

**Yolo County Office of Education
1280 Santa Anita Court
Woodland, California 95776-6127
Phone: (530) 668-6700**

**LEC Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
April 9, 2015**

LEC Coordinator/Representative Attendees:

Sharon Battaglia, Sonoma County Office of Education – Region 1
Tonja Kutz, 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)
Lori Bobb, Public Consulting Group
Lisa Pavelek, Public Consulting Group
Krystle Schmidt, Public Consulting Group
Janice DiCroce, San Diego County LGA

Absent:

Randy Jones, Glenn County Office of Education - Region 2

1.0 Introductions

Each individual stated his/her name and agency affiliation.

2.0 Additions to the Agenda

- Delete item 5.0 (CCSESA Update)
- Add item 7.3 (LEC Co-Chair and Recorder Nominations)
- Add item 7.4 (PCG/DHCS/LEC User Group)

3.0 Approval of Minutes

The February 5, 2015 LEC Advisory Committee meeting minutes were approved.

4.0 Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) Report

4.1 RMTS Implementation

4.1.1 When will the 2014/2015 School-based Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (SMAA) Manual be posted? Has DHCS management completed their review of the revisions to the manual?

- Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that the SMAA manual had been revised since the January 1st RMTS (random moment time survey) implementation. DHCS recently established a committee to review manual revisions and provide edits before the manual is posted on the DHCS website.
- A committee member asked who was selected to be on the SMAA Manual Review Committee and asked why certain individuals were selected to be a part of the committee. Michelle Kristoff stated that the participants were randomly selected. DHCS felt that gathering a small group of participants would allow for a quicker review (and edit) of the manual than would allowing everyone to review and provide input. Michelle Kristoff stated that the following people were asked (by DHCS) to participate in the SMAA manual review process:
 - Dion Andres (Sacramento County LGA), Cathy Bennett (Sacramento City School District)
 - Les Hall (Plumas County LGA)
 - David Huey (Alameda County LGA), Jeremy Ford (Oakland USD)
 - Debbie Geer (Region 2 LEC)
 - Margie Rollins (Region 3 LEC)
 - Margaret Roux (Region 8 LEC)
 - Sherry Purcell (Los Angeles USD)
- Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that DHCS would like to have the manual review and edits completed by committee by the end of April. The revised manual would then be posted to the DHCS website.

4.1.2 CMS 85% Compliance Rate Guidelines – Status of Clarifying Language

- Currently the SMAA manual states that if a claiming unit does not meet a compliance rate of 85%, a warning letter will be sent to the LEA and if compliance is not met in the subsequent quarter, the LEA cannot participate for the remainder of the fiscal year.
- A committee member asked whether the 85% compliance rate applied to each claiming unit or to each MAA universe. Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that the 85% compliance rate would apply to each MAA universe and guidelines would be part of the manual revisions currently in process.

4.1.3 Vacated Positions

Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that guidelines for vacated positions, valid moments and invalid moments would also be part of the manual revisions currently in process. There would be one code for “vacated positions” and one code for “no response to a moment.”

4.2 Status of 2014-130 California DHCS SMAA and LEA Billing Option Program – Audit Requested by Senator Liu. (Will Bureau of State Audit (BSA) staff go to the LEC level for additional information?)

- Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that a committee was formed to work on RMTS integration of the LEA Billing Option Program. The committee is meeting twice a month and it is comprised of LECs, LGAs, LEAs, DHCS staff and the DHCS consultant Navigant staff.
- The committee will be delving into all aspects related to combining the LEA Billing Option Program and the SMAA Program into the RMTS process. The committee will review the impact and effect of combined RMTS on both programs.
- Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that DHCS would create a page on their website to explain RMTS and explain why the LEA Billing Option Program will become a part of RMTS. DHCS intends to post meeting summaries and allow stakeholders to submit comments and concerns to the website.
- A potential date for developing a plan to incorporate the LEA Billing Option Program into RMTS would be July 1, 2015. DHCS must have something ready for CMS to review by 9/30/15. The effective date of implementing the plan is unknown at the time.
- Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that she did not know if BSA staff would request information from LECs, but she surmised that would be a possibility.

4.3 2009/2010, 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 – Final Deferral Resolutions – March 31, 2015 CMS-64 Submission

4.3.1 Has the process been finalized with DHCS’ internal legal, accounting departments and more importantly CMS regarding the ability to net backcasted invoice totals (paybacks to DHCS/amounts due to LEAs)?

- DHCS has not heard back from CMS regarding the proposed backcasting methodology and invoice netting process.
- Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that DHCS was still working through the deferral resolution process. A spreadsheet would be sent out to LECs/LGAs soon showing amounts owed and amounts that could (potentially be) netted through the process.
- A committee member asked DHCS if a claiming unit were still in the negative after going through the netting process, could they roll forward with netting using 13/14 claims. Chief Michelle Kristoff said she would check on this. DHCS would like to accommodate LEAs if possible.
- A committee member asked DHCS if a district (in the negative because of the deferral) chose not to participate in RMTS in 14/15, could they opt to rejoin the program in 15/16? Could district pay back money owed two years later? Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that she could not commit to that being allowed. It is her current understanding that if a district owes money (after

- netting), a bill will be sent to the LEC or LGA to recapture the funds.
- A committee member asked DHCS if districts that did not continue participating in the MAA Program in 14/15 (RMTS) would receive a final settlement of 70% or 30% depending on the amounts of their claims. Chief Michelle Kristoff stated she would find out about this as not all of the process details have been finalized.
 - A committee member asked DHCS what would happen if a district continued participating in 14/15 (for the first quarter), but did not continue participating to have the required 4 quarters to back cast. Chief Michelle Kristoff stated again that not all details have been finalized, but she would make sure this issue was addressed in the final process.

