



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures

Ohio Department of Medicaid
50 West Town Street, Suite 400
Columbus, Ohio 43215

RE: Susan J. Levy, M.D. NPI: 1053350330
Program Year 3: Meaningful Use Stage 1 Year 2

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the Ohio Department of Medicaid (ODM), on Dr. Susan J. Levy's (hereafter referred to as the Provider) compliance with the requirements of the Medicaid Provider Incentive Program (MPIP) for the year ended December 31, 2014. The Provider is responsible for compliance with the MPIP requirements. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of ODM. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures enumerated below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

1. We searched the Medicaid Information Technology System and confirmed that the Provider had an active Ohio Medicaid Agreement during 13 days of the patient volume and meaningful use attestation periods; however, the Provider's paid claims were submitted under the mental health agency the Provider was employed at (see procedure 5) which did have an active Ohio Medicaid Agreement during all of the patient volume and meaningful use attestation period.
2. Using the Ohio e-license center, we verified the Provider type was the same as reported in MPIP and confirmed that the Provider was licensed to practice in Ohio during the patient volume and meaningful use attestation periods.
3. We reviewed the MPIP system and confirmed that the Provider underwent ODM's pre-payment approval process, was approved for incentive payment and received an incentive payment.

We compared the date of pre-payment approval with the date of the incentive payment and confirmed that pre-payment approval occurred prior to payment. In addition, we compared the payment amount with the MPIP payment schedule and confirmed that ODM issued the correct payment amount.

4. We obtained the list of all encounters during the patient volume attestation period from the Provider. We scanned the list and found no duplicate encounters. We also verified that all payer sources were included in the encounter list and found no unrecorded encounters.
5. We compared the Medicaid encounters in the MPIP system with those from the final Provider's Medicaid encounters identified in procedure 4 to determine if the MPIP data exceeded the Provider's encounters by 20 percent. We found no variance exceeding 20 percent and the MPIP data met the 30 percent patient volume requirement.

We did not perform the comparison of the Medicaid encounters in the MPIP system with those from the Quality Decision Support System as the Provider was employed at a mental health agency and there were no paid claims listing the Provider as rendering the service. We selected two Medicaid patient encounters from the Provider's encounter list and reviewed service documentation to verify that the Provider rendered these services. We found no differences.

6. We found that the location where the Provider worked was now using a newer version of the electronic health record (EHR) software reported in the MPIP system. The newer version of the software was able to produce reports showing the Provider's use in 2014. We verified that the newer version of the EHR software was approved by the Office of the National Coordinator of Health IT.
7. We confirmed the Provider did not report multiple locations.
8. We obtained supporting documentation for the core measures and compared it to the applicable criteria. We found no exceptions. For those measures that require only unique patients be counted, we scanned the detailed data and found no duplicate patients.
9. We obtained supporting documentation for the menu measures and compared it to the applicable criteria and we confirmed the minimum number of measures was met including at least one public health menu measure. For those measures that require only unique patients be counted, we scanned the detailed data and found no duplicate patients.
10. We obtained supporting documentation for the clinical quality measures and compared it to the applicable criteria and we confirmed the three core and additional clinical quality measures were met. For the core measures reported at zero, we verified that an alternate measure was reported.

Responsible Party's Written Representation

The Provider did not submit a signed representation letter acknowledging responsibility for maintaining records and complying with applicable MPIP regulations; making available all documentation related to compliance; responding fully to our inquiries; reporting any non-compliance subsequent to the end of the engagement period; and disclosing all communications received from regulatory agencies alleging noncompliance with the Ohio MPIP rules.

This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants' attestation standards. We were not engaged to and did not conduct an examination or review, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion or conclusion, respectively, on the Provider's compliance with the MPIP requirements. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion or conclusion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported. This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Provider and ODM, and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than the specified parties.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

December 29, 2017



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

SUSAN LEVY

ATHENS COUNTY

CLERK'S CERTIFICATION

This is a true and correct copy of the report which is required to be filed in the Office of the Auditor of State pursuant to Section 117.26, Revised Code, and which is filed in Columbus, Ohio.

Susan Babbitt

CLERK OF THE BUREAU

**CERTIFIED
JANUARY 23, 2018**