Informal Dispute Resolution (IDR) Independent Informal Dispute Resolution (IIDR) Key Elements & Updates

Charlene Kawchak-Belitsky, R.N., BSN, NHA Senior manager, IDR/IIDR, MPRO Presented to Tennessee Health Care Association Legislative Conference 3/19/2015

MPRO

I have no relevant financial relationships to disclose with any health care related business or other entity whose products or services may be discussed in or directly affected in the market place by the educational content.

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



Session Objectives

- Identify key regulatory differences between IDR and IIDR
- Identify key components of informal deficiency review and a complete organized case
- Understand the process reviewers utilize in making a recommendation to a state agency



Session Objectives	
#1	
Identify key regulatory differences	
between IDR and IIDR	
Michigan's Hadrin Care Quality Improvement Organization I seem report org	
5	
What is the IDR Process?	
What is the IDR Process?	
IDR process provides nursing homes a	
single, informal opportunity to dispute survey findings subsequent to the receipt of the	
official Statement of Deficiencies (SOD or 2567).	
2501).	
MORAL THAN CAT QUITY INFORMAT CONTINUES New AND AND	
MPRO	
6	
What is the IDR Process?	
Federal certification regulation 42 CFR	
488.331 requires the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) and the state's	
offer facility representatives an informal opportunity, at their request, to dispute survey	
findings subsequent to the receipt of the	
official SOD or 2567 • If successful, the findings should be removed	
or modified and a revised 2567 will be issued	
Michigani Madi Cari Quality Improvement Operatorism www.mpra.org	

_

MPRO

What is the IDR Process?

- · Designated individual(s) from state agency
- Choice of state agency or independent, e.g., MPRO. Facility pays MPRO for IDR review
- All independent and all paid by state agency

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



Types of IDR Reviews

- Desk/written (Tennessee reviews are conducted this way by MPRO for IIDR)
- · Face-to-face
- Telephonic approximately one hour; facilities opportunity to present case, state agency aware and may be on call

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



Independent IDR (IIDR) – Effective Date Jan. 1, 2012

Affordable Care Act and IIDR:

- Final Rule: The Final Rule CMS-2435-F affecting nursing homes was published on March 18, 2011
- Following a nursing home survey, state survey agencies are required to provide an opportunity for IIDR when Civil Money Penalty (CMP) is imposed



IIDR Process	
Details can be found in: CMS S & C: 12-08-NH Memo (Dec. 2, 2011) Federal Requirements for the Independent Informal Dispute Resolution (Independent IDR) Process for Nursing Homes — Interim Advance Guidance	
& CMS S & C: 13-57-NH Memo (Aug. 30, 2013) Escrow and Independent Informal Dispute Resolution Process for Nursing Homes – Applicable to All Civil Money Penalties	
Militaria Traditi Can Gurdin propromeno Coprosione som reprincip	
IIDR Process – Effective Date	
Jan. 1, 2012	
 An opportunity for an IIDR is provided within 30 calendar days of the notice of imposition of a civil money penalty that is subject to being collected and placed in 	
escrow	
 The facility must request an IIDR within 10 calendar days of receipt of the offer 	
Militaria Nada Cari Qualiy inprosement Ozorozone swanzeru rog MPRO	
IIDR Process	
CMS S & C: 12-08-NH Memo (Dec. 2, 2011)	
 A facility may request an IIDR for each survey that cites deficiencies (at a scope and severity of G or above) for which a civil money penalty has been imposed and will be collected and placed in escrow 	
MPRO	

IIDR Process	
Update to Dec. 2, 2011 CMS S & C: 13-57-NH Memo (Aug. 30, 2013)	
 Effective Oct. 1, 2013, CMPs all standard or complaint surveys initiate an enforcement action in which a CMP is imposed where the highest level of deficiency is less than a G level, will also 	
be subject to collection and escrow also creates opportunity for the facility to request to participate in the IIDR process	
Montgam islands Care Quelly Improvement Cognitions wask impris org	
IIDD Droope	
IIDR Process	
CMS S & C: 13-57-NH Memo (Aug. 30, 2013) also indicates:	
"States may not charge facilities for the	
Independent IDR process required under 42 CFR §488.431"	
,	
Managem's listed Care Quality Improvement Engineering 1 were represent	
IIDD Droope	
IIDR Process	
Affordable Care Act and IIDR: • IIDR does not remove or alter the existing	
informal process at §488.331(a) which	
remains for use IIDR is IN ADDITION to the current IDR	
process	
Mitchigan's Health Care Quality Intercomment Organization www.mgro.org	

110	-				
ш)K	Pr	O	CE	288

- The IIDR process does not delay the imposition of any remedies, including a CMP
- IIDR must be completed within 60 days of request
- · IIDR must generate a written record
- Requires notification of state ombudsman, involved resident and/or resident representative

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



IIDR Process

 "Once a facility requests an Independent IDR, the state must notify the involved resident or resident representative, as well as the state's long-term care ombudsman, that they have an opportunity to submit written comment."

