

**Yolo County Office of Education
1280 Santa Anita Court, Suite 100
Woodland CA 95776**

**LEC Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
October 2, 2014**

LEC Coordinator/Representative Attendees:

Randy Jones, Glenn County Office of Education - Region 2
Marjorie Rollins, Sutter County Superintendent of Schools, **Co-Chair** - Region 3
Michelle Cowart, Contra Costa County Office of Education - Region 4
Monica Morgan, Santa Cruz County Office of Education - Region 5
Janice Holden, Stanislaus County Office of Education - Region 6
Susan Ellyson, Madera County Office of Education - Region 7
Ken Gragg, Kern County Superintendent of Schools - Region 8
Margaret Roux, Kern County Superintendent of Schools - Region 8
Rosalee Hormuth, Orange County Department of Education - Region 9
Andrea Tennyson, San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools - Region 10
Octavio Castelo, Los Angeles County Office of Education **Co-Chair** - Region 11

Other Attendees:

Michelle Kristoff, Department of Health Care Services (DHCS)
Tony Teresi, Department of Health Care Services (DHCS)
Bruce Lee, Department of Finance (DOF)
Bill Cornelius, Sutter County Superintendent of Schools
Janice DiCroce, San Diego County LGA

Absent:

Sharon Battaglia, Sonoma County Office of Education - Region 1
Phillip Downing, Los Angeles County Office of Education - Region 11

1.0 Introductions

Each individual stated his/her name and agency affiliation.

2.0 Additions to the Agenda

- Item #4.4.4 was added to discuss the PCG (Public Consulting Group) TSP (Time Survey participant) template and employee identification numbers.
- Item #7.9 was added to discuss regional PCG RMTS (Random Moment Time Study) software training.

3.0 Approval of Minutes

The August 7, 2014 LEC Advisory Committee meeting minutes were approved.

4.0 Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) and Co-Chairs Report

4.1 DHCS Update

4.1.1 CMS (Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services) Financial Management Review (FMR) Report

Chief Michelle Kristoff reported that the FMR has been placed on the back burner by DHCS due to time constraints around the deferral process and the RMTS implementation. Chief Michelle Kristoff said she would check with DHCS legal to see if the FMR report could be released or posted to the DHCS website.

4.1.2 OIG (Office of Inspector General)

No information to report regarding OIG audits.

4.2 DHCS Meeting with LEC LGA Coordinators and Committees

4.2.1 Any changes on how DHCS will be communicating with contractors?

- DHCS Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that DHCS would continue to attend LEC Advisory Committee meetings.
- The LEC Co-Chairs asked DHCS if they would consider attending a LEC Advisory Committee meeting if it were scheduled in Southern California. Chief Michelle Kristoff responded that she could not say for certain that DHCS staff would be allowed to travel (to Southern California) for a LEC Advisory meeting, but staff could likely attend via webinar or video conference.

4.2.2 RMTS Collaborative/Advisory Workgroup – Is the Advisory Workgroup going to continue to meet? Is there still a stated interest from the parties involved?

Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that DHCS staff would standardize Advisory Workgroup meeting minutes and would continue to reach out to Advisory Workgroup members to determine the need for future meetings.

4.2.3 Stakeholders meetings? Will these meetings continue?

- DHCS Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that two stakeholder forum meetings were held in the past and DHCS would be discussing the need for and/or the benefits of additional stakeholder forums.

- The committee discussed how the California Department of Education (CDE) wanted to be involved in the SMAA (School-based Medi-Cal Administrative Activities) program at one point but do not seem to be involved any longer. Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that she met with CDE staff as a way of providing DHCS staff with general information about the educational environment. CDE was helpful in providing information to DHCS that allowed staff to better understand the job title and job category (RTC) justifications they were seeing from SMAA claiming units. Chief Michelle Kristoff further stated that should DHCS experience similar problems with job category equivalency lists, she would not hesitate to meet with CDE again.
- Superintendent Bill Cornelius asked Chief Michelle Kristoff if DHCS had heard about potential legislation that would change or modify the current SMAA Program. Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that she had not heard of any potential legislation.

4.3 LEC and PCG Contracts – CMS/DHCS Review and Feedback

DHCS and CMS are currently reviewing boilerplate PCG/LEC contracts. LECs should submit their final PCG/LEC contract to DHCS for review. DHCS and CMS will determine whether or not CMS must review each LEC/PCG contract.

4.4 RMTS Implementation

4.4.1 Coder Training – Scheduled?

Chief Tony Teresi stated that coder training was being finalized and could be scheduled as early as November 3, 2014. Chief Teresi would notify LECs/LGAs of the final training date/time/location. CMS must review and approve the DHCS coder training before it is presented. All LEC/LGA coders will be trained.

4.4.2 Revised Timeline for Implementation? (Has DHCS received additional adjustments to the RMTS timeline that will be implemented?)

