

REASSUMES/DEFERRALS/OVERTURNS DUE TO VRC ACTIONS

TRANSFERABLE SKILLS ANALYSIS

- Insufficient or poorly documented transferable skills analysis. The VRC failed to show the IW has the **demonstrated skills** to support ATW7.
- VRC uses DOT descriptions for IW's work history instead of reporting IW's **actual duties/equipment used, etc.** in prior jobs
- VRC doesn't have written documentation (e.g. a signed work history from the IW, the employer's job application, claimant's resume, Dept of Employment Security records, etc.) to back up the AWA work history.
- The claimant does not have the transferable skills to be employable based on the labor market information.
- The VRC did not identify that the claimant successfully completed a retraining plan provided by the department under another claim number that would give the claimant transferable skills.

JOB ANALYSIS

- VRC fails to address the IW's specific injury/restrictions in the JA (**Example:** The JA addresses back limitations, but the IW has a hand injury and the JA doesn't address specifics about hand use).
- The JA describes specific physical demands, and indicates (but does not describe **how**) that the employer is willing to accommodate a worker who can't meet those demands.

LABOR MARKET SURVEY

- The LMS lists specific demands, and indicates and/or does not describe **how** that the employer can accommodate a worker who can't meet those demands. The LMS needs to describe the job as it commonly and currently exists in the labor market.
- The LMS consists of a variety of different jobs with varying essential duties and varying physical demands.
- The JA is for one type of job, but the LMS is for another type of job.
- Physical demands of JA & LMS are not compatible
- The LMS physical demands does not support the physical capacities of the claimant as outlined by the attending physician
- VRC provided labor market documentation failing to show that work exists in the IW's labor market area within his restrictions

MEDICAL ANALYSIS

- VRC doesn't address all the accepted conditions when making a voc recommendation
- VRC inappropriately indicated to the AP that if he didn't respond by a certain date she would assume he had concurred.
- The VRC closed voc services as ATW JOI based upon the AP writing an "anticipated date of release."
- VRC did not sufficiently segregate related and unrelated medical issues in the AWA rationale

LIKELY TO BENEFIT ANALYSIS

- VRC recommended vocational services for an IW but provided no analysis of why the IW needed services.
- VRC recommended vocational services for an IW without providing any documentation of how the IW was likely to benefit.

INSUFFICIENT DOCUMENTATION

- Employment history is not completed in the AWA Closing Report
- VRC offered an "expert" opinion, but did not provide a LMS.
- VRC did not address what specific skills the injured worker has/has not learned to be employable in the labor market when plan is interrupted or completed.
- VRC provides documents with the wrong claimant's name or wrong claim number.

OTHER VIOLATIONS OF WAC-296-19A