



## Week 7 Discussions

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 89

**Date:** Thu Feb 26 2009 03:03

**Author:** Miller, Jim <[jmiller@dom.edu](mailto:jmiller@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Modify

Remove

Your job in the discussion is to present the case for who is to blame for what went wrong. In this discussion you are divided into two groups. Each group will take one side of the issue in their initial posting.

GROUP 1: "The consulting company is mostly responsible for the problems  
Balsavich, De

Silva, Franch, Fredericks, Georgikos, Grundas, Guglielmi, Hauser, Jackson, Jeark  
jirm, Johnson, Kalkirtz, Katris

GROUP 2: "The State of Maine is mostly responsible for the problems  
Khan, Kleine, Mather, McCarthy, McCulloch, Mugnolo, Nowak, Poole,  
Puvadolpitak, Reyes, Thomas, Von Roenn, White

Questions 1 and 2: What caused the major delays on this project and the processing problems in the new system? Who is to blame for the problems with the project -- the State of Maine or the Consulting Company? Support your position.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 77

**Date:** Thu Feb 26 2009 03:05

**Author:** Miller, Jim <[jmiller@dom.edu](mailto:jmiller@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Modify

Remove

Review the various conversion strategies for bringing a new system into production (pages 527-528 in the text book).

Question 1: Dominican is in the process of converting to a new email system. See [https://jicsweb1.dom.edu/ics/Home.jnz?portlet=New\\_Student\\_Email](https://jicsweb1.dom.edu/ics/Home.jnz?portlet=New_Student_Email).

Which of the conversion strategies is Dominican using?

Background for Questions 2 and 3: Suppose you were in charge of Information Technology at a small liberal arts college with an enrollment of 2,000 students and a faculty and staff of 200. Currently the faculty and staff and students are using Microsoft Exchange. The college would like to outsource student email to greatly reduce the time and expense of owning and managing the Microsoft Exchange servers. Read <http://www.webpronews.com/topnews/2007/11/28/google-microsoft-compete-for-college-email>. You have decided to convert all students to Google email.

Question 2: What conversion strategy will you use?

Question 3: Why did you choose this strategy?/.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 44

**Date:** Thu Feb 26 2009 11:53

**Author:** Hauser, Amanda <[Heaok711@aol.com](mailto:Heaok711@aol.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

1. Which of the conversion strategies is Dominican using?

Dominican is using the pilot conversion strategy to essentially test the program on a small number of students in order to identify and fix any flaws before it is rolled out to the entire student body.

Background for Questions 2 and 3: Suppose you were in charge of Information Technology at a small liberal arts college with an enrollment of 2,000 students and a faculty and staff of 200. Currently the faculty and staff and students are using Microsoft Exchange. The college would like to outsource student email to greatly reduce the time and expense of owning and managing the Microsoft Exchange servers. You have decided to convert all students to Google email.

2. What conversion strategy will you use?

I would use a phased approach to the conversion.

3. Why did you choose this strategy?

My workplace recently changed their name and had to convert all of the email address to reflect the change. For anyone who has every changed email addresses, it is a process so the phased approach works well. I would allow both addresses to work initially, then phase out the old email by forwarding it to the new email (while allowing the user to only check one email, preferably the new one), until it could eventually be dropped.

From the IT side this is also most practical as it allows them to test the new program while there is still the option of possibly going back if it does not work as they had hoped.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 39

**Date:** Thu Feb 26 2009 15:35

**Author:** Mugnolo, Michelle <[mugnmich@dom.edu](mailto:mugnmich@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

---

**Question 1: Dominican is in the process of converting to a new email system. Which of the conversion strategies is Dominican using?**

Dominican is using the Pilot Conversion Strategy for the new e-mail system that is going to be universal for the university. They are using a small number of students to 'test' the new system and smooth out any kinks in the system before it is implemented for the entire student body.

**Background for Questions 2 and 3: Suppose you were in charge of Information Technology at a small liberal arts college with an enrollment of 2,000 students and a faculty and staff of 200. Currently the faculty and staff and students are using Microsoft Exchange. The college would like to outsource student email to greatly reduce the time and expense of owning and managing the Microsoft Exchange servers. You have decided to convert all students to Google email.**

**Question 2: What conversion strategy will you use?**

If I were in charge of the IT department and decided to outsource student e-mails, I would choose the Phase-In Approach.

**Question 3: Why did you choose this strategy?**

I would choose the Phase-In Approach because it seems like the easiest and most convenient for all parties involved. By allowing students to have access to both e-mail addresses for a period of time will allow them to get use to the new e-mail and if the system is any different than the old one. Also, it will allow students time to have any e-mails forwarded from their old address to the new one. And from an IT perspective, it will allow the IT department time to work out any kinks if there are any, so the transition is as smooth as possible once the old e-mail system is no longer available.

Reply

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 38

**Date:** Thu Feb 26 2009 15:55

**Author:** McCarthy, Sean <[mccasean@dom.edu](mailto:mccasean@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

---

1) Dominican is in the process of converting to a new email system. The

conversion strategy that Dominican is using is the Pilot Study. This strategy introduces the new system to a limited area of the organization (new students during the 2008-2009 academic year). Once the pilot version is complete and is successful, the rest of the university will be converted to the new email system.

- 2) I would use the phased approach strategy.
- 3) I would use the phased approach strategy because it introduces the new system in various stages. I would phase in the new email system by faculty department first then students.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 12

**Date:** Fri Feb 27 2009 08:42

**Author:** Mugnolo, Michelle <[mugnmich@dom.edu](mailto:mugnmich@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

Amanda, I completely agree with you about using the Phase-In approach when changing E-Mails. My company changed e-mail systems this past September and it was a total nightmare. It was a cold turkey change, but only at my office (we were the pilot office) but it was a complete disaster. Since we were the only office to migrate systems all of the e-mails we sent from the new system were 'lost' and we were not able to receive any e-mails either. Communication between our branch and anyone else from other branches was nonexistent. We could communicate with people outside of my organization, but no e-mails were sent or received within the organization. This problem took about a week to fix, so my office was pretty much without e-mail communication for an entire week, it was a disaster. I think it would have been more beneficial for us if we used the phase-in approach, or if everyone was migrated at one time, but I'm sure the IT department didn't expect that to happen... all the kinks in the system were eventually fixed and all of our offices are finally migrated to the new system.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 12

**Date:** Fri Feb 27 2009 09:08

**Author:** Hauser, Amanda <[Heaok711@aol.com](mailto:Heaok711@aol.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

I agree with the phased in approach. However, I might automatically forward the old email to the new email so that the user did not have to go through the hassle of checking two different email addresses. This is what my company did and it worked really well.

If possible, I would also automate a response to emails sent to the old email address to alert the sender that the person's email address was in the process of changing. We had to do that manually when we switched and I'm sure there were people who didn't get the memo.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 39

**Date:** Fri Feb 27 2009 10:11

**Author:** Hauser, Amanda <[Heaok711@aol.com](mailto:Heaok711@aol.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

1. and 2. What caused the major delays on this project and the processing problems in the new system? Who is to blame for the problems with the project -- the State of Maine or the Consulting Company? Support your position.

The first source of delay was the fact that CNSI had never designed a Medicaid claims system. This caused them to use a programming language that was incompatible with the old system. Had they chosen a language that was compatible, they may have been able to integrate elements of the old system with the new system and reduce the time to rollout and problems after rollout.

Another source of delay was that Medicaid experts were not available and rather than wait for them to be available, the consulting team simply went on programming, which often resulted in them having to go back and reprogram. Had they waited for the experts they could have saved time reprogramming.

A main source of processing problems came from the fact that the system was not tested as the consulting firm deemed that there simply wasn't time. The consulting firm also failed to find time to train providers on the new system causing there to be many errors in the forms submitted. Because of the programming language used by the consulting firm, there was no backup system as the old was now incompatible with the new system.

The consulting company is clearly to blame for the issues with the Maine Medicaid system. First of all, to take on such an important and complex system with absolutely no experience designing systems like it is completely irresponsible. Businesses have an obligation to take projects that are within their scope, especially when they have the potential to affect such a large population. They only got the contract because they severely understated the costs in order to come in below the competition. The evidence of their incompetence was clear throughout every step of the process causing the delays and processing problems.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 30

**Date:** Fri Feb 27 2009 11:23

**Author:** Von Roenn, Erika Marie <[erikamarievr@msn.com](mailto:erikamarievr@msn.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

1. Dominican University is introducing a new email system into the organization using a conversion

strategy called the Pilot Study. This strategy incorporates the new system first to a small area of the Dominican such as new students and then once the pilot is complete and success is ensured, the rest of the university will be switched over to the new email system.

2. I would use the phased approach strategy.

3. I would use the phased approach strategy because it incorporates the system into the organization in steps. I would make sure to introduce the new email system to faculty and staff at Dominican first and then the students.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 34

**Date:** Fri Feb 27 2009 13:32

**Author:** Fredericks, Brian <[fredbria@my.dom.edu](mailto:fredbria@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

1. The delays were caused by numerous issues. It should be noted that this system conversion happens all the time in the insurance industry and is well-known to drain on employees and dollars. It was obvious that very poor planning and strategic analysis had occurred on the consultant's side. The project manager and the entire project mgmt process didn't account for the correct timelines that could accurately be completed. There wasn't the time nor experience available to run testing on the system prior to going live with the new structure in place.

It also appears that the auto adjudication rules were not updated correctly. This would have allowed the claims to be handled electronically at a higher percentage than was the result. If a claim errors out or an incorrect approval/rejection occurs, it must then touch a person. Every time that claim touches an employee, it costs money. It seems as though the existing staff on hand was assuming that previous auto adjudication rates were going to remain in the future which is a bad misstep. As the large inventories pile up, more bad news is in the pipeline. When this occurs, people are not getting their money and more calls begin to come in and sometimes claims get sent in again and again. Customer service is damaged heavily. The larger the claims inventory, the larger uncertainty there is about the total claims dollars that are in the hopper. In the insurance business, this means that you have a real good chance of being wrong at setting your claims reserves.

2. The state of Maine spent \$15M on this vendor. State's are constantly under budget scrutiny and they were misled by CNSI. It was found that CNSI did not have the MediCaid experience necessary to implement this plan. Once they were on board as a vendor, they have to be held accountable and on the hook for the RFP that they presented. It was apparent that they were not substantially suited to take this on and lost money on the project. However, it stated that they received future state Medicaid contracts since they had worked with Maine. They probably did benefit from the mistakes that they made due to the increase in revenues from these new clients while the state of Maine is left holding the bag with a large contingency of their voting citizens upset and ready for a change.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 35

**Date:** Fri Feb 27 2009 14:15

**Author:** Fredericks, Brian <[fredbria@my.dom.edu](mailto:fredbria@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

1. Dominican is utilizing a pilot strategy. They have implemented this with new students only to begin

the pilot process.

2. I am going to argue the direct cutover approach, because everyone else said the phased in approach and that isn't any fun.

3. The school is small and the faculty is as well. Not their body size but I am speaking of the population. My other recommendation would be to implement this in the summertime as well. The combination of a "small" population and summer could mean that any disruptions would be less consequential. I would also argue that most students and faculty are not transmitting vital data as compared to a larger business organization. School budget constraints can be problematic and this conversion could be lower cost with this strategy. Such a small school has a better ability to "over"communicate to its members so that any training or timelines can cause less havoc to their daily lives.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 27

**Date:** Fri Feb 27 2009 14:17

**Author:** Puvadolpitak, Prapaipit <[pizzanaja@yahoo.com](mailto:pizzanaja@yahoo.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

Q1.

Dominican try to convert their email to outsourcing company by using Pilot approach. Dominican wants to test the system by starting with small group of people start using and then if the new system work well, they would try to convert all students later on.

Q2.

I would use Phase in approach

Q3.

Why? Because when you start to put in the new system, it take time for everybody to get used to and comfortable with it. so it can't be rush. Therefore, by slowly increase amount number of new users, would be easier to find the errors and easier to fix it before letting the error ruin the whole company.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 26

**Date:** Fri Feb 27 2009 15:38

**Author:** Puvadolpitak, Prapaipit <[pizzanaja@yahoo.com](mailto:pizzanaja@yahoo.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

Q1

-The main reason that caused the project delay is because CNSI is not keep the promise. The project suppose to be done in 12 months however, 27 months go by, the system still wasn't ready.

-The cause of processing delay are the new system keep reject the claim much more than the old system which cause the claim keep piling up and 300,000 claim were frozen.

-The claim software error which cause charging the wrong amount of patient billing

- The Difficulty of filling out the new form because of lacking of training and access information
- State chose to re-enroll information rather than transferring existing information from the old system
- There are not enough people to handle the phone call. There are only 13 people to answer phone call from 7000 providers. Which is showed the lack of back up plan.

Q2.

It definitely State fault because IT department decide to have new system rather than fixing the old system.

- IT department think that they could saving the cost and more flexible for the new system. However, they did not consider to other more important issues.
- IT department also reject to using outsourcing firm. State has no common sense when there are only 2 firm are bidding on the big project with very low bid.
- State fault that they did not check the CNSI firm before let they take control of very important project.
- State made a huge mistake of letting lacking experience "a no-name company" to handle this big of the project.
- State fault that they did not offer training for providers on the new system nor did the state properly train the staff that would be responsible for fielding calls from providers with problems

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 22

**Date:** Fri Feb 27 2009 15:43

**Author:** Kalkirtz, Jason <[kalkjaso@my.dom.edu](mailto:kalkjaso@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

Question 1: Which of the conversion strategies is Dominican using?

Dominican is using the Pilot Conversion Strategy for the new e-mail system. This strategy introduces the new system to only a limited area of the organization.

Background for Questions 2 and 3: Suppose you were in charge of Information Technology at a small liberal arts college with an enrollment of 2,000 students and a faculty and staff of 200. Currently the faculty and staff and students are using Microsoft Exchange. The college would like to outsource student email to greatly reduce the time and expense of owning and managing the Microsoft Exchange servers. Read <http://www.webpronews.com/topnews/2007/11/28/google-microsoft-compete-for-college-email>. You have decided to convert all students to Google email.

