Ryan White Part A
Performance Improvement Advisory Team
Minutes of February 20, 2009

Behavioral Science Research,
2121 Ponce De Leon Blvd., Suite250
Coral Gables, FL 33134

#	Members	Organization	Guests
1	Carla Valle-Schwenk	OGC	Aleida Avila – PHC-AHF
2	Sergio Lindarte	SFAN	**BSR Staff**
3	Frederick Downs, Jr.	Consumer Representative	Robert Ladner
4	Jasmin O'Neale-Lewis	University of Miami	Beth Hayden
5	Kathy Mercogliano	University of Miami	Clarice Evans
6	Karelia Godinez	Citrus	Susy Martinez
7	Ruth Weber	Empower U	Sandra Sergi
8	Karen Hilton	University of Miami	Ariela Eshel Bernstein
9	Tom Pietrogallo	Care Resource	
10	Iris Chamagua	Mercy Hospital	
11	Jackie Taylor	Jessie Trice Community Health Center	
12	Ed McGowan	Concept House	
13	Michael Williams	SOBAP	

1. PIAT members reviewed the January 16, 2009 minutes. No changes were made.

2. **Standing Business**

- Medical Case Management Updates
    - Technical Assistance (TA) Visits – Ariela Bernstein reported TA visits were continuing with some agencies improving more than others. One case management agency that had been resistant to TA, has been reviewed by the County and will, per a County directive, begin receiving TA in April. At one of the larger case management agencies with more than one physical location, TA visits will alternate every other month between the two locations and concentrate on review of a single item. Beth Hayden remarked that there continue to be discrepancies between information in progress notes, documents filed and what is checked in the Financial Assessment (FA). Some case managers continue to have problems discerning when the use of a Head of Household Letter is appropriate and some continue to have problems understanding how to correctly determine household size for purposes of the FA.
    - Case Management Proficiency Exam – Sandra Sergi informed the PIAT that the proficiency exam was administered during the February Medical Case Management trainings. Exams will be graded and results will be presented to the County by the end of March. The March trainings will review changes made to the FA in order to make the form clearer (draft of revised FA is included with meeting materials) and also

begin exploring the elements that should be included when documenting the FA in a progress note.

- AETC Outpatient Medical Record Reviews – Beth reported that AETC has completed all outpatient medical record reviews. The exit interview at Mercy Hospital has not yet been conducted; Dr. Beal of AETC is scheduled to present the exit interview at Mercy on May 29th, 2009 and will also present an overview of Miami's Ryan White medical provider reviews at the May 29th meeting of the Medical Care Subcommittee.
- Oral Health Care Record Reviews – Reviews are under way with two scheduled for February; the last review is scheduled for March. Agency specific reports are being prepared and distributed. The Oral Health Care Subcommittee has not formally set a performance threshold, however since all other thresholds have been set at 80%, oral health care reports are also using 80% as a threshold. Providers whose individual scores fall below 80% will be asked to submit corrective action plans and BSR will remonitor in approximately six (6) months to measure improvements. Once all agencies receive their individual reports, BSR staff will present an aggregate report to the Oral Health Care Subcommittee during its May meeting.

3. **New Business**
   - Financial Assessment Revisions –
     - **Section 1.1.** Questions were added regarding the Ryan White Health Insurance Program and AICP. PIAT suggested changing Ryan White Insurance Program to Ryan White prescription copay/deductibles.
     - If the answer to the insurance programs is "No", BSR had requested programming be added to eliminate blank fields that are irrelevant from printing out. This appears not to have been done.
     - **Sections 1.2 and 1.3.** These sections are grouped differently. The primary change made is that all fields are now required. "Yes" or "No" must be entered next to each listed program; they cannot be left blank.
     - **Section 2.1.** The section has been organized into Employment Income, Benefits Income and Other Sources of Income. HOPWA assistance is to be entered as income; the amount of assistance is noted on the lease. BSR will clarify with Ray Lewis regarding amounts for utility assistance.
     - **Section 2.2** The section has been modified to include a drop down box that lists the type of financial relationship that will qualify another individual to always be counted as part of the household.
     - **Section 2.3** Proof of Income has been clarified and updated to add proofs approved by the County that were previously missing from the form; the PIAT suggested changing the wording for proof of income to read "Check the document that provides proof of income and attach to the FA".
     - **Section 2.4** The Expenses column has been modified to report monthly expenses and then calculate annual expenses as a logic check to Section 2.1., which includes both monthly and annual income.
     - On the last page of the FA, redundant questions regarding proof of residency were removed.

