Meeting Summary

Project / Initiative:	FASAMS
Meeting Purpose:	JAD with DAC
Meeting Date:	2/9/2021
Meeting Time:	10:00am - 11:00am

	Attendee	Office		Attendee	Office
	Jonathan Hall	SAMH	x	Danielle Downing,	Credible
x	Richard Power	SAMH		Natalie Kelly	FAME
x	Greg Nix	SAMH		Paul Bebee	FAME
	Tracey Fannon	SAMH		Jesse Lindsey	FEI
	Shivana Gentry	SAMH		Andrew Barden	FEI
x	Ed De Cardenas	SAMH		Rodney Pritchard	Knight Software
x	Nathan McPherson	OITS		Josh Botbol	Let's Talk Counseling
x	Mark Granto	OITS		Arthur Cooksey	Let's Talk Interactive
x	Victor Gaines	OITS		Jason Lee	Let's Talk Interactive
x	Wen Cao	OITS	x	Jennifer Ramirez	LSF
	Mike Idoni	BHCPNS	x	Ryan Lavender	Netsmart
	Beau Frierson	BHCPNS		Andy Mead	Netsmart
x	Sharyn Dodrill	Carisk		Roderick Harris	NWFHN (BBCBC)
x	Diego Wartensleben	Carisk	x	Lisa Tajdari	NWFHN (BBCBC)
x	Larry Brown	CFBHN	x	Roderick Harris	NWFHN (BBCBC)
x	Joseph Glidden	CFBHN		Seana Zagar	Qualifacts
	Joanne Szocinski	CFBHN		Matt Lightner	Streamline
x	Nydia Neris	CFBHN	x	Katie Morrow	Streamline
	Mike Lupton	CFCHS		Johnny Guimaraes	Thriving Mind (SFBHN)
x	Tom Rose	CFCHS	x	Debbie Stephenson	Five Points
x	William Garcia	CFCHS			
	Steve Lord	Circles of Care			

X – Attended in person
R – Attended remotely

Meeting Summary

Agenda and Discussion Summary

#	Topic	Comments
1	Review Action Items	Nathan opened meeting and gave brief overview of current status. He identified Beau's ticket and Greg's recommendation for holding a separate staffing with him. He then brought up Diego's request for an enhancement to the subcontracts has been created but it will not be put in to the system until summer. Diego then brought up effective dates for current OCAs. Rich responded by saying all the OCA's have been coded to start on 7/1/21. Nathan then referenced the table below for feed back. Johnny spoke up and said it would be helpful to have a summary or some detail for the historical data what validations will be turned on or off and what are the expectations for some of the new data fields for submission of historical data into v14. Rich was asked if he had an opinion and he said he did not at this time. Debbie then spoke up and asked if the dates listed are open for change. She reported they are beginning the upload of their data following the historical purge and will notify SAMH if she encounters any problems. Johnny asked for clarification on the purge and Nathan said he would have to submit a ticket for his purge. Nathan said the purpose of submitting a formal request for data purge is ensure the process will not cause any problems.

Plans for Submission of Historical Data

Submitting Entity	Plan Description	Estimated Completion
SFBHN	Convert all historical data into v14 and request a wipe of v13 data from FEI	3/31/21
LSF	Convert all historical data into v14 and request a wipe of v13 data from FEI	4/30/21
CFCHS (Five Points supported)	Will request a purge of V13 and will resubmit V13	3/31/21
CFBHN	Will request a purge of V13 and will resubmit V13	2/28/21
NWF Health (formerly BBCBC) (Five Points supported)	Will request a purge of V13 and will resubmit V13	3/31/21
BBHC (Carisk supported)	Convert all historical data into v14 and request a wipe of v13 data from FEI	2/28/21
SEFBHN (Carisk supported)	Convert all historical data into v14 and request a wipe of v13 data from FEI	2/28/21

2 & 3	2. Review Plans for Submission of Historical Data
	
	3. Discuss Open Issues
		Nathan then moved on to agenda item 2 and reviewed the status of the requests/issues. He then stopped at action item 3 (request for policy guidance) and asked Rich to speak to this. Rich said their thinking is the best places to move the POMS to the original admission. He said they do not want to restrict the providers from carrying out their tasks and not create duplicative actions in the field to obtain the necessary data. Sharyn said it would require reprogramming on the part of providers and ME's. She asked how the diagnosis is going to be linked to the PAC? He said there are a lot of reasons why SAMH is not comfortable altering tracking based on diagnosis. Discussion held between Sharyn and Rich on how best to operationalize this issue. Rich said he has no problem building the validation but the more rules active leads to more records rejected. Jennifer spoke to her team's experience with entering co-occurring data and it was successful. She said the system is just waiting for an update to program area. They did not change the admission date and the system accepted that. Rich said she just updated the admission record. Jennifer confirmed and that they put in a new diagnosis and POMS and encountered no problem. Sharyn asked for clarification which Jennifer provided. Diego asked about services and how most OCA's are either SA or MH and if its required to change client from initial PAC to co-occurring. General discussion held on proper coding for co-occurring as it presents. Discussion came to conclusion with Sharyn saying the ME's would provide SAMH with their ideas and preferences for a decision to be made. She asked Roderick to follow up with the rest of the state vendors to obtain their recommendations and requests regarding this issue. Jennifer said no code change is required, simply a policy change and communication. Nathan wrapped by reiterating the request for ME and vendor recommendations to be submitted to SAMH before next JAD. He then moved on to the issue of a client changing from child to adult. Rich said the solution to this is the same as above. Jennifer said she would try it in her pilot testing but that she agrees with Rich's analysis that this is not a separate issue. Nathan asked if a formal policy needs to be developed or not. Rich spoke up and said he saw an issue with the original admission. Nathan provided brief review of Rich's solution. Roderick said he saw no objection at this point but they require a policy to clarify the process. Discussion opened on the development of a handbook to guide people new to FASAMS. Nathan said SAMH would develop the crosswalk on discharge reasons from v12 to v14. This will be on next meeting agenda. Nathan then moved to Sharyn's question regarding PlacementOutcomeCodes. No objections raised to making this vocabulary change. Nathan confirmed the change would be implemented.
		