- Chief Tony Teresi stated that DHCS would be flexible and make exceptions during the initial RMTS implementation. A revised timeline would be posted on the DHCS website soon.
- DHCS reminded the LEC Advisory Committee that all time survey participant lists must be reviewed by DHCS and each LEC/LGA must maintain their own equivalency list of job titles and job categories. The equivalency lists would be reviewed by DHCS and CMS. DHCS is working on creating a form to use for equivalency lists and subsequent justifications of positions.
- DHCS discussed the need for justification for all job titles that are not on the “approved positions” list and how LEAs would be required to prepare supporting documentation and justification. The LEC Advisory Committee reminded DHCS that if justification were necessary for every position not listed on the “approved positions” list, there would be a lot of “canned” justification provided, as many positions in education have similar job titles and perform similar duties.
- DHCS reminded the LEC Advisory Committee that each LEC/LGA must

have a paper moment (RMTS) process in place in the event of an audit. A committee member asked DHCS to confirm that a paper moment process would not be required if the LEC/LGA had no paper moment participants. Chief Tony Teresi stated that if the LEC/LGA does not paper moment participants, then there would be no need for a paper moment process.

4.4.3 Status of San Diego LGAs RFP

Nothing to report

4.4.4 PCG TSP Template

A committee member stated that according to the draft RMTS plan, employee identification numbers were required as part of the time survey participant roster and this was proving to be difficult for school districts. The employee identification field is not a software requirement; so many LEAs are leaving this field blank on the TSP list. Chief Tony Teresi stated that DHCS would provide clarification on employee identification number requirements and the next posting of the manual would reflect this clarification.

4.5 Reasonableness Test Criteria (RTC)

4.5.1 New Instructions Regarding Payment of Prior Claims – (when will this be posted?)

DHCS anticipates that information regarding prior claims will be posted on the website soon.

4.5.2 Has DHCS met with CMS to discuss the concerns stakeholders raised on the 9/17/14 conference call? If so, what was the outcome of the discussion?

DHCS discussed concerns brought up at the September 17th conference call (between DHCS & SMAA stakeholders) with CMS and DHCS is awaiting a decision from CMS on whether or not interim payment percentages would be changed or whether the interim payment percentages would remain as originally stated by CMS. DHCS realizes the interim payment percentage of large invoices is a concern to all.

4.5.3 DHCS indicated that an invoice was created to calculate the percentages of claims to be released. Will DHCS be providing the contractors with a list of final calculations for each quarterly claim? Similar to the quarterly reports?

- Chief Tony Teresi stated that DHCS would be sending LECs/LGAs a list of placeholder invoices with original dollar amounts as well as the proposed settlement amounts for each claiming unit.
- A committee member asked DHCS if claiming units could make changes to their 12/13 claims, as they were submitted using the old RTC guidelines. Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that the changes that were done to 12/13 invoices were for a reason, so she questioned why there would be a necessity to change them again. A committee member stated that the “reason” changes were made to 12/13 invoices was because DHCS Analysts advised LECs/LEAs to make changes (lowering coding to benchmark figures and/or removing clerical/admin staff over 20%) so that the claims could be paid. Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that some LEAs did not make changes and provided justifications instead.
- The committee discussed the unfairness of the RTC process and how the

12/13 claims were affected. DHCS said they would discuss this issue with their administration and provide further guidance if necessary.

4.5.4 Will the proposal for paying prior claims be based on the original claim submitted (prior to the First CMS 64 certifications)? How will DHCS track invoices that were corrected and/or revised for required adjustments (such as salary and benefit corrections, incorrect GL data, etc.)?

- Many of the details are still to be determined. The proposed settlement will be based on amounts that were “early claimed” by DHCS for payment by CMS.
- DHCS is working on tracking details and the logistics of how to track and account for invoices that were corrected/revised due to the RTC process and how to track invoices that were corrected/revised because of other reasons. In addition, DHCS is working on how to track and account for money that was sent in due to RTC revisions of original invoices.

5.0 CCSESA (California County Superintendents Educational Services Associate) Update

- Superintendent Bill Cornelius reported that he would be attending a CCSESA quarterly meeting in October and he would share information with Superintendents about the status of the SMAA Program. He further stated that LEC members should let him know of any information that they would like him to convey to the Superintendents. Superintendent Cornelius stated that he and CCSESA would support the LEC Advisory Committee in any way they could, including meeting with DHCS Administration if/when necessary.
- Superintendent Cornelius thanked the LEC Advisory Committee for all of their efforts toward improving the SMAA program and their commitment to the success of the SMAA program. He stated that as we are nearing the end of a 2-year process of working through the deferral, we are (all) hopeful that MAA reimbursement money will soon be released by CMS/DHCS.
- The LEC Advisory Committee expressed their gratitude to Superintendent Cornelius for his continued advocacy and support.