Question 2: What conversion strategy will you use?

I would choose the Phased Approach.

Question 3: Why did you choose this strategy?

I would use this system because it introduces the new system in stages. I would fist use the faculty to test the new system since they are smaller in number, and then I would introduce it to the students.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 19

**Date:** Fri Feb 27 2009 17:01

**Author:** Reyes, Paul Michael Jocson <[preyesnd@gmail.com](mailto:preyesnd@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

The state of Maine is mostly responsible for the problems. The first issue was that Maine was using an

outdated Honeywell system from the 1970s. This should have been updated earlier, before the HIPAA deadline.

Maine could have done what Massachusetts did, using a web portal as a front end to its existing legacy systems. They also had the option of outsourcing claims to a service provider.

Maine put a request for proposals in April 2001, perhaps too late when they were aware of the coming changes since the late 1990s. With ample time, they could have revised their Request for Proposal (RFP) that would have received bids more in line with Keane's (the other bidder) \$30MM initial proposal.

The state of Maine's lack of initiative led it to resort to a consulting firm with no experience, which led to their problems.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 25

**Date:** Fri Feb 27 2009 17:20

**Author:** Reyes, Paul Michael Jocson <[preyesnd@gmail.com](mailto:preyesnd@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

1. Dominican is using the pilot study (program) as their conversion program.

2. I would use pilot approach as well.

3. Ideally I would prefer to use the parallel strategy, but since I am a small college, I do not have enough funds to run it. The direct cutover is too risky, since student e-mail contains important information. The phased approach could possibly confuse students. Therefore, the pilot study seems the best option in this scenario.

Error and bugs can be found in this study and worked out before the conversion is made.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 16

**Date:** Fri Feb 27 2009 18:44

**Author:** Jearkjirm, Wannarat <[jearwann@dom.edu](mailto:jearwann@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

What caused the major delays on this project and the processing problems in the new system?

I think the major delay starts from the beginning since team had difficulty getting consulting time with the Medical experts on staff at the Bureau of Medical Service. Team should have held the judgments about rules and requirements which are necessary to foundation of system. I think this state of decision making is very importance and must have the experts' participation. This is because when the foundation goes wrong or incomplete, other problems followed such as rejecting claims, called, and cost.

Who is to blame for the problems with the project?

Consulting Company

From the beginning when raising the proposal, CNSI should have seen whether the plan is workable within timeframe, 12 months, or not. Plus, as a consulting company, even they are new for this type of Medicaid system; they should have researched or studied about the system before actual implementation so that at least they can guide their customer, Maine, that what basic requirements or information are necessary for setting up this new system.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 16

**Date:** Fri Feb 27 2009 19:06

**Author:** Thomas, Sarah D <[thomsara@dom.edu](mailto:thomsara@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

Question 1: Dominican is in the process of converting to a new email system. See [https://jicsweb1.dom.edu/ics/Home.jnz?portlet=New\\_Student\\_Email](https://jicsweb1.dom.edu/ics/Home.jnz?portlet=New_Student_Email). Which of the conversion strategies is Dominican using?

Dominican is using the pilot conversion strategy. "The pilot study strategy introduces the new system to only a limited area of the organization" (Laudon and Laudon, 528). They are introducing this pilot to new students in the 2008-2009 school year. This group of students will make sure the system is complete and works properly; then the system will be introduced to the rest of the students.

Question 2: What conversion strategy will you use?

I would use the phased in approach to convert students to a new email system.

Question 3: Why did you choose this strategy?

I chose this strategy because it "introduces the new system in stages, either by functions or by organizational units" (Laudon and Laudon, 528). I think that this is a good choice because it allows certain groups to start using the system and adding others as appropriate. The small college might not have a big enough budget for a parallel strategy because it is very expensive, although it is the safest conversion approach. I would not recommend the direct cutover approach because of the high risk to replace a complete old system without having anything to fall back on. The phase in approach is safer than the direct cutover and less expensive than the parallel strategy, which are both good for a small college.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 16

**Date:** Fri Feb 27 2009 20:38

**Author:** Kalkirtz, Jason <[kalkjaso@my.dom.edu](mailto:kalkjaso@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

Your job in the discussion is to present the case for who is to blame for what went wrong. In this discussion you are divided into two groups. Each group will take one side of the issue in their initial posting.

Questions 1 and 2: What caused the major delays on this project and the processing problems in the

new system? Who is to blame for the problems with the project -- the State of Maine or the Consulting Company? Support your position.

GROUP 1: "The consulting company is mostly responsible for the problems

I believe that the consulting company is mostly responsible for the problems. CNSI new program was based on J2EE, which was a mismatch with the legacy coding from the old system. This new system was not even capable to handling Medicaid claims. CNSI had never before designed a Medicaid claims system. For the bid for the implanting the new system, the state received only two bids. The other firm that CNSI was competing against made a bid to the state for twice as much money. This just shows how many requirements should have been implemented into the new system and how unreasonable CNSI's new system was. The new team that was put in place by CNSI, made many shortcuts due to time restraint that most likely compromised the system in greater amounts. The staff was not trained correctly and inaccurate judgments were made. There were no back up or parallel systems to support the development of the new system. The new system suspended 50 percent of claims in the very first week while the old system suspended claims at an average of about 20 percent. Another problem which is why CNSI is to blame was due to providers whose claims had been suspended were filing second claims, which were suspended automatically by the new system because they were tagged as duplicates. Providers calling in to complain were rarely able to get through. Major delays were due to an incompatible system, a staff that was not properly trained, and a staff that was too small in number to handle Medicaid claims. Another major problem was that this new system was never tested to actually see if it could handle Medicaid claims. Within three months of the system being implemented, 300,000 claims were frozen. The CNSI staff of 65 worked feverishly to fix all the glitches in the new program, but their efforts were accompanied by a lack of regard for critical management guidelines. The new system was error prone that even issued checks to doctors for their total charges for a procedure instead of the amounts that were actually covered by Medicaid. Over payments totaled \$9 million.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 14

**Date:** Fri Feb 27 2009 20:43

**Author:** Thomas, Sarah D <[thomsara@dom.edu](mailto:thomsara@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

Questions 1 and 2: What caused the major delays on this project and the processing problems in the new system? Who is to blame for the problems with the project -- the State of Maine or the Consulting Company? Support your position.

There were many things that caused the major delays and processing problems in the new system. The new system rejected and suspended many claims. This, in turn, caused problems for "providers who weren't getting paid and were forced to turn away Medicaid patients or even shut down their operations" (Laudon and Laudon, 589).

Additionally, existing information could not be transferred to the new system- it was rendered as incomplete. This caused the company to employ a new system without the use of any parallel or backup system, which we learned from the text, is very dangerous. This definitely caused problems considering there was no testing done for a new system that did not have a backup!

The company did not employ enough people to handle to workload of the system. There was no way that a staff of 13 people could handle the calls from 7,000 providers. Sadly, the people that were brought in were not even properly trained. "The state did not offer training for providers on the new system; nor did the state properly train the staff that that would be responsible for fielding calls from providers with problems" (Laudon and Laudon, 590). All of these items caused the delays and problems in the new

system.

The state of Maine is largely responsible for these problems. They had the responsibility to hire a company who could handle the workload and do a good job, with a very important project! They only had two companies put in a bid for the work: shouldn't that have been a clue that they did not have a reasonable request? Furthermore, shouldn't the state have thought twice that one firm proposed twice as much money as the firm that was chosen? I do not think that the state thought wisely about their decision. I think that they made a lot of requests and just wanted to get the job accomplished as cheaply as possible. A lot more logical thought should have been put into such an important decision. Finally, when they did hire someone, the state should not have cut corners. They should have tested the system and trained their people properly. They cited that there were time and budget constraints; however, what is the cost of such delays and failures? Isn't it better to do things correctly the first time around than to use time and money messing up and having to redo things?

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 12

**Date:** Fri Feb 27 2009 20:59

**Author:** Kalkirtz, Jason <[kalkjaso@my.dom.edu](mailto:kalkjaso@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

I agree with Erika that it would be beneficial to use the phased approach strategy because it can incorporate the system into the organization in steps. Introducing the new email system to faculty and staff at Dominican first and then the students would be the most productive way to establish this new system.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 24

**Date:** Fri Feb 27 2009 21:08

**Author:** Kalkirtz, Jason <[kalkjaso@my.dom.edu](mailto:kalkjaso@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

I agree with Amanda that one of the major problems was that the system was not tested by the consulting firm. The consulting company should have tried to find ways to implement the system in a phased approach or a parallel structure. They stated that it was not an option, but with all the technological advances today, I am sure that they could have found a way.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 12

**Date:** Fri Feb 27 2009 21:57

**Author:** Jearkjirm, Wannarat <[jearwann@dom.edu](mailto:jearwann@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

Brian, I like your response. It's fun : )

I agree that school budget could be a big constraints to the cutover approach, however small school will get along better with this strategy. The summer trial idea is good. Just a little thought that even it's less

communication during summer but the most effective communication channel during summer is by student e-mail address as well. Anyway, I also think that it still have less consequence than start launching in other time in a year.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 17

**Date:** Sat Feb 28 2009 01:11

**Author:** Hauser, Amanda <[Heaok711@aol.com](mailto:Heaok711@aol.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

I disagree that it was the fault of the state because they obviously did not have the expertise to know how to evaluate the consulting firm's progress and methods. All of the delays you mentioned were the fault of the consulting firm rather than the state as they were the ones leading the conversion. You said it yourself in your answer, "CNSI did not keep the promise."

Where the state did fail was in finding a reputable company rather than just going with the lowest cost provider. Sometimes you get what you paid for.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 12

**Date:** Sat Feb 28 2009 01:14

**Author:** Hauser, Amanda <[Heaok711@aol.com](mailto:Heaok711@aol.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

I agree with the phased-in approach, however, for different reasons. I think an email conversion is fairly simple as far as conversions go so extensive testing isn't necessary. I think what takes time with an email conversion is notifying one's contacts of the new address. This is why I think it would be good to offer some sort of automated notice to anyone emailing the contact that would give them the new address and conversion date. Going a step further would be to have a program that would automatically update the email address in the contact's address book, although I'm sure many programs would not allow this.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 11

**Date:** Sat Feb 28 2009 01:17

**Author:** Hauser, Amanda <[Heaok711@aol.com](mailto:Heaok711@aol.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

I'm not sure if faculty are the best party with which to start. It could be very problematic if students are unable to contact their professors, especially during 8 week classes. It might be fine if done over the summer, however, as we are well aware, there are still graduate courses over the summer. I would recommend starting with staff as they have other means of communication with one another should the email conversion encounter problems.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 20

**Date:** Sat Feb 28 2009 07:08

**Author:** Balsavich, Stephen Joseph <[sbalsavich@midwestbank.com](mailto:sbalsavich@midwestbank.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

1.) Causes of major delays on this project and the processing problems in the new system include: non-compliance to outsource claims processing systems, lack of regard for critical management guidelines when attempting to fix software errors, the claims system software was "error-prone", refusal to abide by recommended data input entry, shortage of personnel/staff to effectively manage service calls (in part due to budget issues), IT/IS incompatibility (old system to new system), decision-making without proper knowledge and input, utilizing shortcuts in attempt to catch up, only one back up plan, and design problems in the system.

2.) Who is to blame? The consulting company is responsible for the setbacks with the Maine Medicaid system. It is evident (especially when reviewing the causes mentioned above in question one) that they did not properly prepare to tackle such an undertaking. Their lack of preparation, research, and expertise in nearly every area of this transaction is unmistakable. The consequences of this poor business operation not only cost millions of dollars, it ?caused harm to healthcare providers and their patients.?

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 17

**Date:** Sat Feb 28 2009 07:24

**Author:** Balsavich, Stephen Joseph <[sbalsavich@midwestbank.com](mailto:sbalsavich@midwestbank.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

1.) Dominican is utilizing the pilot study conversion strategy.

2.) I would use the phased approach in order to accommodate the needs of students.

