

## **CMHAMM IS Work Group**

### **Meeting Minutes 2/4/04**

CEI – Joanne Holland, Chuck Dougherty

Gratiot – Scott Overfield, Heather Kohus

Ionia – Andy Igel

Manistee-Benzie – Brenda Monk

Newaygo – Randy Betts, Debbie Cline

1. IS Work Group Report – Chuck Dougherty will email the report to the workgroup members for review and feedback. The report will be presented to Core group on March 3<sup>rd</sup>.
2. FY03/04 837 Status – At this point none of the encounter files for FY03/04 have been submitted to DCH. The affiliation allowed amount was finalized this week, therefore we will continue to process files for submission to DCH.
3. Unbundling Specialized Residential – There was a question whether the boards need to go back to October 1 to unbundle the Specialized Residential services. There are a few issues with going back to October. One is DCH has indicated they may not necessarily use the data. Another is the services would no longer match the treatment plan/PCP and there are legal issues with adjusting the PCP retroactively. Since DCH is stating January 1<sup>st</sup>, the general consensus is to report CLS and Personal Care from January 1 forward. The work and resources involved in going back to October would be over and above any benefit from having the data.
4. DCH Information on FY 02/03 Data – DCH provided a spreadsheet of the number of consumers reported by PIHP by FY. CEI has begun some analysis on the data and have found that the QI count matches the expected amount and early indications are the same for the encounter data. The workgroup discussed different methods of validating the data being extracted for the QI and 837. They included sharing resources to get reports from Roger and developing something in Redix that Gratiot and Newaygo could use. Brenda Monk will check with Redix to see if there is a runtime version available.
5. HIPAA Security Risk Analysis – Scott Overfield asked if any of the boards have put together Risk Analysis teams and if the PIHP needs to be involved with all of the affiliate CMHSPs. The group agreed to share any experiences and documentation they have in this area. Andy Igel from Ionia indicated he has already completed this work with other CMHs and will share documentation and templates developed for Risk Assessment, gap analysis, etc.
6. Encounter Data System Validation – Scott Overfield asked if CEI will be providing direction and/or assistance to the affiliate CMHSPs in regard to the EQRO/DCH discussion at the December conference. Each board will need to ensure they have the necessary data validations in place. CEI is willing to produce a first draft document in response to the areas covered in the EQRO materials. There are also indications this may be a phone review and not a face-to-face visit.
7. Chester Award – Randy Betts presented Brenda Monk with the Chester Award along with a wonderful poem describing her attention to detail and contributions to the affiliation. Congrats Brenda!
8. Electronic Record - Brenda Monk described the product that Icon is developing for Manistee-Benzie. She presented sample forms and identified some of the processes staff

would use to complete the forms. MB has not yet entered the testing phase and has an expected go live date of April 1<sup>st</sup>.

9. Provider Workgroup Update – Randy Betts asked if there had been any feedback from the provider workgroup. Chuck Dougherty sent the proposal from the IS workgroup. It recommended about 20 hours of design work before IS could give an accurate estimate on the scope of the project. At this point there has been no response from the workgroup.
10. Adult Benefit Waiver – Debbie Cline asked for confirmation on how far back we are able to go with the ABW. Heather Kohus has a letter from CMS dated January 2004 that indicates we can go back to January 1<sup>st</sup>. Heather will try and locate the letter for Debbie.
11. Resubmission of 837 Data – According to DCH PIHPs may resubmit encounter data if there is a change in the allowed amount for a service. It is unclear how much of a change is required for resubmission. However, the encounter software has not been designed for this type of a resubmission, i.e. the technical capability does not exist. This seems to be more of a billing process than an encounter process, which raises some concerns.

Joanne Holland  
CEI Business Analyst