6.0 Review of August 7, 2014 Committee Meeting Items

No discussion

7.0 LEC Committee Business

7.1 Review DHCS Report

- The committee members discussed their frustration with the RTC process and how many 2012/13 MAA invoices were reduced to meet the RTC guidelines that are no longer in place. After being reduced by the RTC process, these claims may be reduced even further as they are subjected to the “back-casting” process.
- The committee discussed how LEAs would be justified in submitting corrected 12/13 MAA invoices. Many participants were removed from the invoice claims due to the 20% admin/clerical cap. In addition, time survey percentages (on many invoices) were lowered just to meet the RTC benchmarks. The committee discussed that moving forward with RMTS, there would be no 20% admin/clerical cap and there would be separate invoices for each cost pool. It is unfair for the LEA to be subjected to reductions by both the RTC process and the

“back-casting” process (whatever that back-casting process may be). The committee discussed the need for guidance to come directly from DHCS on this issue.

7.2 Discussion on Agenda Topics from PCG LEC Weekly Implementation Call

- The committee discussed PCG timelines and how completion of TSP rosters to meet the (vendor and DHCS) deadlines was challenging when MAA Coordinator training had not yet happened in all regions.
- The committee discussed various software glitches experienced with the PCG software and discussed the importance of communication between the LEC and the software vendor.

7.3 Equivalency List – “Best Practices” or individual LEC/Consortia?

- The committee discussed the equivalency list requirements as explained by DHCS. While all LECs were aware that equivalency lists would be necessary, LECs were not anticipating the type of justifications (and the potential amounts of justifications) that may be required by DHCS.
- The committee discussed the fact that the equivalency list is a requirement of the state, and as such, perhaps it should be included in our RMTS software system. The necessary data is included in the TSP roster and DHCS has access to the rosters in the RMTS software system
- Regions 9 and 11 volunteered to develop a “best practices” equivalency list guideline and review process.
- Region 2 volunteered to write up a PCG “optional services” form to provide a state required equivalency list.

7.4 February Meeting in Southern California?

The committee discussed the possibility of moving the location of the LEC Advisory Committee meeting to southern California a few times during the year starting in February 2015. This would make travel easier on southern California representatives. However, the committee would risk not having face-to-face time with DHCS representatives (because of state travel restrictions). The committee consensus was to continue holding the LEC Advisory Committee meetings in the Sacramento area.

7.5 LEC Lunch Fund

Co-Chair Margie Rollins reported that the lunch fund is currently @ \$2,000. A lunch fund invoice will be sent to all LECs in a few months.

7.6 LEC Bylaws Signatures

The LEC Advisory Committee Bylaws were signed by the LEC Co-Chairs.

7.7 CASBO presentation April 2015 (LEC interest)?

Region 10 LEC representative Andrea Tennyson asked the LEC members if there was any interest in providing a School-based MAA presentation at CASBO (California Association of School Business Officials) annual conference in San Diego in April 2015. The committee discussed the success of past SMAA presentations at CASBO conferences. Committee members will consider (and further discuss) the possibility of providing a “roundtable” SMAA discussion at CASBO in 2015.

7.8 Review of new DHCS contracts

The committee discussed the new DHCS SMAA contracts. Several items were added to the contract this year. Many LECs are sending the contracts to their legal departments/consultants for review.

7.9 Report out on PCG Regional Trainings

The committee discussed the scheduled PCG regional RMTS software training of LEA MAA Coordinators. Each LEC shared the scheduled dates of RMTS software training(s) in their region. Some LECs sent the TSP roster to the LEA Coordinators (for completion) prior to training so that completion deadlines could be met. Other LECs were waiting until the LEA MAA Coordinators received the software training before requesting TSP roster completion.

8.0 LEA Medi-Cal Billing Option Ad-Hoc Committee Report – Janice Holden

- John Mendoza was present at the October LEA Ad-Hoc Committee meeting and he discussed the possibility of a new LEA Billing SPA (State Plan Amendment) with an implementation date in 2015. We do not know at this time if RMTS must be a part of the new SPA. DHCS is currently working with the State vendor (Navigant) and CMS regarding the new SPA and more information will be available for discussion at the December meeting.
- CRCS (Cost and Reimbursement Comparison Schedule) reviews for 2006/07, 2007/08, 2008/09, 2009/10 were completed.
- CRCS reviews of 2010/11 and 2011/12 are 90% complete.
- If LEAs do not submit their CRCS, DHCS will withhold 100% of their claim.
- The December meeting will be held in Natomas.

9.0 Items for December 2014 Committee Meeting

10.0 Adjourn

*The next LEC Committee Meeting is **Thursday, February 5, 2015** at:*

Location to be Determined