

NEXT CALL: Monday, December 15th at 1:30 PM

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. Conference call number is: 1-800-914-8405; code is: 1785191#.

Update on Deferral Issues

- I. Review of the 6 back casting proposals (These can be found at www.teachersforhealthykids.org → SMAA/LEA Workgroup → Webinar Materials)
 - a. All proposals have a common theme: using RMTS results and applying them to old invoices
 - b. The state has not run any numbers and can't provide data to use for the simulations
 - i. They have gathered proposals options but do not know what the result in payments would be. CTA has agreed to run simulations. DHCS has agreed to a work group hosted by CDE that will look at the proposals for the settlement agreement
- II. Back casting Proposals
 - a. Proposal #1 uses a high number as time spent on SMAA i.e. 11.36%. Range from other states is 1.36 to 11.36%
 - b. Proposal #2 depends on LAUSD data. CTA has agreed to run simulations for the proposals.
 - c. Proposal #3 → needs assessment proposal. This will be written out by LEA workgroup We are trying to come up with a plan that does not involves waiting until 2018 for funds to be released and looks at outliers
 - d. Proposal #4 → Tanya (Bear Valley) is working on proposal #4 to use data and determine if districts are within the standard deviation, and what the outliers will look like
 - e. Flaw in proposal #5
 - i. Could have a negative impact due to small percentages
 - f. Flaw in proposal #6
 - i. Describes back casting but does not use any new data
- III. Question: has your district received a check yet?
 - i. No answer from group

RMTS – Report on DHCS Discussions

- I. Time table
 - a. According to the stakeholders call on Monday, December 8th – all TSP lists should be reviewed by Friday, December 12th
 - b. If the wrong positions are included in the pool and they are called for moments, those moments would be considered invalid

- i. Tony Teresi (DHCS) said that those moments would either be placed in the un-billable category or invalid category
 - 1. There was concern that this was not correct information and these moments should not be placed in an un-billable category
 - c. If the program is to start at the beginning of 2015, then notifications of the moments requested would have taken place during winter break
 - i. How can moments be tracked if schools are not in session?
 - d. Additionally, come January 5th, 2015, some school districts will not be back in session
 - i. Those who are back in session will be spending time checking emails and may not understand the need to respond
 - e. Most LEAs are **not prepared** for RMTS to begin on January 5th, 2015
 - f. TSP lists have not been uploaded to the PCG website yet
 - g. One district reported not signing the LEC contract because their CFO won't sign anything that does not have any monetary amounts listed
 - h. LEAs don't have a contact person at PCG
 - i. They are being instructed to go through their LECs/LGAs
 - 1. When doing so, the LECs/LGAs respond that they are not the software vendor and can't provide answers
 - i. One district reported asking PCG a clarifying question
 - i. PCG responded that as they are the software company they don't have the answer, and to ask their LEC/LGA
 - ii. LEC/LGA responded that they are not an education organization and they had 'no idea'
 - j. MAA coordinator training slides should be posted on the DHCS website this week
 - k. Question: have any LEA coordinators provided TSP training for their employees?
 - i. Many of the group responded yes, but they are receiving questions that they don't have answers to
 - l. Comments from group are that the slides presented by SMAA/LEA workgroup at workshops/webinar were more helpful than the slides used during PCG training
 - m. Comments from are that their biggest apprehension is regarding the TSP lists
 - i. Are they correct?
 - ii. Have the lists been certified?
 - iii. When will they find out?
 - n. One of the workgroup's goals is to obtain reasons why Quarter 1 should not count
 - i. TSP issues
 - ii. Contracts have not been signed
- II. Maria with CBSA had a meeting with DHCS
 - i. ACSA, CSBA & DHCS were in attendance. CASBO was to attend but couldn't
 - ii. Purpose of the meeting: to clarify DHCS' role in oversight
 - 1. Their response is they don't have a role in oversight; only to review the contracts between the LEC/LGA and PCG not the LEC/LGA and the LEA

- b. There are many discrepancies in the contracts that have been sent to LEAs from LECs/LGAs
 - i. Contracts range from 1-3 years
 - ii. Contracts don't provide estimated costs
 - iii. Contracts give more authority to the LECs than what CA state law dictates
 - c. DHCS stated they will only provide oversight if something goes against the manual and they are not required to approve any contracts
 - d. Question was asked if DHCS keeping track of which districts have dropped out of the MAA program
 - i. Their response was that if districts are dropping out it is unfortunate, and they are hoping they don't
 - ii. They don't have record of which districts have dropped out of the program
 - e. Two districts received word that a person from their TSP lists were emailed and selected for a moment and to verify contact information
 - i. This was not sent to anyone else in the district
 - 1. Why isn't everyone being notified?
 - 2. There is no uniformity occurring in this program
 - f. Reports state that testing of the program will occur on 12/22
 - i. How can testing occur if districts won't be in session?
 - g. LEAs want the RMTS program to work – they are not trying to hinder the program
 - i. They are trying to provide a say in how it works due to the fact that it effects them directly
- III. Webinar Poll Results
- a. 53 individuals in attendance via computer or phone
 - b. Has your district submitted their TSP list?
 - i. Yes: 29
 - ii. No: 1
 - iii. No Response: 23
 - c. Has your district received a contract?
 - i. Yes: 21
 - ii. No: 12
 - iii. No Response: 20
 - d. If your district received a contract, has it been signed?
 - i. Yes: 5
 - ii. No: 11
 - iii. No Contract Received: 16
 - iv. No Response: 21
 - e. Is your district partnered with a LEC or LGA?
 - i. LEC: 18
 - ii. LGA: 15
 - iii. No Response: 20
 - f. Rate this webinar 1 (low) – 5 (high)

SMAA/LEA Workgroup: Minutes from call – 12/8/2014

- i. 1: 0
- ii. 2: 0
- iii. 3: 3
- iv. 4: 14
- v. 5: 13
- vi. No Response: 23
- g. Would you attend a webinar on this topic or similar topics again?
 - i. Yes: 29
 - ii. No: 0
 - iii. No Response: 24

NEXT MEETING: 12/15/2014 @ 1:30 PM