

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

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

Office Reviewed: Seattle 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):	1544
Number of cases reviewed:	47
Number of errors in element:	7
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	98%

Describe Findings:

Results for the Seattle District Office were excellent 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.

In terms of deficiencies, the majority of the errors were related to the Statement of the Case (SOC). Several RD's did not provide any information on development actions taken to adjudicate the claim. In addition, the standard in accepting an SEC claim was not stated in one RD.

Other Significant Findings:

None

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

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

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

Office Reviewed: Seattle 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):	2509
Number of cases reviewed:	44
Number of errors in element:	37
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	93%

Describe Findings:

The Seattle 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 for this office. Of note, the office's development letters were detailed and conveyed the specific evidence needed to accept the claim.

In terms of deficiencies for Part E recommended decisions, the majority of errors were linked to decisions not effectively explaining all the evidence of record evaluated to reach a determination on eligibility within the Explanation of Findings. Another trend noted during the AR was that SEM searches and SOAF's were not properly saved in OIS.

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: Seattle District Office

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

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

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	1351
Number of cases reviewed:	50
Number of errors in element:	1
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	99%

Describe Findings:

The Seattle District Office exceeded the acceptable rating in the Payment Processing Category, with an overall rating of 99%. Only one of the fifty cases reviewed for the Seattle District Office contained an error.

The error noted that the EN-20 date stamp did not match the AOP received date in ECS. There was not a memo documenting the reason why these differed.

REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
Amy Zenobi	06/23/2016
Greg Nelson	6/23/2016

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

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

Office Reviewed: Seattle District Office

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

Standard:	Category 4: ECS Coding
------------------	------------------------

Sample Size (total # of indicators in the element that were reviewed):	965
Number of cases reviewed:	52
Number of errors in element:	2
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	98%

Describe Findings:

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

The Seattle district office easily exceeded the acceptable rating for this category with a 98% rating. No common trends were noted in this category. Errors identified in this category included a recommended decision issuance date not matching the decision date in ECS, and a medical condition in the recommended decision that did not match the medical condition in ECS.

Overall, the district office performed exceptionally well in this category.

REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
Curtis Johnson & Katina Johnson	June 24, 2016

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

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

Office Reviewed: Seattle 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):	456
Number of cases reviewed:	38
Number of errors in element:	13
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	97%

Describe Findings:

Overall the Seattle District Office performed exceptionally well in the Wage-Loss Claims category. The District Office performed with 97% accuracy in this category.

Five errors were noted in which the denial of wage-loss claims was solely based on the AAW. However medical evidence was not obtained to determine whether the claimed condition caused the employee's wage-loss during the claimed wage-loss period. Five additional errors focused on omission of key facts (development actions for medical evidence and SSN records) and inclusion of irrelevant information in the Statement of Case and Introductory paragraphs of the Recommended Decision.

Finally, a few errors were noted involving missing development actions and/or insufficient 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: Seattle 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:	12
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	92%

Describe Findings:

Overall the office performed well in this category, exceeding the acceptability rating with a 92%.

In the few errors noted within this category, deficiencies were found based on a lack of medical rational to support the claimed consequential conditions being related to an accepted condition. Additionally some acceptance letters were noted to not include a description of medical evidence used as the basis for the acceptance.

Other Significant Findings:

None

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: Seattle 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):	204
Number of cases reviewed:	51
Number of errors in element:	7
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	96%

Describe Findings:

Overall the Seattle District Office performed satisfactorily in the development of HHC requests. It should be noted that the Seattle District office performed with 96% accuracy in this category.

In terms of deficiencies, several cases were noted in which the reviewer found the need for additional development. Additional errors included authorizations not being bronzed into OIS, cases lacking justification for denial and one instance in which a denial did not advise the claimant of their right to request to a recommended decision.

Other Significant Findings:

None

REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
Debby Howell	July 15, 2016

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

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

Office Reviewed: Seattle 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):	238
Number of cases reviewed:	41
Number of errors in element:	8
Acceptable rating:	90%
Rating for review:	98%

Describe Findings:

Overall the Seattle District Office performed exceptionally well in this category. It should be noted that the District Office performed with 98% accuracy in this category, which reflected a mere eight errors noted in this element.

In terms of the deficiencies, three of the errors were linked to the absence of a written request for reopening. PM-1900.3 specifically states that the request for reopening must be a written request and all three were via phone conversation.

The remaining five errors were due to the fact that for each of these cases, no summary of the issue under review was included in the Director's Order or the Denial of the Reopening Request.

Other Significant Findings:

None

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