



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: Nancy E. Hale, C.N.P. NPI: 1649465238
Program Year 2: Meaningful Use Stage 1 Year 1

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the Ohio Department of Medicaid (ODM), on Nancy E. Hale'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 (MITS) and we found that the Provider had an active Ohio Medicaid Agreement during the patient volume and meaningful use attestation periods.
2. Using the Ohio e-license center, we found the Provider type was the same as reported in MPIP and confirmed the Provider was licensed to practice in Ohio during the patient volume and meaningful use attestation periods.
3. We reviewed the MPIP system and found that the Provider underwent the 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 we found that the pre-payment approval occurred prior to payment. In addition, we compared the payment amount with the MPIP payment schedule and we found 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 confirmed 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 Quality Decision Support System data and the final Provider's Medicaid encounters identified in procedure 3 to confirm if the MPIP data exceeded these two reports by 20 percent. We found no variances exceeding 20 percent and we recalculated patient volume using MPIP encounters and final total encounters on the Provider's encounter list and the Provider met the 30 percent patient volume requirement.
6. We confirmed the Provider was using the electronic health record (EHR) system as reported in the MPIP system.

7. We could not perform the procedure to confirm if over 50 percent of total encounters were included on the meaningful use report and occurred at locations with the CEHRT installed because the Provider's meaningful use reports did not identify the location on all of the encounters. The one location the Provider attested to in the MPIP system was listed in MITS.
8. We obtained supporting documentation for the core measures and compared 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 to the applicable criteria and confirmed if the minimum number of measures was met, including at least one public health menu measure. We found no exceptions. 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 with the applicable criteria and confirmed if the minimum number of measures was met with at least one measure from three different domains. We found no exceptions.

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 the ODM, and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than the specified parties.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

June 14, 2018



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

NANCY HALE

CUYAHOGA 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
JULY 26, 2018**