CODING TECHNICAL COMMITTEE AGENDA
May 17, 2017

NEW CTC MEMBERS

Veronica Marshall (AB)
Aviaja Kunuk (NWT)
Sean Swenarchuk (MB)

The CTC now has members representing:
Alberta *(Eve Cyr, Veronica Marshall)*
Manitoba *(Sean Swenarchuk)*
New Brunswick *(Diane Baker)*
Newfoundland *(Deanne Layman)*
Nova Scotia *(Doug Roberts)*
Northwest Territories and Nunavut *(Aviaja Kunuk)*
Ontario *(Linda Kacur, Wes Armstrong)*
Saskatchewan *(Lynn Bourgeois, Lucille Wiebe)*

2016 CODING EXERCISE

◦ **Overall results**
  ◦ Did all jurisdictions participate?
  ◦ Jurisdictional scores
  ◦ National scores by variable
  ◦ Scenarios with the most errors

◦ **In regards to errors**
  ◦ Questions from jurisdictions regarding errors/answer key?
  ◦ Changes required to coding manual (additional wording, examples, etc.)?

2017 CODING EXERCISE

◦ **Request less sample cases from the jurisdictions?**
  We currently request 10 samples per jurisdiction.

◦ **Dates**
  Request sample cases by: *(September 30, 2017)*
  Start date: *(December 1, 2017)*
  Completion date: *(March 30, 2018)*
  Evaluation report distributed by: *(April 30, 2018)*

WORKING GROUP GOVERNANCE

The Coding Technical Committee (CTC) is comprised of subject matter experts in work injury/claim coding, with most members having 20+ years' experience with the NWISP program. (We have one non-voting member who is a coding supervisor). Not all jurisdictions are represented on the CTC (we have asked if their senior NWISP coders were interested in joining, but they were not). The AWCBC has set guidelines for the CTC (e.g., majority vote/consensus; which groups are invited to review a CTC recommendation, etc.) Once the CTC has made a recommendation, the issue goes to all jurisdictions through various KSM and NWISP groups. Those groups have two weeks to respond to the issue. Once the issue is resolved by the AWCBC, it becomes part of the Coder's Reference Manual/Issues for all jurisdictions to refer to, which ensures national consistency. We are now asked to revisit the current procedure noted above (suggest the AWCBC be involved in the discussion, since we are asked to discuss changing what the AWCBC currently has in place). We are also asked to discuss if staff with limited work injury/claim coding can make recommendations as part of the CTC.

To be discussed:

1. Confirm the established CTC decision making process (for every day issue resolutions, i.e. changes to Coding Manual, etc), and discuss whether there should be any changes to the current process.
2. Establish membership criteria for CTC. (e.g., suggested qualifications/experience for CTC membership).

PTSD CLAIMS

- ◦ Review how jurisdictions with a CTC representative currently code these claims.

- ◦ Should a psychological diagnosis always be chosen over a physical diagnosis, even when severe physical injuries are involved?

- ◦ How should we capture PTSD diagnosed with another psychological diagnosis of equal severity (e.g., PTSD is diagnosed with MDD)?

POSSIBLE NEW CODES

- ◦ The AWCBC will survey the jurisdictions' capabilities to add new codes.

- ◦ Should new codes become a possibility, this will be very helpful in capturing more detailed information regarding high-risk industries (health care) and scenarios we see more and more of (stress, assaults).

REVIEW OF OLD ISSUES TO DETERMINE VALIDITY OF DATA

∘ Old issues continue to be reviewed. The Coding Manual and Reference Manual are being updated by the AWCBC as necessary. The AOC Alpha Index is being updated as well.

NEW ISSUES IN PROGRESS

∘ On a recent AWCBC survey, a comment was made that the CTC's discussions do not always appear fact-based. We should note our research in our discussion threads for the NWISP Committee's review.

AOC SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

∘ The CTC will continue to provide feedback to the AWCBC regarding system improvements (e.g., suggestions to make the invalid code search more user-friendly, etc.)

EQUIVALENT TERMS

∘ Provide the AWCBC with equivalent terms to populate the "Search Equivalent Terms" section on the AOC. These terms will also be helpful for Alpha Index Search.

CTC RECOMMENDED RESOLUTIONS

∘ When decision is split, do we continue to enter these as "no consensus reached" for our Recommended Resolution.

CTC WORKPLAN (Processes and Timelines)

∘ Coding Exercise
   (Sample cases are required by September 30, 2017)
   ∘ Diane - Request samples from jurisdictions in mid-July.
       Send reminders at the beginning and near the end of September.
   ∘ Diane – At the beginning of October, ask CTC to add suggested cases into the coding exercise section.

◦ <u>Diane/CTC</u> – At the end of October, have conference call to choose the 12 coding exercise cases.
◦ <u>Diane/CTC</u> – Have conference call in November to discuss the Answer Key.
◦ <u>Diane</u> – Prepare draft Answer Key and Rationale document for CTC review.
◦ <u>CTC</u> – Suggest changes to answer key by mid-November.
(Coding Exercise Start Date December 1, 2017)
◦ <u>Diane</u> – Enter the Answer Key and Rationale onto the AOC before end date.
(Coding Exercise End Date March 30, 2018)
◦ <u>Diane</u> – Distribute the evaluation reports/scores by April 30, 2018.

◦ <u>Review of old issues to determine validity of data</u>
   ◦ <u>Diane and Michelle</u> – This is ongoing. Diane is reviewing the scenarios. The issues that are straightforward are sent to Michelle and she is making updates to the coding manual, etc. Some issues may require CTC review.

◦ <u>New Issues In Progress</u>
   ◦ The CTC doesn't always meet the two-week turnaround time for a recommended resolution for new issues. Continue striving for a two-week turnaround?
   ◦ At times, a new question is added during the discussions. CTC members who have already responded to the issue must review the issue again and respond to the new question. Should another two weeks be given to respond to new questions?