

**Department of Health Services  
Treatment Intervention Advisory Committee (TIAC)**

Date: October 27, 2017  
10:00 AM to 12:00 PM  
Department of Health Services (DHS)  
1 W. Wilson Street, Room B155  
Madison, WI 53707

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Committee Members:** Jennifer Asmus (via phone), Roger Bass, Tia Schultz (via phone), Amy Van Hecke (via phone), Lana Collet-Klingenberg, Julie Harris

**DHS Staff:** Pam Lano

**Members of the Public:** none

**1. Welcome**

Lana called the meeting to order at 10:03am.

**2. Public Testimony**

No members of the public were in attendance.

**3. Operational**

The committee reviewed minutes from the meeting held on April 28, 2017. Roger made a motion to approve the meeting minutes; Julie seconded the motion. Lana abstained from voting due to her absence at the April meeting. All approved and the motion carries.

Pam Lano, DHS/BBM staff to the committee, introduced herself as the new committee coordinator. Email address for the committee coordinator is [DHSTIAC@wisc.gov](mailto:DHSTIAC@wisc.gov).

Department is following a new process for public meeting notices. TIAC meeting agendas will now be posted at [publicmeetings.wi.gov](http://publicmeetings.wi.gov), as well as the TIAC website.

**4. Treatment Reviews - NONE**

Re-reviews were put on hold for the current meeting per the committee's motion on 4/28/2017. Re-reviews for the next meeting will be determined at the end of today's discussion.

**5. Process Discussion**

Review cycle for Level 4 & 5 interventions

Committee reviewed motion from prior meeting as well as administrative code (DHS107.035) that mentions the need for annual re-reviews.

It was noted that the literature search is not unduly time-consuming. Writing the recommendation memo is typically the time-consuming part of a re-review. The edits to the new memo (see below) are expected to simplify this process.

If changes to the review cycle are desired, the committee identified the following considerations:

- Level 5 includes 2 modes: no data and evidence of harm. Potentially harmful modalities may not warrant an automatic re-review.
- Level 1 modalities are not currently re-reviewed. Because Level 2 modalities are also considered “established treatments,” they may not warrant an automatic re-review.
- Because Level 4 treatments are labeled as “experimental” they may need to stay on the active cycle, per admin code definition.
- It may not make sense to continue re-reviewing treatments for which there is no continued request from providers or consumers.

Committee members noted that they do not typically look for new research or “become aware of” new research on treatment modalities unless someone shares the information with them, such as the Department or advocates. Because the need for review (or re-review) is usually identified by the Department and then communicated to the committee, the committee concluded that decisions about modalities that require review or re-review should come from the Department. These requests may be initiated due to Department needs or requests made to the Department by outside entities.

*The committee coordinator will communicate this information to the Department, with consideration of efficient use of the committee’s efforts, and will advise committee of any changes in operating procedures.*

#### Process to request reviews and re-reviews

Amy noted that the current process for reviews and re-reviews sometimes includes a provider submitting information for the committee to review, but not always. She noted that having a standard process and standard expectation for providers to submit research studies “levels the playing field” for all requestors.

Committee members were uniformly in favor of having providers prepare a “submission packet” to request a review.

Roger noted that the Department should reach out to providers to request research and other information, to ensure that providers have the opportunity to “submit their best work.”

Tia noted that providers should compile some references, but that the committee will still conduct a literature review. She noted that requestors may be disappointed if none of their references are reviewed by virtue of not meeting the committee’s basic research-quality requirements.

The committee discussed the value of publicly sharing more information about the committee’s review process on the TIAC website. It was noted that some information about the process may be helpful to include in a “submission packet.” Roger noted that the Department may need to clarify that the TIAC reviews treatment packages rather than individual treatment techniques.

*Lana will review and update the committee’s internal guidance document. Pam will inquire about adding the guidance document, in part or in full, to the TIAC website.*

### Proposed changes to recommendations memo

Tia noted that she likes the idea of having all the information in one document. She asked whether the recommendation memo could include the entire review history in one document. The committee agreed that a single document that includes all references and previous committee conclusions is desirable and increases the transparency of the committee's work. This may also simplify updates to the recommendation memo.

*The committee coordinator will develop a sample for one of the existing modalities and will distribute to the committee for review.*

### Scope of TIAC reviews/other questions from Department

Pam Lano identified possible areas for inquiry related to the behavioral treatment benefit. The examples pertained to parameters of effective treatment for established treatments, such as diagnostic populations, ages, and treatment settings. Committee members cited trauma and EBD as concerns that seem to be coming up more often in schools, and that may become populations of interest for Medicaid.

*Lana (committee chair) noted that specific questions can be directed to her, then she will triage for appropriateness and will confer with committee members as needed to determine whether questions are within scope for the committee to address. This would constitute a specific re-review of a modality.*

### Approach for adding committee members

Committee members noted that the approach to identifying new committee members should be mindful of expertise areas that may be helpful to the department. Current committee members have extensive expertise on autism spectrum disorders but may have less knowledge and experience with other DD populations. Repeated requests on a certain topic or for a certain population may be a trigger to seek new committee members with relevant expertise. *Committee members to email chair with suggestions.*

### Desired changes/updates to website (e.g., submission packet for review requests)

As noted earlier, committee members were in favor of including additional information about their review process on the website.

Also as noted earlier, the committee was in favor of adding information about requesting a review of a modality, possibly with an accompanying submission packet.

Some titles and names require update. *Committee members to submit updated curriculum vitae to chair to ensure that all public information about members is current and accurate.*

Some committee members noted that they often direct colleagues to the website to access determination memos and noted that many people attempt to click on the modality name instead of the bullet to access the memo. After discussion, the committee agreed that it is useful to have the document links in the table, to support readers' awareness of the modality's level. They

suggested that a pdf icon might be more obvious than a bullet point as clickable link. *Committee coordinator will take this feedback back to the webmaster.*

## **6. Updated Reviews for next meeting**

The following modalities, with ratings of Level 2 or 3, should be reviewed for the next meeting.

TEACCH  
ESDM  
Music Therapy  
Multi-Systemic therapy  
Collaborative & Proactive Solutions

The Department will review the remaining modalities that have been reviewed previously and will advise the committee chairperson of any additional reviews that may be needed. *The committee chairperson will assign reviewers within the next few weeks.*

## **7. 2018 TIAC meeting dates**

After a brief discussion about the meeting schedule for 2018 and recurring scheduling challenges for committee members who are connected to schools and universities, Lana made a motion to reduce the number of annual TIAC meetings from 4 to 3. Roger seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously. *The committee established dates for 2018 TIAC meetings: February 23, June 29, October 26. All meetings will occur from 10:00am - 12:00 noon.*

## **8. Meeting Adjournment**

Roger made a motion to adjourn the meeting, and Amy seconded the motion. Motion carried. Meeting was adjourned at 11:35am.