

WYOMING HEALTH INFORMATION MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION
--WYHIMA—
AUGUST/SEPTEMBER 2009 NEWSLETTER
Installment #1

Greetings and Salutations to all WYHIMA members and other interested parties:

I can not believe that it has been three months since we last met for our Spring Meeting in Casper. On the other hand, in relative perspective, it is even harder to believe how fast the 2009 AHIMA House of Delegates and National Convention and Trade Show are approaching (just 33 days away). And even more amazing is how fast our 2010 WYHIMA Spring meeting will be here!!! Some may say "what is he talking about – our Spring Meeting is not for another nine months yet!" However, relatively speaking that is not that far off with all of the planning that needs to be done in the next 60 days – setting the date/locations, notifying members and vendors, contact and contract with hotel and speakers and a lot more.

But before we get to far ahead, let's back up and talk about more recent happenings.

As your new President I was privileged to go to Chicago on July 17th for the AHIMA team talks and July 18/19th for the AHIMA Leadership conference. I will not go into the full saga of the trials and tribulations of getting from Sheridan to Chicago. I will just say that things started to get bizarre even before I left and what should have been a relaxed 6 hour flight from Sheridan to Chicago turned into a 14 hour expedition with a total of 4 cancelled flights (cracked [propeller, broken strut on landing gear, blown engine type of cancellations). I finally arrived in Chicago at 3:00am with meetings scheduled to start at 7:30 that same morning (at least the hotel had held a room for me.)

Once I got to Chicago everything started to fall into place and go well (because of the problems getting to Chicago the hotel clerk felt sorry for me and got approval to upgrade my room at no additional cost – to bad I was only in my room to sleep). The meetings were great as was the weather.

The theme of the team talks/leadership conference was "iLead", - or, as our AHIMA President elect Rita Bowen put it in her campaign "We can all lead from where we sit by just taking part and giving our input." To start the meetings off Vera Rulon, the current AHIMA President announced that AHIMA election results (these results can be found on the AHIMA.com website). Vera also announced that Linda Kloss AHIMA CEO had decided to step down after many years of outstanding service. Her resignation will take effect in December. The AHIMA

board has hired a search firm to recruit potential candidates to fill the CEO role. Linda will be greatly missed as our CEO.

After Vera's presentations, Rita discussed designing the organization of the future. She discussed the challenges our organization is going through now as well as the challenges we may face in the future. A big part of the ensuing discussion concerned where the health care industry may be headed in the near future and beyond - these are exciting, yet trying times for all.

After lunch the House of Delegate (HOD) teams reported on their activities since the 2008 HOD convened in Seattle during the National Convention. I have been working on the "Organizational Development Team." This team has been dealing with the challenge of equitable apportionment of delegates for the each state.

Currently AHIMA uses a system of apportionment by which each state is entitled to one delegate for each 100 members, or part thereof, up to a total of 6 delegates at which point it is capped. Therefore, states with 501 members have the same number of delegates as a state with say 3,500 members. We have been working on coming up with a better apportionment process. Wyoming currently has 110 voting members so we are entitled to 2 delegates – or one for each 55 voting members – on the other hand California has 3,885 voting members and 6 delegates or 1 delegate for each 600 members. And some would say well just let every state have one delegate for every 100 period. However that would mean that the current HOD would have approximately 550 delegates WAY TO MANY TO CONDUCT ANY MEANINGFULL BUSINESS. Therefore, our challenge is to find a better method for distributing delegates; a system that is fair to all states; a method that maintains a fairly consistent size to the house (there are currently about 225 delegates in the HOD and under our current system this will grow each year as more of the smaller states hit the magic number of 501 voting members which gives them the max number of 6 delegates) and hopefully a method that will not need to be tweaked every couple of years.

AND GUESS WHAT – we think we may have found it. Originally, the idea was presented that we just up the base level from 1 delegate for each 100 members (the 100 member base method) to 1 delegate for every 500 members (the 500 member base method). This would keep the size of the house a little more even – for a period of time, and would spread the number of delegates out a little better over the whole of the membership. We also stated that all states no matter how small should have 2 delegates – this is to allow "mentoring" of delegates in the smaller states. THEN THE CALIFORNIA GROUP CAME UP WITH A PERCENTAGE BASED FORMULA FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF DELEGATES. (please see the two spreadsheets below)