Discussion moved to types of proof of income and length of validity. PIAT was in agreement that where the case manager clearly documents he or she has questioned the client and finds the client's financial status unchanged AND the client has presented a type of proof such as an SSI letter, that is, a situation in which no change is the normal case, the case manager can write "No change" on the original document at the 6 month update, initial and date the document. For employed clients, it is always advisable to present current (x 6 mos.) proof of income. Discussion then moved to using the 'Post It' feature on SDIS to prevent clients who are determined to be ineligible for Ryan White services at one agency to alert other agencies to which the client might turn to try to gain entry to the Ryan White service system by possibly presenting less complete or different information regarding his/her eligibility. The Post It note should alert that the client in question may not be eligible for Ryan White services without providing any other detail about the client, but providing the contact name and number for the person creating the Post It.

Discussion then moved to the SDIS agency restricted access to progress notes. Members raised the question, why progress notes are restricted to the agency that entered them, when the client has signed an Informed Consent to Release and Exchange Information among agencies. It was noted certain information protected by State law, such as mental health and substance abuse entries, should be excluded from general access. SDIS users voiced their opinion that the system would be more efficient if agencies could have unrestricted access to progress notes. The issue of general access to progress notes will be raised with ACMS. Discussion then moved to the Informed Consent and when it should be obtained during the intake/registration process. Consensus was that the Informed Consent should be obtained (completed, signed and dated) prior to entering client information into the SDIS system.

- 2009 Service Delivery Evaluation Survey – Parts A and B

  Clarice Evans lead the PIAT through the new questions/changes made to the 2009 Service Delivery Evaluation Survey: Ryan White Program. The following changes were recommended:

  A.21 should be moved to the beginning since the PAC Waiver question should screen out clients receiving case management and medical services through PAC and not through Ryan White Part A.

  A.23 and A.24 – Breakout into AICP, prescription deductibles and prescription copays

  B.4. - Change "medical case manager to medical case management agency or medical case manager/peer counselor"

  B.10 - Separate into two questions – one to quantify the time required to actually obtain an appointment date and the other – to quantify the time between requesting an appointment and the actual date of the physical appointment

  B.25 – Change "intake/front desk staff" to "front desk staff"

  B.26 - Break into two questions – one dealing with how comfortable is the client in discussing/giving personal information and the second – how comfortable is the client with the way agency staff handle the client's personal information

  2009 Service Delivery Evaluation Survey - Part C

  Change throughout the document, "HIV doctor" to "medical provider"; PIAT recommended adding questions on 1) the reason the client is here to see the medical provider 2) of the medical providers the client sees, which is most helpful to the client 3) how many times has the client gone to the emergency room during the last 12 mos. 4) a follow up question to

C16b. - if client has visited the medical provider as a walk in, how many times has this occurred

C.11. - Make the same changes that were made to the question in the medical case management section

C.19. - Was reworded to "Has your medical provider ever given you printed, recreational materials?"

PIAT suggested asking some health literacy questions based on HIV/AIDS knowledge as a validity check for client answers. Tom Pietrogallo will share with Clarice, sample questions developed at Care Resource. The PIAT was asked to send comments and suggestions to Clarice.

- 2009-2010 Quality Management Work Plan – A draft of the QM plan was distributed for review. A timeline for all proposed QM activities will be presented at the March 20 PIAT meeting. Ariela asked the PIAT to email comments and suggestions for additional projects prior to the March meeting.

- June 2009 PIAT Meeting – The PIAT agreed to cancel the June meeting as a result of the Needs Assessment meetings scheduled to take place during the month of June. PIAT members were encouraged to attend the Needs Assessment meetings.

4. **Next Meeting – Friday, March 20, 2009**