Meeting Summary

Project / Initiative:	FASAMS
Meeting Purpose:	Data Advisory Committee (DAC) Meeting
Meeting Date:	11/30/2021
Meeting Time:	10:00am - 12:00pm

	Attendee	Office		Attendee	Office
R	Beau Frierson	Lakeview		Joanne Szocinski	Credible
	Debbie Stephenson	5 Points		Wesley Ordonez	
	Johnny Guimaraes	SEFBHN		Danielle Downing	Credible
	Renee Session	FEI		Matt Munyon	LSF
	William Garcia			Larry Brown	CFCHS
	Jesse Lindsey	FEI		Chris Jones	NWFLHN
	Diego Wartensleben	BBCB		Nydia Neris	
	Dan Field			Tom Rose	
	Joseph Glidden			Ryan Lavender	
	James Brockman			Steve Lord	
	Richard Power	SAMH			

X – Attended in person
R – Attended remotely

Agenda and Discussion Summary

#	Topic	Comments
1	Service Record Counts	

Count of Service Event Records by ME and Year

ShortName	FY18-19	FY19-20	FY20-21	FY21-22
BBCBC	377,247	350,280	410,354	38,727
BBHC	508,640	487,932	562,473	115,123
CFBHN	1,216,661	1,283,628	1,216,348	
CFCHS	319,118	353,456	528,804	31,783
LSF	633,359	527,490	1,074,193	53,484
SEFBHN	580,403	580,980	649,250	156,621
SFBHN	216,374	76,309	628,506	50,412
Total	**3,851,802**	**3,660,075**	**5,069,928**	**446,150**

(As of 11/29/2021)

Meeting began with a review of record counts from each ME. Matt Munyon reported they plan to resolve the issues they are experiencing and will be in a position to bring their data up to spec by January 2022. Joe Glidden then spoke. He said the report he is seeing; he is not seeing any numbers comparable to what he has in his records. Nathan asked to speak with Joe privately regarding the query he ran to confirm they are looking at the same numbers. He said he would request Larry Brown run the numbers to double check. Joe said he would follow up after investigating this with Larry first. Nathan then asked Joe what percentage he believes his organization is at. He said the current service records are only around 30-40% complete from the providers and there are some issues with the POMs being submitted by the providers as well. He reported the majority of issues are originating in the POMs and is likely tied to the business rule on that issue. He reported they are submitting about 15% of their data in at this time. Steve confirmed this is an issue with the POM validations. Nathan requested an update on the POM rule. Jesse said the LOC requirement has been turned off, the CGAS should as well and the POM requirement has been put back on as the 3 month extension expired. Joe said the POM data was fine till the validation was turned back on and this issue resides in his providers. Diego then spoke up, referencing Treatment Episode, p. 61 that says each TE requires two type 2 evaluations. He said this means everyone requires an LOC and at least 2 LOF evals for everybody. Jesse reviewed the validations and confirmed LOC is off, CGAS is on. Jesse said users can go into the configuration tab and pull up the list of rules. Jesse provided a visual walk through of how to do this. This area of discussion concluded at this time. Nathan then referenced previous discussions held over the pending records. Dan Field spoke to this and said they are on target for file submissions and he said there really isn't much left to be figured out. It will just depend on how submissions from the field go forward so its hard to give a date for when the requisite data will be entered or available. He said he would need to hear from the MEs if things are going well, since he can't speak to that level of the data entry. Johnny then spoke up, saying he's seen some real nice movement in their Netsmart partners. He said they are hesitant to upload large data packets due to the issue of errors so its just

		trickling in. Dan acknowledged this concern and how Netsmart has been addressing the issue. Dan identified that individual providers are being exceptionally sensitive to ensuring they submit error free data, and this may be hampering efforts to obtain the desired data. General conversation held b/w Dan and Johnny regarding data coming in from the field and why it may be sparse. Beau spoke up and identified a primary issue they are seeing in their submissions that some went in and they are now experiencing errors when they attempt updates. That has led him to deleting the existing episode and then replace with the updated record. He expressed confusion over why this is occurring. He discussed how FASAMS doesn't truly delete a record, it simply flags it as deleted and he believes this is causing the problem and thought it had been resolved. Nathan confirmed FASAMS does not hard delete and only marks the data as deleted. Discussion held on this, how the delete records process is supposed to operate, and that there should be no issues for resubmission and instead this is a problem on the ME side. Chris Jones said NWFL would look in to this issue. Nathan said this should not be an issue.
3	Discussion Topics	Nathan referenced that there are two enhancements currently slated for deployment that will address this issue. He reported that OITS and FEI are being very careful to not cause any of the ME's or providers to make changes. He reported that several organizations are prepped for this change, but others are not and not to be overly concerned as it is a fluid situation at the moment. • Change to Add PAC to POM Nathan gave brief review of the issue and then turned the meeting over to Jesse to address this more fully. Nathan requested that any potential problems be identified today before SAMH commits to making this change. Jesse reported that the primary issue raised was concerns on the version change, and how to bring the providers into the new format of the single Co-Oc track. Jesse brought up enhancement WI 502779 which delineates the change of place PAC on POM, how the rules and validations will change, changes to unique constraint rules, and some other internal matters to ensure the change goes through the system completely. Dan and Jesse engaged in a brief discussion over the issue of historical data and the new plan for future data reporting and how the proposed change doesn't solve the problem. Diego spoke up in disagreement and laid out an example of how a single issue client becomes co-occurring and how this plan allows for the update to occur more naturally. Jesse said an individual is not required to close any open episode but can simply add an additional episode to the client file. Jesse reviewed whether FASAMS allows reporting of same service under different episodes. Diego's point was that the TE was not represented in the Unique Constraint rule (3.1.3 – Ch 6, v14). Dan related how this information is received from the field because this issue doesn't match to the data entry from the field which would introduce confusion which would lower the data quality. His point is that each admission is entered in the field as having the possibility to follow the separate treatment episodes which are then reconciled at case closure. Discussion ensued between Dan and Diego regarding field reality to database reality. No agreement achieved on proper route of data entry. Rich then spoke up and asked: 1) Jesse – there's a co-occurring record and a co-occurring program. Jesse confirms FASAMS supports both routes of co-occurring entering the record. Rich identified

