DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY PHYSICAL DISABILITY AGENCY
2900 CRYSTAL DRIVE, SUITE 300
ARLINGTON, VA 22202-3557

AHRC-D 12 February 2015

MEMORANDUM FOR Presidents, U.S. Army Physical Evaluation Boards

SUBJECT: Physical Evaluation Board (PEB) Procedural Guidance Memorandum #10: In-Process Quality Assurance Reviews

1. References:

a. DoDI 1332.18, Subject: Disability Evaluation System (DES); August 5, 2014

b. DoDM 1332.18, Volume 3, Subject: Disability Evaluation System (DES) Manual: Quality Assurance Program (QAP); November 21, 2014

c. Section 524 of Public Law 112-239, "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013", January 2, 2013

2. In-Process Reviews (IPRs) were mandated by Congress in the NDAA FY 2013. The Department of Defense subsequently directed that the IPRs "support the MEBs and PEBs making more accurate and consistent decisions while ensuring proper execution of duties." They are to "enable the identification of errors or areas for improvement while a case goes through the various stages of review and determination."

3. The USAPDA IPR process consists of three major components: The Medical Treatment Facility (MTF) case rejections, case returns, and review of case files by senior, experienced PEB members.

4. MTF rejections are not currently available for electronic retrieval. It is therefore required that each PEB's administrative team keep records of the number of case files rejected, the reason for rejection, and the MTF to which the case was returned. By the 5th of each month starting a new fiscal quarter, each PEB will provide their monthly and quarterly totals of IDES cases rejected by MTF, including the reasons for rejection, to the Quality Assurance Program Manager (QAPM).

5. MTF returns are tracked in by the electronic Physical Evaluation Board (ePEB). By the 5th of each month starting a new fiscal quarter, PDA operations will provide to the QAPM:

a. The number of IDES cases received by MTF and PEB

b. The number of cases that entered adjudication by PEB

c. Number of cases returned to MTF's by MTF and PEB

d. A list by returns, by MTF, containing the case ID and return codes

6. Each PEB will conduct their own IPR case reviews. The case reviews will consist of 10 cases from the signature list of each PEB. By the end of the preceding month, the QAMP will notify the PEBs on which of the first five days of the tested month to select their cases. The first 10 cases based on dated placed, from newest to oldest and excluding presumption of fitness cases, will comprise that months sample. Each PEB will make a list of the selected cases and include it with the submitted surveys.

7. The PEB president or their designate will assign an experienced permanent party physician and adjudicator to review each case. Reviewers will not be assigned to cases they have previously adjudicated. The selection of and number of designates are at the PEB president's discretion and may change from month to month. The designated reviewers will be annotated on the list of selected cases.

8. Each reviewer will review the case using the current version of the IPR survey (enclosure 1). PEB Presidents will review the completed surveys. In cases where a reviewer has noted a perceived error, the PEB President will review the case. If the PEB president believes that an error has been made, they will discuss their finding(s) with the voting members. When the voting members concur with the findings of the review, corrections to the case will be completed prior to the initial DA 199 being sent to the Soldier. If a non-concurring persists following this review, the PEB president will annotate this in block 9c of the IPR survey. The case will be reviewed at PDA after it completes the PEB.

9. Each PEB will collate the IPR survey sheets (adjudicator case 1, physician case 1, adjudicator case 2, etc.) The collated surveys, along with the list of selected cases and reviewers, will be scanned into a single PDF and sent via encrypted e-mail to the adjudicating PEB President and the QAPM. Reporting is to be completed by the last business day of the month.

