

Message

From: Victor Kintz [REDACTED]
Sent: 2/28/2013 3:14:37 PM
To: Mills, Sheryl B [/O=PROD ISHEALTH MESSAGING/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=MillsSB]
Subject: RE: Hi Sheryl!

Thanks Sheryl, good to know.

Victor

From: Mills, Sheryl B [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2013 7:06 AM
To: Victor Kintz
Subject: RE: Hi Sheryl!

Some MACs have complained in the past that a 15 minute eval is insufficient time to perform all the necessary assessments for a thorough evaluation and plan of treatment.

They may throw that complaint in with other medical necessity reasons. Generally, the denial reason about the length of the evaluation gets dropped at higher levels of review in favor of focusing on medical necessity issues. For example, I don't recall ever having a conversation with a judge about it.

Sheryl Mills M Ed CCC SLP

[REDACTED]

From: Victor Kintz [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2013 9:55 AM
To: Mills, Sheryl B
Subject: Re: Hi Sheryl!

Thanks Sheryl.

What are the issues with a 15 min. eval? I see a ton of those.

Victor

On Feb 28, 2013, at 9:45 AM, "Mills, Sheryl B" [REDACTED] wrote:

Thanks Victor, you are very kind. Unfortunately, I don't seem to be able to come up with the information you need for this. ☹

From the feedback I've gotten this morning it seems I'm the only one who has had a denial for this reason. And it's been so long ago since I've had one that I can't recall the exact wording. (I hate to think what this says about my age! Ha!) However, I believe it was not the only reason for the denial but was mentioned along with medical necessity denial

reasons. The wording was likely similar to the wording the MACs use when they question a 15 minute evaluation as being insufficient time to perform an evaluation. The MACs question the accuracy of the reporting due to whatever technical issue they feel they have identified.

Sorry I don't have more for you. If anyone else comes up with anything, I'll be sure to pass it along. sm

Sheryl Mills M Ed CCC SLP

[REDACTED]

From: Victor Kintz [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2013 8:43 AM
To: Mills, Sheryl B
Subject: RE: Hi Sheryl!

Thanks so much! You are so good to work with.

Victor

From: Mills, Sheryl B [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2013 3:27 AM
To: Victor Kintz
Subject: RE: Hi Sheryl!

I sent an email out last night and will see what I hear back. Sm

Sheryl Mills M Ed CCC SLP

[REDACTED]

From: Victor Kintz [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 8:43 PM
To: Mills, Sheryl B
Subject: RE: Hi Sheryl!

Thanks. Do you think any of your cohorts might? Just trying to see how the denial was worded by the MAC.

Victor

From: Mills, Sheryl B [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 4:41 PM

To: Victor Kintz
Subject: RE: Hi Sheryl!

Hi back to you. ☺

I have seen denials for this in the past, but nothing recently where I would have a denial letter to send you. sm

Sheryl Mills M Ed CCC SLP

From: Victor Kintz [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 4:38 PM
To: Mills, Sheryl B
Subject: RE: Hi Sheryl!

Hello Sheryl, here is an old question. Can you provide me with a de-identified letter where a claim was down coded for rounding of minutes?

Victor

From: Sheryl Mills
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 11:24 AM
To: Victor Kintz
Subject: RE: Hi Sheryl!

Not lately, but yes I have seen some denials for this reason in the past... if it appears the therapist is rounding instead of recording the exact minutes provided a denial can result.

Sheryl Mills M Ed CCC SLP

From: Victor Kintz
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 2:24 PM
To: Sheryl Mills
Subject: RE: Hi Sheryl!

Sheryl, have you seen any denials for the rounding of minutes under Part A?

Victor

<image001.jpg>

From: Sheryl Mills
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 10:38 AM
To: Victor Kintz
Subject: RE: Hi Sheryl!

That will make it harder to defend but I would still try an appeal with the evaluation order and the MD signature (no date) on the therapy certification/evaluation. I would probably get a delayed certification signed by the MD and add it to the medical record if you are within 2 years...it would not hurt

Sheryl Mills M Ed CCC SLP



From: Victor Kintz
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 1:33 PM
To: Sheryl Mills
Subject: RE: Hi Sheryl!

Thanks so much Sheryl. I always appreciate your expertise. What if the Physician Cert/Re-Cert does not mention therapy?

Victor
<image001.jpg>

From: Sheryl Mills
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 10:20 AM
To: Victor Kintz
Subject: RE: Hi Sheryl!

Therapy evaluations/plans of care do not require MD signature for part A PPS, although many facilities still get them signed as best practice (I would HIGHLY recommend it)

If there is a SNF certification for the stay and an order for therapy, I would certainly appeal.

Federal Register Vol 69 no 146 page 45780 bottom of second column continuing into the 3rd column

Sheryl Mills M Ed CCC SLP



From: Victor Kintz
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 1:15 PM
To: Sheryl Mills
Subject: RE: Hi Sheryl!

Part A, same answer?

Victor

<image001.jpg>

From: Sheryl Mills

Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 10:07 AM

To: Victor Kintz

Subject: RE: Hi Sheryl!

Hi you!!

This is part B?

You could get a delayed certification to repair the missing date on the PT evaluation, BUT you will need something to prove the physician was aware of the services at the time of the services. See below.

If you have something that proves the MD was aware at the time of the services (items below), I would certainly appeal. Sm ☺

Medicare Benefit Policy Manual Chapter 15

220.1.3 - Certification and Recertification of Need for Treatment and Therapy Plans of Care

D. Delayed Certification

EXAMPLE: Payment should not be denied, even when certified 2 years after treatment, when there is evidence that a physician approved needed treatment, such as an order, documentation of therapist/physician/NPP discussion of the plan, chart notes, meeting notes, requests for certification, certifications for intervals before or after the service in question, or physician/NPP services during which the medical record or the patient's history would, in good practice, be reviewed and would indicate therapy treatment is in progress.

Sheryl Mills M Ed CCC SLP



From: Victor Kintz

Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 12:59 PM

To: Sheryl Mills

Subject: Hi Sheryl!

Question, Eval order states PT/OT (only). No PT Clarification order. PT evaluation is signed by the physician but not dated or date stamped. Are the PT services defensible in an appeal?

Victor

<image001.jpg>

The information contained in this E-mail transmission is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged, confidential, and protected health information.

If you received it in error, you are on notice of its status. Please notify us immediately by reply e-mail and then please delete this message from your system. Please do not copy it or use it for any purposes, or disclose its contents to any other person. To do so could violate state and Federal privacy laws. Thank you for your cooperation. Please contact the sender if you need assistance.

Dedicated to Hope, Healing and Recovery.