

Health Information Technology Work Group – Session 2		
2.3.2015	9:00 AM – 12:00 PM	Harrisburg, PA
Meeting called by	Secretary Karen Murphy	
Type of meeting	Health Information Technology – session 2	
Chair(s)	Secretary Karen Murphy	
Introduction and Recap of Last Workgroup Session		
9:00 – 9:15 AM	Secretary Karen Murphy,	
Discussion	The workgroup was kicked off with a recap of the previous HIT workgroup and brief overview of conclusions from the other four workgroups	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Restatement of the workgroup charter ▪ Timeline for HIP ▪ Guiding principles from HIT Workgroup Session 1 ▪ Preliminary conclusions from other workgroups that affect HIT 	
HIT functionality and use cases identified		
9:15 – 10:15 AM	Patricia Mactaggart, Senior Advisor at Office of the National Coordinator / Office of Care Transformation	
Discussion	Patricia shared learnings from other states who are undertaking similar efforts, with particular focus on functionality and operationalization. Patricia shared high-level structures to think about health information technology and the flow of data throughout the system from data sources to end users.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Patient/consumer should be the end focus of all initiatives ▪ Focus should be on how HIT supports other elements of HIP ▪ In order to be successful, PA needs to quickly get to addressing the technology functionality needs of the Commonwealth and identify a set of specific initiatives to drive forward in the near term and a higher-level approach for HIT more generally in the long term ▪ Although some states have improved in specific areas, no state has completely figured out all elements / requirements of HIT 	
Care Coordination Use Case		
10:30 – 11:00 AM	Patricia Mactaggart, Senior Advisor at Office of the National Coordinator / Office of Care Transformation	
Discussion	Patricia introduced framework for health information technology using the example use case of care coordination: the framework includes data collection, data extraction/sharing/transport, and technology functionality	
	HIT framework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Technology functionality is a pyramid of functions that build bottom-up from foundational requirements (e.g., security mechanisms, consent management functions) to higher-level functionality (e.g., analytic services, consumer tools) ▪ Governance, Policy/Legal, Financing, and Business Operations is required to support this technology functionality 	
HIT focus area exercise		
11:00 – 11:45 AM	Dr. Lauren Hughes	
Discussion	All attendees split up into break-out groups for the exercise. Each break out group focused on key strategic questions focusing on care coordination as the use case	

<p>Data Collection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are many touchpoints where data collection is required (patients, primary care physicians, specialists, pharmacists, community organizations, educational institutions, etc.) ▪ An all payer claims and clinical database is needed (mentioned throughout the workgroup) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Where data belongs to the patient (not a vendor) ○ Centrally managed by a neutral/government entity ○ Data is automatically pushed at the point of collection and easily pulled by whoever needs it ▪ Barriers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Significant portion of the provider population are still using paper (not EMRs) ○ If given an option, many people may opt-out, especially for behavioral/mental health or substance abuse data ○ Interstate or border populations may use / generate data in other states but current solutions do not incorporate interstate data sharing or interaction 		
<p>Data Extraction/Sharing/Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The key user endpoints are consumers, providers, payers (commercial and government), and policy makers (both government and data aggregators, like surveillance) ▪ Need state-wide clinical and claims database ▪ The state does have some pieces in place – current federated model allows data to be pushed (but not stored centrally) ▪ There are some challenges <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Gap in ambulatory care data (and other types of data) ○ Issues with collaboration between regional HIE participants (due, in part, to competition) ○ Adoption is low of current infrastructure 		
<p>Technology Functionality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Solution has to be part of existing provider workflow - it cannot give professionals more work ▪ Encounter notification must be implemented, so that whoever is being held accountable actually knows that the patient is utilizing services ▪ Right now home health and long-term care are left out (as well as other providers in continuum of care), and they must be included 		
<p>Conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HIT work group will identify a couple specific initiatives to support the broader HIP (i.e. what HIT is required for Payment, Transparency, Population Health, Care Delivery Transformation) • Governance is recommended as the first area to focus efforts • HIT workgroup needs to interact with other workgroups to make sure proposed solutions are aligned with the other work groups • Based on the evaluation of other states, for CMMI, the strategy needs to specifically address each part of the framework: Financing, Policy/Legal, Business Operations, and Governance 		
<p>Closing and next steps</p>		
11:45 AM – 12:00 PM	Dr. Lauren Hughes	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Participate in follow-up webinars or calls	Work Group Members	TBD
Participate in third work group session to refine HIT strategies and identify interdependencies with other workgroups	Work Group Members	April 2016

Note: Any policy suggestions included in the minutes do not reflect the Administration's position or intentions.