

Audit Manager Standard Reports

Scoring Methodology

Standard scoring: Audit Manager scoring methodology is every code gets 1 point if correct and zero points if over-coded, under-coded, incorrect, additional, or wrong category

Stetson E Scott, MD

Eastside

Date of Review: 03-14-2023

Number of Dates of Service Reviewed: 10

Project Name: 2023 Family Medicine Audit

Overall Score: 57%



Provider Detailed Report

E/M Coding: Total Sample Size 10 codes

Findings	Count	%
E/M Level appears to be correct	5	50%
E/M Level appears to be over-coded	2	20%
E/M Level appears to be under-coded	2	20%
E/M Level appears to be Wrong Category	1	10%

CPT® / HCPCS II Coding: Total Sample Size 4 codes

Findings	Count	%
Code(s) appear to be correct	3	75%
Code(s) appear to be incorrect	0	0%
Additional code(s) supported	1	25%

Modifier Coding: Total Sample Size 3 modifiers

Findings	Count	%
Modifier(s) appear to be correct	0	0%
Modifier(s) appear to be incorrect	0	0%
Additional Modifier(s) supported	3	100%

ICD-10 CM Coding: Total Sample Size 12 codes

Findings	Count	%
Code(s) appear to be correct	8	67%
Code(s) appear to be incorrect	3	25%
Additional code(s) supported	1	8%

E/M Detailed Review: Total Sample Siz

Findings
Over coded by 1 level
Over coded by 2 levels
Over coded by 3 levels
Over coded by 4 levels
Under coded by 1 level
Under coded by 2 levels
Under coded by 3 levels
Under coded by 4 levels
Number of category changes

RVU Comparison

wRVU Comp
Total wRVU Value

RVU Comp
Total RVU Value

Dollar Comparison

Total Dollar Comp
Total Dollar Value

Provider Detail Report

E/M Coding: Total Sample Size 11 codes		
Findings	Count	% Occurrence
E/M Level appears to be correct	5	45%
E/M Level appears to be over-coded	2	18%
E/M Level appears to be under-coded	4	36%
E/M Level appears to be Wrong Category	0	0%
Weighted accuracy rate: 64%		
CPT® / HCPCS II Coding: Total Sample Size 7 codes		
Findings	Count	%
Code(s) appear to be correct	5	71%
Code(s) appear to be incorrect	2	29%
Additional code(s) supported	0	0%
Modifier Coding: Total Sample Size 5 modifiers		
Findings	Count	%
Modifier(s) appear to be correct	0	0%
Modifier(s) appear to be incorrect	0	0%
Additional Modifier(s) supported	5	100%
ICD-10 CM Coding: Total Sample Size 36 codes		
Findings	Count	%
Code(s) appear to be correct	29	81%
Code(s) appear to be incorrect	5	14%
Additional code(s) supported	2	6%

Individual code scores: Every code gets 1 point if correct and zero points if incorrect/additional/wrong category.

For example: 11 total EM codes. 5 correct, 6 incorrect: $5/11 = 45\%$.

This calculation is the same for CPT, Modifiers, and ICD-10 codes.

Project Summary Report

The project Summary report provides both code accuracy rates and overall accuracy rates for each provider and all providers combined.

Individual Code Accuracy Rates:

Every code gets 1 point if correct and zero points if incorrect/additional/wrong category. (same as Provider Detail Report)

Project Summary Report - Overall Accuracy:

The overall accuracy rates are calculated by adding up all correct codes then dividing by the total code count. It is NOT an average of all code accuracy rates.

Note: The overall accuracy score is NOT an average of all code accuracy rates, but is a percentage of the total possible ($\# \text{ correct codes} \div \text{total \# of codes}$)

For the example below:

- Bates: total correct 2 (0 EM + 1 ICD-10 + 1 CPT + 0 Mod) divided by total of all codes 6 (1 EM + 2 ICD-10 + 2 CPT + 1 Mod) = $2/6 = 33\%$
- Total: total correct 14 (4 EM + 3 -ICD10 + 6 CPT + 1 mod) divided by the total sample of each code 25 (7 EM + 6 ICD-10 + 9 CPT + 3 mod). $14/25 = 56\%$

Audit Project Summary Report																						
Results For Audit Project : Test - EM Settings																						
Report Run Date : 10/22/2019																						
Evaluation / Management Coding										ICD-10 Coding				CPT / HCPCS Coding				Modifier	Overall Accuracy			
Provider Last	Provider First	Clinic	Provider Speciality	Correct	Over	Under	Wrong	Total	Accuracy Rate	Correct	Incorrect	Added	Accuracy Rate	Correct	Incorrect	Added	Accuracy Rate	Correct	Incorrect	Added	Accuracy Rate	Overall Accuracy
Bates	Garrett	AAPC	Family Practice	0	1	0	0	1	0%	1	1	0	50%	1	1	0	50%	0	0	1	0%	33%
Smith	John	AAPC	Family Practice	4	2	0	0	6	67%	2	2	0	50%	5	2	0	71%	1	0	1	50%	63%
Total				4	3	0	0	7	57%	3	3	0	50%	6	3	0	67%	1	0	2	33%	56%

Confidential Material: This information, prepared pursuant to our engagement letter, is solely for the use and benefit of Demo Enterprise and is not intended for reliance by any other person.

Note: The Overall Accuracy rate cannot incorporate weighted scoring.

Project Detail Report

Individual code scores: Same as the other two reports above.

Practice Accuracy Scores

The practice and provider overall scores (seen below in the red box) are calculated in the same way that the overall accuracy on the Project Summary Reports. Total correct divided by total possible.

Project Name: Test - EM Settings		Practice Reviewed: 2		Report Run Date: 10-22-2019		Number of Dates of Service Reviewed: 3	
Draft Copy This is the Attorney Client Privilege Statement							
Project Detailed Report							
EM Coding: Total Sample Size 7 codes							
Findings	Count	%					
EM Level appears to be correct	4	57%					
EM Level appears to be over-coded	3	43%					
EM Level appears to be under-coded	0	0%					
EM Level appears to be Wrong Category	0	0%					
CPT® / HCPCS® Coding: Total Sample Size 9 codes							
Findings	Count	%					
Code(s) appear to be correct	6	67%					
Code(s) appear to be incorrect	3	33%					
Additional code(s) supported	0	0%					
Modifier Coding: Total Sample Size 3 modifiers							
Findings	Count	%					
Modifier(s) appear to be correct	1	33%					
Modifier(s) appear to be incorrect	0	0%					
Additional Modifier(s) supported	2	67%					
ICD-10 CM Coding: Total Sample Size 6 codes							
Findings	Count	%					
Code(s) appear to be correct	3	50%					
Code(s) appear to be incorrect	3	50%					
Additional code(s) supported	0	0%					
EM Detailed Review: Total Sample Size 7 codes							
Findings	Count	%					
Over coded by 1 level	1	14%					
Over coded by 2 levels	1	14%					
Over coded by 3 levels	0	0%					
Over coded by 4 levels	0	0%					
Under coded by 1 level	0	0%					
Under coded by 2 levels	0	0%					
Under coded by 3 levels	0	0%					
Under coded by 4 levels	0	0%					
Number of category changes	1	14%					
Practices							
Practice Name	Practice ID	%					
AAPC	19801828	54%					
Providers							
Provider Name	Practice Name	%					
Smith, John	AAPC	67%					
Bates, Phil Garrett	AAPC	33%					
RVU Comparison							
wRVU Comp	Original	Audited	% Change				
Total wRVU value	17.03	13.85	-19%				

Overall Accuracy Rate:

You can choose which codes to include in the overall accuracy rate

You can choose which codes to include in the overall accuracy rate in the REPORTING PARAMETERS within the AUDIT GUIDELINES. Under Overall Accuracy Score, check each code type you want to include in the overall accuracy score.

Audit Guideline Settings

Assign Report Parameters

Report Type:
Provider Detailed Report - Regular Audit

Mark as Attorney Client Privilege:
 Yes No

Include Signature Page:
 Yes No

Mark as Draft Copy:
 Yes No

Include Project Name in Header:
 Yes No

Include E/M Coding section:
 Yes No

Include Number of Wrong Category in E/M Coding Section:
 Yes No

Include CPT / HCPCS II section:
 Yes No

Key Findings and Recommendations Page Break:
 Yes No

Include Key Findings section:
 Yes No

Include Competency section:
 Yes No

Inclusion of Scanned Images:
 All Images Only Images that contain incorrect

Project Details Report Summary
 Include summary for all DOS Only include su

Overall Accuracy Score:

- E/M
- CPT and HCPCS
- Modifier(s)
- ICD
- HCC

Include Payer:
 Yes No

Weighted scoring:

Weighted scoring allows you to assign fractions of a point for each coding level. Weighted Scoring is set up in the Audit Guidelines.

See screenshot below for an example.

- Correct – 1pt
- Under coded 1 level - .5 pts
- Under coded 2 levels = .25 pts
- Under coded 3 or 4 levels = 0 pts
- Over coded 1-4 levels = 0 pts
- Additional = 0 pts

Scoring Method

Please select the scoring method you wish to use in order to calculate your compliance accuracy rate for evaluation and management services.

Calculation Method

- Standard - Calculate both under and over coded results as incorrect
- Compliance - Calculate only over coded results as incorrect
- Weighted - Use customized weighted values for E/M accuracy rate calculations
- Weighted Compliance

E/M Correct: 1

E/M Undercoded by 1 level: .50

E/M Undercoded by 2 levels: .25

E/M Undercoded by 3 levels: 0

E/M Undercoded by 4 levels: 0

E/M Overcoded by 1 level: 0

E/M Overcoded by 2 level: 0

E/M Overcoded by 3 level: 0

E/M Overcoded by 4 level: 0

Wrong Category: 0

Which reports display weighted scoring?

Provider Detailed Report

Weighted scoring on first page for all code types

Provider Detailed Report

E/M Coding: Total Sample Size 1 codes

Findings	Count	% Occurrence
E/M Level appears to be correct	1	100%
E/M Level appears to be over-coded	0	0%
E/M Level appears to be under-coded	0	0%
E/M Level appears to be Wrong Category	0	0%
Weighted accuracy rate: 100%		

CPT® / HCPCS II Coding: Total Sample Size 3 codes

Findings	Count	% Occurrence
Code(s) appear to be correct	1	33%
Code(s) appear to be incorrect	2	67%
Additional code(s) supported	0	0%
Weighted accuracy rate: 33%		

ICD-10 CM Coding: Total Sample Size 3 codes

Findings	Count	% Occurrence
Code(s) appear to be correct	2	67%
Code(s) appear to be incorrect	1	33%
Additional code(s) supported	0	0%
Weighted accuracy rate: 83%		

Project Detailed Report

- Weighted scoring on first page for all code types
- Practice & Provider scores are determined by Audit Guidelines settings: Report Parameters > Project Details Report - Practice score settings determine which code sets are included in score

Project Detailed Report

E/M Coding: Total Sample Size 3 codes

Findings	Count	% Occurrence
E/M Level appears to be correct	2	67%
E/M Level appears to be over-coded	1	33%
E/M Level appears to be under-coded	0	0%
E/M Level appears to be Wrong Category	0	0%
Weighted accuracy rate: 67%		

CPT® / HCPCS II Coding: Total Sample Size 4 codes

Findings	Count	% Occurrence
Code(s) appear to be correct	1	25%
Code(s) appear to be incorrect	3	75%
Additional code(s) supported	0	0%
Weighted accuracy rate: 25%		

ICD-10 CM Coding: Total Sample Size 9 codes

Findings	Count	% Occurrence
Code(s) appear to be correct	5	56%
Code(s) appear to be incorrect	3	33%
Additional code(s) supported	1	11%
Weighted accuracy rate: 78%		

E/M Detailed Review: Total Sample Size 3 codes

Findings	Count	%
Over coded by 1 level	0	0%
Over coded by 2 levels	0	0%
Over coded by 3 levels	0	0%
Over coded by 4 levels	1	33%
Under coded by 1 level	0	0%
Under coded by 2 levels	0	0%
Under coded by 3 levels	0	0%
Under coded by 4 levels	0	0%
Number of category changes	0	0%

Audit Guidelines: Report Parameters > Project Details Report - Practice score settings determine which codesets are included in score

Practice Name	Practice ID	%
AAPC	19805829	100%
Tim's Peds	10079888	50%

Audit Guidelines: Report Parameters > Project Details Report - Accuracy score settings determine which codesets are included in score

Provider Name	Practice Name	%
Burns,DO,Mike	AAPC	100%
Dylan,DO,Bob	Tim's Peds	50%

Project Summary Report

- Weighted scoring on first page for all code types
- Overall Accuracy calculates standard scoring only

Audit Project Summary Report
Results For Audit Project : Testing Weighted Scoring
Report Run Date : 06/05/2019

Provider Last	Provider First	Clinic	Evaluation / Management Coding							Accuracy Rate	Accuracy Weighted Rate	ICD-10 Coding				Accuracy Rate	Accuracy Weighted Rate	CPT / HCPCS Coding				Accuracy Rate	Accuracy Weighted Rate	Overall Accuracy
			Correct	Over	Under	Wrong	Total	Correct	Incorrect			Added	Accuracy Rate	Correct	Incorrect			Added	Accuracy Rate					
Burns	Mike	AAPC	1	0	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	2	1	0	67%	83%	1	2	0	33%	33%	57%			
Dylan	Bob	Tim's Peds	1	1	0	0	2	50%	50%	3	2	1	50%	75%	0	1	0	0%	0%	44%				
Total			2	1	0	0	3	67%	67%	5	3	1	56%	78%	1	3	0	25%	25%	50%				

Standard Scoring only (pointing to Overall Accuracy column)