

NEXT MEETING: June 16th, 2014 at 11:00am. Call in number: 1-800-444-2801; Code: 4010981

Districts and Groups in Attendance:

Sherry Coburn – San Joaquin COE	Cathy Bennett – Sac City USD	Leticia Garcia – Riverside COE
Karen Cloutman – San Diego USD	Sherry Purcell – Los Angeles USD	Melissa Lovick – Downey USD
Tony Carillo – Palm Springs USD	Jeremy Ford – Oakland USD	Vina Guzman and Maria Thomas– CSBA
Dawn Bray – Beaumont USD	Lydia Bourne – CSNO	Donna Ross – Oceanside USD
Christine Wilhite – Butte COE	Rob Roach – Twin Rivers USD	Margarita Bobe – Los Angeles USD
Tracy Cole – Natomas USD	Tanya Perry – Bear Valley USD	
Carol Keyes – Palm Springs USD	Janice DiCroce – San Diego COE	

School District Updates

- Melissa Lovick began the conversation by discussing that she received a letter from her LEC (region 11) that stated they would take care of all of Downey’s needs for their RMTS and were sending out a contract for all LEAs in Region 11 LEC to sign.
- Melissa declined, stating that she does not agree with the “one stop shopping” method offered by Region 11; She asked that Downey USD have a contract with Region 11 LEC that only provided RMTS services that were required in the State RMTS draft plan.
- Region 11 LEC coordinator said that he would contact Business Advisory services at the LEC and notify them of the tiered type of contract requested by Downey USD. She has not heard back from the Region 11 LEC stating that they would not be agreeable to this type of contract.
- Melissa also pointed out that the email from Region 11 stated that the vendor rates would be cost effective, but did not discuss specific pricing.

Update from LEC Meeting on 6/5/14

- DHCS attended this meeting with the LGA co-chairs.
- It was stated that Jen Brooks will be out of the office for the month of June and Carol Cain-Smith has retired.
- Most points on agenda received a “no update” response from Michelle Kristoff at DHCS
- Michelle Kristoff stated that ‘the plan to move RMTS forward is in the Governor’s office. Once this is approved, it will be sent to CMS’
- 100 RTC claims have been reviewed; all were from Kern County (this was noted in LEC mins for April meeting)

- DHCS said that CMS would be coming that afternoon in to review the next round of RTC's; appx 100 more
- This group noted -At this pace, it would take 6 ½ years to process all RTC's
- The September deadline DHCS set to finish processing all RTC has been moved to October
- Michelle Kristoff was unsure if RTC status letters to LGA/LECs (whether claims were approved or denied) have been sent out
- Kern County LEC representative confirmed receiving a 'small check'
- Tony Teresi from DHCS provided the LECs with four RTC samples, 2 approved and 2 conditionally denied. He did not provide handouts or the samples in writing.
- It was noted that the samples were such a small representation of the majority of invoices. Very small claiming units. One sample of approved and conditionally denied was based on all 4 quarter invoices were sent as a package- and 2nd quarter had 8 clerical participants, when quarter 3 & 4 only had 3 clerical participants 'doing the job' - therefore quarter 2 was conditionally denied asking them to reduce the clerical to 3, since that's all it took to 'do the job' in quarter 3 & 4. LEC co-chair stated to the group – just don't submit all of your quarters together. Tony agreed when invoices are submitted separately, they are reviewed separately.
- Another example of a conditionally denied invoice included a school counselor, yet the invoice did not indicate the school counselor was 'credentialed'. Note- DHCS does not understand, schools cannot hire 'non-credentialed school counselors' there is no such thing.
- An example of an approved RTC was from a small school district of 300 students with only one MAA participant with a code 8 percent over the benchmark at 15%. DHCS felt this was reasonable and necessary, with only one person 'doing the job'.