3.) This is the best approach to support students in the conversion/transition. By using the phased approach, students would have a stretch of time in which both e-mail accounts (Microsoft Exchange and Google e-mail) function. This would allow students to update address books, notify people of their e-mail address change, and still receive e-mail from both accounts (until notification). Time is the prime factor here.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 18

**Date:** Sat Feb 28 2009 10:13

**Author:** Thomas, Sarah D <[thomsara@dom.edu](mailto:thomsara@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

Amanda, I understand the reasons why you put this at the fault of the consulting firm rather than the state; however, I'm not sure that I entirely agree. Yes, the consulting company did lead the conversions. However, I feel that the state tried to take too many shortcuts, and their poor evaluation and choice was a result of the biggest shortcut of all. They should have given more thought to the fact that there were

only two bids for the job. They also should have considered the fact that the company they chose was asking for half the amount of money as the other bid. Furthermore, they did not allow for training, testing, or any sort of backup because of their time and budget constraints, which they ended up paying for in the end. I do find fault in the fact that the company took a job knowing that they did not have the proper knowledge and experience to be successful; however, I think that the responsibility for hiring them and incurring those subsequent failures falls on the shoulders of the ill-managed state operations.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 11

**Date:** Sat Feb 28 2009 10:22

**Author:** Thomas, Sarah D <[thomsara@dom.edu](mailto:thomsara@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

Sean, I like the idea of starting with the faculty. I think it could be very helpful to have the faculty first get acquainted with the system and then serve as a resource to help their students with any potential problems or difficulties. The faculty may be able to advise students of potential problems or help them out of situations that may arise. It would be important, however, to make sure that students have more than one email to get in touch with the faculty in case they experience difficulties during the phase in of the new system.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 9

**Date:** Sat Feb 28 2009 10:51

**Author:** Mugnolo, Michelle <[mugnmich@dom.edu](mailto:mugnmich@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

Sean, I also agree that it is a good idea to use the phase approach and to introduce the new system to the faculty and staff before the students. I think this will be beneficial for a couple of reasons. One being that all of the kinks in the system will be able to get worked out with the faculty and staff before it reaches the students. Also, students are more adaptive to change, especially when it comes to IT because we grew up with computers, etc. so it would be more beneficial to make sure the faculty and staff know how the new system operates because they may have a little more difficult time than the students may have.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 10

**Date:** Sat Feb 28 2009 13:44

**Author:** Puvadolpitak, Prapaipit <[pizzanaja@yahoo.com](mailto:pizzanaja@yahoo.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

yeah I think I would do the same thing for small college. Budget is important and need to make sure that money that would invest for are worth it.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 10

**Date:** Sat Feb 28 2009 13:49

**Author:** Puvadolpitak, Prapaipit <[pizzanaja@yahoo.com](mailto:pizzanaja@yahoo.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

I disagree with you because I think if State have more common sense to no hire this company at the first place, the whole problem might not even happen. State try to save their money buy hiring "NO-Name company" instead of fixing the old system or hiring outsourcing that more professional.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 7

**Date:** Sat Feb 28 2009 15:58

**Author:** Jearkjirm, Wannarat <[jearwann@dom.edu](mailto:jearwann@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

For their budget and time constarints, I would not say that State of Maine has no fault to blame. However, the most mistake which causing delay and following problems should be accounted for the consulting company. Lacking their expertise and less preparation on researching and studying well of their project are the most costly mistakes. I think even it was a new company but if CNSI study the system well the company should be able to set better procedures (for example meeting in with the Bureau regarding necceary input in the system, problems finding, and analysis for new system design)and even recommend State to have back up plan in case new system is failed.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 8

**Date:** Sat Feb 28 2009 19:16

**Author:** Kalkirtz, Jason <[kalkjaso@my.dom.edu](mailto:kalkjaso@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

You make a good point Amanda. Yes, there can be some incompatibilities with the student and staff communication which is essential for 8 week online classes. Perhaps the way to go is to first start with staff to staff communication of the new system and then gradually introduce it the rest of the university.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 10

**Date:** Sat Feb 28 2009 19:45

**Author:** Kalkirtz, Jason <[kalkjaso@my.dom.edu](mailto:kalkjaso@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

I agree with you that the consulting company is responsible for the setbacks with the Maine Medicaid system. It is obvious that the consulting company was not prepared to take on such a task of implementing a new Medicaid system for the state of Maine. The companies lack of preparation, research, and expertise lead to the enormous problems that the new system demonstrated. Millions of

dollars were wasted due to the consulting companies unprofessional exertion.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 13

**Date:** Sat Feb 28 2009 20:52

**Author:** Guglielmi, Chantel <[guglchan@dom.edu](mailto:guglchan@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

The project to switch from one claims processing system to another was not thoroughly researched prior to creating the new system. The company should have researched the old system that was in place, understanding the language it was written in and what needed to be improved upon. The new system should have been mostly compatible with the old system so that older files could be transferred over properly. The company should have had a member from Medicaid on the team the ENTIRE time. For a company to not know anything about the Medicaid system in general and not have a Medicaid specialist on-staff is simply dumb, especially if this is their first time ever having to comply with standard processing guidelines. The company didn't train or hire enough employees to take customer service calls. They should have recognized this problem the first week when they found the major glitches in the system, anticipated the number of calls to increase substantially, and immediately hired several more people and trained them better. Lastly, they didn't fully test the system. In general, the Medicaid processing system is extremely important not only to the government but also the thousands of providers and thousands of patients. This was not a small or insignificant job, and many people were hurt. Taking the extra time in the beginning before rolling out the system to test it would have saved much more time in the long run. The government hired the company and the company failed to do their job, simply put.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 8

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 00:23

**Author:** Jearkjirm, Wannarat <[jearwann@dom.edu](mailto:jearwann@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

I agree with both you. I also think that while the consulting company already know themselves as a newer for Medicaid system, at least they should have suggested back up plan in case the new system fall which was actually happened.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 8

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 09:27

**Author:** Balsavich, Stephen Joseph <[sbalsavich@midwestbank.com](mailto:sbalsavich@midwestbank.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

Yes, I agree. The state was "penny wise and dollar foolish." Instead of getting it right the first time by properly investing the appropriate amount of time, money and expertise, in the end they found themselves having to invest additional time and money to try to resolve the disorder that was created.

Reply

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 9

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 10:11

**Author:** Balsavich, Stephen Joseph <[sbalsavich@midwestbank.com](mailto:sbalsavich@midwestbank.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

I like your idea to begin implementation during the summer months. With utilizing the direct cutover approach, I think this a good idea considering lower traffic volumes. Hopefully, the glitches could be worked out prior to fall classes resuming.

[Reply](#)

---

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 13

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 10:23

**Author:** Guglielmi, Chantel <[guglchan@dom.edu](mailto:guglchan@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

I completely agree with everything you said. One of the reasons why this company failed was because they never built a system like this before. However, this could have been a very small reason if they didn't mess everything else up. It seems like not only was this their first project of this kind but that is was their first project of all time. Everyone knows that you can not expect anything to work the first time you do it, especially if you don't consult the right people, have enough time, and never test it. Those expectations were completely unreasonable even if this was the 20th system of this kind they built. They bid into this mess because they wanted to make a name for themselves but didn't really care about hurting their current name. I think its hilarious that other states hired them to do the same thing after this Maine project. Oh! You've got to love our political system!

[Reply](#)

---

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 13

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 10:42

**Author:** Guglielmi, Chantel <[guglchan@dom.edu](mailto:guglchan@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

I agree with everything you say. Apparently you know a lot more background about how the insurance business works compared to the information given in the case. The company should've been more prepared to handle this project. They messed up on several levels that hurt their client (the government of Maine), which in turn hurt many providers and ill citizens of Maine. This should've also hurt their reputation but instead seemed to not entirely affect it. The company should've taken this project much more seriously than it did. An experienced project manager should've been placed in charge. Simple GANTT and PERT charts could have been used to understand and solve their time-crunch as well as what needs to be done in what order. Instead they were very sloppy with this project, and not only didn't take personal responsibility for the failure but tried to pass it on to the state.

[Reply](#)

---

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 7

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 11:00

**Author:** Puvadolpitak, Prapaipit <[pizzanaja@yahoo.com](mailto:pizzanaja@yahoo.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

---

I think consulting firm may be part of mistake. However, I think the main problem is because the State doesn't careful hiring the right company to work on this important project. State hire lack of experience company at first place therefore, you can't really expect the quality of work.

Reply

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 8

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 11:02

**Author:** Puvadolpitak, Prapaipit <[pizzanaja@yahoo.com](mailto:pizzanaja@yahoo.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

---

yeah i think it's the best option so far for Dominican because starting off slowly would reduce the risk of ruining the whole system. I think dominican did pick the right choice to start so far.

Reply

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 24

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 11:12

**Author:** Guglielmi, Chantel <[guglchan@dom.edu](mailto:guglchan@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

---

1. It appears that Dominican is using a pilot study in order to change from the old Dominican email service to the new one. They introduced this system only to incoming students this year while current or past students are still using the old system. They chose the new students to use for the pilot program because they were never familiar with the old system ( they couldn't complain about having to change and learn a new system). It also allows the IT department to fix any glitches in the system while it is still serving a relatively small student population before introducing it to the entire campus body.

2. I think that the pilot strategy seems most efficient in this case. First, like Dominican, I would have all incoming students be forced to use the new system. After a few months and careful testing of the system and student feedback, I would hope that the new system would be suitable to start introducing to the rest of the student body. I would hold multiple, mandatory user information seminars prior to those particular students switching over or starting the new system. I would introduce the new system in stages of class divisions (faculty, freshman, senior, junior, sophomore).

3. I chose this strategy because it allows the IT department to test a small group of people to see how they respond to the system. Problems due to the new system can be taken care of on a smaller scale compared to a campus-wide scale. It is much easier to address certain issues for 200 people compared to 2,000. Once these issues are addressed and the system is running smoothly, taking care the pilot student's expectations and needs, it can be slowly introduced to the rest of the school. Information classes would be mandatory happening once a day for one week prior to the change-over. This would reduce the amount of questions and calls the IT center receives when a group is switching over.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 8

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 15:11

**Author:** Thomas, Sarah D <[thomsara@dom.edu](mailto:thomsara@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

This case has two very interesting sides! I have stated that I find great fault within the state because of the way they chose to outsource from a very small pool and on the basis of cost alone. However, I must also agree with you that there is definitely fault on the part of the consulting firm. It is so irresponsible that a firm would take such an important job without having any experience in the field. The lives of many patients and providers were in the hands of a company without any knowledge, as were the overall operations for the state of Maine. A firm should never take on a project that they do not know how to accomplish. However, the final decision of who to hire must remain with the state of Maine, who is responsible for that decision.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 9

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 15:17

**Author:** Thomas, Sarah D <[thomsara@dom.edu](mailto:thomsara@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

Brian, I think that you have a great idea to implement a program during the summer. You make a great point about the reduction in costs because of fewer classes and activities, as well as a reduction in consequences if there are difficulties with the system. I think that this would be a great way to implement a new system; hopefully things would be worked out in time for all students and faculty to return to classes in the fall.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 10

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 16:18

**Author:** Von Roenn, Erika Marie <[erikamarievr@msn.com](mailto:erikamarievr@msn.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

I agree with Michelle that it would be beneficial for students to have access to both e-mail addresses so that they don't end up losing any important contacts during the phasing in process.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 15

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 16:33

**Author:** Von Roenn, Erika Marie <[erikamarievr@msn.com](mailto:erikamarievr@msn.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

The state of main is most at fault for the issues with the Medicaid System. First of all, the state was trying to process over 100,000 Medicaid claims per week alone on a an outdated system. The system was not capable of handling all of the requirements from HIPAA or the online access that the state needed. Furthermore, the IT department should have realized that an even better solution would have been to outsource the claims to a service provider. A request for proposals did not go out until April 2001 and when a contract was finally recieved in October 2001 there was only twelve months left before the HIPAA compliance deadline. The state of Maine's lack of initiative and the failure of the new system itself led to further problems with payments as well as general confusion with forms. In the end, the new system ended up costing the state of Maine an additional \$30 million and still Maine was the only state that had not satisfied the HIPAA requirements.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 18

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 17:23

**Author:** Kleine, Todd Douglas <[tkleine@dom.edu](mailto:tkleine@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

After reading the case discussion, two large deficiencies are apparent which implicate the State of Maine as a key player in the mis-execution of this Medicaid system.

First, the State of Maine allowed the new system to take over as a direct cutover rather than a parallel strategy or another more practical conversion theory. In dealing with thousands of dollars a claim and an overall assurance of claim payment delivery, it is extremely risky to abandon a system (albeit archaic) for one that has not been extensively tested and proven successful. I am currently working with a project that has been in beta test for weeks and will be piloted by a group before a majority of items are even processed by the system. I could not even imagine taking the approach the State of Maine did with this project in regards to conversion.

Secondly, I feel that the State of Maine was negligent in allowing a company with such lack of experience manage a project of the scope. According to the text, the State of Maine clearly increased the risk of their project, almost dooming it failure, by relying on a company that was new and lacked the technical expertise of this scope of project. If 49 other states were able to make the HIPPA deadline (some much smaller and with less resources than Maine), apparently something was wrong in the foundational decisions of this project.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 8

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 17:24

**Author:** Grundas, Charles <[cgrundas@gmail.com](mailto:cgrundas@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

The designed and implemented systems by CNSI are responsible for knowing the limitations of the workforce. Even when the president of the company, B. Chatterjee, stated his company lacked experience in the Medicaid field, he should have recognize he may bite off more than he could chew. When there or only 13 people working with 7000 providers, there was a lack of logic in not seeing potential bottlenecks. When CNSI used the J2EE system, they should have seen it was a mismatch to streamlining procedures. Not only did CSNI subject itself to ridicule among the technology industry, it assisted in ruining the health care system for an entire state.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 15

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 17:32

**Author:** Kleine, Todd Douglas <[tkleine@dom.edu](mailto:tkleine@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

As a member of the IT staff at Dominican University, I was introduced to the concept of hosted email services as I began my job in our department a year ago. The decision was made to utilize Microsoft Exchange labs for all new student email services effective approximately June 1, 2008. The strategy deployed is a combination parallel strategy and phased approach. All new students (regardless of undergraduate or graduate) would receive an Exchange Labs account and as existing students graduated, their old accounts would be eliminated. We selected a group for essentially a year to test to ensure that the new system was viable for student use. Though the approach is stronger in the parallel strategy, both were ultimately used.

As a CIO at a small institution, I would utilize a pilot study strategy that incorporated a phased approach. Depending on the cost ramifications of running two systems, I would make decisions on the length of phases. Speaking from experience, minimal issues have presented in the Exchange Labs conversion process and the transition has been overall smooth. I would choose this approach because our group could test out the capabilities and run preliminary assessments on the quality and experience of the user before the large population is affected by a conversion. This essentially reduces risk for project failure.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 7

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 17:33

**Author:** Grundas, Charles <[cgrundas@gmail.com](mailto:cgrundas@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

Even though there is validity in the state's short coming, CSNI knows its own limitations. Before the company even attempted to submit an quote, it should know the extent of the operations the outsourcing would entail. The lack of knowledge on CNSI over shadows the state's own poor judgment. You don't step into the ring if you know you can't fight.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 9

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 17:34

**Author:** White, Genti <[whitgent@my.dom.edu](mailto:whitgent@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

Q1: Some of the major causes of the delay on the project and processing problems in the system included the fact that the software was prone to error. The system would issue checks to doctors for the total charges instead of the actual amount covered by medicaid. Also, the providers were having difficulty filling out the forms correctly. Errors in the forms caused the claims to be flagged as a

suspended file.

Q2: The state of Maine is to blame in this case. CNSI recommended that the state require all providers to re-enroll in order to ensure that the information would be complete in the new system. However, the state instead decided to simply transfer the data over to the new system. This caused errors in the new system due to incomplete information. Also, the state did not offer providers training on the new system and did not even offer their staff training on the new system. The state did not even employ a decent back up plan.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 11

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 17:38

**Author:** White, Gentri <[whitgent@my.dom.edu](mailto:whitgent@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

Q1: Dominican is using the pilot study strategy

Q2: In converting to Google email I would employ the pilot strategy.

