letters were detailed and conveyed the specific evidence needed to accept the claim. The office also paid particular attention to documenting the case files with the appropriate supporting documentation, including SEM searches, IH, and CMC development.

In terms of the deficiencies for Part E recommended decisions, the majority of errors were linked to inadequate explanations as to how decisions were reached, particularly with respect to analysis of the relevant evidence in the claim and the applicable law.

Other Significant Findings:

None

REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
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: Jacksonville District Office

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

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

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	1330
Number of cases reviewed:	49
Number of errors in element:	2
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	99%

Describe Findings:

The Jacksonville District Office exceeded the acceptable rating in the Payment Processing Category, with an overall rating of 99%. Of the forty-nine cases reviewed for the Jacksonville District Office, only two contained errors.

The error in one case showed the ECS phone note was not recorded regarding verification of the bank routing number, the account number, and the account type. In this case, the payment was transmitted successfully to the bank. The other error found showed that the final payment documents were not scanned into OIS.

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

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

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

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

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

Standard:	Category: ECS Coding
------------------	----------------------

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	950
Number of cases reviewed:	51
Number of errors in element:	3
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	97%

Describe Findings:

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

The Jacksonville district office easily exceeded the acceptable rating for this category with a 97% rating. No common trends were noted in this category. Errors identified in this category included failure to include offset information in ECS coding and an impairment decision which erroneously included causation components within the ECS coding.

REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
Curtis Johnson, Katina Johnson	06/23/16

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

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

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

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

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

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	480
Number of cases reviewed:	40
Number of errors in element:	21
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	95%

Describe Findings:

Overall the Jacksonville 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, ten errors were found. These focused on the omission of key facts (missing development for medical evidence and/or medical evidence establishing causal relationship between accepted condition and wage-loss) and missing development actions in the Statement of Case and Explanation of Findings. Additionally, three errors involved the denial of wage-loss claims based solely on the AAW. However medical evidence was not obtained to determine whether the claimed condition caused the employee's wage-loss.

Finally, three errors were noted involving 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

REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
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: Jacksonville District Office

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

Standard:	Category # 6: Consequential Illnesses/Acceptances
------------------	---

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	200
Number of cases reviewed:	40
Number of errors in element:	15
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	92%

Describe Findings:

The deficiencies in this category were linked to the acceptance of the consequential illness claims despite the provided physician's letter not stating that the consequential illness was directly linked to the accepted condition.

Other Significant Findings:

Case reviews show that while physicians provide opinion on consequential illnesses, it is important claims staff to review opinions in light of the guidance of PM 2-1500.4. This section of the PM describes the importance of obtaining convincing and well-rationalized opinions on consequential illnesses.

REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
Theresa Apple, Catherine Carter	July 15, 2016

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

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

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

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

Standard:	Category #7 : Home Health Care (HHC) Requests
------------------	---

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	196
Number of cases reviewed:	49
Number of errors in element:	15
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	91%

Describe Findings:

Overall the Jacksonville District Office performed well in this category with a rating to 91%.

The deficiencies noted in this category included documents supporting the Home Health Care (HHC) requests and decision letters missing in OIS, and findings that additional development of medical evidence was needed to support HHC requests.

Other Significant Findings:

None

REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
Melissa Vives	July 15, 2016

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

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

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

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

Standard:	Category #8 : Reopening Requests
------------------	----------------------------------

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	240
Number of cases reviewed:	40
Number of errors in element:	2
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	99%

Describe Findings:

Overall the Jacksonville District Office performed exceptionally well in the Reopenings category. It should be noted that the District Office performed with 99% accuracy in this category, which reflected a mere eight errors noted in this element.

In terms of the deficiencies, the outcome of both cases was not correct. In both instances, Circular 15-05 relating to asbestos exposure was in effect at that time. As the claimed condition under review in each case was for COPD, asbestos exposure should have been assumed even though it did not show up in the SEM database. As such, the reason for each denial (lack of evidence of exposure) was inappropriate, as the asbestos exposure was not considered.

Other Significant Findings:

None

REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
Matt Buehrle	July 15, 2016