Notice must include:

- · A brief description of the findings of noncompliance
- · Designated contact person for questions
- For res/res reps, contact info for long-term care ombudsman

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



IIDR Process

- "Involved resident is a resident who was the subject of a complaint, or who filed a complaint that led to a deficiency finding that is the subject of Independent IDR"
- "Resident representative means either the resident's legal representative or the individual filing a complaint involving or on behalf of a resident"



22	
IIDR Process	
States options for IIDR: IIDR may be conducted by: "A component of an umbrella state agency provided that the component is organizationally separate from the state survey agency"	
"Organizationally separate – means a distinct office or division that functions independently from the office or division that conducts survey or certification activities of nursing homes"	
OR	
Michigan's listed the Coard Quality Improvement Cognition (in Immunitary org	
23	
IIDR Process	
"An independent entity with specific understanding of Medicare and Medicaid program requirement selected by the state and approved by CMS" (e.g. MPRO)	
Michigan's Noville Care Quality Improvement Cognitionins wave improving	
IIDR Process	
States that already had a process in place that met these requirements were able to when to CMS for approval.	
 submit them to CMS for approval CMS approved each state's process 	
whether conducted by state agency (organizationally separate) or an approved	
third party entity	

IIDR Process

Can you do both IDR & IIDR?

- · An IIDR will...
- "Not include the survey findings that have already been the subject of an informal dispute resolution under §488.331 for the particular deficiency citations at issue in the independent process under §488.431, unless the informal dispute resolution under §488.31 was completed prior to the imposition of the civil money penalty"

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



Independent IDR Process

Can you do both IDR & IIDR?

- · The answer is yes if...
- "...the informal dispute resolution under §488.31 was completed prior to the imposition of the civil money penalty"

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



Independent IDR Process

What if the state survey agency disagrees?

- The complete written record will be sent to the applicable CMS regional office (RO) for review and final decision...
- Provide the portion(s) of the IIDR recommendation with which it disagrees, the basis for its disagreement and any relevant survey documents..."



IIDR Process

What if the state survey agency disagrees?

- CMS' RO will review the IIDR recommendation and records along with the state's written disagreement of the IIDR's recommendation and will provide written notification to the state survey agency of the final decision
- The state survey agency will then send written notification of the final decision to the facility within 10 calendar days of receiving the final decision from the CMS RO

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



IIDR Process

A quick look at the differences:

IDR process

Facility is notified of opportunity to IDR with receipt of CMS -2567 SOD

Facility must request IDR within 10 calendar days

No completion timeframe

indicated

Must generate a written record

Notification of resident, etc., not indicated

Independent IDR process

Notified of opportunity to IIDR with CMS notification of imposition of CMP

Facility must request within 10 days of offer of opportunity for IIDR from CMS

Must be completed within 60 days of request

Must generate a written record

Include notification of state

ombudsman, involved resident/resident representative to provide opportunity for comment

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



IIDR Process

A quick look at the differences:

IDR process

Must be CMS approved process and conducted by state or by an entity approved by CMS

CMP payment due 15 calendar days after final administrative (formal) appeal upholding CMP

CMS makes the final determination of the IDR

IIDR process

Must be CMS approved process and conducted by state or by an entity approved by CMS such as component of State Agency as long as organizationally separate, or independent entity with specific understanding of Medicare/Medicaid program requirements selected by the state and approved by CMS

CMS may collect and place imposed CMPs in an escrow account on whichever of the following occurs first: 1)The date on which the IIDR process is completed or 2) The date that is 90 calendar days after the date of notification of imposition of CMP

CMS makes the final determination of the IIDR

MPRO

Session Objectives #2

Identify key components of an Informal Deficiency Review and a complete organized case

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



Informal Deficiency Review – Survey Considerations

- Starts at entrance conference open communication and information sharing
- During the survey communicate with staff
- Exit conference surveyor to communicate areas of concern... providers ask questions

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



Anatomy of your CMS-2567

3 Basic Components

1) Regulatory Reference

- · A survey data tag number,
- The CFR or LSC reference,
- The language from that reference which specifies the aspect(s) of the requirement with which the entity was noncompliant.
- An explicit statement that the requirement was "NOT MET."