Q3: I chose this strategy because it would allow the organization to test out the new system before completely relying on it. If there turns out to be a flaw in the new system, then the old system is still available until the flaw can be corrected.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 6

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 17:41

**Author:** Mather, Bonnie M <[bmather@dom.edu](mailto:bmather@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

1.) What caused the major delays on this project and the processing problems in the new system? I think the most significant delay was not hiring the right firm in enough time to complete the project effectively. Additional delays and processing problems were due to programming, based on Java Platform Enterprise Edition which was incompatible with the legacy code of the old system. Budget constraints prevented enough staff on the project which slowed down development and affected response time to complaints. Fixing programming errors, adding new code to accommodate Medicaid rule changes and adding storage capacity and processing power slowed things down considerably, even though the deadline was extended by a year. Corners were cut when it came to all-inclusive testing, and no training was given to providers who used the new system or to the staff that had to field questions from providers. There was no backup or parallel system for support because of the incompatibility in programming. Programming and design problems came up limiting the size of claim files and causing thousands of claims to be suspended and log jam the system.

2.) Who is to blame for the problems with the project?

The state of Maine is to blame for the problems with the project due to a lack of leadership, foresight and poor planning. HIPPA was enacted in 1996 and the states had until October 1, 2002 to be in compliance with the patient privacy and security standards. That was at least 6 years. Although there were other factors they were considering, like cost-effectiveness, easier maintenance, online accessibility for providers and flexibility to accommodate future changes, there was nothing in this case

study that indicated management of DHS, the IT staff and end users communicated about the best resolution to this challenge. DHS did hire a private contractor to work with its IT staff but it doesn't say when. With the complexity and scope of this project, it is incomprehensible that the people involved thought they could build, test and implement this system without major problems. One immediate red flag should have been the response to the RFP. Then to select a company with no experience in this area, because of the low cost was asking for serious trouble.

A major blow to this whole debacle was the cost overruns for the state of Maine that included hiring the project management consultant, the accounting firm of Deloitte & Touche, the database specialist (for Operations manager) and the appointment of a Medicaid expert, who should have been there from the beginning.

The biggest losers were the patients and the providers who had to suffer through the waste and mismanagement of government.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 6

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 17:45

**Author:** Grundas, Charles <[cgrundas@gmail.com](mailto:cgrundas@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

Regarding Question 1, It is the pilot strategic that comes into effect. Now the pilot strategy is the introduction of new systems to selected area within the organization. For the fall semester of 2008, the new students will use the updated system because they are not affected by the old system in any way. This appears to be a clean start without the resistance to change.

Regarding Question 2, the school should start with the pilot approach for testing protocol and for any errors within the system. Once testing was complete and successful, the school should bring other groups into the mix. The logic in this decision allows the school to complete testing to ensure the emails will work. Once everything is ready for go, not everyone will accept the change and some resistance may stem from altering the new system. By phasing, everyone will eventually have a look at how the e-mails will operate. The strategy is similar to the start up of Internet Explorer 8. The beta version is there to let people process and analyze the system to make changes. Then slowly but surely, Microsoft will phase out Internet Explorer 6 by not allowing updates to occur on the system. This action leads everyone toward IE8 after everyone has tested the system.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 7

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 17:50

**Author:** Grundas, Charles <[cgrundas@gmail.com](mailto:cgrundas@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

You are exactly right about using the phasing approach. With a smaller school, financing these changes may not be an option to use parallel strategy. The overall cost to run two systems may really cripple a budget for an IT department. Also methods such as the direct cut over leaves the school open for a complete failure of the program if everything does not work out perfectly.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 9

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 18:00  
**Author:** McCarthy, Sean <[mccasean@dom.edu](mailto:mccasean@dom.edu)>  
**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

---

Having access to both email for a limited time would be beneficial for the students. However, I would make sure the students are aware that it is only for a limited amount of time.

Reply

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 10

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 18:58  
**Author:** McCarthy, Sean <[mccasean@dom.edu](mailto:mccasean@dom.edu)>  
**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

---

The State of Maine is mostly responsible for the problems it incurred during overhauling their Medicaid claims processing system. A federal government mandate forced states to update their current mainframes in order to comply with new HIPAA legislation. Maine decided it would be more cost effective to purchase a new mainframe instead of upgrading their current mainframe like neighboring states were doing. Maine's IT department also rejected to outsource their claims processing systems to a service provider, Electric Data Systems (EDS).

Maine hired CNSI to complete and deploy the new processing system, which was required by law to be up and running within 12 months. The system was up and running 27 months late. Besides being late, the new mainframe failed miserably and within 2 months, over 300,000 claims were frozen. The new system cost the State of Maine an additional \$30 million and forced many medical providers to turn away Medicaid patients. The state of Maine should have either upgraded their mainframe or outsourced their claims processing system.

Reply

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 8

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 19:51  
**Author:** Johnson, Clarence <[johnclar@my.dom.edu](mailto:johnclar@my.dom.edu)>  
**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

---

1.) What caused the major delays on this project and the processing problems in the new system?

Non-compliant processing systems, no critical management guidelines for fixing software errors, maintaining error – prone software, lack of properly trained staff, and attempting shortcuts to mask problems within the software are factors that caused major delays on the project and the processing problems for the new system.

2.) Who is to blame for the problems with the project -- the State of Maine or the Consulting

Company? Support your position.

The consulting company is mostly responsible for the problems with the Medicaid software. CNSI designed a new software system for Medicaid that was not compatible with the old system. This created the processing problems stated above. It was CSNI's responsibility to ensure that the software would work properly before installation, not after.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 8

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 20:23

**Author:** Johnson, Clarence <[johnclar@my.dom.edu](mailto:johnclar@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

1.) Dominican is in the process of converting to a new email system. Which of the conversion strategies is Dominican using?

The conversion strategy that Dominican is using is the Pilot Conversion Strategy.

2.) What conversion strategy will you use?

I would use the phased approach.

3.) Why did you choose this strategy?

I would choose the phased approach because it's easier to implement. You could introduce the new email system in stages so people could get familiar with the software. Faculty and staff would be the first unit I would phase in the software because the numbers are minimal, and then with students.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 11

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 21:33

**Author:** Jackson, Laura <[ljackson@dom.edu](mailto:ljackson@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

The problems with this project are vast and start with poor planning on the part of the consulting firm. Preparing to execute the program within 12 months was an unreasonable promise. Granted, the HIPPA guidelines required that timeline, but the fact that the firm's bid came in so much lower than the only other competitor suggests that they underestimated the project's scope.

The next issue is, of course, conversion to the new system. There was far too much room for error and rather than each account registering anew, they tried to carry over old information that truly caused an array of compatibility issues, error messages, etc. The project seemed to require strict guidelines for usage, that generated countless errors, back-ups, and millions of dollars in delays.

The culpability for this project certainly falls on the consulting firm. When a Request for Proposal is sent out, bidders must present a feasible plan for execution, this plan was clearly not thought out, practiced, troubleshot, or quickly resolved when the problems began. Maine was behind the entire country because this firm made false promises and offered poor business strategies.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 13

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 21:44

**Author:** Jackson, Laura <[ljackson@dom.edu](mailto:ljackson@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

Dominican's email conversion is being offered to allow students "lifelong emails" with improved size and accessibility for these accounts. (this is, of course, great from my perspective as the Alumni Director who often hears from grads inquiring about this very idea!) The approach is a phased approach which has allowed the older emails and new emails to exist in parallel for a while and slowly move in to the new email style. There have been some issues for students with the new email style because people are hard to retrain...though the system appears to be functioning well.

If I were the IT Director at a small liberal arts school, I can see how outsourcing email would be a good idea. It is certainly a space and management issue for a small university. Converting to Google would certainly provide space and a universality to student emails that would be easily embraced on campus. I would, of course, recognize that the conversion of people can sometimes be harder than the conversion of data! So, I would use a phased approach to the conversion beginning with the freshman in order to generate buy-in. I think those who have not been trained on the old way can begin with the new way. I would say faculty should be converted in parallel allowing them to have both their old emails and their new emails allowing them to try the new way, but be able to return for a time to the reliable way.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 7

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 22:07

**Author:** Reyes, Paul Michael Jocson <[preyesnd@gmail.com](mailto:preyesnd@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

1. A major reason for the delay in the project was the state of Maine's late start. HIPPA was passed in 1996, and the deadline for compliance was 2002. This was a six year window, and Maine did not start the project until 2001. This was one year before the deadline, and the system did not debut until 2005, AND it was not operational.

2. The state of Maine knew ahead of time of the deadline. They could have used at least half the time to review their legacy systems and decide if they needed to upgrade it, or go with a new direction. The other remaining three years could have been used to beta test the system to work out all the bugs.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 6

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 22:15

**Author:** Reyes, Paul Michael Jocson <[preyesnd@gmail.com](mailto:preyesnd@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

2 and 3.

A phased approach could be appropriate for this situation. Since there is a small student body and faculty, implementation in stages would work since communication to all users would be easily dispersed. It would be more difficult at a larger institution, since it would be hard to monitor everyone's progress.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 8

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 22:29

**Author:** Mather, Bonnie M <[bmather@dom.edu](mailto:bmather@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

Q1.) Dominican's conversion strategy seems to be the pilot study.

Q2.) I would use the phased approach strategy starting with incoming Freshmen at the beginning of the school year. In the next semester, I would phase in Sophomores and Juniors and in the summer, the Seniors and Grad students, so at the beginning of the new school year all students would be on Google.

Q3.) I chose this strategy to avoid the expense of the parallel strategy and to prevent the risk of dislocations, disruptions and the cost of corrections that could occur if using a direct cutover to a new system.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 22:42

**Author:** De Silva, Virangi <[virangi@hotmail.com](mailto:virangi@hotmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

**Question 1:** What caused the major delays on this project and the processing problems in the new system?

New system designed by CNSI caused higher rejecting rates much more frequently than the old system. The 300,000 claims were frozen within two months. During the first week system suspended an unusual high number of claims around 50 percent or 24,000 claims.

Providers had a difficult time and tendency to make errors in filling up 30 to 40 fields of information that needed in claim forms. This increased number of suspended files resulting huge number of claims to be held back.

CNSI made judgments about medical rules and requirements irresponsibly without having proper input from medical experts. This caused them to reprogram parts of the system again

later when medical experts are available. This increased the time in fixing errors.

The J2EE programming used by CNSI was not compatible with the legacy code from the old system. This is a clear example to show the inexperience of CNSI in designing Medicaid claims systems.

Further Medicaid was behind on \$50 million for the payments of 10,000 claims suspended by the system and for the statements repeatedly received by the doctors for their rejected claims.

**Question 2:** Who is to blame for the problems with the project – the State of Maine or the Consulting Company? Support your position.

Consulting company is to be blamed for the problems with the project. Without having any prior experience of designing a Medicaid claims system the CNSI entered into such a large and significant project. This inexperience caused CNSI to miss the deadline in 27 months and to have an unusual higher number of rejecting rates when compared with old system. Due to higher rejecting rates made by the system the Maine was unable to compensate seven thousand nonprofits and healthcare service providers properly.

CNSI lack of communication is another problem in designing the system. Lack of communication caused them to make judgments about medical rules and requirements irresponsibly without having proper input from medical experts. This made them to reprogram parts of the system again later when medical experts are available. This resulted waste of time & money and longer period working on the system by causing problems to healthcare providers and their patients.

Therefore the consulting company is to be blamed for the problems with the project.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 9

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 23:09

**Author:** Poole, Merritt <[poolmerr@my.dom.edu](mailto:poolmerr@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

Question 1: What caused the major delays on the project and the processing problems in the new system?

The Maine Medicaid Claims System project was a disaster of major proportions. Several factors contributed to the processing problems, developmental delays, and catastrophic consequences that ensued:

- (1) Hiring a vendor that had no experience in building a Medicaid claims system.
- (2) No proper training given to providers on new system, or staff who would field the calls from providers
- (3) The J2EE software language did not coordinate with the legacy code used in the old system. This code was also risky for use in a state government setting, considering its scalability and typical use in large corporate settings.
- (4) The new claims system was designed to look at claims in much greater detail than the old

system. By doing so, the state of Maine would comply with HIPAA requirements, and would increase the accuracy of payments. CNSI recommended that all providers reenroll to complete their information according to new system requirements. However, Maine's IT department chose to take the shortcut, by simply transferring the existing information off of the old system. However, this information was considered incomplete by the new systems rules. This led to the heaping "suspended file".

(5) IT switched over to new system overnight with no backup system,

(6) The DHS team was significantly understaffed, contributing to the large delay in its debut.

(7) Numerous errors were embedded into the code. This was due largely in part by the frequent reprogramming in order to comply with Medicaid rule changes, on the federal and state levels. These changes created integration problems, as the programmers had to add more computing power, and storage capacity to accept this information.

Question 2: Who is to blame for the problems with this project?

The State of Maine is to blame for the failure of this project. Its first mistake was hiring a vendor that had no experience in developing a Medicaid claims system. This oversight was multiplied by the decision to build a new and relatively unproven technology platform for the entire system. Rather than follow the lead of other states, it fell vulnerable to the tight budget and time constraints. The state of Maine seemed to panic, rather than evaluating this decision full-circle. As a result, corners were cut in necessary areas - the team was understaffed and often took shortcuts, and proper training for providers and staff was not provided, to name a few. These time and money savers ultimately wasted time, and cost significant sums of money. Maine strongly believed that this new system would be more flexible, easier, and cost-effective. However, it is preposterous that it state would elect to change to this questionable system, when dealing with resident's healthcare, and payment to doctors, etc. Innovation was not the key to survival here. When the state of Maine had only received two proposals, a red flag should have gone up. The lack of response, and difference in price between the two bids (100%) should have implied that the bid and project requirements were unrealistic and unreasonable. Even if Maine missed the HIPAA deadline, at least millions of dollars and hours of time would have been spared.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 6

**Date:** Sun Mar 01 2009 23:43

**Author:** Poole, Merritt <[poolmerr@my.dom.edu](mailto:poolmerr@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

Question 1: Which of the conversion strategies is Dominican using?

