

PI - Provider Quarterly Screening

Purpose:

This procedure provides guidance for ensuring a periodic and systematic review and analysis of post-payment data contained in MMIS SUR Subsystem and Data Warehouse Reports is completed.

Identification of Roles:

IME PI— conduct a periodic and systematic review and analysis of post-payment data.

Performance Standard:

Use State approved provider type list for quarterly selection

Path of Business Procedure:

All provider types and peer groups are screened on at least an annual basis to determine those that may justify a closer review. This review is described in the PI Unit annual work plan. This review is also conducted on a random review of all providers and, in theory, all provider claims, whether aberrant or not. This analysis may be conducted in conjunction with the periodic meetings of the Operations Assessment Committee or may be completed independent of this group.

The Account Manager, Operations Manager, and Database Management Administrator comprise the group charged with conducting screening and analysis of all relevant SUR Subsystem Reports and Data Warehouse Reports.

- Step 1. The Account Manager schedules the meeting to conduct the above report analysis.
- Step 2. Each report is reviewed individually. The review includes, but is not limited to, the most widely used reports.
 - a. Summary Profile Report (IAMS6700–R001)
 - b. Summary Profile Exception Report (IAMS6700–R002)
 - c. Exception Review Index (IAMS6900–R001)
- Step 3. Specific attention is placed on the Exception Review Index Report (#3 above). This mainframe report produces a separate provider ranking for each category of service, and ranks each provider in descending sequence by a total exception weight based on the routine quarterly summary profile cycle. It

identifies the most likely abusers of the program, as determined by the PI exception criteria set in the system parameter files. System parameters may be revised quarterly, or more often, if the need arises. This is one of the most useful reports and is reviewed in the early stages to identify provider cases.

- a. This mainframe report is imported into a Microsoft Excel workbook for further sorting and grouping
- b. Each provider type (designated by category of service or class group) targeted for “screening” during the quarter in question is displayed on a separate worksheet within the workbook
- c. The provider rankings in each peer group, according to total exception weight, are maintained as they are displayed in the mainframe report version
- d. The top 20-25 providers in each peer group are highlighted to draw the attention of the above review staff
- e. These top providers in each peer group are screened to determine whether any have been reviewed within the past 12 months, whether any are the subject of a referral, and whether any data warehouse reports exist or can be created to obtain a closer look at the provider’s claim detail. These reports may be created either hard-copy or can be left in an electronic format
- f. Providers appearing worthy of a closer review are assigned membership within a review project and are assigned to staff for review
- g. For all “aberrant” providers selected for close review in a given class group at least one “non-aberrant” provider from the same class or peer group is selected, at random, for a close review

Step 4. Another set of standard reports, consisting of data from the data warehouse, is created each quarter for the provider types scheduled for screening. When data at the procedure code (HCPCS) level exists for a given provider type, a report is produced identifying the number of claims and total dollars paid for each procedure code. For all provider types scheduled for review, a report is produced identifying the largest providers, in terms of dollars paid to assist in selecting providers appearing worthy of closer review. These reports are produced in electronic format, in Microsoft Excel. The SQL statements used to produce these reports are located at <\\dhsime\PI\Data Warehouse\Paul\SQL\Templates\DW12\Analysis Reports>. As with the review of SURS subsystem reports, for all aberrant providers selected from data warehouse reports from a given peer group at least one non-aberrant provider from the same peer group is selected, at random, for review.

Step 5. The selection of a non-aberrant provider is conducted with the intent to complete an “across-the-board” random review of all providers, an objective of the former triennial System Performance Review (SPR) requirements (repealed January 1, 1998). This provider review follows the same protocol as with an

aberrant provider with respect to project and reviewer assignment, data selection and mining, and communications with the provider.

FORMS/REPORTS:

Summary Profile Report (IAMS6700–R001)
Summary Profile Exception Report (IAMS6700–R002)
Exception Review Index (IAMS6900–R001)

RPF References:

6.1.2.2.6

Interfaces:

MMIS SURS Subsystem

Attachments:

None