HOD DELEGATE APPORTIONMENT OPTION PERCENT OF MEMBERSHIP

Lower %	Upper %	Delegates	Delegate Distribution	Percent of Vote
up to	.9999%	2	20 CSAs	22%
1.00%	1.999%	3	14 CSAs	23%
2.00%	2.999%	4	6 CSAs	13%
3.00%	3.999%	5	4 CSAs	11%
4.00%	and over	6	8 CSAs	26%
Board				6%
Total Delegates = 185				

Impact to CSA Delegate Count	
Plus 1 Delegate	10 CSAs
No change	11 CSAs
Minus 1 Delegate	12 CSAs
Minus 2 Delegates	18 CSAs
Minus 3 Delegates	1 CSA

Pros

- Maintains an even distribution of delegates based on percentage of membership
- Provides a long-lasting formula that holds as AHIMA membership grows
- May encourage CSAs to initiate membership growth
- Provides a minimum of 2 delegates for all CSAs
- Provides an additional delegate for largest CSAs
- Less cost and coordination to AHIMA and the CSAs
- 10 CSAs gain a delegate, 31 CSAs lose a delegate/s

Cons

- 10 CSAs gain a delegate, 31 CSAs lose delegate/s

HOD Apportionment Options

Based on 2009-2010 HOD Apportionment Calculation

Chapter	Total Mem	Voting Mem	Delegates	Option: % of Membership		Option: 500- member Base
				Percentage	% of Membership	500 Base
AK - Alaska	213	170	2	0.36%	2	2
AL- Alabama	766	666	5	1.39%	3	3
AR- Arkansas	570	478	5	1.00%	3	2
AZ- Arizona	836	734	5	1.54%	3	3
CA - California	4824	3885	5	8.13%	6	6
CO- Colorado	925	805	5	1.68%	3	3
CT- Connecticut	396	375	4	0.78%	2	2
DC- District of Columbia	316	284	3	0.59%	2	2
DE - Delaware	86	78	1	0.16%	2	2
FL - Florida	3045	2568	5	5.37%	6	6
GA - Georgia	1402	1243	5	2.60%	4	4
HI - Hawaii	147	123	2	0.26%	2	2
IA - Iowa	766	660	5	1.38%	3	3
ID - Idaho	387	331	4	0.69%	2	2
IL - Illinois	3229	2745	5	5.74%	6	6
IN- Indiana	1399	1204	5	2.52%	4	4
KS - Kansas	877	738	5	1.54%	3	3
KY - Kentucky	747	644	5	1.35%	3	3
LA - Louisiana	951	829	5	1.73%	3	3
MA - Massachusetts	1110	1033	5	2.16%	4	4
MD - Maryland	870	783	5	1.64%	3	3
ME - Maine	300	270	3	0.56%	2	2
MI - Michigan	2451	1998	5	4.18%	6	5
MN - Minnesota	1811	1548	5	3.24%	5	5
MO - Missouri	1454	1201	5	2.51%	4	4
MS - Mississippi	572	489	5	1.02%	3	2
MT - Montana	265	247	3	0.52%	2	2
NC - North Carolina	1698	1487	5	3.11%	5	4
ND - North Dakota	252	190	2	0.40%	2	2
NE - Nebraska	482	444	5	0.93%	2	2
NH - New Hampshire	194	177	2	0.37%	2	2
NJ - New Jersey	1161	975	5	2.04%	4	3
NM - New Mexico	297	252	3	0.53%	2	2
NV - Nevada	297	268	3	0.56%	2	2
NY - New York	2689	2318	5	4.85%	6	6

OH - Ohio	2689	2210	5	4.62%	6	6
OK - Oklahoma	703	652	5	1.36%	3	3
OR - Oregon	697	613	5	1.28%	3	3
PA - Pennsylvania	2444	2122	5	4.44%	6	6
PR - Puerto Rico	154	139	2	0.29%	2	2
RI - Rhode Island	106	103	2	0.22%	2	2
SC - South Carolina	786	677	5	1.42%	3	3
SD - South Dakota	260	229	3	0.48%	2	2
TN - Tennessee	1607	1460	5	3.06%	5	4
TX - Texas	3523	3040	5	6.36%	6	6
UT - Utah	329	311	4	0.65%	2	2
VA - Virginia	878	785	5	1.64%	3	3
VT - Vermont	62	57	1	0.12%	2	2
WA - Washington	1368	1222	5	2.56%	4	4
WI - Wisconsin	1647	1492	5	3.12%	5	4
WV - West Virginia	366	334	4	0.70%	2	2
WY - Wyoming	117	103	2	0.22%	2	2
Total	55521	47789	215	100.00%	174	167
Board of Directors	12	12	12		12	12
Final Totals	55533	47801	227		186	179

As you can see, by using the percentage based method of apportionment would keep the number of delegates in the house around the 200 level and would be “self sustainable” over time – as some states got larger and made up a larger percentage of the total membership this would result in other states making up a smaller percentage and thereby could loose delegates – thereby maintaining the equilibrium of the HOD.