Dominican is using the pilot study strategy, as the new system is being introduced to new students enrolled in the 2008-9 academic year.

Question 2: What conversion strategy will you use?

I would use the phased approach strategy.

Question 3: Why did you choose this strategy?

The phased approach seems to yield the greatest benefits, in comparison to the other conversion strategies. The direct cutover approach is impractical - simply replacing the old system with the new is too risky that can lead to calamitous effects (time, money). The parallel strategy is advantageous, lending itself to use of the new and old system. However, Laudon cites that this approach bears a hefty expense, and also requires extra staff/resources. Since this is a small university, the parallel approach is not a good fit. The phased approach does entail a slower transition, yet the feedback received from students and faculty will drive the further success of the conversion. Rather than trying to predict the

reactions from students/faculty/staff, or attempt to debut a perfect conversion of this email system, the system will improve step by step with each additional group. The kinks will emerge, and they will be addressed.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 4

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 00:04

**Author:** Kalkirtz, Jason <[kalkjaso@my.dom.edu](mailto:kalkjaso@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

I completely agree with you that the company should have had a member from Medicaid on the team the ENTIRE time. For the consulting company not being familiar at all with the Medicaid system, and not having a Medicaid specialist on-staff is not an intelligent move for the consulting company. Things could have possibly worked more efficiently if the consulting company put the appropriate people in the right places.

I also agree with you that the company did not train or hire enough employees to take customer service calls. The consulting company should have recognized this problem the get go. They knew that major glitches were presented in the system and should have anticipated an increase in customer service calls. The consulting company should be thinking ahead and immediately hire more employees to help with their business troubles.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 12

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 00:06

**Author:** Kalkirtz, Jason <[kalkjaso@my.dom.edu](mailto:kalkjaso@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

I like your idea of a pilot strategy. I like the idea of introducing the system to all incoming students first for a few months, and then introducing the system to the rest of the student population and faculty. As far as the mandatory information seminars for the new system, I am not quite sure if students and faculty would attend a meeting. I think it is a good idea, but I am just not sure if people will take time out of their day to attend the seminar for an email system.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 7

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 00:54

**Author:** Georgikos, Stavros <[SGEORGIKOS@LIVE.COM](mailto:SGEORGIKOS@LIVE.COM)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

I believe the consulting company is most responsible for the problems. CNSI received the contract to complete and deploy a new processing system. However, they began messing up when they missed their deadline. Also, shortly after the new system was rolled out, the system was rejecting claims and most of the rejected claims were being held up. Within 2 months 300,000 claims were frozen. Even the president of CNSI admitted that his company lacked the experience of working with Medicaid systems

and described his own company as “a no-name company” looking for an entry way into claims systems processing management. CNSI did not have the information system capabilities to sustain a project of such magnitude. In this case, the consulting firm definitely bit off more than they could chew.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 8

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 01:01

**Author:** Georgikos, Stavros <[SGEORGIKOS@LIVE.COM](mailto:SGEORGIKOS@LIVE.COM)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

- 1) The conversion strategy that Dominican is using is the Pilot Study.
- 2) I would use the phased approach strategy knowing this would be the most accommodating strategy for the students.
- 3) I would choose this strategy due to the fact the students would not have a lot of down time when utilizing their e-mails. With the phased approach strategy students would be able to use multiple e-mails while getting slowly introduced to the new e-mail system.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 07:51

**Author:** Guglielmi, Chantel <[guglchan@dom.edu](mailto:guglchan@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

I disagree that the phased-in approach seems the most convenient for all parties. If Dominican was switching over to gmail, it would be hard to expect students, faculty and staff to only start with the gmail calendar application for a time period, then start building a contact list, then use it to send out emails, and then use it to receive emails. I think Dominican is doing it the right way through the pilot approach. Test the system on a few people, provide information sessions, fix any glitches with the pilot group, and finally introduce the system to the rest of the campus population.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 07:52

**Author:** Guglielmi, Chantel <[guglchan@dom.edu](mailto:guglchan@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

I disagree that the phased-in approach seems the most convenient for all parties. If Dominican was switching over to gmail, it would be hard to expect students, faculty and staff to only start with the gmail calendar application for a time period, then start building a contact list, then use it to send out emails, and then use it to receive emails. I think Dominican is doing it the right way through the pilot approach. Test the system on a few people, provide information sessions, fix any glitches with the pilot group, and finally introduce the system to the rest of the campus population.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 10:56

**Author:** Hauser, Amanda <[Heaok711@aol.com](mailto:Heaok711@aol.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

I'm not so sure that outsourcing the claims would have been a good idea, and it may have even violated HIPPA standards by exposing patient information to a third party.

The state of Maine also could not control how many forms it had to process unless it limited access to healthcare for those that used Medicaid, which would have been worse.

While the state did lag behind terribly and cut corners, the consulting company was still in charge of the project and should have managed it better. I would have been embarassed to be associated with such an organization.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 11:07

**Author:** Balsavich, Stephen Joseph <[sbalsavich@midwestbank.com](mailto:sbalsavich@midwestbank.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

Good points concerning the risky conversion strategy implemented (or lack thereof) as well as the state's decision to outsource a company with little experience and expertise. At the same time, the state of Maine didn't do their research either-in terms of finding a more equipped company to service their needs.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 9

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 11:15

**Author:** Balsavich, Stephen Joseph <[sbalsavich@midwestbank.com](mailto:sbalsavich@midwestbank.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

Good points concerning the pressure on the IT department to problem-solve concerns and issues that arise from the conversion. Utilizing the pilot strategy would lessen the stress of the situation by simply reducing the number of participants piloting the new e-mail system. The mandatory informational classes are also a good idea to assist/support students with the transition.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 10

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 15:11

**Author:** Fredericks, Brian <[fredbria@my.dom.edu](mailto:fredbria@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

I agree that poor planning was a major issue from the company's side. Not taking into account that their chosen vendor did not adequately estimate the scope of the project. When evaluating bids from potential vendors, it is important to look at more than the final estimated cost. You really need to take into account how that number was determined and that the bid contains all the necessary elements for your project.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 10

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 16:01

**Author:** Fredericks, Brian <[fredbria@my.dom.edu](mailto:fredbria@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

Laura, I agree with your strategy of phasing in the new email system and realizing that the people factor is just as important as the technical factors to consider when undertaking this project. I think for new students, many would already be at least somewhat familiar with Google email thus allowing for an easier transition.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 17:37

**Author:** Jackson, Laura <[ljackson@dom.edu](mailto:ljackson@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

I do think that the state of Maine is definitely shifting the blame when they were the ones who selected the consulting firm, but in some ways, that's the power of a RfP, That firm promised to execute something effectively, and THEY sited the staff, the costs, etc. Perhaps Maine should have questioned the company further before selection, but they are using tax payer money and have an obligation to accept a low bid that promises successful execution.

Maine's biggest failure was selecting when only two bids came in, that alone was cause for reflection.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 17:39

**Author:** Jackson, Laura <[ljackson@dom.edu](mailto:ljackson@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

I like the idea of a pilot group, which would work well with a small university. However, does that group risk being too different and therefore facing problems that might not exist if a larger population were working in the new system. That is, professors would adapt to the new style. More problems can be troubleshoot with a larger group...maybe a pilot group that is substantial, like a full class or a half of a class...several hundred.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 8

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 19:11

**Author:** McCarthy, Sean <[mccasean@dom.edu](mailto:mccasean@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

I also think that it was poor planning/analysis by the State of Maine. The state should have played more active role in handling this situation. Now, taxpayers are paying double for what the original sovereign cost. The entire project management process didn't account for the correct timeliness that could accurately be completed. The state should have had some sort of back up plan in place or at least be able re-coup some of the costs due to project delays.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 19:15

**Author:** McCarthy, Sean <[mccasean@dom.edu](mailto:mccasean@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

Sarah, I agree with you 100%. In end, the State is responsible for hiring of the firm that didn't have the proper qualifications/experience with this type of mainframe conversion.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 11

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 19:26

**Author:** Nowak, Robert J <[nowarobe@dom.edu](mailto:nowarobe@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

I believe that the State of Maine was mostly responsible for the problems mentioned in the article. Most of these problems occurred during the overhauling of their Medicaid claims processing system. Part of new HIPAA legislation, states were forced to update their mainframes to be in compliance. In Maine's case, they decided to buy a new mainframe instead of updating their old one like many surrounding states did. Their system was 27 months late, the mainframe failed horribly, and 300,000 claims were frozen costing Maine to pay out an additional \$30 million and turn away patients from Medicaid care. The point is that Maine should have just upgraded instead of buying a new mainframe which would have eliminated this problem and saved the state \$30 million.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 9

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 19:33

**Author:** Nowak, Robert J <[nowarobe@dom.edu](mailto:nowarobe@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

Question 1: Dominican is using a pilot strategy.

Question 2: I would use the phased approach.

Question 3: I would use the phased approach strategy because of the way it incorporates the organization into steps which seems like it would simplify things. I would let the students test it out since they are in greater number and you are able to get a more accurate feedback.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 8

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 20:53

**Author:** Kleine, Todd Douglas <[tkleine@dom.edu](mailto:tkleine@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

I agree that one of the biggest issues with the case was that CNSI had little to no background in dealing with this type of project. This is one of the biggest risk factors in the failure or success of a technology based project. It seems the choice of CNSI was inappropriate for this project.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 8

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 20:55

**Author:** Kleine, Todd Douglas <[tkleine@dom.edu](mailto:tkleine@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

From the IT department, one of the greatest sales on the Exchange Labs email system was for alumni and to include a lifetime account for students and alumni. This system would increase the odds of keeping alumni connected with or at least thinking about Dominican University. This is a major enhancement over our legacy system.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 21:18

**Author:** Grundas, Charles <[cgrundas@gmail.com](mailto:cgrundas@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

Once CSNI posted its quote, it was responsible to understand the needs of the state of Maine. Without HIPAA knowledge, CSNI was doomed to a joke within the technology industry. CSNI saw the opportunity to make a few revenue dollars without the proper analysis of its own working systems.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 21:27

**Author:** Franch, Kimberly <[dalskimb@dom.edu](mailto:dalskimb@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

1. The consulting company is mostly responsible for the problem for many reasons. First, this project of creating a new system for Maine's Medicaid was the first project of its type that CNSI had ever taken on. CNSI admitted that it lacked the experience necessary to take on a project like this and that it was looking for a way in to the claims system industry. This lack of experience led CNSI to propose a platform, J2EE, that did not match correctly with the old system. Also, once they figured out that they were really behind CNSI began to take shortcuts to complete the project. CNSI then showed their inability to complete this job properly by only allowing 1000 lines of code.

2. The inexperienced consultant, CNSI, was definitely to blame for the problems with the project as illustrated by the above reasons. I am appalled that they were hired again, after the clean up of this mess, to institute other Medicaid contracts. I understand that they must have learned some very valuable lessons, but doubt that those lessons make CNSI an expert.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 6

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 21:28

**Author:** Mugnolo, Michelle <[mugnmich@dom.edu](mailto:mugnmich@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

Questions 1 and 2: What caused the major delays on this project and the processing problems in the new system? Who is to blame for the problems with the project -- the State of Maine or the Consulting Company? Support your position.

There are many things that caused the major project delays and processing problems in the new software. One reason for this problem is that the new system rejected and suspended many claims, which resulted in Medicaid patients to be turned away or providers to shut down their operations because they were not getting paid. The state of Maine was trying to process over 100,000 Medicaid claims per week on an outdated system that couldn't handle the workload and the online requirements from HIPAA or the online access that the state needed. Also, the software was prone to error and the system would also issue checks to doctors for the entire amount instead of the actual amount charged by Medicaid. Providers were having difficulty filling out the forms and errors in forms caused claims to be flagged as a suspended file. It would have also been better if the IT department outsourced claims to a service provider. The lack of initiative by the state of Maine, and the failure of the new system was the opening of Pandora's Box with payment problems as well as general confusion with forms. By the end of the project, the state of Maine spent an additional \$30 million and they still did not fulfill the HIPAA requirements. The state of Maine is to blame for this situation for numerous reasons. The CNSI recommended that the state require all providers to re-enroll in order to ensure that the information would be complete in the system, but instead of requiring this, the state simply just transferred the data over to the new system. This neglect to follow what the new system required caused errors in the new system because information transfers were incomplete. The state of Maine did not offer training on the new system to providers or their staff, and to top it off did not have a solid back-up plan in case of a system error or malfunction.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 9

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 21:29

**Author:** Grundas, Charles <[cgrundas@gmail.com](mailto:cgrundas@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

You are absolutely right in approaching the e-mail system with a pilot study. The way you test and how often you test a system insures the system will work how it is needed. The students involve work as a beta testing group to see if the changeover if worth the effort. If a series of similar problems arise, the school has a better chance to either alter the system or cancel testing and just try to update the current software.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 8

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 21:39

**Author:** Franch, Kimberly <[dalskimb@dom.edu](mailto:dalskimb@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

1. Dominican is using the pilot study because they are introducing the new MyD.U.Mail only to students who started at the university during 2008-2009.
2. I would use the phased approach.
3. I would use the phased approach in order to first gain the buy in of the faculty and staff of 200. I would then roll it out in 2 last phases starting with the graduates and ending with the undergraduates so that the positive buy in of the older generation can spread to the younger.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 10

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 22:04

**Author:** De Silva, Virangi <[virangi@hotmail.com](mailto:virangi@hotmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

**Question 1:** Dominican is in the process of converting to a new email system. See [https://jicsweb1.dom.edu/ics/Home.jnz?portlet=New\\_Student\\_Email](https://jicsweb1.dom.edu/ics/Home.jnz?portlet=New_Student_Email). Which of the conversion strategies is Dominican using?

Dominican is using pilot study strategy in converting to the new email system.

Pilot strategy is first used only for limited part of the organization such as one department or one unit. If it is successful in that department or in that unit then it will be implemented to the whole organization simultaneously or in stages.