problems simply switching a client from MH or SA to Co-Oc because it potentially creates a false record in the system. He did not identify where the Co-Oc PAC does not fix the identified problem in a simple fashion. He asked if the current setup has made it more confusing than necessary. Joe Glidden said he confirmed that such a scenario is still overly complex and asked for specifics on entering discharge codes when transiting TEs. Jesse then identified the current transfer path for v13 records into v14 and including the current transition. He identified the mistaken labels and areas of FASAMS at launch which has changed since and with the new PAC on POM plan, Jesse then presented the new layout taking everyone's issue into creation. Jesse presented a new tentative plan to decouple the POM from the Admission and instead it would be submitted against the placement. Larry asked what the utility is of having the start and end date for episodes in this solution? Jesse said it still has to do with the TEDS data requirements. Diego said placing PAC on POM is perfect solution in his opinion and the only issue is whether you open Co-Oc instead of MH or SA. Dan identified that upon the Co-Oc PAC being entered, the client cannot be reported under any other PAC. So the POMs won't line up for SA or MH clearly. Discussion held as to which POMs to report on, if prior POMs would have to change or be translated, or how future POMs are to be determined. General discussion had as to how the field operates in terms of clients with Co-Oc and how the care coordination is going to work which is going to impact when and where the specific POMs data is going to be generated. Steve said the general instructions to the field is to pull the last POM and enter "unknown" to the area that they are not working on directly and that the last clinician to meet with the client when a POM is due is required to enter it at that time.

Nathan then brought the discussion to an end. He said the PAC on POM approach appears to be the best approach at this time. It sounds like there might be the need to add an additional rule that says you can go from SA to Co-Oc but not back from Co-Oc to MH or SA. He asked for confirmation – Joe said he wants to talk to his providers first, commenting that Beau's response that this solution is not what has been being practiced was correct. General dispute to proposed solution. He asked if there would be a risk if FASAMS allowed for changing from Co-Oc to MH or SA only? General discussion ensued. General consensus that this is problematic. General discussion ensued. Nathan than spoke up and clarified the two options: 1) enforce a rule for the POM that says you can only go one way, from MH or SA to Co-Oc and not back or 2) Allow POM to change back to MH or SA. He asked which of the two options present a problem. The problem remains in the concept of Co-Oc, how that relates to the current MH or SA track that exists, and that multiple approaches to this issue are being pursued.

Jesse requested a direct instruction from SAMH prior to any changes. Rich said he needed to review and study the problem because many aspects of it were missing from his understanding of the problem. SAMH to follow up on findings at next JAD.

- Change to disable Subcontract validation rules

Nathan said OITS wants to remove some of the subcontract elements. Reason 1 – while well intentioned, in practice, not getting the data desired Reason 2 – concerns that it is preventing service records from being entered. He clarified no changes have been made, no changes are being made, except some of the rules to hopefully increase service event submissions.

		• Pamphlet Companion Prototype To be held at next JAD. • Update on new performance metrics Johnny raised question that some of his providers are under the belief that the evaluation section had been eliminated. Jesse confirmed and said only the CGAS is currently required. Rich said these decisions are still open for discussion. Jesse confirmed that the evaluations had been replaced with the GFI. Johnny reported this is causing confusion in the field. Brief discussion ensued whether this was over the Ch 5 update and the new values in the App1 regarding ignoring orders as well. Diego expressed mild concern at this report and matched some of his concerns regarding the language in the chapter. Dan expressed dislike with items he identified in the pamphlet as incorrect and matchup to system reality. Nathan acknowledged the concerns regarding some of these editing edits and probably some cleanup to do and identified some of the errors that he was aware of. Diego requested direct explanation on LOC and LOF evals and frequency. Nathan demurred a direct response and said he has some questions about it, but it will be followed up on. General discourse on how the Pamphlet is read literally as direct instruction from SAMH. Nathan thanked everyone for their participation, the meeting generated good information to take further action on and confirmed the next JAD two weeks out.
4	Questions and Comments	