

RICK SCOTT GOVERNOR

JUSTIN M. SENIOR SECRETARY

December 8, 2017

Mr. Justin M. Senior, Secretary Agency for Health Care Administration 2727 Mahan Drive Tallahassee, Florida 32308

Dear Secretary Senior:

In accordance with Internal Auditing Standards, attached is a status update from the Division of Health Quality Assurance in response to our report *#15-08, Background Screening Clearinghouse Program* published on June 6, 2016.

Management has indicated corrective action has been either initiated or completed for each of our report issues. A detailed description of all issues, recommendations, and management's responses can be found in the attached table. We will schedule another follow-up review in six months to assess the status of the efforts taken by the Division of Health Quality Assurance to correct all open issues.

If you have any questions regarding this status report, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mary Beth Sheffield

Mary Beth Sheffield Inspector General

MBS/jh Attachment cc: Sherrill F. Norman, Auditor General Toby Philpot, Chief of Staff Mallory McManus, Communications Director Molly McKinstry, Deputy Secretary for Health Quality Assurance Ryan Fitch, Bureau Chief of Central Services



Facebook.com/AHCAFlorida Youtube.com/AHCAFlorida Twitter.com/AHCA_FL SlideShare.net/AHCAFlorida

No.	Finding(s)	Recommendation(s)	Previous Management Response(s)	Status Update, Anticipated Completion Date and Contact
1	BGS unit has not established a quality assurance (QA) process to review analysts' eligibility determinations	We recommend BGS implement a QA process and develop a sampling program that includes reviewing high risk determinations, such as criminal offenses committed in other states, or the criminal history of an applicant with a large number of offenses.	Status as of June 16, 2017 The enhancement to the system for a QA process was implemented 5/16/17. The enhancement provides a mechanism for screenings to be routed to supervisors for review before a final determination is made. We are currently reviewing the best process for both an accurate number of screenings to be subject to a QA for SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Timely) measure purposes to correlate with the least amount of delay in turnaround time for determinations. <i>Anticipated Completion Date: July 1, 2018.</i> <i>Taylor Haddock</i> <u>Status as of December 20, 2016</u> Requirements have been written for the first step in a QA process. <i>Anticipated Completion Date: March 2017.</i> <i>Taylor Haddock</i> <u>Status as of June 6, 2016</u> We concur with a need to implement a QA process for eligibility determinations. We will implement a process for management review of a sample of eligibility determinations. We will pursue system enhancements to include the QA process as part of the application and create a work item for management (and staff/peer reviews) including the identification of "high risk"	No change in status Anticipated Completion Date: July 1, 2018. Taylor Haddock

N	lo.	Finding(s)	Recommendation(s)	Previous Management Response(s)	Status Update, Anticipated Completion Date and Contact
				scenarios that would automatically result in a management or peer review.	
				Anticipated Completion Date: July 1, 2017 Taylor Haddock	
	2	The BGS unit does not effectively monitor analysts' turnaround time to review background screening results.	We recommend management continue to work with IT to develop appropriate reports to monitor the number of days to make eligibility determinations.	Status as of June 16, 2017We have implemented two SMART (measure reports for staff (one for criminal history review and one for exemption review). These reports measure the initial action by staff when receiving either a criminal history or exemption to review. Reports have been put into a Tableau Dashboard for management to monitor on a monthly basis.The SMART measure report for criminal history review only counts the time from assignment to initial decision (which includes a decision that additional information is required.) Our ultimate goal is to have the additional information requested uploaded directly to the system. This would not only streamline the process but would also give us system dates to refine the SMART measures.Anticipated Completion Date:July 31, 2019. Taylor HaddockStatus as of December 20, 2016 The BGS Unit currently has a working report to monitor the initial review turnaround time of a screening by analysts.	No change in status Anticipated Completion Date: July 31, 2019. Taylor Haddock

No.	Finding(s)	Recommendation(s)	Previous Management Response(s)	Status Update, Anticipated Completion Date and Contact
			Currently on the list of future enhancements is the ability to upload additional documentation received from individuals who have been screened. When that enhancement is developed the Unit will also create a system and business process to capture the time from when the additional documentation is received to when the analyst updates the eligibility results. <i>Anticipated Completion Date: January 2018.</i> <i>Taylor Haddock</i>	
			<u>Status as of June 6, 2016</u> The Unit is currently working with IT on developing a variety of reports using the Clearinghouse data including staff productivity measures. With limited resources, we have prioritized reports needed to ensure patient safety as the top priority. However, the Unit will continue to work towards completion of this reporting ability.	
			Anticipated Completion Date: January 1, 2017. Taylor Haddock	
3	Staff in some other state agencies experienced delays in accessing the BGS Clearinghouse.	We recommend that the BGS unit implement processes to help ensure that state agencies receive timely access to the BGS Clearinghouse.	Status as of June 16, 2017 The Agency was provided an LBR for the front end redesign that is required to change access and will be state agency staffed for implementation by July 1, 2018.	Research is ongoing for the best front-end redesign system. Development is estimated to begin in early Spring. <i>Anticipated Completion Date: July 1,</i> 2018.
			Anticipated Completion Date: July 1, 2018. Taylor Haddock	Taylor Haddock