Likewise first Dominican plans to introduce it to new students (academic year 2008-2009) and depending on the success University plans to introduce it to all the Dominican students.

*Background for Questions 2 and 3: Suppose you were in charge of Information Technology at a small liberal arts college with an enrollment of 2,000 students and a*

faculty and staff of 200. Currently the faculty and staff and students are using Microsoft Exchange. The college would like to outsource student email to greatly reduce the time and expense of owning and managing the Microsoft Exchange servers. Read <http://www.webpronews.com/topnews/2007/11/28/google-microsoft-compete-for-college-email>. You have decided to convert all students to Google email.

**Question 2:** What conversion strategy will you use?

I will use pilot study strategy.

**Question 3:** Why did you choose this strategy?

Because first I can use the pilot study strategy only to one department and could see the results in that specific department. If it works smoothly and successfully in that department then I can implement it to the whole college at once without having any risks or problems. This is convenient and saves time with compared to the phased approach.

The phased approach takes longer time to complete the conversion process because this approach introduces the new system in stage by stage basis either by functions or by organizational units. Also this cannot install to the whole organization at once like the pilot study strategy. Also it requires extra development work to program software bridges. (<http://web.sxu.edu/rogers/cs111/conversion.html>)

I will not use parallel strategy because that is not the best suited option for a “small” liberal arts college. I don’t think this “small” liberal arts college would have enough funds to undergo high expenses to run simultaneously the old system and the new system together until it’s assured that new system functions without errors.

The direct cutover strategy is too risky to use. This replaces the old system with the new system from the first day onwards. Therefore if the new system doesn’t work properly, college will not have any other system to fall back.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 8

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 22:09

**Author:** De Silva, Virangi <[virangi@hotmail.com](mailto:virangi@hotmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

I agree with you Paul. The best conversion strategy would be pilot study strategy for this small liberal arts college.

As you mentioned, I would also prefer to use parallel strategy because that is the safest conversion

approach. But as a "small" liberal arts college this will be very expensive for the college to run simultaneously the old system and the new system together until it's assured that new system functions without errors. As a "small" college it will be difficult to find additional staff or resources to run the extra system.

As you mentioned the direct cutover strategy would be too risky to use. Because if the new system doesn't work properly, college will not have any other system to fall back since it replaces the old system with the new system from the first day onwards.

I like to add that phased approach takes longer time to complete the conversion process because this approach introduces the new system in stage by stage basis either by functions or by organizational units. Also it requires extra development work to program software bridges.  
(<http://web.sxu.edu/rogers/cs111/conversion.html>)

Therefore I also think that the best option for the college is to use the pilot study strategy. Because once completed working smoothly and successfully in one department then we can conveniently install it to the whole college at once saving time with compared to the phased approach strategy.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 7

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 22:11

**Author:** De Silva, Virangi <[virangi@hotmail.com](mailto:virangi@hotmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

Brian, you mentioned in question 2 that you are going to use the direct cutover strategy. I have to disagree with you in that..

Because it's very risky to use this approach as it mentions in our text book. This strategy replaced the old system completely with the new system from the first day onwards. If you find any problems in the new system there will be no other system to fall back. The whole college will be in a great trouble and this will incur a great cost for the college too.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 6

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 22:17

**Author:** Khan, Mujahed <[Khanmuja@my.dom.edu](mailto:Khanmuja@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

The major delays in the processing of Medicaid claims was the result of inconsistent coding systems. There was also the issue of new and extensive claims processing procedures that needed to be learned by the healthcare providers. Additionally, there were not enough fully skilled phone operators on the end of Medicaid to assist the practitioners.

Clearly, the State of Maine is where the most blame falls. The state should have looked at each consulting company's past experiences to gauge a better understanding of who would perform the job

best before contracting with any firm. The state should have also realized the significance of Medicaid within the state, it should have thoroughly assessed and planned what actions Maine would take in case there were delays in processing. Finally, most healthcare providers and citizens of Maine will blame the state because, the state is responsible for the Medicaid program and it can be held accountable by the people whereas CNSI cannot be.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 4

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 22:20

**Author:** Khan, Mujahed <[Khanmuja@my.dom.edu](mailto:Khanmuja@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

I agree that the State should have notified all healthcare providers of the changes in the Medicaid system and had them newly register rather than trying to transfer the information from different data systems.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 4

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 22:29

**Author:** Poole, Merritt <[poolmerr@my.dom.edu](mailto:poolmerr@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

Thank you for your personal insight in this discussion. I found it quite interesting to hear your point of view, since you work as a member of Dominican's IT staff. As an observer on the outside, it seemed like Dominican had just implemented the pilot conversion approach. But as you have pointed out, it is a combination of two strategies. Have you found that this choice was effective?

You have also emphasized a major advantage of using the phased approach - it certainly does reduce the risk of project failure, and ramifications of future consequences. If you were to implement the system in the presented context would you use the same length of the phases as dominican had?

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 4

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 22:41

**Author:** Poole, Merritt <[poolmerr@my.dom.edu](mailto:poolmerr@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

I agree, the State of Maine made a drastic decision to change simply change out their current legacy system to a new one that is neither well recognized nor well tested. There were many stakeholders involved, and this unreasonable decision put all of them at risk, suffering consequences in the end. The State of Maine seemed to lack business sense here. If the other states took a different route to comply with the HIPAA standards and it worked, why would they venture away from this route? I cannot even comprehend the magnitude of the mistakes they made.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 4

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 22:55

**Author:** Johnson, Clarence <[johnclar@my.dom.edu](mailto:johnclar@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

The question of who is at fault can lie in a person's interpretation of the facts. The fact that the State of Maine chose CSNI as the company to create the new system is a strike. The fact that the State did not do their due diligent in researching this particular company goes to my second strike. So on this information alone, I could see why a person would blame the State of Maine. However, in my opinion, CSNI is more to blame because of the errors within the new system. The fact that the new system was not compatible with the old system was a big mistake on the part of the consulting firm. Also, the fact that the project took 27 months to complete when it was originally scheduled for 12 months was another.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 22:59

**Author:** Johnson, Clarence <[johnclar@my.dom.edu](mailto:johnclar@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

I believe the phased approach is the best conversion strategy for the school. You could implement the new system in steps, first with faculty and then with the student body.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 4

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 23:07

**Author:** Khan, Mujahed <[Khanmuja@my.dom.edu](mailto:Khanmuja@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

Dominican University is currently using the pilot study strategy to introduce the new e-mail system. They are using this with new students only.

The best conversation strategy that should be used for the small liberal arts college is the direct cutover strategy. This will replace the old system with the new system in a single day. This strategy is very cost-effective for a small school. It is also not very risky because, Google email has been tested out by other campuses and is noted as being successful.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Mon Mar 02 2009 23:57

**Author:** Jearkjirm, Wannarat <[jearwann@dom.edu](mailto:jearwann@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

Dominican uses Pilot Conversion Strategy.

I would choose the Phase-In Approach.

Because it will allow students to get use to the new e-mail system, as well as it allows school to have safe transition period.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 00:12

**Author:** McCulloch, Ben <[bdmcculloch@gmail.com](mailto:bdmcculloch@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

The major delays in the Medicaid processing system were threefold. Firstly, the state did not move quickly after the passing of the HIPAA law to begin the process of acquiring a new system. Secondly, the state made attempts to cut costs, and in many cases, cut corners in planning and execution of a new system. Last, the state did not make sure workers and vendors were properly trained. The result was a delayed arrival of a system that had been much more costly than planned, and having a staff that was ill equipped to support the system. The state of Maine is to blame, simply because the state was responsible for complying with the law, whereas the consulting company was only responsible to fulfill its contract.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 6

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 09:56

**Author:** White, Genti <[whitgent@my.dom.edu](mailto:whitgent@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

I agree with you that it is the states fault. You make a good point that the state should have taken the time to compare the costs/benefits of fixing the old system versus switching over to a new one. I also agree with you that the state was careless in making sure that the companies they were dealing with knew what they were doing. There was a red flag when the state received 2 bids with such a discrepancy in bid amounts.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 09:59

**Author:** White, Genti <[whitgent@my.dom.edu](mailto:whitgent@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

Although I think that it would be more expensive to have the two systems running at the same time, I agree with you in that the phase in approach would allow students to become familiar with the new system and allow more time to transition to the new system smoothly.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 4

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 10:19

**Author:** Mugnolo, Michelle <[mugnrich@dom.edu](mailto:mugnrich@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

Sarah, I completely agree with you that the fault is in the hands of the state. The state is responsible for hiring a firm that did not have the experience or knowledge for the project at hand, which should have been somewhat obvious in the low-ball bid they offered the state. The state also took many shortcuts, which led to failures that the state had to deal with in the end. Like you said, the consulting firm is partly to blame because they knowingly took the job knowing they were not capable, but I still believe the main fault in this falls in the hands of the state of Maine.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 11:06

**Author:** Von Roenn, Erika Marie <[erikamarievr@msn.com](mailto:erikamarievr@msn.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

I agree completely that the State of Maine relied too heavily on another company instead of taking more responsibility on itself. The state should have worked more closely with the new system instead of assuming that all of their problems were instantly going to be solved with an advance in technology.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 6

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 11:11

**Author:** Von Roenn, Erika Marie <[erikamarievr@msn.com](mailto:erikamarievr@msn.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

I agree that using the phased approach is the best method in this case. I think Laura makes a good point about people being hard to retrain when being introduced to a new system like email. While some people have said that the phased approach would take longer than say the pilot strategy, I would think that working in stages would better benefit these specific people having trouble.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 14:40

**Author:** Poole, Merritt <[poolmerr@my.dom.edu](mailto:poolmerr@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

You have made a strong point at the end of your discussion point. The State of Maine was required to comply with the new HIPAA standards, and made the wrong decisions in order to meet this deadline. The root of the problem started with Maine, while the consulting company was simply fulfilling its agreed-upon contract. It was not going to deny the business, professing that they did not have much experience in successfully carrying out this task. The State of Maine itself made the decision to cut corners that cost them millions as a result.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 14:44

**Author:** Kleine, Todd Douglas <[tkleine@dom.edu](mailto:tkleine@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

I agree that the timeframe in which the RFP's were released for bids was too last minute to accommodate quality search for a provider. It seems as if the State of Maine either assumed ease in finding a consultant for the project or they were disorganized in the project management. From the looks of everything else, I'd assume the later.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 6

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 14:46

**Author:** Poole, Merritt <[poolmerr@my.dom.edu](mailto:poolmerr@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

I do not feel that the direct cutover strategy is appropriate in the presented context of a small school. Even though the Google email system has been tested out and deemed successful at other schools, the one slip up that decreases its reputation could occur at our small school. The new email system could also not coordinate with facets of our old system. The direct cutover strategy is simply too risky, as it does not allow any room for testing and gauging of initial reactions. Even though it would take a single day, recall the article we just read regarding the state of Maine. They wanted to save time and money, so they cut unnecessary corners...and suffered drastic consequences. Since communications is vital for every individual, whether student, faculty or staff, at a college, the direct cutover strategy just does not seem feasible.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 6

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 14:49

**Author:** Kleine, Todd Douglas <[tkleine@dom.edu](mailto:tkleine@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

Direct cutover approaches are very risky from a project management perspective. In many projects I've worked on, cutover seems to be the most desired approach. However, in execution, the right elements must be in perfect place to have such a strategy prove successful. Especially with technology (and in life

in general), the probability of a perfect execution is low.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 15:38

**Author:** Fredericks, Brian <[fredbria@my.dom.edu](mailto:fredbria@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

Just today, my company had an investor relations article released regarding the acquisition of a claims auditing system called ClaimsXten back in 2007. It speaks to the rollout schedule in 2009 and beyond. This will allow us to use a more standardized approach across the fifteen companies that participate under the WLP umbrella. Please see below.

## **The Launch of Standardized Claims Editing Aims to Save WellPoint Millions**

March 03, 2009

In 2007, in an effort to help achieve claims standardization across the enterprise and maintain cost of care savings, WellPoint signed a substantial contract with McKesson Health Solutions to purchase and implement ClaimsXten, an industry-leading automated claims auditing software program. Estimated to save WellPoint over one hundred million dollars over the next six years in claims editing, ClaimsXten has already been implemented in several WellPoint markets, with the full roll-out expected in late in 2010.

Once fully implemented, ClaimsXten will assist our efforts in WellPoint's enterprise-wide drive for consistent, standardized claims editing and bundling - a system of checks and balances in which claims are reviewed to ensure adherence to industry standards for coding. ClaimsXten will not only allow us to manage editing processes from a central location, help to save money, but is defensible and will be made transparent to providers.

"The implementation process has been on target and the money saving results is remarkable," says Bob McIntire, senior vice president, Provider Engagement and Contracting. "Once ClaimsXten is fully deployed, the average projected monthly savings for all WellPoint markets is estimated to be several million dollars per month."

As Provider Engagement and Contracting's most significant cost of care initiative, ClaimsXten will be fully operational in all WellPoint markets by the close of 2010. Currently, as of January 2009, ClaimsXten was fully implemented and operational in the New Hampshire, Maine, Connecticut and Georgia Blue Plans. New York will roll out the program in early April and by October 2009, California, Nevada, Colorado and UniCare will launch the program.

By providing a solution that enhances an enterprise-wide standardization of claims, we will not only be able to improve member and provider service through more consistent, efficient and flexible measures, but will be able to generate a significant cost of care savings across the enterprise.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 4

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 15:40

**Author:** Khan, Mujahed <[Khanmuja@my.dom.edu](mailto:Khanmuja@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

---

I think that politicians too often, waste time debating and criticizing current proposals rather than taking the initiative of supporting it or finding a better solution to the problem. The state of Maine probably experienced this issue when HIPPA was in its initial stages. Lawmakers took inaction while Medicaid members ultimately suffered the consequences.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 16:05

**Author:** Khan, Mujahed <[Khanmuja@my.dom.edu](mailto:Khanmuja@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

---

While I appreciate your concern for risk that the school may face if the e-mail system does not work properly, I still believe that the cutover strategy is the best option.

