

## DCF/DAC-Subcommittee Bi-Weekly JAD

Date: 10/6/2020

Start Time: 10:00

End Time: 11:00

Attendees: Jonathan Hall, Tracey Fannon, Rich Power, Greg Nix, Jesse Lindsey, Mike Lupton, Tom Rose, Joanne Szocinski, Diego Wartensleben, Jennifer Ramirez, Nathan McPherson, Danielle Downing, William Garcia, Victor Gaines, Larry Brown, Johnny Guimaraes, Ryan Lavender, Sharyn Dodrill, Beau Frierson, Katie Morrow, Larry Brown, Matt Lightner, Roderick Harris

### Opening Remarks:

Jonathan: My apologies, I did not send an agenda out today. I think when I cancelled last week's meeting, I did allude to Jesse having several enhancement documents he is going to go over with us today. In a moment we'll go straight into that. Just a few agenda items before we get started with those. I imagine those might take up a little bit more of our time today.

Item	Presenter	Time Limit
<b>1. Pilot Update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Participants: LSF, Streamline, MRHC/Starting Point</li><li>b. Status Report: To date they have submitted all the provider data for the providers included in the pilot study; subcontract data, as well as client data sets and are currently working on treatment episode data sets for both of the providers participating.</li><li>c. On the treatment episode data they've submitted to this date, the only error we've identified in the system was related to the amount in the subcontract data set for the payment field. Those issues have been identified and corrected.</li></ul>	Jonathan Hall	
<b>2. FASAMS Assessment Tool Code</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. We are calling it General Functional Improvement Tool Code</li><li>b. This one is pretty simple. It will allow FASAMS users to identify if a client has a Baseline status (1), Improve Functioning status (2), Not Improve Functioning status (3) or Maintain Stable Functioning status (4).</li><li>c. They are going to create a new assessment ToolCode in the Treatment Episode data set with specific score codes and we are also going to expire all other Functional Evaluation ToolCodes (5, 6, 8, and 9) on 2/1/2021, when this enhancement goes into production.</li><li>d. Sharyn asked about CGAS for ED and SED children because we have the performance measure for it, but it's not required in FASAMS. She wants to know if DCF will allow that measure to not be reported until this new ToolCode goes into effect. Jonathan said DCF would look into it.</li></ul>	J. Lindsey	10:10-10:30

<p><b>3. Unique Constraint Rule</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. This one is essentially the prevention of having duplicate records accepted into the system.</li> <li>b. This rule will generate an error when a user submits data that is the exact same as an existing record in the system but uses a different SRI</li> <li>c. We will send the enhancement out for everyone to look over and discuss next week.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>4. Recommendations from FEI Developer on How to Match Version 13 Records to Version 14 Records</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. To generate the dimensional model and confirm we're not bringing in duplicate records into the dim model.</li> <li>b. Matching Treatment Episodes between Version 13 and 14 that are continuous the two different versions of FASAMS.</li> <li>c. We will send the composite keys out to everyone and let them look at them and have them reply back to us within a week if they think this captures everything.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>5. Request to Turn Off the Rules That Require Performance Outcome Metrics, Diagnosis and Evaluations to be Submitted Upon Admission.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The purpose of the request is that during the transition to Version 14 these may put some people in a tough spot because of manually re-evaluating and re-entering all that information for each new admission, which is very laborious and also would adjust their performance outcomes schedules so that everybody that submitted on Version 14 would now in their system would be on the same POM schedule so they wouldn't have to relive that nightmare quarterly.</li> <li>b. The other option that was also considered was to pull in data from existing POMs and put that in the admissions they create in Version 14. People didn't feel comfortable with that. They thought it would create a lot of coding complications on the E.H.R.s side on things, and then also would feel a bit like deriving data that wasn't the most current or accurate.</li> <li>c. Originally, DCF had recommended, and this might have been a little bit of a short-sided recommendation, as clients natural POM schedules presented themselves, they would be entered into Version 14. But since providers won't be working in a dual structure, they couldn't do that intermittently. They would either have to wait until all of their clients had received an updated POM interlinked with DCF. This would essentially cause three to four months lag time in receiving any service events, as well as potentially the Managing Entities.</li> <li>d. DCF's concern while we're considering it is that with the dimensional model, we should be able to link back to the previous POM and still maintain that data and use that data and wait on an actual POM schedule to get updated data.</li> <li>e. Our primary concern is that people who were submitted post go-live with Version 14 wouldn't get entered and we would miss that information.</li> <li>f. We recognize that turning off this rule will not be long-term, but just in the initial phase.</li> <li>g. Nathan had a question for the group – we heard Danielle explain how she plans to help people complete all their admissions in Version 14. Is that a decision that is necessary to make consistently for all the MEs</li> </ul>		

<p>or do we have the ability to be flexible and say MEs can handle that differently based on a business sense?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>h. FEI response – unfortunately, the rules are global rules, so if it gets turned off for one ME, it gets turned off in the system completely. Unfortunately, we don't have specific rules for specific MEs, at least not at this point.</li> <li>i. We just wanted to get input from everyone on this issue. I don't think anything is set in stone. We make take a few viable options off the table and just wanted you to be aware before we did it.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>6. Action Items</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Jesse will be sending out the unique logic for the dimension model for everyone to review and provide feedback at our next meeting.</li> <li>b. We will schedule a meeting for next week strictly to discuss the User Constraint Logic and the Dimensional Model criteria.</li> <li>c. I'll need to find a way for contract managers to maybe put some documentation in place to alert people that performance outcomes may be potentially incomplete in November through February due to the new enhancement we're putting into place.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>7. Decisions to be made</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. DCF and FEI still need to decide whether we are going to apply the user constraint rules once they're agreed upon in Version 13 as well as Version 14.</li> <li>b. How we're going to handle the User Constraint Rule once duplicate records get punted so that it doesn't affect an MEs error record. We'll explore that and FEI will come back with a solution.</li> <li>c. As we are navigating the dimensional model and getting some of the concerns with it using the admission date and the SRIs, FEI and DCF will need to look into that a little more to see how we are going to treat it moving forward. We'll have some thoughts on that for next Tuesday.</li> </ul>		