On Thursday of last week the Operations work group of the HOD had a conference call to discuss the various methodologies and of the 24 states represented on the call (the Operations work group actually has 36 states represented on the team however only 24 took part on the call) all 24 voted to present the percentage method to the full HOD in October at the National Convention as a resolution to change the current bylaws. You can find a draft of that proposed bylaw change at the following:

1. Proposed Bylaws Amendment on Delegate Apportionment – [Action Item-Proposed Bylaws Amendment on Delegate Apportionment](#)

Other proposed changes discussed by the other HOD work groups include the following:

2. Proposed Resolution for Professional Guidelines/Best Practices for Electronic Documentation – [Action Item-Proposed Resolution for Professional Guidelines/Best Practices for Electronic Documentation](#)

3. Proposed Resolution on Volunteer and Leadership Development – [Action Item-Proposed Resolution on Volunteer and Leadership Development](#)
 - Note: *The Volunteer and Leadership Development HOD Team will review this resolution on Monday, August 31. While no additional revisions are anticipated, some revisions may be possible. If the Team agrees on revisions, an updated resolution will be posted immediately after the Team meeting and a revised date added.*

Please share your questions or comments in a Community Discussion in the State Leaders and HOD CoP.

Wow – that covers just the discussions and resulting actions that have taken place since that first day of team talks.

The next installment of the August/September newsletter will come out later this week and cover the important discussions and resultant information that came out of the two days of the leadership conference.

The third installment will come out next week and discuss ongoing discussions with the Colorado group concerning the proposed joint spring meeting in 2010. At the present time the input I have received from WYHIMA members is running about 90% positive to move forward with the joint meeting. The main concern voiced has been the poor economy and travel costs – which we will have no matter where the location is. Therefore, I am polling the WYHIMA board members for a consensus to move forward.

Dave Westlake

WYOMING HEALTH INFORMATION MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION
--WYHIMA—
AUGUST/SEPTEMBER 2009 NEWSLETTER
Installment #2

Again, Greetings and Salutations to all WYHIMA members and other interested parties:

This is the second installment of the WYHIMA August/September newsletter. This installment will cover the important discussions and resultant information that came out of the two days of the leadership conference I attended in Chicago on July 18-19, 2009.

The leadership conference is a time when newly elected presidents and members of the boards of the various state associations can come together to get basic training on a variety of topics. This year's meetings had concurrent sessions concerning:

- Board of directors best practices
- Recruitment and retention activities for members
- Discussions about the new delegate toolkit
- Speaking to be heard to influence others to take action
- A panel discussion on "how to get to the table and influence the future"
- Legislative and regulatory advocacy
- How to interact with regional media to heighten their awareness of the HIM profession and our activities
- Marketing and branding
- Continuing education programs relating to coding,
- Other CSA achievements and best practices

WOW, if that was not enough to cover in two days we also had four really big sessions on:

- Managing association finances
- IRS and State tax concerns
- CSA business partnerships and possible pitfalls of "endorsements", plus
- CSA business partnerships, memorandums of agreement and contract development

In this newsletter I would like to concentrate on the information I received in these last four key sessions.

I found the sessions on Managing association finances and IRS/State tax concerns to be very interesting and helpful. In particular, the tax codes changed last year so that now ALL non-profit organizations need to file tax returns. This

change went into effect in 2008, however there was (is) a clause that gives non-profits a three year window to start filing. Therefore, many states did not file the tax returns last year. One of the nice things is that being a small state with less than \$25,000 in reserves and/or bringing in less than \$25,000 a year in revenues, we only have to file a rudimentary report at both the state and federal levels.

We are classified as a "501 (c)3 organization – a non-incorporated, non-profit charity and/or educational organization – I think we fall more under the educational aspect. Under a 501 (c)3 classification, vendors can sponsor functions and donate funds and products to the organization; all monies must be spent on related activities to the organizations purpose. Interestingly, if we pay an individuals way to go to AHIMA's "Hill Day" activities in Washington D.C. then we have to file a "lobbying expense report" and if we pay speakers more than \$600 as an individual then we have to file 1099 reports – however, as I understand it, if we pay them over \$600 in a calendar year as "private contractors" instead of as individuals we do not have to file a 1099.

