NEXT MEETING: Monday September 8th 2014 @ TIME 1:30pm

School districts from across the state were part of the meeting. Below are minutes. Pass these on and let others know they can join in the calls. New Conference call number is:

Report from Stakeholders Group Conference Call on 8/26

The stakeholders group consisting of DHCS, CDE, CSBA, ACSA, CTA, CCESA, LEC and LGA representatives and representing the LEAs, Sherry Purcell(LAUSD), Cathy Bennett(Sac City) and Tanya Perry (Small schools and Bear Valley Unified) held a conference call on August 26 to discuss what to do about 14/15 claiming. The RMTS program will not begin until January 2015. The following suggestion was offered by the LEAs and accepted by the group:

An Alternate Suggestion for 14/15 Q1 & Q2 back-casting:

- NO training required for Q1 & Q2 (LGA note: participant trainings are taken care of at the time a participant logs in to complete their RMTS moment)
- NO worker log (LGA note: this would run counter to the new approved methodology)
  - FY 14/15 Q1 averaged (using 3 quarters of data in 13/14)
  - LEAs to develop TSP list for 14/15 Q2 (and have lists approved)
  - Use the Q3 (LGA note: and/or Q4 RMTS percentage results {averaged Q3 & Q4 MAA time results if using two quarters} and apply to Q2 list and costs)

These questions were raised on the phone call and sent on to DHCS to answer:

- If CMS approves our suggested back-casting …
  - What is the timeline/due date for LEAs to submit their TSP list (for costs) for Quarter 2?
    - Will DHCS write a PPL regarding this – since the manual indicates deadlines for TSPs?
  - For FY 14/15 Quarter 1, if the LEA did not participate in SMAA FY 13/14, please confirm that they will not be able to invoice for first quarter.

RMTS Timeline

The timeline and minutes from the last meeting were attached to the LEA Workgroup meeting notice. Feedback was asked for from the group

DHCS originally wanted a turnaround time for feedback by this past Tuesday, Aug 27th but stakeholder’s group said they would need at least 2 weeks to provide meaningful feedback. Michelle Kristoff agreed to hold off on discussion. She will be on vacation for two weeks starting 8/29. Please review the timeline and give us feedback so we can relay possible changes to DHCS by September 5th
During the stakeholders meeting it was pointed out that there has been no consistency with timeline so we welcome something coming out from DHCS. However, LECs are already implementing changes without giving districts time to develop participant lists. For example Region 10 participant list is due 9/12/14. We requested that DHCS post on their website information that the program start date has changed and inform LECs that their timeline for participant lists is not in sync with the new changes.

**Region IX Meeting in San Francisco**

- Participants included: NEA by phone from Washington DC, CTA, CMS in person and by phone to Baltimore, DHCS by phone, and HHS region IX acting director. Estelle Lemieux from CTA and Hellan Roth Dowden attended in person
- Brian Berdulis from the financial management group of CMS- Center for Medicaid and CHIP Services in Baltimore discussed issues since 2003 with California’s program. He said billing had increased from $323 million in 2010 to $508 million in 2011. It was pointed out that this was the time when the recession hit California and that the number of Medi-Cal eligible children increased. It was pointed out by CTA that during the same time period of concern from 2003 on, the number of uninsured children had decreased from nearly 23% down to 5% of those eligible but not enrolled in medi-cal. Schools were second only to counties where outreach and enrollment occurred. California schools and DHCS should be rewarded for successful outcomes, not penalized by deferral that impacts all districts where there might have been issues with few claims. Overall, this was a huge success and in line with the goals of the Affordable Care Act. Further, children with IEPs and special needs had less ability to access services, so schools needed to play a larger part. The issue with the use of teachers was raised and it was pointed out that many of the personnel who would do referrals such as counselors and nurses had been laid off due to a decrease in school funding by nearly $20 billion over these five years. We also brought up the community college issue and the great work financial counselors were doing to enroll students when they applied for financial aid. Since they weren’t on the list of providers, their claims were being denied even though they were carrying out the purpose of the program. We asked for an immediate resolution to California’s issues without additional requests for justification and pointed out that it was unfair to school districts to change the rules of the program mid-course. Tim Hill who heads the Financial Management Group for CMS said he would get back to us. We requested an answer in writing to the points that need resolution (see attached). HHS has also said they would like us to bring representatives from several school districts to San Francisco to discuss with the regional CMS and HHS staff our success in the schools.

**Meeting with CDE and DHCS on 8/27**

Jeremy Ford from Oakland and Sue Vang (CDE) attended a meeting requested by DHCS of CDE to better understand schools. Written materials were given to DHCS by CDE.

- Purpose: Involve CDE and go over how schools operate in general
- DHCS seemed to be confused and want an ability to use specific job titles instead of realizing that many job titles vary throughout the schools
- They asked very general questions related to education- for example why are school counselors involved in MAA?
- It was felt that it was positive that DHCS was asking for help but the level of their understanding clearly pointed to the problems at hand

It was announced that Jen Brooks will be taking another job at DHCS and that John Mendoza will assume the responsibilities that Jen had previously for the moment. Michelle and Tony will report directly to him.