No.	Finding(s)	Recommendation(s)	Previous Management Response(s)	Status Update, Anticipated Completion Date and Contact
No.	Finding(s) The BGS Clearinghouse does not contain complete information for exemption cases, and the electronic case documents archived in Laserfiche are not always	Recommendation(s) 1. We recommend the development of written guidelines and procedures outlining the documents and system fields that are required to be completed.	Previous Management Response(s)Status as of December 20, 2016An LBR has been submitted for the reengineering of the way other agency users receive and maintain access to the Clearinghouse.Anticipated Completion Date: July 1, 2018. Taylor HaddockStatus as of June 6, 2016 	
	complete.		<i>Taylor Haddock</i> <u>Status as of December 20, 2016</u> Staff is actively working on creating guidelines and procedures for both system usage and the scanning of exemptions from disqualification. <i>Anticipated Completion Date: July 1, 2017.</i> <i>Taylor Haddock</i>	Anticipated Completion Date: December 31, 2017. Taylor Haddock

No.	Finding(s)	Recommendation(s)	Previous Management Response(s)	Status Update, Anticipated Completion Date and Contact
		2. We recommend a system edit be created to prevent the closure of a case unless all items in the system checklist have been checked as completed.	Status as of June 6, 2016We concur with the recommendations, and will add them to future Clearinghouse application development.Anticipated Completion Date: July 1, 2017 Taylor HaddockStatus as of June 16, 2017A ticket to add the recommended system edit has been created and will be included in future development.Anticipated Completion Date: July 1, 2018 Taylor HaddockStatus as of December 20, 2016 A ticket to add the recommended system edit has been created and will be included in future development.Anticipated Completion Date: July 1, 2018 Taylor HaddockStatus as of December 20, 2016 A ticket to add the recommended system edit has been created and will be included in future development.Anticipated Completion Date: July 1, 2017 Taylor HaddockStatus as of June 6, 2016 We concur with the recommendations, and will add them to future Clearinghouse application development.Anticipated Completion Date: July 1, 2017 Taylor HaddockStatus as of June 6, 2016 We concur with the recommendations, and will add them to future Clearinghouse application development.Anticipated Completion Date: July 1, 2017 Taylor Haddock	No change in status. Anticipated Completion Date: July 1, 2018 Taylor Haddock
5	The BGS Exemption section lacks adequate written guidelines.	We recommend management consider establishing written guidelines for processing exemption applications.	Status as of June 6, 2016 To dictate a consistent process would require promulgation of a rule and remove the ability to consider a case-by-case approach, however, all cases	Completed

No.	Finding(s)	Recommendation(s)	Previous Management Response(s)	Status Update, Anticipated Completion Date and Contact
			are reviewed by management in both the Unit and the Secretary's office.	
			Anticipated Completion Date: Completed	
6	The BGS Exemption section, at the time of our review, did not review sealed criminal history records on adults.	We recommend that the BGS unit continue to review sealed adult criminal history records in determining eligibility.	Status as of June 6, 2016 The BGS unit is currently following the recommendation. Anticipated Completion Date: Completed	Completed
7	The BGS unit has not finalized a process to identify employees that have been determined ineligible, but are still listed as employed on the provider's roster.	 We recommend that the BGS unit finalize their process to monitor employer's actions after notification of an employee's rapback. We also recommend that HQA finalize their enforcement process to fine violators. 	 <u>Status as of June 6, 2016</u> The recommendation is currently being followed. The process is: 1. Facility is notified when a potential employee eligibility status changed. 2. Staff runs a report to identify ineligible employees on an employee roster. 3. Facility is contacted by certified mail, and instructed to correct the employee issue. 4. If the issue is not corrected it is elevated to licensure unit for corrective action (including a fine). 5. If it is still not correct, field staff is sent out to investigate and depending on the field investigations findings may result in an action against the license. 	Completed
			Anticipated Completion Date: Completed	