We have to file a federal 990-N general tax filing form by November 15, 2009 which covers activities from 6/1/08 to 6/30/09. We have to file this form if our 2007 revenue was less than \$25,000; 2008 was less than \$25,000; 2009 was less than \$25,000 and 2010 is less than \$50,000Forms can be obtained at <http://epostcard.form990.org>. On the form we only need to include our tax ID number, our legal name and address (To help ease the problem of changing addresses every year depending on where the newly elected secretary/treasurer lives - it was suggested that we get a set address – like at "Post Office Boxes Are Us." That PO box would be our permanent official business address and then just have the mail forwarded to the new officer), and we need to include the names and addresses of our principle officers on the filing also.

If we do not report for a three year period we will loose our non-profit status. There are three other stipulations that we must have written policies that cover: 1. Conflicts of interest, 2. whistle blower retaliation, 3. document retention/destruction (in particular, no destruction of any documents if under investigation – hum, wonder where that came from – can we all say ENRON?) It is recommended by AHIMA legal council that we track our revenues very carefully and that we keep reserves under \$25,000. It was stated that non-profits should not have "profits" to show – we should not be increasing our reserves every year past what we might need for a year or two over what our current yearly needs would be. In other words, we should maintain only enough reserves to cover a year or two if we were to bring nothing more in.

A little more on the 1099 forms. We should not pay an individual an hourly rate, all fees should be on a set "per function" rate. Also, we should have contracts

with speakers so that they are contractors not "hired" individuals. If we pay any fees on a monthly basis (for example our web manager fees) we should make sure we make the checks out to a company – not to the individual.

Oh, here is another little twist. IF we create a manual (or a cook-book or what ever) and sell it, then we may need to pay state and federal sales taxes.

Let's talk about "endorsements" and business partnerships for a moment. AHIMA legal council cautions states about "endorsing" specific products. Just recently Laurie and I had received a request from one of the healthcare magazines asking us to "endorse their magazine. By doing so we could put an add in the magazine monthly at a reduced rate and members would get a copy of the magazine. However, the magazine could then use WYHIMA as an organization in their advertising stating that WYHIMA "endorsed their magazine" over any other healthcare magazine. That is why you have to be careful in selecting one product over all others through "endorsing" it. When it comes to business partnerships, if they are set up appropriately, these partnerships can create extra value for our members. AHIMA has set up business partnerships with credit card companies, rental car agencies and at convention time, with various airlines in order to give members breaks on the business' products. However, it can be confusing as to which types of relationships make sense and which do not. Developing business relationships requires balancing between opportunity while assuring that the mission and business interests are maintained and the assets, brand reputation and position of the association are protected.

Things to think about in developing good business partnerships:

- Does the arrangement advance WYHIMA and AHIMA mission?
- Does it create a competition with other programs already promoted by the state or AHIMA?
- Does the partnership offer financial/educational gain for the organization?
- What are the interests of the other party in establishing this partnership?
- What are the risks?
- Are there (better) alternatives?
- WHAT IS THE WORST THING THAT COULD HAPPEN IF THE PARTNERSHIP WAS DEVELOPED?
- How long would the commitment be fore?
- Can the commitment be terminated before the end of the agreement and if so under what conditions?
- WHO IS LEGALLY ACCOUNTABLE FOR WHAT?

All relationships involve risk. Are the risks acceptable and is there proper recognition of them in the agreements?

As you will hear below, WYHIMA will be setting up a "business partnership" with Colorado for the Spring 2010 meeting through a "memorandum of understanding." This document will lay out the arrangements as to who will do what, what are each parties responsibilities and how the costs and revenues will be split. I should have a draft of that document by the end of next week which I will go over with the board and then we will share that information with the membership.

The third installment of the August/September newsletter will come out sometime in the next couple of weeks and discuss the details of the ongoing discussions with the Colorado group concerning the joint spring meeting in 2010. As things stand now, we ARE moving forward with a joint meeting with Colorado. I just received a message today from Kathy DeVault who has been representing Colorado in our talks. She sent me and the WYHIMA board the following email (This is very exciting):

Hi Dave - - From what I understand, this (*the joint meeting*) is a go.

Kim and I are in the final process of choosing a location – looks like it will be one with close proximity to downtown and the Cherry Creek shopping district.

The dates we are currently planning for are May 5, 6, & 7, 2010.

Shortly, we will begin to plan the meeting program and would love input from your state leadership for presentation/speaker suggestions.

Thanks,

Kathy

Kathy DeVault, RHIA, CCS
312-233-1520 Office

Dave Westlake
President, WYHIMA