

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: June 24, 2019 – June 28, 2019

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2018 – March 31, 2019

Standard:	Category 1: Payment Processing
------------------	---------------------------------------

Number of cases reviewed:	51
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	99%

Describe Findings:

With respect to the Jacksonville District Office, the one deficiency found resulted from a clerical error where incorrect bank account information was entered in ECS Notes. The bank name, city, routing number, and telephone number in ECS Notes was different from the information provided by the claimant on the Form EN-20. However, the claimant's information written on the EN-20 was correct. There was no memo or phone note clarifying the discrepancy. As a follow-up action, the reviewer contacted the claimant and confirmed that they did receive the payment and that the information on the Form EN-20 was correct.

The Jacksonville District Office performed exceptionally well with regard to processing payments.

REVIEWER(S)	DATE
Rodney Alston, Kristina Green, Danny Hemphill, Kathryn Jimmerson, William Pridy, Barry Davidson, Kimberly Bender, Lisa Slattery, Frankie Wallace, Deanne Roberts, Andrea deVry	June 27, 2019

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: June 24, 2019 – June 28, 2019

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2018 – March 31, 2019

Standard:	Category 2: Part E Causation Claims Element 1: Development and Causation Assessment Element 2: Outcome and Written Quality
------------------	---

Number of cases reviewed	44
Rating for Element #1	96%
Rating for Element #2	95%
Acceptable rating:	90%
Overall Category Rating:	95%

Summarize Category (or Element) Findings:

With respect to this Element 1, the reviewers identified eleven deficiencies related to inadequate causation and medical development. Such deficiencies include three claims where the claims examiner (CE) did not send causation development letters to the claimant, either initially or following receipt of a negative Contract Medical Consultant (CMC) report. In another claim, the CE did not send the treating physician a copy of a Site Exposure Matrix (SEM) search showing that the employee was not exposed to toxins that the physician cited as a factor in the claimed illness. In two other claims, the medical development was determined to be inadequate because the CE did not seek clarification of conflicting medical evidence. Finally, in another claim, the CE did not provide a negative Industrial Hygienist (IH) report to the treating physician for comment.

The reviewers identified twenty deficiencies in this Element 2. Nine of the deficiencies were identified in recommended decisions and development letters that were not adequately proofread for clarity and accuracy. For example, in one case the date of a medical report appeared in the decision as 20187. In two other cases, the dates on the recommended decision (RD) cover letter and RD did not match, or the zip code was incorrect.

In five other deficient cases, necessary reports (CMC/IH/TOX analysis) were not included or listed as part of the enclosure in the cover letters. In one such case, the RD cover letter incorrectly advised the claimant that a copy of the CMC report was available upon receipt of a written request. Other deficiencies included a case where the waiver form did not include the case ID, a case where the Statement of Accepted Facts (SOAF) was missing employment dates, and another case in which the RD recommended an award of benefits, but did not identify whether the acceptance was under Part B or Part E.

Finally, in two cases, the reviewers found the RDs lacked an adequate discussion to support the decision outcome.

REVIEWER(S)	DATE
Rodney Alston, Kristina Green, Danny Hemphill, Kathryn Jimmerson, William Pridy, Barry Davidson, Kimberly Bender, Lisa Slattery, Frankie Wallace, Deanne Roberts, Andrea deVry	June 27, 2019

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: June 24, 2019 – June 28, 2019

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2018 – March 31, 2019

Standard:	Category 3: Post Remand/Reopening Adjudication Element 1: Post Remand/ Reopening Development Element 2: Recommended Decisions – Outcome and Written Quality
------------------	---

Number of cases reviewed	49
Rating for Element #1	89%
Rating for Element #2	94%
Acceptable rating:	90%
Overall Category Rating:	95%

Summarize Category (or Element) Findings:

In Element 1, the reviewers found three cases with deficiencies within Indicator 1, pertaining to appropriate development actions taken to address outstanding issues identified within the remand or reopening. In Indicator 2, two errors involved medical development that was insufficient to address the issues in the remand. In one case the Claims Examiner (CE) did not contact the claimant's treating physician for a medical opinion concerning the connection between two of the claimed conditions, but instead referred the case to a CMC. In another case, the reviewer found the CE's development letter to the treating physician lacked discussion on the toxic exposure development and the outcome of such development.

In Element 2, two errors pertain to incorrect factual information contained within the cover letters or RD. In one case, the waivers were contained an incorrect mailing address. In a second case, the RD did not contain a case ID or the decision date.

Two reviewed cases, with RDs to deny, did not include the CMC or IH referrals used to justify the decision outcome. Other deficiencies identified that are specific to the Statement of the Case (SOC) include two other cases where toxic substance exposure

development was not presented as part of the relevant background evidence. For example, in one case the SOC missed discussion on the new toxic substances identified by the treating physician.

In four other cases, the SOC communicates information out of chronological order or in a manner that is not understandable to the reader.

Reviewers identified six deficiencies in the Explanation of Findings section of decisions due to vague explanations, explanations based on incorrect information, or a failure to provide clearly-written narrative supporting the conclusions arrived at in the decisions.

Lastly, one case deficiency resulted from a Conclusion of Law that did not identify the part type associated with the denial, and three cases were found deficient due to grammatical errors.

