*This is a brief summary of the call that took place on Friday on SMAA. It summarizes the discussion and lists outcomes. T**he next call is scheduled for 2pm on Thursday March 13.***

Call-In Number: 1-800-444-2801
Code: 4010981

Update:
DHCS will hold a stakeholders meeting on March 24th in Sacramento from 9:00am – 12:00pm At 1700 K Street, Sacramento, CA. Please submit agenda items through the SMAA mailbox at smaa@dhcs.ca.gov by March 19, 2014. There will also be a webinar for those who want to call in.

Please RSVP to the SMAA mailbox and indicate if you will attend in person, by webinar, or telephone conference line.

Letter from Senator Liu:

As part of our ongoing effort to increase transparency and responsiveness from DHCS regarding the SMAA program, Senator Carol Liu has sent DHCS a request for information to gain clarity on the scope of the SMAA program and the issues associated with the deferral and transition to RMTS.

Attached is the letter sent last week to DHCS. The agency has responded stating they believe they will be able to provide the requested information by March 14th.

We will share the response from DHCS with you to ensure that leaders and practitioners have as much information on this vital program as possible. Our intent is to clarify questions that have surrounded the program for some time. We will continue to work with supporters of school based health in order to address barriers and the impacts of the interruption in funding and the transition to the RMTS accountability process.

Input and communication with LEA's, local leaders and practitioners is vital to improving and sustaining school based health programs. Thank you again for your efforts to continue to bring vital services to California students.

The SMAA LEA work group will meet from 12:30 until 3pm on the 24th in Sacramento at 1415 L St suite 850.
If you would like to order lunch, please let us know. Attached is a menu.
Please let us know if there are items you would like to see on the agenda. The group is growing as more districts understand what the RTC will mean in terms of back claims and what the proposed RMTS will mean for districts moving forward.

Other Activities:
An Op Ed signed by Sacramento school district board members has been written and will be

submitted for publication in the Sacramento Bee. Similar Op Ed pieces can be developed for other areas of the state.

A meeting is scheduled for representatives of the work group with Superintendent of Schools Tom Torlakson for the week of the 17th.

A response to a letter from ACSA/CCSEA has been developed (see below)

CCSESA/ACSA Letter

It was discussed that ACSA and CCESA had met with the Health and Welfare Agency and had sent them a letter asking them to move forward with the RMTS and not ask for Interim Claiming so that a larger work group could develop an RMTS that districts could live with. The letter contained inaccuracies that the signers might not have been aware of.

Below is a response to the letter that you might want to share with your districts. A copy of the letter is attached.

> *Some of the information represented by CCSESA and ACSA in their letter to CHSS Secretary Diana Dooley dated March 4, 2014 regarding the loss of funding to LEAs if the DHCS RMTS Implementation Plan is delayed a year and an additional year of Interim Claiming is approved is inaccurate.*
>
> *Facts of the situation are these:*
>
> · *Interim Claiming has NO impact on RTC processes and payments for back years. All RTC claims will be processed as received. as the RTC is a separate issue from Interim Claiming.*
>
> · *1 year of Interim Claiming will result in one more year of back casting*
>
> · *FY13-14 plan already will do back casting*
>
> · *FY14-15 has no approved process yet for back casting; this needs to be negotiated*
>
> · *RTCs will continue to be processed and payments will continue*
>
> *Ongoing payment delays will be more attributable to the ongoing processing challenges between LECs/LGAs/DHCS (i.e., review and approvals; paper vs. Share Point) than with a one year delay in the RMTS rollout and an additional year of Interim Claiming.*

MAA Appeals Process
Comments are due Tuesday March --th. They must be sent to:

Attached are some changes in mock up form. Rob from Twin Rivers is working on this as well. Please send your own comments such as:

- There should be an Administrative Law Judge who makes the final determination
- The appeals process does not address how the LEAs appeal decisions of their LEC/LGA or the state. The way it is written, it is for the LECs/LGAs to appeal but does not deal with redress for an LEA. Yet, the LEA is the one who is fiscally responsible. What is the process for an LEA to appeal the decision of the LEC or LGA?

- Why would a LEC? LGA initiate an appeal if they are the ones who disagree with the LEA?
- There is no timeline for the appeal
- There is no requirement for a written explanation for a denial. This should be added

Rob Roach's Comments:

Much of the DHCS's draft is establishing the LEC's and LGA's authority over the program. Since the issue at hand is the appeals process I left that part alone and concentrated on the actual appeal process.

I struck out the DHCS's current appeal language and to make things easier and more recognizable for the DHCS I used the already existing appeals process from the LEA Medi-Cal Direct Billing Option's Cost and Reimbursement Comparison Schedule (CRCS) process. My rational is that if we are going through an audit or adjustment we've already gone through the normal procedure of a review of statutes and exit conference, what we need is Mediation/Administrative Law Judge appeal process. This is especially true since the DHCS readily admits that they have been neglected their role of oversight in the MAA Program and in all likelihood their staff has little or no program knowledge; having an impartial party mediate issues and if that does not work then the option of having a Administrative Law Judge review the matter just makes sense to me.

Planning for the March 24th Meeting
Another planning meeting is scheduled for the 13th at 2pm (see above)

Comments on the Latest Guidance from DHCS
The latest guidance clarifies that the due date is April 30th to DHCS. However, some of the LECs are requiring all documents be in by March 30th.

There was a discussion of what is actually occurring in the field. Districts are being told for example to remove all classroom teachers from the claims. if not they won't sign off and send the claims forward. However the role of the LECs is to review, not approve the claims. Districts are finding their claimed amount cut in half even before the claims are sent to DHCS. Some are being discouraged to send in justification since it has been stated this will slow the process. This is not true. Districts are free to submit justifications. There is still a problem in San Bernardino where the LGA is refusing to accept justifications. DHCS appears to be trying to provide some guidance but there are pressures on the LEAs to comply with more rigid guidelines set by individual LECs.

Response to the LEC newsletter after latest guidance
The latest LEC newsletter states that most districts accept what the LECs are doing but LAUSD and Sacramento are leading the complaints and causing trouble. It was felt that it was important for DHCS to hear from as many districts as possible that there was more general discontent. Many districts are resigned to following their LECs because they don't know there is an alternative. It was felt that this group needs to let other districts know that they do have a voice. Over 55 districts have contacted the SMAA LEA Work group to express concerns about the RTC and the proposed RMTS. Districts need to use the SMAA mailbox at: smaa@dhcs.ca.gov to express concerns and to also let the LEC know if you do not agree with their plan to move forward. Contact them at ----------

Please send us any stories you might have about what is actually occurring in the field, the percentage your claimed amount has dropped, etc so we can share with DHCS. You can leave off your district name if you don't feel comfortable.