4.3.2 Any estimated timeline for settlement and interim payments?

- Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that interim payments for 12/13 and 13/14 claims could not be processed until after the final settlement and deferral interim payments are completed (for 11/12 and prior claims).
- A committee member asked DHCS if it would be possible to grant a global filing extension for the 2013/14 MAA invoices which are due to DHCS on 4/30/15. Chief Michelle Kristoff responded that filing extensions would be granted on a case-by-case basis. She further stressed the reason for deadlines and the importance for DHCS to meet their 24-month deadline with CMS rather than risk losing MAA funding.

4.4 CMS Financial Management Review (FMR) Report – Update

4.4.1 DHCS Response to FMR Report - Have the reports been sent to the affected LECs/LGAs and LEAs?

- Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that she thought she had sent the DHCS response to the CMS FMR report, as well as the final FMR report to the affected LECs/LGAs in December 2014.
- Region 6 LEC representative Janice Holden stated that she had not received this information from DHCS. Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that she would get the reports to Region 6 immediately.

4.4.2 Final CMS FMR - Have the reports been sent to the affected LECs/LGAs and LEAs?

Chief Michelle Kristoff will provide the final CMS FMR report to the affected LECs/LGAs immediately.

5.0 CCSESA Update (removed from the agenda, no report)

6.0 DHCS/PCG (Public Consulting Group)

6.1 85% Compliance Rate - When and how will the SSP accommodate moving moments to comply with the 85% compliance rate? (Code 18 – Invalid – No Response – Inaccurately Coded)?

- PCG reported that they were currently awaiting DHCS directive as to what constitutes an invalid moment so that they could reconfigure code 18 appropriately.
- A committee member asked why moments that lapse (or are missed) are not auto coded as “invalid” moments. PCG responded that typically, no response to a

moment would count against compliance and an “invalid” moment would not count against compliance.

- PCG stated that in other states, an “invalid” moment does NOT count against compliance. PCG further stated that there appeared to be some conflicting information in the SMAA manual regarding invalid moments.
- A committee member asked DHCS and PCG to please include LEC members in manual discussions. It would be a good idea to create a user group comprised of DHCS, PCG, and end users (LECs/LGAs).
- PCG stated that when PCG first approached DHCS, it was to build a partnership. PCG has no objection to including LECs in discussions with DHCS. However, the structure and agenda of these discussion could become counterproductive if large groups of people were involved. A committee member suggested that perhaps one representative from each MAA universe could be involved with all DHCS and PCG discussions and meetings.
- Chief Michelle Kristoff stated that DHCS would be willing to create a workgroup with one representative from each MAA universe to be involved in all software and program issues discussed by PCG and DHCS (moving forward).

6.2 How do we change codes if the LECs or DHCS do not agree with the code provided?

PCG stated that they were working on a short-term solution to change codes and should have procedures for the short-term solution available to the LECs sometime next week. In the long term, coding changes would be automated based on user permission/rights. For audit purposes, all coding changes will include detailed information (why the coding change was necessary, who made the coding change, when was the coding change made, etc.).

6.3 The Senior Coder needs to have the ability to change a code anytime during the quarter. – Status

PCG stated that they were working with DHCS on this issue.

6.4 Vacated positions, without replacements (and have a moment assigned) affect response rate compliance? PCG indicates these moments will not be coded until the end of the quarter. Please provide guidance.

PCG reported that they were working with DHCS to split code 18 into 2 codes (one that affects compliance and one that does not affect compliance). The coding would be done at the end of the quarter based on DHCS guidance.

6.5 Is the final time survey results report included in the software user’s license? Please provide the instructions for this report.

PCG stated that they were awaiting directive from DHCS before building the report.

6.6 Procedure for providing the LEAs a report of the TS results for purposes of the 30-day appeal period? - Status

- PCG stated that clarification on report parameters must be provided by DHCS before they could move forward with report development.
- A committee member asked DHCS about the 30-day period for LEAs to review and appeal and what message should we relate to LEAs about when they can

expect to review their coded moments. Chief Michelle Kristoff reported that she would talk to Chief Tony Teresi about this issue and hopefully it could be resolved on the next Monday morning implementation conference call.

6.7 Moving forward - Will the PCG system accommodate the input of school calendars for the entire FY for the 15/16 school year? If so, will that potentially eliminate the 5 student attendance day issues? Versus the 5 calendar days?

- A committee member stated that in her region, the spring break period was split between two quarters and if we could input the entire school calendar at the start of the fiscal year, there would not be a need to make adjustments to moment expiration dates.
- PCG stated that most states operate on “calendar” days and not student attendance days, so they are working with developers to possibly create a 12-month fiscal calendar in California.
- The committee discussed how a TSP (time survey participant) could be sampled before summer vacation and returns more than a month later to respond to their random moment.
- PCG stated that the system functions based on 5 student attendance days and options were provided to address the end of school year issues. The options are listed below and the option selected was option #3.
 1. Work as configured (5 student attendance days)
 2. Cap response time at 15 calendar days
 3. