

## FILE REVIEW REPORT

Name: Jack Hayes

Score: 20 out of 84

Company: Rowe International Ltd.

0=Needs Improvement; 1=Satisfactory; 2=Exceptional

Type of Claim:  Lost Time     Medical

Litigated:  Yes     No

Review Areas	Claim Management Activities	Not Applicable	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Exceptional*
<b>File Management</b>	1.) Were initial and follow up contacts made timely and appropriately?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2.) Were all appropriate "first payments" made in a timely fashion?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3.) Was effective, timely diary control evidenced by documented action plans and follow through?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4.) Was file documentation thorough?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
	5.) Was there evidence of timely and effective supervision?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Comments:</b>  <i>Processing type activities (indemnity/medical payments, filing of forms, etc.) were done timely as needed. But, file management type activities did not reflect the aggressiveness indicated by the claim facts. Ongoing communication with the injured worker, employer, treating MD was not frequent enough or focused on the issues that needed to be addressed/resolved to bring the file to closure. More frequent supervisory intervention and guidance may have helped the adjuster recognize &amp; focus on the critical issues.</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Score: 2</b></p>					
<b>Coverage</b>	6.) Was compensability or liability determined in an appropriate and timely manner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
	7.) Were all aspects of coverage properly documented and confirmed, including policy number, effective dates and limits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Comments:</b>  <i>Based upon the documented facts, it appears that this claim would have been considered compensable under the State WC Act (CA). But, there is no evidence that the adjuster verified that the Benefit State (CA) was, in fact, a covered state under the policy. If not, this claim is not covered under the policy even though it may be compensable. Is there another carrier involved?</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Score: 1</b></p>					

\* Exceptional rating should only be used for those actions with a better outcome than ordinarily would be expected.