

# CENTRAL INDIANA FIRST STEPS

Provider Issues Committee Meeting

10/3/14 Date

Name	Agency	Changes to current contact info
1. Ed Oehl	SPOE	
2. Debbie Davis	SPOE	
3. Teri Williams	Collech	
4. Barb Blasin	PediPlay	
5. Natalie Newlin	PediPlay	
6. Carrie Tamminga	SNISC / BHHE Network	
7. Pat Seban	psseban@syncmorservices.com	Syncmore
8. Judy Chowdry	ACT	
9. Donna Holtz	PSA	
10. Natalie Case	Feeding Friends	
11. Shela Cardosa	SPOE	
12. Crystal Scott	Talking Time	
13. Michelle Colome	COHHE	
14. Deb Mahr	Accora	
15. Katerina Juwood	ProKids	

# CENTRAL INDIANA FIRST STEPS

Provider Issues Meeting

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name	Agency	Changes to current contact info
1. Jason Bern	CPC	
2. Holly Andria	ESC	
3. Elizabeth Verceluchheim	ACT	
4. Hannah King	TRC, PeaPlay	
5. Stacy Hobbs		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		

**Cluster G Provider Issues Committee Meeting Agenda  
October 3, 2014**

**Outcome Statement:** Families are presented with adequate information to make an informed choice regarding the selection of provider Agencies and location of services.

**Performance Standards:**

1. Families in all areas of the cluster will have available providers for needed services.

**Performance Measures:** Profile reports and First Steps data system reports will be utilized in the measurement of this performance standard.

- 1) Introductions (if needed)
- 2) Approval of minutes
- 3) Action Item Updates
- 4) *Teamwork* Review
- 5) QIP Data
- 6) SPOE Updates
- 7) Announcement/Close

**CENTRAL INDIANA FIRST STEPS  
LOCAL PLANNING & COORDINATING COUNCIL  
Provider Issues Committee Meeting Minutes  
October 3, 2014**

**Present:** Debbi Davis-SPOE, Alicia Cardoza-SPOE, Judy Chowdry-ACT, Donna Holtz-PSA, Carrie Tamminga-SJIISC/SRNDHH, Barb Blain-PediPlay, Jason Berty-Children’s Therapy Connection, Deb Miller-Accord Therapy, Angela Dick-SPOE, Patti Sebanc-Sycamore Services, Natalie Case-Feeding Friends, Elizabeth Voge-Wehrheim-ACT, Natalie Newlin-PediPlay, Holly Andria-Crossroads, Teri Williams-Collab for Kids, Crystal Scott-Talking Time, Laura Ray-TTLC/PediPlay, Stacy Holmes-Council, Katarina Groves-Council

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Items
<b>Welcome &amp; Introductions</b>	Katarina called the meeting to order and introductions were made.	
<b>Teamwork Software Review</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alicia reviewed the teamwork software and related SPOE processes. She also provided a handout with terminology and examples from Teamwork. A question arose about what is meant when SCs say “dropping information in the box.” It was explained that this was not a physical box, but rather a virtual holding area for data to be inputted into Teamwork. Angie advised that data entry turnaround is about two days. If agencies are noticing issues with the process, they should let team mangers know. Agencies should also keep the SPOE updated on Provider changes.</li> <li>• Alicia will be going on maternity leave, so providers can contact Carrie Ann for general questions and Kesha for technical questions.</li> <li>• There was a question about when an agency receives a request for a provider. Donna said there used to be a template that helped guide the agency in terms of what a child’s needs were and what type of therapy was needed. She said that now, the entire evaluation often has to be down loaded to understand the needs of the child. Alicia said that this information should be included in the recommendations area of the debriefing form. It was stated that this is not always happening or the agency is getting a request before the evaluation is complete. Debbi said she would emphasize the need to SC’s to be thorough while completing the information provided to agencies.</li> <li>• Holly asked how best to notify SCs of a</li> </ul>	

