



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: Suzy E. Shortt-Tucker, C.N.P. NPI: 1487909792
Program Year 1: Adopt, Implement or Upgrade

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the Ohio Department of Medicaid (ODM), on Suzy E. Shortt-Tucker'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 the patient volume attestation period.
2. Using the Ohio e-license center, we confirmed 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 attestation period.
3. We reviewed the MPIP system and confirmed 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 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 Provider's list of all encounters for an alternate patient volume attestation period (October 1, 2014 to December 31, 2014) as the Provider stated they entered the incorrect original patient volume period (October 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013) in the MPIP system. 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 for the alternative patient volume attestation period and the final Provider's Medicaid encounters identified in procedure 4 to confirm if the MPIP data exceeded these two reports by 20 percent. We found variances exceeding 20 percent and recalculated the Medicaid patient volume using the Provider's Medicaid encounter list. The Provider met the 30 percent patient volume requirement.
6. We found that the Provider's electronic health record (EHR) system was different than reported in the MPIP system. We obtained an invoice and the contract to confirm the EHR system selected by the Provider. We confirmed that the new EHR system was approved by the Office of the National Coordinator of Health IT.

Responsible Party's Written Representation

We attempted to locate the Provider; however, we could not find any current contact information and the Medicaid contract agreement ended on February 24, 2018. As such, we were unable to obtain 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 11, 2018



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

SUZY SHORTT-TUCKER

OUT OF STATE 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 10, 2018**