		1. Valid Code and OCA combinations [Beau Frierson]
		   • Several code combinations are not possible [impact: might cause under reporting]
		   • Certain OCA can't be used – lack crosswalk [impact: might hinder billing]
		Update: Beau submitted a list of issues\concerns. SAMH HQ staff is reviewing and preparing feedback.
		
		2. Add EffectiveDate and ExpirationDate to SubcontractOCA [Diego Wartensleben]

DCF meet with Diego and Joe Glidden to gain a better understanding of this request. Diego explained some of his subcontracts have ExpenditureOCAs with EffectiveDate and ExpirationDate dates that are not the same as that of the parent subcontract record. The group also discuss how this change might be implemented without impact to other MEs that don't require this level of granularity.

Update: DCF has established a new system enhancement to add EffectiveDate and ExpirationDate as optional fields in the SubcontractOCA record. Diego asked if this could be implemented sooner. DCF will not be able to implement this change any sooner than 7/1/2021.

Resolved

3. Request policy guidance. How should submitting entities provide FASAMS data as the Program Area Code (PAC) changes during an episode of care (e.g. SA -> MH, MH -> SA, SA-> Co-occurring, etc.)? [Mike Lupton and Steve Lord]

Not yet resolved. Potential options to be discussed:

- Open multiple episodes
- Open as Co-occurring
- We could potentially determine based on service types provide under the episode
- Include PAC on the POM and remove PAC from admission

Update: Jennifer shared her recommendations. Others in the group shared comments. No decisions reached.

4. Request policy guidance. How should submitting entities provide FASAMS data as the client ages into adulthood? [Mike Lupton and Steve Lord]

Not yet resolved. Potential options to be discussed:

- Discharge and re-admit, can already do
- We can determine based on age at POMS, they would then only submit MH or SA, not adult or child

5. How should discharge reason codes be cross-walked from v12 to v14? [Diego Wartensleben]

6. Request vocabulary change to the PlacementOutcomeCodes [Sharyn Dodril]

Request revising the language to read:

"The code indicating the outcome of the placement for the individual of the treatment episode.
Optional
Required to be submitted at the time the EndDate is submitted.
Must be one of the following values:
   1 for ~~Successful [~~moving to a lower level of care at same provider~~]~~
   2 for ~~Unsuccessful [~~moving to a higher level of care at same provider~~]~~
   3 for Discharge~~*~~ [referral to another provider or no referral at completion of placement]"
(FASAMS Chapter5, Version 14.0, page 31)

DCF Response: No objection if all MEs agree.

Meeting Summary

4	Version 15 Planning	Nathan then moved on to the final item of the agenda. He asked for feedback on anything substantial in the current version that needs addressing or if there are processes they want to see go into production for the next version. Sharyn brought up duplicative efforts and Rich said the goal is to have all the reporting go into FASAMS to reduce the duplicative efforts currently happening. Nathan then concluded meeting with request for feedback. No feedback given. Meeting concluded: 1051a What significant changes should be included in version 15? When should version 15 be scheduled for testing and implementation? **Update**: Nathan asked the group for recommendations in the next meeting.

Action Items

#	Item Description	Assignee	Estimated Completion
1	Consider options to provide periods of dedicated support to submitting entities and faster feedback to issues and questions as they submit historical data. **SAMH and FEI will accommodate requests from submitting entities.**	Richard Power	~~2/8/2021~~ Complete
2	Review the list of concerns Beau submitted regarding code values and assemble feedback. **Initial review complete. Recommend a separate working meeting.**	Greg Nix	2/8/2021
3	Evaluate options to implement changes Diego requested to the SubcontractOCA sooner than 5/1/21 or to relax existing validation rules. **Request evaluated – Can't implement sooner.**	Jesse Lindsey	~~2/4/2021~~ Complete
4	Review suggested changes regarding PAC from Jennifer and Sharyn **Review completed**	Richard Power	~~2/8/2021~~ Complete
5	Provide recommendations regarding the content and scheduling of version 15.	(Submitting Entities)	2/9/2021