	<p>family’s change in address or other information . Alicia said that a message should be sent within Teamwork. There was also a question about whether Teamwork can accept encrypted information from agencies. If the information is encrypted, an agency can send the information via regular email, but it won’t be captured in Teamwork.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alicia also pointed out that a Teamwork training video will be available soon.</li> <li>• Debbi asked the group what was needed from the SPOE to get providers ready for Teamwork. She said the SPOE could be ready to add providers to projects in Teamwork the week of November 17<sup>th</sup>.</li> <li>• There was discussion about HIPPA and the need for some agencies to adhere to those guidelines and how this might impact the process. Debbi will coordinate with agencies that have systems that are HIPPA compliant.</li> </ul>	
<b>Approval of Minutes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Katarina asked everyone to review the minutes from the last meeting. Jason made a motion to approve the minutes as written, and Carrie T. seconded the motion. The motion carried, and the minutes were approved.</li> </ul>	
<b>Action Item Update</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding communication/ recommendations for changes in services among agencies, the Assessment Team, and the SPOE, Debbi drafted a process for agencies to review (entitled Service Change Communication Procedure).</li> <li>• Laura pointed out that there is no mention of the family being part of the discussion in the first few bullets. Debbi noted that the “team” always includes the family, so where “team consensus” is referenced, that includes the family. Debbi also noted that the Service Coordinator discusses the recommendations with the family. The family also receives the 10 day notice, and conversations are facilitated by SCs at meetings. Carrie T. pointed out that families are also sometimes looped into email communications around service changes.</li> <li>• Holly asked about the phrase “Team discussion will continue until team consensus is reached.” She wondered</li> </ul>	

what indicates that consensus has been reached. Debbi said that consensus is agreement among all team members, and does not mean majority rules. She said that if the team cannot come to agreement, services should remain status quo until either consensus could be reached or an answer is determined by other means (i.e. state intervention, Due Process, etc.).

- Judy asked whether this was a new procedure. Debbi said that this should be the procedure being followed now, and the document was intended to clarify best practice as requested at the annual meeting.
- Jason asked for a timeline on the 1<sup>st</sup> bullet. Debbi said she would revise to include a timeline and that changes should be at least 10 days out. Angie and Debbi also noted that Teamwork information is always available. Providers/agencies do not have to wait for items to be sent to them.
- Barb wondered about the agency's ability to monitor communication around changes in service since providers can initiate the changes at any time and because the recommendations have sometimes already been made. Debbi said she doesn't intend the process to be different from what should be happening currently and that agencies can set-up the guidelines about how the discussions happens within their agency and how that information is brought forward to the Assessment Team and the SPOE.
- Judy asked if they could have cell phone numbers for Assessment Team members. The SPOE will provide these.
- Jason requested a template for how this information is shared, specifically using the word "recommendation" because he felt that providers do not always feel like the Assessment Team recommendations are open for discussion.
- Concerns were again raised about agencies' ability to monitor what Assessment Teams and Providers are recommending for service changes since agencies have been given the responsibility of monitoring things like

	<p>cost per child. The issue is SC's sometimes initiate change requests generated by the parent, and not the provider. After some discussion, Debbi said that this should not be happening and change requests should come from a provider. She will clarify this with SCs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Debbi asked that any additional feedback to the outlined process be submitted within a couple of weeks. This draft will also be reviewed with SPOE and AT staff, and a final version will be sent out once everybody has given input.</li> </ul>	
<b>SPOE Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Debbi reviewed SPOE data and noted that the cost per child for the cluster is within the range provided by the state. She noted that in our current contract, we must address cost per child in terms lowering it or maintaining it. Debbi reviewed what Cluster G does to maintain current levels (reviewing initial service levels, reviewing requests for service increase, and sending agencies their cost per child quarterly). She asked if there was anything else that needed to be included. No additions were suggested .</li> <li>• Debbi also pointed out that she sent the most recent QIP to everyone. The area below the 96% threshold for Cluster G was Child Outcomes. . Debbi again asked for input from everyone and reminded them that they are welcome to make suggestions on the QIP, as it is intended to be a reflection of the Cluster's work on the issue.</li> <li>• Carrie said that the webinar training about child outcomes was very helpful for providers.</li> </ul>	
<b>Announcements/Close</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bryan is no longer with ProKids and the manager position will likely be restructured. . Debbi also said that communication between AT and ongoing providers will be a priority for the new manager. She will keep the group updated.</li> <li>• The SPOE database has been updated. It was changed from an Access database to a web-based system.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Next Meeting:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• January 9, 2015 at the 9:30am at the ProKids office</li> </ul>

Respectfully submitted,  
Stacy Holmes