

DCF/DAC-Subcommittee Weekly JAD Meeting Minutes

Date: 2/2/2021

Start Time: 10:00

End Time: 11:00

Attendees: Mike Lupton, Larry Brown, Johnny Guimaraes, Mike Idoni, Steven Lord, Danielle Downing, Ryan Lavender, Beau Frierson, Richard Power, Greg Nix, Joanne Szocinski, Lisa Tajdari, Mark Grant, Nathan McPherson, Tracey Fannon, Matt Lightner, Roderick Harris, Joseph Glidden, Sharyn Dodrill, Diego Wartensleben, Jennifer Ramirez, Rodney Pritchard, Seana Zagar, Jesse Lindsey, Nydia Neris, Andrew Barden, Eduardo De Cardenas, Victor Gaines, Sai Maddipoti, William Garcia, Lisa Tajdari

Agenda Items:

Nathan opened the meeting. Greg reviewed Ch 5 and App1 updates, should be on webpage COB today or tomorrow and that the ME IT reps should have received an email with the updated documents. He then reviewed the agenda and provided some background regarding the reason for putting these items in the agenda.

Item	Presenter	Time Limit
<p>1. Review Plans for Submission of Historical Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nathan brought up the short list of the plans and deadlines and asked participants if that appears in line with their planning. - Johnny brought up that there are still several issues outstanding that will need to be resolved – mainly around validations. Nathan asked if additional help would be beneficial. Johnny said they had been planning to utilize the Helpdesk process but would prefer something faster and more direct. Nathan said SAMH would staff that request. - Debbie said that level of support would be very helpful. She brought up the new OCAs coming on board and being able to test in UAT would be greatly helpful. 	Nathan	
<p>2. Open Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nathan then moved on to this topic. He brought up Beau’s concerns regarding code combinations and OCAs. He reported that latest batch produced 170 errors. He said a lot of them were regarding cost centers and covered services. Greg asked for clarification that he’s submitting per the Pamphlet. Beau confirmed. <p>2.1 Review of Diego’s concerns regarding undo delete and add effective/expiration date to subcontract OCAs. Diego said until the subcontract enhancement goes through, they can’t upload their data. Jesse brought up the idea of removing the effective/expiration date rules</p>		

but going through the enhancement process would be looking at May as earliest date to make this fix. Nathan asked if everyone still wanted the enhancement to go through. Sharyn said yes but that until the fix is put in the problem remains. Diego described the update, deletion and reupload process he would have to follow regarding turning the rules off and then the enhancement goes through. Joe brought up the carry forward funding issue and how critical the effective and expiration dates in subcontract is. Nathan said SAMH would staff and investigate and would report back to the group at the next week's meeting. Mike asked why SAMH is requiring ME's to provide this data when SAMH has that information already. Nathan said he thought the issue has to do with subcontract providers which are out of the scope of SAMH. He brought up that all that is needed to be known is known so having this process in the system doesn't make sense. Rich said he didn't fully disagree but brought up some of the complexities of the subcontract section that SAMH has no control over. Joe asked if this issue is cropping up in v14. Nathan asked Jesse to investigate. Jesse confirmed he would follow up and determine what the issue may be. General discussion ensued on how the various EHRs and MEs handle this issue. Nathan acknowledged there are differing business practices that need to be taken into account.

2.2 Program Area Code – How provide FASAMS data as PAC changes during episode of care? Discussion held about the difficulties of maintaining an accurate history of the client when Admission only allows one given PAC.

Jennifer spoke and said this issue came up during the v14 Pilot. Her suggestion was a client is SA or MH and then changes to co-occurring to create a business rule to allow for the new diagnosis with a new POM to go with the new diagnosis. Steve responded that this is a good idea. He asked if a POM could be submitted with that minimal information rather than putting in all the required columns of data. General discussion held amongst participants on Jennifer's process. Nathan wrapped up discussion by identifying that there isn't a business process from SAMH's side but obviously from the ME's. Requested they return to their people, review the issue and submit their findings and thoughts in preparation for next week's meeting.

2.3 Nathan began wrapping up the meeting by identifying the issues raised, requested the reps start thinking of what they want in v15. Steve then asked about the Baker Act codes. Jesse said they are working on revising the rules in the system. Nathan thanked

Jennifer for her and her team's work with SAMH for the pilot.		
3. Version 15 Planning - Meeting ran out of time. ME IT reps asked to staff with their people and report back the following week.		

Meeting concluded: 1100