



OHIO AUDITOR OF STATE
KEITH FABER



OHIO AUDITOR OF STATE KEITH FABER



88 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
ContactMCA@ohioauditor.gov
(800) 282-0370

Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Up Procedures

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

RE: Lucia V. Coleman, M.D. NPI: 1043339407
Program Year 2: Meaningful Use Stage 2 Year 1

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the Ohio Department of Medicaid (ODM), on Dr. Lucia Coleman's (hereafter referred to as the Provider) compliance with the requirements of the Medicaid Provider Incentive Program (MPIP) for the year ended December 31, 2015. 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 compared the Provider's Ohio Medicaid Agreement dates from the Medicaid Information Technology System to the patient volume and meaningful use attestation periods. We found the Provider had an active agreement in effect during the attestation periods.
2. Using the Ohio e-license center, we compared the licensure type and effective dates to the patient volume and meaningful use attestation periods. We found no exceptions.
3. Using the MPIP system, we confirmed the Provider underwent the ODM's payment approval process, was approved for an incentive payment and received an incentive payment.

We compared the date of the payment approval with the date of the incentive payment and confirmed the payment approval occurred prior to the payment. In addition, we compared the payment amount with the MPIP payment schedule and found no variance.

4. We obtained the Provider's encounters during the patient volume attestation. We scanned the list and found duplicate encounters. We removed duplicates and recalculated encounters. We also scanned the list and found that it included multiple payer sources.
5. We recalculated the Medicaid patient volume from the adjusted encounters identified in procedure 4 and confirmed the Provider met the 30 percent the patient volume requirement.
6. We found that the Provider's location was using a newer version of the electronic health record (EHR) software reported in the MPIP system. We verified that the newer version of the EHR software was approved by the Office of the National Coordinator of Health IT.

7. We obtained the Provider's list of locations and a patient volume encounter report for the meaningful use period. We selected 10 encounters from the patient volume report and traced the names to the meaningful use report. We found five of the 10 encounters did not trace. We determined that one location was not included in the meaningful use report and that encounters from this one location accounted for over 90 percent of the total 451 encounters during the meaningful use period. The Provider stated that these encounters are not included as Medical/Somatic procedure codes are not recognized for meaningful use reporting.
8. We obtained supporting documentation for the 10 objectives 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 duplicates.
9. We obtained supporting documentation for the clinical quality measures and compared it to the applicable criteria. We confirmed the minimum number of measures was met with at least one measure from three different domains.

Responsible Party's Written Representation

The Provider declined to 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 requirements of the Medicaid Provider Incentive Program. 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.



Keith Faber
Auditor of State
Columbus, Ohio

June 5, 2019

OHIO AUDITOR OF STATE KEITH FABER



LUCIA COLEMAN

LUCAS 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 11, 2019**