REVIEWER(S)	DATE
Rodney Alston, Kristina Green, Danny Hemphill, Kathryn Jimmerson, William Pridy, Barry Davidson, Kimberly Bender, Lisa Slattery, Frankie Wallace, Deanne Roberts, Andrea deVry	June 27, 2019

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: August 12, 2019 – August 16, 2019

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

Review Period: June 1, 2018 – May 31, 2019

Standard:	Category #4: Part B Recommended Decisions
	Element #1: Outcome and Written Quality

Number of cases reviewed	47
Rating for Element #1	94%
Acceptable rating:	90%
Overall Category Rating:	94%

Summarize Category (or Element) Findings:

The Jacksonville Office rating of 94% exceeds the acceptable rating level for Category 4.

22 errors were noted, which were distributed throughout the indicator questions. Two trends were observed in analyzing the 22 errors that were marked in total for Category 4. 6 errors involved some type of issue with the employee's name (name spelled incorrectly in the RD or cover letter). 9 errors pertained to the medical conditions, or decision components involved. These errors included the following: the written decision and/or cover letter purported to deny conditions which (in fact) had not been claimed; a decision which denied impairment, even though there was no impairment claimed; a certain part/section of the decision referred to condition(s) that did not match the rest of the RD; cover letter/conclusions did not state the conditions that were being adjudicated.

Additionally, 2 error remarks noted inadequate discussion of employment (both errors involve the same case); and there an additional 2 error involving a survivor claim, in which there is a lack of discussion regarding a previous claim that had been brought by the employee prior to employee's death (the 2 errors that were indicated both pertain to the same case).

Summarize Other Significant Findings:

None identified

AP TEAM REVIEWER(S)	DATE
Amy Zenobi, Jennifer Blair, Richard Smith, Bernadette DeHerrera, Daniel Divittorio, Michelle Taylor, Traci Murphy, Krista Kozlowski, Kory Johnson, Andrea DeVry	August 16, 2019

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: August 12, 2019 – August 16, 2019

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

Review Period: June 1, 2018 – May 31, 2019

Standard:	Category #5: ECS Coding Element #1: Recommended Decision Coding Element #2: Accepted Medical Condition Coding Element #3: Causation Path Coding
------------------	--

Number of cases reviewed	52
Rating for Element #1	99%
Rating for Element #2	96%
Rating for Element #3	89%
Acceptable rating:	90%
Overall Category Rating:	95%

Summarize Category (or Element) Findings:

The Jacksonville District Office exceeded the overall acceptability rating for ECS Coding. Notably, there were 10 errors out of the 52 cases reviewed. Under Element 1, there were 2 errors where the employment dates between ECS and the written decision did not match.

3 errors were found under Element 2. All errors show the medical eligibility date was incorrectly coded in ECS. Two of the 3 errors were identified within 1 case file.

Five errors were found under Element 3. Two of the 5 errors were missing "Part E based on B" causation paths as there was a positive NIOSH causation path under Part B. The remaining errors show toxic causation paths in ECS were missing SEM database search information. SEM searches were conducted but not recorded in the toxic causation paths.

Summarize Other Significant Findings:

None Identified

AR TEAM REVIEWER(s)	DATE:
Amy Zenobi, Jennifer Blair, Richard Smith, Bernadette DeHerrera, Daniel Divittorio, Michelle Taylor, Traci Murphy, Krista Kozlowski, Kory Johnson, Andrea DeVry	August 16, 2019

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: August 12, 2019 – August 16, 2019

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

Review Period: June 1, 2018 – May 31, 2019

Standard:	Category #6: Consequential Illness Acceptances Element #1: Development Element #2: Consequential Illness Letter/RD – Outcome and Written Quality
------------------	---

Number of cases reviewed	43
Rating for Element #1	99%
Rating for Element #2	100%
Acceptable rating:	90%
Overall Category Rating:	99%

Summarize Category (or Element) Findings:

Overall, the Jacksonville District Office is performing above an acceptable level in this category. The review team identified 1 deficiency.

The lone error was identified within Element 1, Development. The team noted that the medical evidence which was used as the basis to accept the consequential illness in this particular case lacked sufficient rationalization from the treating physician.

Summarize Other Significant Findings:

None Identified

AF TEAM REVIEWER(S)	DATE
Amy Zenobi, Jennifer Blair, Richard Smith, Bernadette DeHerrera, Daniel Divittorio, Michelle Taylor, Traci Murphy, Krista Kozlowski, Kory Johnson, Andrea DeVry	August 16, 2019

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: August 12, 2019 – August 16, 2019

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

Review Period: June 1, 2018 – May 31, 2019

Standard: Category #7: OIS Indexing (Incoming & Outgoing Correspondence)

Number of cases reviewed	52
Rating for Element #1	89%
Rating for Element #2	95%
Acceptable rating:	90%
Overall Category Rating:	91%

Summarize Category (or Element) Findings:

A total of fifteen (15) errors were identified in this category, thirteen (13) within the incoming correspondence element.

Twelve out of the thirteen errors within the incoming correspondence element occurred due to incorrect category/subject classification. Six out of twelve errors involved 3 specific trends where documents should have been classified under the following category/subject classifications: "Forms and Claims/Words of Claim," "Other Inquiries/Privacy Act Request," and "Other/Environmental /Scientific Studies." An additional error involved incorrect category/subject classification due to an improperly separated document. The remaining errors within the element did not fall under any specific trends.

Both errors within the outgoing correspondence element involved improper use of specific subjects in the category of "Other" which followed no specific trend.

Other Significant Findings:

None Identified

AR TEAM REVIEWER(S):	DATE:
Curtis Johnson, Charles Bogino	August 16, 2019