First, I think that the scenario needs to be put in perspective. The state of Maine provides Medicaid benefits to 260,000 residents, while the small school will be providing e-mail to only 2,000 students. A glitch in the Medicaid system is a major issue because it pertains to peoples health while e-mail is an important tool to a student's education it cannot be compared to the same degree.

Second, if the Google e-mail system did not function properly, the school does have other avenues of communicating important information with students. The university can send letters, communicate through professors, post notices around campus and more importantly the school can use a student's personal e-mail address, if listed.

Finally, it is important to understand that sometimes small institutions do not always have the funds necessary to tackle error-proof strategies but it is essential that they take risks in order to one day be successful.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 18:26

**Author:** Mather, Bonnie M <[bmather@dom.edu](mailto:bmather@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

---

The following article is a follow up to the article we read on the Microsoft vs Google competition for college e-mail programs. I thought it was interesting that Microsoft always seems to be playing catch-up.

[Hosted Microsoft Exchange on campus fuels Google vs. Microsoft fight](#) - by Colin Steele, News Writer, 28 May 2008, SearchITChannel.com

The hosted [Microsoft Exchange Labs](#) is now available through Microsoft's [Live@edu](#) program, expanding the [Google vs. Microsoft](#) battle on college campuses.

Microsoft said Tuesday that it is adding the hosted Microsoft Exchange Labs to Live@edu, its [online services](#) for colleges and universities. [Paul DeGroot, an analyst for Directions on Microsoft](#) in Kirkland, Wash., said the move is a direct response to Google, which has had success getting schools to dump Microsoft Exchange systems for Google Apps Education Edition. (Google Apps for Edu, as it's also known, features Gmail, Google Talk, Google Calendar and other tools.) "This is a very important long-term play," DeGroot said. "Microsoft has more to lose here." DeGroot noted that Microsoft may not gain financially by adding the hosted Microsoft Exchange Labs to Live@edu -- it may just be a way to keep colleges and universities from jumping ship to Google. The fact that Microsoft is still going forward with the strategy shows how seriously company executives take the Google vs. Microsoft showdown, he said. Microsoft's willingness to compete with Google suggests that they do see this as the future," he said. But Bruce Gabrielle, senior product manager for Live@edu, denied that the move was meant to escalate the Google vs. Microsoft battle. He pointed out that Live@edu debuted on campuses before Gmail and Google Apps.

"We're just paying attention to what users are asking for," he said. "Microsoft needs to make a decision. Are we an on-premise software company, or are we a software-plus-services company? We're a software-plus-services company, and we need to keep up with the industry trend." The Live@edu team will now turn its attention to the channel, where value-added resellers (VARs) and systems integrators (SIs) can help the hosted Microsoft Exchange Labs tie into schools' back-office [enterprise resource planning](#) (ERP) and student information systems, Gabrielle said. "Something we've been talking about a lot internally at Microsoft is, 'What is the partner role?'" Gabrielle said. "Partnering is the next big strategic move for us." Launched in 2005, Live@edu previously offered Hotmail inboxes for hosted email customers. Colleges and universities were looking for hosted email as more students abandoned their school-provided email addresses for other services that they could access from Web browsers and mobile devices, Gabrielle said. College students are "a whole new breed," he said. Tim Gilbert, chief marketing officer for Campus Management, a Microsoft partner in Boca Raton, Fla., agreed that higher education is a unique market. Unlike some other businesses and organizations, colleges and universities promote openness, collaboration and innovation -- and Live@edu services make it possible to do so, Gilbert said. "This announcement really strikes the final string on the chord that Microsoft gets it in terms of the spirit of higher education," he said. Hosted Microsoft Exchange Labs, now available through Live@edu, gives users up to 10 GB of inbox space and can handle attachments of up to 20 MB. Students and alumni can access their email, contacts and calendars through Outlook Web Access, Microsoft Office Outlook and Web-enabled mobile devices, Microsoft said. Additional features include calendar sharing, student directories, distribution lists and custom themes with school logos and branded email addresses.

Microsoft claims that about 2,000 colleges and universities in 86 different countries are Live@edu customers. Google boasts "thousands" of customers but did not provide a specific number.

[http://searchhitchannel.techtarget.com/news/article/0,289142,sid96\\_gci1315373,00.html](http://searchhitchannel.techtarget.com/news/article/0,289142,sid96_gci1315373,00.html)

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 6

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 19:03

**Author:** De Silva, Virangi <[virangi@hotmail.com](mailto:virangi@hotmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

Chantel, the mandatory information classes would be a good idea to learn about the new system. Also information classes will provide students, faculty, and staff a smooth transition to the new system minimizing the number of inquiries and phone calls to the IT department.

The main advantage in using the pilot study strategy is that once it is started working smoothly and successful in one department it can be implemented to the whole liberal arts college at once unlike the phased approach strategy. Being able to implement it to the whole college at once saves time and make convenient the whole conversion process.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 19:05

**Author:** De Silva, Virangi <[virangi@hotmail.com](mailto:virangi@hotmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

Todd, I agree with you, State of Maine was negligent to offer such a large and significant project to a company like CNSI that never used designing Medicaid claims systems before. When State of Maine received only two proposals they could have revised the Request for Proposal (RFP). Then they would have received more bids from companies who had worked on similar claims systems.

Further, State of Maine did not offer training for providers on the new system and also did not train the staff in order to handle the calls from providers with problems. To handle customer service calls from 7000 providers there were only 13 people on the staff.

Finally State of Maine not only missed the HIPAA deadline by 27 months but also had to spent more money unnecessarily on the new processing system.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 19:58

**Author:** Johnson, Clarence <[johnclar@my.dom.edu](mailto:johnclar@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

I agree that the state of Maine should have just updated their old mainframe instead of having CSNI create an entirely different system. This could have save them both time (delays they encountered) and money (over 30 million) spent for the project.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 20:01

**Author:** Johnson, Clarence <[johnclar@my.dom.edu](mailto:johnclar@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

The phased approach is the best conversion stage for the school. It allows you to implement the new system in steps instead of all at once.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 20:23

**Author:** Fredericks, Brian <[fredbria@my.dom.edu](mailto:fredbria@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

I think it's interesting that you took the perspective of doing the phased approach, but starting with the current users first and ending with new students. I can understand some of the advantages to this but think it might be difficult to first phase in a group (faculty and staff) that is accustomed to a different system, rather than new students.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 20:28

**Author:** Von Roenn, Erika Marie <[erikamarievr@msn.com](mailto:erikamarievr@msn.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

That's a good point...a red flag should have gone up when the state received two bids with such variety in amounts. If the state had just taken the time to overhaul the old system, they would have saved themselves \$30 million dollars and a lot of distress from overdue claims.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 21:04  
**Author:** Nowak, Robert J <[nowarobe@dom.edu](mailto:nowarobe@dom.edu)>  
**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

I think your answer to question number two was rather poor Mr. Fredericks. You should have picked the phased in approach not because everyone else picked it, but because it is the post appropriate answer in my opinion.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 4

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 21:08  
**Author:** Nowak, Robert J <[nowarobe@dom.edu](mailto:nowarobe@dom.edu)>  
**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

I agree with Mujahed when he commented on the fact that politicians spend too much time debating and criticizing current proposals rather than taking the initiative of supporting solutions to problems. Things could be implemented at a faster pace if they just did the research and make decisions based on that information.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 2

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 21:10  
**Author:** McCulloch, Ben <[bdmcculloch@gmail.com](mailto:bdmcculloch@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

Right. The consultant probably shouldn't have taken the contract, but the situation calls to the Harry Truman saying, "The buck stops here." Maine was ultimately responsible for the final outcome, regardless of what services the consulting firm delivered or not.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 21:17  
**Author:** Reyes, Paul Michael Jocson <[preyesnd@gmail.com](mailto:preyesnd@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

2 and 3.

A parallel strategy would be too expensive and time consuming for a small liberal arts college with a small study body and faculty staff.

A direct cutover strategy is a high risk and possibly high reward. If it is not successful, then it would be almost catastrophic in terms of a breakdown of communication between students and the faculty. They would have to resort to phone calls or bulletin messages in order to post announcements.

The phased approach and pilot study are more practical for this situation. Both are implemented over a period of time, and there is ample time to go over potential bugs. This would be best tested during the summer session, when both student and faculty population is low.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 21:26

**Author:** McCulloch, Ben <[bdmcculloch@gmail.com](mailto:bdmcculloch@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

Q1: Dominican is using the Pilot conversion strategy, by testing the email system with new student accounts, which also allows for current and past students to use their email accounts without any inconveniences.

Q2: I would phase the use of the new email in. The phasing strategy would allow me to convert accounts over a period of time that would allow for the IT department to correct any issues that arose, without the problems affecting the entire community at once.

Q3: I chose to phase the new email accounts in because I believe that it would be more productive and practical than any other options. A convenient byproduct of the organization being a college is that after graduation, many students stop using their school email addresses. This would allow the IT department to systematically switch the entire system to the new email, except for the alumnus, which could be converted over at the end with a much smaller impact.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 21:27

**Author:** Reyes, Paul Michael Jocson <[preyesnd@gmail.com](mailto:preyesnd@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

1 and 2.

The state of Maine's negligence is the cause for delay. They had more than enough time to request proposals. However, since they waited till the last minute, they only had 2 contractors to choose from, and neither were well qualified.

The state of Maine issued interim payments based on average claims, which led to an overpayment (and then recovery) of \$9MM. After CNSI recommended that providers re-enroll, the [Maine] department chose to transfer existing information from the older system. This led to an additional \$30MM loss.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 6

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 21:28

**Author:** McCulloch, Ben <[bdmcculloch@gmail.com](mailto:bdmcculloch@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

I agree Brian. I would think that it would be easiest to get new students accustomed to using the new email, which would basically remove the need to convert that group of students since they are starting fresh with the system.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 21:47

**Author:** Franch, Kimberly <[dalskimb@dom.edu](mailto:dalskimb@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

After reading many responses and sides to this controversy, I have to conclude that it is both the state's and CNSI's faults that this project did not work. I do not think that just one or the other can be blamed. While the state did a poor job of collecting bids and choosing a contractor, CNSI did an equally poor job with the execution of this project.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 21:48

**Author:** Franch, Kimberly <[dalskimb@dom.edu](mailto:dalskimb@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

I completely agree with Sean as to the phased approach (and it is also what I recommended). I also agree with his approach plans to first phase in the faculty, then the students.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 2

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 21:49

**Author:** Jackson, Laura <[ljackson@dom.edu](mailto:ljackson@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

I definitely see your point. It's the responsibility of the proposals to properly outline their financials. I think the dilemma is really a question of whether the firm's "newness" to the program and bad proposal or Maine's "settling" with too few bidders is the greater issue. Ultimately, trying to save money at the time of proposals did not take into account the millions lost by delays and bad management after the fact. I would be great to know how Maine's RfP compared to the requirements laid out by other states. I don't think outsourcing was a bad idea, just terribly executed.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 21:49

**Author:** Mather, Bonnie M <[bmather@dom.edu](mailto:bmather@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

The following letter dated April 4, 2002 was sent to all State Medicaid Directors offering assistance and providing documents to help them in the implementation of HIPAA. The letter was signed by the Director, Dennis G. Smith. Following the letter, I have inserted the website to view the documents, particularly the Risk Assessment Checklist. With information and assistance provided to all the states, it is even harder to understand why Maine suffered through the implementation of HIPAA.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES  
Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services  
7500 Security Boulevard, Mail Stop S2-26-12  
Baltimore, Maryland 21244-1850

Dear State Medicaid Director:

The purpose of this letter is to provide you with assistance in your on-going activities to implement the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act's (HIPAA) Administrative Simplification (A/S) provisions. Guidance on submitting a compliance plan to obtain a one-year delay in the compliance date until October 17, 2002, for the HIPAA Transaction Rule was sent in a separate letter (SMD #02-003) dated March 7, 2002.

Enclosed with this letter are two sets of documents. One is titled "Electronic Data Interchange Transaction: HIPAA Readiness Checklist." The other is a model Advance Planning Document (APD) designed to help expedite your requests for enhanced Federal financial assistance relative to HIPAA-related changes to your Medicaid Management Information System.

#### HIPAA READINESS CHECKLIST

This checklist was designed by experts to assist states in cataloguing the actions they have taken, and those they plan to take, to become HIPAA compliant. It provides a set of useful benchmarks that can help gauge the degree of progress you have made to date, and the activities still remaining to be undertaken or completed. This is a self-assessment tool designed specifically by and for state Medicaid agencies. Should anyone on your staff need assistance regarding its use, they should contact their respective regional office Medicaid systems lead or Henry Chao, here in Baltimore, at (410) 786-7811, [hchao@cms.hhs.gov](mailto:hchao@cms.hhs.gov).

#### MODEL ADVANCE PLANNING DOCUMENTS FOR HIPAA

Use of the enclosed model APD should significantly shorten the traditional APD process. Its use is completely voluntary but we believe it will help focus both of our efforts on the most important issues which need to be aired. It was designed with the help of state system staff who have had considerable experience in submitting APDs in the past, and we think this is a faster, better way to achieve mutually satisfactory results relative to systems changes needed under HIPAA.

In all, this package contains the following documents:

- Attachment A: An APD Guidance Document. This document provides details on the APD process, and appropriate sections of the regulations.
- Attachment B: Appropriate sections of Part 11 of the State Medicaid Manual (SMM) provide detailed information on allowable costs.
- Attachment C: Model HIPAA Planning APD
- Attachment D: Model HIPAA Implementation APD
- Attachment E: State Medicaid Director letter dated December 5, 1995 clarifies policy regarding sole-source procurements.

If your staff has any questions regarding the enclosed documentation, please have them contact your MMIS representative in your regional office, or Jason Goldwater of my staff, at (410) 786-0476.