Meeting with Diana Dooley/Update on RTC & RMTS

Attendees: Diana Dooley- CHHS, Karen Stapf Walters – SBE, Toby Douglas- DHCS, Mari Cantwell - DHCS, ACSA, CCSESA, CSBA, CTA & CDE

- Dooley was troubled by quality of RTCs that had been received by the state; unsure how CMS planned to respond to these issues.
- Felt claiming units are not meeting the minimum threshold.
- CDE brought up that there were no written examples of what should have been written in the justifications for districts to use. DHCS said if they provided them, they were afraid they would have been used as a "cookbook" for claims so they didn't provide anything.
- Dooley thought the request for examples were reasonable and asked DHCS to prepare and give to group. CCSESA took responsibility for distributing to the group.
- Dooley feels that the drafted plan to roll out on July 1st is a good faith gesture to CMS. Otherwise it would look like CA was not on board w/the RMTS methodology.
- She also feels that asking for 50-80% of the monies is a bit high; would opt to ask for 30-40%; but there is no guarantee that CMS will give anything.
- It was brought up that LEAs would still have all the liability even though the LECs and LGAs were taking over the program. She thought this was a good point. They should discuss more shared liability at the LEC/LGA level as part of the new plan.

- CDE offered to assist DHCS on RTC processing (multiple times). DHCS has declined stating they have 15 people working on it, but appreciate their offer. A question was asked if these were 15 volunteers or actual staff and it Toby Douglas (DHCS) would not verify.
- DHCS was unable to answer how they would catch up on processing RTC's.
- DHCS was overall unable to answer specific, pointed questions regarding their efforts.
- CMS claims CA has not made a formal request for interim claiming as per Marilyn Tavenner's office. This was told to congressional staff. Response from CHHS is it was an informal verbal request, not in writing.
- CHHS stated that CMS is concerned about program integrity.
- ACSA asked if a regulatory process could be implemented providing oversight for SMAA (involving stakeholder group's participation). Secty. Dooley did not respond favorably to this idea, she said we don't need more regulation.
- CHHS stated federal money coming in is a priority.
- School organizations at the meeting said they simply want choice and flexibility.
- Toby Douglas said the current plan was on the website- it isn't. He said DHCS would post it soon. No timeline was given.
- A comment was made about SMAA reimbursements being "unrestricted funds" and districts utilize them in many different ways to actively run their MAA programs. DHCS – Jen Brooks has mentioned on several occasions that MAA funding should not be used for salaries or staffing of SMAA, as a result Toby Douglas (DHCS) said that he will make sure Jen understands that unrestricted funding can be used in this manner.

Discussion about what will happen next:

- Question: What kind of contract will be written if there is only one vendor? Concerns/rules for a sole-source contract should be established.
- Question: What happens when the software chosen doesn't work with all school districts? There is no other option...
- A training is planned for August/September with staff and the program would begin in October 2014. Several pointed out this is too late. There needs to be time to:
 - o Building Participant Lists /Cost Pool: Usually school districts will begin looking at this at the end of the school year and then complete it when school starts again to account for new employees, those who have retired, resigned, etc. Errors in establishing the Participant Lists /Cost Pool will negatively impact the error margin for the time survey.
 - o Define each participant's daily work schedule in order to determine moments available for random selection. Errors in work schedule rules also negatively impact the error margin.
 - o LEC's will "help", however, school districts/LEA's are the only ones able to generate the specific information needed
 - o Consortium: if one LEA does not pull weight on all of these components of the time survey, the reimbursement to all LEAs in the consortium will be impacted.

SMAA/LEA Workgroup Call – June 9th, 2014 at 11:00am

- DHCS had stated a concern that if districts were allowed to do their own coding they may commit fraud.
 - o Districts have been doing what they were told based on the guidelines; the guidelines were changed in the middle of it. **This is not fraud.**
- DHCS website issues: a login is all of a sudden required to access stakeholder information under their SMAA program page. Hellan will follow up with DHCS/CHHS on this. (see below)
- This is the link to the website. When you try this link, you can enter the website without the dialog box coming up. Note that under “what’s new!” the last program update is dated April 24th 2014
- <http://www.dhcs.ca.gov/provgovpart/Pages/ParticipantUniverse.aspx>
- And for your edification, DHCS has put on YouTube the audio from the two stakeholders meetings:
- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tpAHxUjgUoY>
- http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2_LVCf6AZEE

Next Meeting – June 16th at 11:00am