

The coding decision card

An option you have been arguing about — the boxes first, the money second.

THE CONCEPT Feasible set — Before optimising anything, establish which options legitimately exist.

Read the lesson: pmhnpmba.com/fellowship/90833

COMPOSITE · 80 VISITS · ONE MONTH

A RULE IS NOT A LEVER

BOX 1

SEPARATE THERAPY HAPPENED?

BOX 2

16 MINUTES OR MORE?

BOX 3

IN THE NOTE?

ANY NO

→ OFF THE TABLE

The worked composite from the lesson. Yours goes in the blanks.

THE OPTION

What it is

A code, a service line, a new offering

What you believe it adds per visit

\$

Visits a week it could apply to

BEFORE THE MONEY — THE BOXES

- ☐ The service is actually performed, and it is distinct from the visit it sits beside.
- ☐ The time is documented, separately, and the note says what was done in it.
- ☐ It is inside your licence, your training, and your scope in this state.
- ☐ The contract you are actually under recognises it — you have read that, not been told it.
- ☐ The note would survive being read by someone who was not there.

One box unticked and the option is not in your feasible set. There is nothing to price. Optimising an infeasible option is the most expensive kind of arithmetic there is.

ONLY IF EVERY BOX IS TICKED

Added per visit

\$

Eligible visits a week

×

Added, a week

= \$

Minutes added per visit

Minutes a week

× eligible visits

×

Hours a week

÷ 60

÷

Your real hourly

From sheet 8

× \$

The hours, priced

= \$

NET, A WEEK

= \$

A negative net is a finding, not a failure. It is the week you stopped arguing about the code.

THE MONDAY RULE

Pull ten recent charts — the last ten, not the best ten. Three columns: did a separate therapy service happen; how many minutes, therapy only; is it in the note. Any no, that chart is a no. Count the yeses — that is your real number, not the thread's. If you did it and it is not in the note, that is a documentation problem, and that one you can fix. If you did not do it, that is not a problem. That is a fact.