<http://www.cms.hhs.gov/mmis/downloads/smd40402.pdf>

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 21:51

**Author:** Georgikos, Stavros <[SGEORGIKOS@LIVE.COM](mailto:SGEORGIKOS@LIVE.COM)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

You make a very valid argument. There were many outside factors that contributed to the failure of the medicaid information system. The consulting firm is not the only one to blame. The state of maine, as you have pointed out, played a major role in the downfall of the information systems.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 4

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 21:52

**Author:** Jearkjirm, Wannarat <[jeawann@dom.edu](mailto:jeawann@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

I like your idea about Pilot study. My answer was phrase in approach however after read your response I also think that the pilot study is also another good option.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 4

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 21:53

**Author:** Jackson, Laura <[ljackson@dom.edu](mailto:ljackson@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

Obviously, as the alum director, I LOVE the lifelong email option. I think truly being able to offer a program that to some extent "guarantees" less transition later is comforting to people and also best for the university in the long run...no need to worry about keeping up with growth, alum expectations, etc...when you can offer them a service that doesn't infringe on the university's resources for current students. It's transition now that offers less transition later, an important selling point!

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 6

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 21:55

**Author:** Jackson, Laura <[ljackson@dom.edu](mailto:ljackson@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

Bonnie, this is a great article! I had no idea how prevalent the use of microsoft and google web-based emails are in universities. So cool, and so much space!

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 21:56

**Author:** Georgikos, Stavros <[SGEORGIKOS@LIVE.COM](mailto:SGEORGIKOS@LIVE.COM)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

I agree. The phased approach strategy, as you have stated, is the best approach. Even though the parallel strategy would be a suitable strategy, the phased out strategy would be in the best interest of the student. Therefore, the phased out strategy would be in the best interest for Dominican to utilize.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 22:24

**Author:** Katris, Viki <[katrviki@my.dom.edu](mailto:katrviki@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

1. Which of the conversion strategies is Dominican using?
  - a. Dominican is using the pilot study strategy which introduces a new system to only the New Students of Dominican. If this works out, the new email system will be installed for Dominican's entire student population.
2. Background for Questions 2 and 3: Suppose you were in charge of Information Technology at a small liberal arts college with an enrollment of 2,000 students and a faculty and staff of 200. Currently the faculty and staff and students are using Microsoft Exchange. The college would like to outsource student email to greatly reduce the time and expense of owning and managing the Microsoft Exchange servers. You have decided to convert all students to Google email.

2 and 3 What conversion strategy will you use? And why?

I would most likely follow the phased approach strategy because it introduces the new system in stages. That way I might first start with new incoming students, move onto all undergraduate students, grad students, and eventually with faculty. Or perhaps I would start with the faculty first because they are less in number and then move onto the students at once since there are only 2,000. This would help introduce the new system to a select few, while slowly phasing out the old system.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 4

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 22:25

**Author:** Katris, Viki <[katrviki@my.dom.edu](mailto:katrviki@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

1.and 2. What caused the major delays on this project and the processing problems in the new system? Who is to blame for the problems with the project -- the State of Maine or the Consulting Company? Support your position.

- a. The initial problem was that shortly after it's rollout, the Maine Medicaid claims system was rejecting claims causing millions of dollars in claims to be held back. The deal called for CNSI to complete and deploy the new processing system by the HIPAA compliance deadline, and due to financial limitations and time restraints Maine hired CNSI, who had little experience with critical management guidelines and

they had never before designed a Medicaid claims system.

The president of CNSI even admitted that his company lacked the experience of working with Medicaid systems and admitted that they were a “no name company” who was merely trying to enter into claims processing systems management. Therefore, a source of delay was that of not being able to properly make judgments due to the lack of experience.

A second source of delay was that when CNSI planned the programming based on Java Platform Enterprise Edition, which was different from the old system’s code. This later caused additional delays because there was no backup or parallel system because the legacy code from the old system was incompatible with the new code numbers. Even further down the timeline, CNSI discovered programming and design problems in the system that limited the size of claim files to 1,000 lines of code and providers calling to complain were rarely able to get through.

Another delay was caused when the Medicaid claims system experts became available for CNSI’s aid, and CNSI’s team didn’t have the reprogram parts for the system. This wasted time, and even though the deadline was extended for another year, the team was preoccupied fixing errors and writing a new code to accommodate the Medicaid rules changes.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 23:38

**Author:** Kalkirtz, Jason <[kalkjaso@my.dom.edu](mailto:kalkjaso@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

Erica, your points are interesting about the state of Maine being the one to blame. I think that both the state of Maine and the consulting company had their faults. The state should have been more aware of their system problems (an outdated system) and implemented a strategy to fix it. They should have researched what the consulting company had to offer them and if their system was compatible to handling Medicaid claims. In the end, the new system ended up costing the state of Maine an additional \$30 million and still Maine was the only state that had not satisfied the HIPAA requirements.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 4

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 23:47

**Author:** Katris, Viki <[katrviki@my.dom.edu](mailto:katrviki@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

I believe it was more the state's fault than CNSI's because the state felt the pressure for the time restraint as well as the financial restraints and had an offer from Keane who had worked with similar systems, including Maine's Medicaid eligibility processing, but because they set their proposal at a higher price than CNSI, Maine chose one over the other. The state knew that CNSI lacked the knowledge and experience.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 4

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 23:52

**Author:** Kalkirtz, Jason <[kalkjaso@my.dom.edu](mailto:kalkjaso@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

I agree with Paul that the parallel approach is the best way to go with introducing the new system while still running the old system. Essentially running the two at the same time so that you can make sure to work out all the glitches in the new system and students and staff can still rely on the old system. The pilot approach is a good approach. You can introduce the new system to a specific department and eventually introduce the new system to the rest of the University.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 5

**Date:** Tue Mar 03 2009 23:56

**Author:** Katris, Viki <[katrviki@my.dom.edu](mailto:katrviki@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

Charles, I like your response in using the pilot approach, like Dominican is using now. I think it does make most sense, logically, to make sure the new email system works correctly before utilizing it on all the students. This would definitely prevent wasting time in the future if there were to be any problems while using the other approaches.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 4

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 06:58

**Author:** McCarthy, Sean <[mccasean@dom.edu](mailto:mccasean@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

That is great information. I am glad you found it.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 2

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 08:46

**Author:** Mugnolo, Michelle <[mugnrich@dom.edu](mailto:mugnrich@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

I agree that it is important that when evaluating bids from potential vendors that it is imperative to take into account a lot more than the final estimate cost. How did the company get to that final number? What did they take into consideration? And what did they potentially leave out either intentionally or by accident? Although the consulting firm is partly at fault, I still believe that the fault remains in the hands of the state of Maine, because they should have looked at the bigger picture and not just the final estimate. They had two bids on the project, and this one was significantly lower. That should have been a red flag to the state to look into why the bid was so low, or vice versa, why the other bid was so high.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 4

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 10:04

**Author:** Mather, Bonnie M <[bmather@dom.edu](mailto:bmather@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

Remove

In my initial response to the failure of the timely implementation of Maine's new Medicaid system, I mentioned the aspect of poor planning. According to this quote from Laudon & Laudon, they seem to agree:

"Without proper management, a systems development project takes longer to complete and most often exceeds the allocated budget. The resulting information system most likely is technically inferior and may not be able to demonstrate any benefits to the organization. Great ideas for systems often flounder on the rocks of implementation." (p.556)

The "scoring model" is another tool that would have served Maine well, especially after selecting a vendor with no Medicaid claims processing experience. Dick Thompson, the head of procurement for Maine said, "It was something we should have done from the start; have someone who knew the business working full-time on the project." (p.591) Experts who know the issues and technology are key when using the scoring model and Maine did not have enough "experts" involved to keep them on the right track.

Finally, one of the phrases that caught my eye in the implementation process was "user-designer communications gap." In my previous experience with implementing an insurance agency system, there was definitely a user-designer communications gap, although not to the extent where a lot of time and money was wasted. However, it did result in additional cost. In Maine's case, the gap seemed more like a chasm. With the lack of information and training to providers and staff, the suspended claims backed up, the complaints couldn't be responded to fast enough and the system overloaded. Table 14-4, p.574 illustrates the typical User-Designer Communications Gap.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 12:14

**Author:** Mather, Bonnie M <[bmather@dom.edu](mailto:bmather@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

Initially, when reading the background for question 2 & 3, the last line says "you have decided to convert all **students** to Google email." I mention this because there have been a lot of comments including faculty and staff in the conversion.

There was one comment regarding the conversion of faculty and staff first because they may need more training or attention because students have grown up with computers and adapt quicker. I take issue with this statement because it is stereotyping. I've used computers for at least the last 25 years and there are a lot of people in my age range that are computer savvy.

Finally, Todd, I like the idea of keeping the alumni involved and connected over their lifetime. They are a great asset to the University and should not be discounted. As an alum, I was grateful that I received communication from Dominican, but the electronic connection is great because you can do it from anywhere.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 2

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 13:33

**Author:** White, Genti <[whitgent@my.dom.edu](mailto:whitgent@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

I agree with your point that the state is responsible Medicaid program and they are ultimately the responsible party. I think you are right in that most health care providers that are affected by these problems are going to look to the state. Therefore, the state should have been more cautious and thorough in making its decisions.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 2

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 13:36

**Author:** White, Genti <[whitgent@my.dom.edu](mailto:whitgent@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

I agree with you that the phase in approach would work well for smaller colleges, especially those that do not have many resources or a huge budget.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 13:47

**Author:** Katris, Viki <[katrviki@my.dom.edu](mailto:katrviki@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

I agree with Virangi, that if there were to be any problems with the system it would be a wasted effort and require additional time and costs to correct the problems. I, too, believe this approach would be too risky.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 2

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 18:51

**Author:** Nowak, Robert J <[nowarobe@dom.edu](mailto:nowarobe@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

I agree that the state should be held liable if they chose to purchase a new CNSI instead of upgrading the old one knowing the CNSI lacked the knowledge and experience.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 2

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 18:53

**Author:** Nowak, Robert J <[nowarobe@dom.edu](mailto:nowarobe@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

I too like the idea of the pilot strategy for the same reason Jason mentioned. I think it would work well in any setting.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 2

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 19:49

**Author:** Franch, Kimberly <[dalskimb@dom.edu](mailto:dalskimb@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

I do agree with the viewpoint that CNSI should have done research on the industry and similar project in order to be better prepared. However, I would also consider this Maine's job to ask them how they knew they would be able to complete the project.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 2

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 20:01

**Author:** Franch, Kimberly <[dalskimb@dom.edu](mailto:dalskimb@dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

While I understand the basic premise behind using the Pilot strategy, I still side with the phased approach. I think it is more important to obtain the buy in of different departments or sections of the university one at a time, rather than the buy in of just the brand new students first.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 2

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 20:01

**Author:** Khan, Mujahed <[Khanmuja@my.dom.edu](mailto:Khanmuja@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

I agree that the state of Maine should have figured out a better way to handle the denied or suspended claims rather than paying too much in interim payments.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 22:33

**Author:** Georgikos, Stavros <[SGEORGIKOS@LIVE.COM](mailto:SGEORGIKOS@LIVE.COM)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

I agree. The state of Maine should have never hired a consulting firm that was incapable of handling a job of that magnitude. I also believe that a parallel strategy would have been a more fitting conversion method if utilized properly.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 2

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 22:39

**Author:** Georgikos, Stavros <[SGEORGIKOS@LIVE.COM](mailto:SGEORGIKOS@LIVE.COM)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

I do see what you mean regarding the pilot approach. You make a valid point. It is wise to check for any complications in the new email system before allowing the students to utilize it. This would assure that the e-mail system functions properly before any additional measures are taken.

[Reply](#)

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 3

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 22:56

**Author:** De Silva, Virangi <[virangi@hotmail.com](mailto:virangi@hotmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

I agree with you Laura. The CNSI is to be blamed for the problems such as higher rejecting rates with compared to the old system, for judging the medical rules and requirements irresponsibly without having proper input from medical experts which had caused them to reprogram parts of the system again later when medical experts are available, for using J2EE programming which was not compatible with the legacy code from the old system etc.

CNSI had no previous experience in designing Medicaid claims systems. Chatterjee, president of CNSI had admitted this and mentioned the CNSI as a “no-name company” that was trying to enter into the claims processing business. CNSI acted irresponsibly by accepting such a large and significant project without having any experience in the subject area.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 2

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 23:13

**Author:** Katris, Viki <[katrviki@my.dom.edu](mailto:katrviki@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

I agree with Kimberly. I believe that the state of Maine made the initial mistake of hiring an inexperienced team, while CNSI progressed the Medicaid system's failure even further through their lack of efforts, wasting time, and poor planning.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 2

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 23:13

**Author:** McCulloch, Ben <[bdmcculloch@gmail.com](mailto:bdmcculloch@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

Piza,

I do think that the state should have done a better job of getting a more prominent company to handle the project. However, I can also see the value in company that is as flexible as many smaller, less known companies are. Although it may seem counter intuitive, I think it may have helped to have two companies consult on the project, filling different roles. I think at times, its beneficial to have more than one consultant on a project, especially when a diversion of skills is present.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 2

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 23:15

**Author:** McCulloch, Ben <[bdmcculloch@gmail.com](mailto:bdmcculloch@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D1: Who is most at fault?

[Remove](#)

---

True, but what would have been the backlash if they had chosen to overhaul the system and it proved to be unsuccessful? I think the public outcry would have been worse in that situation.

[Reply](#)

---

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 2

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 23:18

**Author:** McCulloch, Ben <[bdmcculloch@gmail.com](mailto:bdmcculloch@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

[Remove](#)

---

I have to agree with you Merritt. I guess much of the selection depends upon how much a person values their organization's email capabilities. A company that used, but doesn't depend on email as much as a university may choose to do the direct method. However, in the case of Dominican, I feel that the direct method would be the wrong one to use as the risks and problems resulting in an error are too great.

Reply

**Forum:** Week 7 Discussions

Times Read: 2

**Date:** Wed Mar 04 2009 23:19

**Author:** Katris, Viki <[katrviki@my.dom.edu](mailto:katrviki@my.dom.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: W7D2: Conversion Strategies

Remove

Bonnie, I really liked this article. And I also like that Microsoft's strategy is unique and efficient, while Google is hesitant to even specify on its number of users. Interesting.

Reply

OK