10. Point of contact for this memorandum is MAJ Keith Toler at (703) 325-1557, keith.d.toler.mil@mail.mil.

//signed//
TODD GARLICK
COL, GS
Director, U.S. Army Physical Disability Agency

Encl
IPR Survey

Name:	Date:	Compo: AD ARNG USAR
Last 4 of SSN:	PEB: NCR JBSA JBLM	Soldier's Elections: FOR QA USE ONLY Concurred with IPEB Non-concurred with IPEB Requested VARR
Reviewer:	MTF:	

In-Process Review

Italicized references are to the DA 199 Standard Language Document

1. PEB Process (Army-specific requirements)		
a	Soldier has one or more BH conditions combined with a post-concussive condition and the PEB included a physician	**Y N N/A**
b	Soldier had 8+ conditions failing retention standards and PEB included a physician	**Y N N/A**

2. Unfitting Condition(s) *(See Unfit Rationales)*			
a	# unfitting conditions	**#**	
b	# to standard / # not to standard	**# To standard:**	**# Not to standard:**
c	For *each* "**not to standard**" entry indicate:	Tally (optional)	Total
	1. Did not use standard language		
	2. Missing supporting information on DA 199		
	3. Cited documents do not support findings		
Comments:			

3. Not Unfitting Condition(s) *(See Not Unfitting Rationales)*			
a	# not unfitting conditions	**#**	
b	# to standard / # not to standard	**# To standard:**	**# Not to standard:**
c	For *each* "**not to standard**" entry indicate:	Tally (optional)	Total
	1. Did not use standard language		
	2. Missing supporting information on DA 199		
	3. Cited documents do not support findings		
Comments:			

4. EPTS/PSA (Where 8 year rule does not apply) *(See EPTS/PSA Rationales)*			
a	# conditions PEB determined EPTS without PSA	**# (or N/A)**	
b	# to standard / # not to standard	**# To standard:**	**# Not to standard:**
c	For *each* "**not to standard**" entry *indicate:*	Tally (optional)	Total
	1. Did not use standard language		
	2. Missing supporting information on DA 199 showing clear and unmistakable evidence of EPTS without PSA		
	3. Cited documents do not support findings		
Comments:			

5. V1, V3, V4 *(See Block V Rationales)*			
a	# conditions PEB determined V1, V3, and/or V4 "Yes"	**# (or N/A)**	
b	# to standard / # not to standard	**# To standard:**	**# Not to standard:**
c	For *each* "**not to standard**" entry *indicate:*	Tally (optional)	Total
	1. Section V of DA 199 did not reflect the correct finding(s)		
	2. Missing supporting information in onset of DA 199		
	3. Cited documents do not support findings		
Comments:			

Name: Last 4 of SSN:

6. Disposition of TDRL Placement *(See Unstable Rationales)*			
a	# conditions PEB determined unstable	**# (or N/A)**	
b	# to standard / # not to standard	**# To standard:**	**# Not to standard:**
c	For *each* "**not to standard**" entry *indicate:*	Tally (optional)	Total
	1. Did not use standard language		
	2. Missing supporting information on DA 199		
	3. Cited documents do not support findings		
	4. Block IIId of the DA 199 was not correct (IIId should be no)		
Comments:			

7. Application of VA Ratings	
DA 199 includes all proposed VA disability rating(s) for each compensable unfitting condition(s). Chose N/A when no compensation based on EPTS/ no PSA.	**Y N N/A**
Comments:	

8. DA 199 Administrative Rationales *(see DA 199 Section VI Complete ePEB Admin Rationales)*		
a	All required administrative rationales are included	**Y N**
b	Administrative rationales are consistent with previously conveyed PEB findings.	**Y N**
Comments:		

PEB President or Designated Representative Only:		
9. Changes in ePEB and resulting DA 199		
a	Did this review result in administrative changes in ePEB?	**Y N # if Y:**
b	Did this review result in the case's original adjudicators making changes in ePEB that will potentially change the Soldier's compensation?	**Y N # if Y:**
c	Did a non-concurring opinion persist after reviews were completed? If yes, this case will be reviewed at PDA.	**Y N N/A**
Comments:		

10. PEB Accuracy and Consistency		
a	This case was accurately adjudicated (Did not require more than administrative changes following the review)	**Y N**
b	The adjudication of this case was consistent with similar cases	**Y N**
If the adjudication of this case was not consistent with similar cases, why? Does it reveal the need for possible changes in training, procedures, rules, etc?		

Review Summary: (to include noteworthy remediation made as a result of review; identification of adjudication issues stemming from inadequate MEB information).