Anatomy of your CMS-2567	
2) Deficient Practice Statement • The specific action(s),error(s), or lack of action (deficient practice),	
 Outcome(s) relative to the deficient practice, when possible A description of the extent of the deficient practice or the number of deficient cases relative to the total 	
number of such cases, The identifier of the individuals or situations referenced in the extent of the deficient practice, and The source(s) of the information through which the evidence was obtained.	
Michigans Teach Card Quality Improvement Organization www.mycn.t.ct	
Anotomy of your CMS 2567	
Anatomy of your CMS-2567 3) Relevant Facts and Findings	
 The facts and findings relevant to the deficient practice, answer the questions: who, what, where, when, and how. They illustrate the entity's noncompliance with the requirement or regulation. 	
Sources of Evidence may include:Observation(s)	
• Interview(s)	
 Review of Record(s) and Other Document(s) 	
Miningers Teach Card Quality Improvement Organization www.myn.t.et	
36	
IDR/IIDR Preparation	
Review the Statement of Deficiencies	
(SOD)/ CMS 2567	
 Does the 2567 provide observations, record review, interviews, etc. that support 	
the deficient practice statement?	
 Refer to state operations manual EXHIBIT 7A PRINCIPLES OF DOCUMENTATION 	
Militages 1 Realth Card Quality Improvement Organization were reprinted	
MPRO	

IDR/IIDR Preparation

- Read the deficient practice for each example and for each tag
- Address all examples separately and each stated deficient practice
- Re-read entire narrative and attachments to ensure you got it all covered for each deficient practice statement and each example/resident

MicNgan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



IDR/IIDR Preparation

- Is the issue cited at the correct tag?
- Is the issue cited at the correct scope and severity, if Immediate Jeopardy or Substandard Quality of Care?
- Is there new information available that could have been provided to surveyors at the time of the survey?

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



Your Work Continues!

- Provide a narrative statement about the disputed citation; your point of view and what you are requesting
- Give an explanation of why you feel the deficiency is incorrect or invalid referring to the specific regulatory language for the citation
- Provide supporting documentation that demonstrates how you were in compliance with the regulation – if not available at time of survey explain why



Considerations for IIDR Preparation

- · Avoidable vs. Unavoidable
- Regulatory Language & Scope & Severity
 - Reference State Operations Manual (SOM)
 Appendix P Survey Protocol for Long Term
 Care Facilities & Appendix PP Guidance to
 Surveyors for Long-term Care Facilities
- Immediate Jeopardy
 - Reference SOM Appendix Q Guidelines for Determining Immediate Jeopardy

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mgro.org



Considerations for IIDR Preparation

State Operations Manual and Appendixes All available at www.CMS.gov

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



Making the Most of an IIDR

Review of Common Problems and Documentation Concerns

Suggestions for Preparing

Materials to Submit for IDR/IIDR Review



Common Problems in Documentation

- Sending TOO MUCH documentation
 - Obscures the documents the reviewer will seek
 - Reviewer has to read it all and sometimes find more to support the citation
- Emotional narratives
- · Requesting review of tag as past non-compliance

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



Common Problems in Documentation



- Attachments poorly organized
 - Lends confusion to the supporting evidence
 - May increase review time and therefore cost of review

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



Common Problems in Documentation



- Chronology of events not easily determined
- Original dates and times questionable
- · Dates not legible
- Dates cut out during copying



Common Problems in Documentation



- IDR requests submitted without any supporting documentation
- IDR requests that focus mainly on a narrative viewpoint
- Documents to support your rebuttal are highly recommended

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



Suggestions for IIDR Case Materials

- · Number the pages submitted
- · Can be handwritten on each page
- Divider tabs, binders and staples not necessary for MPRO
- Mark exhibits that relate to narrative, "exhibit 1 or A", page 1 of 4, RE: R #1

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



Suggestions for IIDR Case Materials

- If requesting IIDR on multiple tags, make sure documents relate to specific tag
- Information of significance to the citation can be circled or boxed with a pen or highlighter
- Check each page after copying the original document
- · Provide identifier lists if applicable

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization	

Suggestions for Survey Time that
Could Help Later With Case
Materials

Documentation of compliance with standards is most effective when it occurred <u>prior</u> to and/or during the survey, e.g. statements & interdisciplinary notes

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



SESSION OBJECTIVES

#3

Understand the process MPRO reviewers utilize in making a recommendation to a state agency

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



MPRO Overview

- Accredited by URAC, a national health care accrediting organization, as an Independent Review Organization (IRO)
- An IRO must have a regulatory compliance program and take steps to ensure:
 - The organization is not subject to any conflict of interest that could compromise the integrity of the external review process
 - The organization maintains confidentiality and documentation of all cases reviewed
 - Completes reviews timely



IIDR Review Goals

- To provide an objective and reliable review for each cited deficiency
- Complete each review within the required timeframe
- Ensure the quality of review decisions through internal monitoring and ongoing training of reviewers

MicNgan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



IIDR Review Process:

- An objective process embedded in a continuous quality improvement framework
- The reviewers follow objective steps and an algorithm that equally considers information identified in the SOD and information submitted by the requesting nursing home

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



MPRO Reviewer Selection

- A reviewer with no identified conflict of interest is selected to complete a requested review
- MPRO forwards all documents received from requesting facility for review to the reviewer(s)
- Reviewer is notified of the review time frame and a due date
- MPRO currently has 10 reviewers. Experience varies between provider and surveyor background



MPRO Overview

MPRO IDR/IIDR review personnel experience:

- IDR/IIDR review staff include long-term care directors of nursing, nurse consultants, former state surveyors/licensing officers, clinical social workers and nursing home administrators
- Reviewers receive orientation to the MPRO IDR process and take part in monthly training sessions with quarterly case QA reviews



MPRO Capabilities Overview

- · MPRO reviewers have experience with:
 - Federal nursing home regulations
 - State specific nursing home regulations
 - Life safety code
 - Regulations for intermediate care facilities for developmentally disabled
- · Each professional reviewer is assigned a unique reviewer I.D.



IIDR Review Process

- IDR reviewer reads the regulatory standard and interpretive guidelines pertinent to the citation under review (with each tag reviewed)
- · This is important in each review even when reviewer is familiar with the regulation; it helps reviewer concentrate on focal issues of regulation
- Each example in the citation is considered individually



36	
Was There a Deficient Practice?	
The reviewer considers whether a deficient practice was identified in the citation	
\sum	
Michigan's Hardric Card Quality Improvement Digarization wave reprising	
Decision Point	
Was there a Was there a deficient deficient practice? practice?	
practice: practice:	
Yes, No,	
continue review delete citation	
Mintgars health Care Quality Improvement Organization wave impressing	
60	
Supporting Material	
 The reviewer decides what specific documents would refute the citation or 	
demonstrate that facility was in compliance with the regulation at the time	
of the survey	
Michigans Newton Card Guardia September of Signaturation 1 were represent	

Supporting Material Review The reviewer: · Looks for these specific documents in materials submitted with the request · Examines these specific documents Carefully goes over all other facility-provided documents · Does not have any copies of documents duplicated during the survey · Does not have any surveyor notes MPRO **Supporting Material Analysis** · Each example in the citation is considered individually · Reviewer examines if documents submitted refute any or all cited examples **Decision Point** All examples One or more refuted examples remain

Yes,

delete citation

Review remaining documents

Recommendations for
Outcome Options

- · Supported in full
- Amended (corrections or deletion of examples)
 - No change in scope and severity
 - Decrease scope and/or decrease severity
- · Delete
- CMS has the ultimate authority for accepting the recommendation or not

Michigan's Health Care Quality Interspensed Consultation 1, ware more one



Review Process References

- Reviewer bases the recommendation on regulation, standards of practice, American Medical Directors Association (AMDA) clinical process guidelines, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) infection control guidelines for long-term care and other reference materials
- Published, peer-reviewed professional magazines, such as American Journal of Nursing, Caring for the Ages, Provider Magazine, Advance for LTC Management, etc.
- · Credible websites

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



Clinical Standards of Practice

- · Criteria for a standard of practice
 - Current
 - Published
 - Nationally recognized
 - Outcome oriented
 - Peer-reviewed



Completed IDR Reviews

- MPRO returns a narrative written recommendation report to the state agency with rationale and references
- State agency reviews recommendation to determine their agreement with outcome

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mgro.org



Completed IDR Reviews

- Facility is notified of final outcome by state agency
- How contacted and what report is sent varies by state agency and if IDR or IIDR

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organization | www.mpro.org



Thank You Any Questions?

Charlene Kawchak-Belitsky, IDR/IIDR senior manager ckbelitsky@mpro.org 248- 465-1038

Angela Nelson, IDR/IIDR support tech anelson@mpro.org 248-465-7357

Michigan's Health Care Quality Improvement Organizatio 22670 Haggerty Road, Suite 10 Farmington Hills, Mi 4833 248-465-7300 | www.mpro.or

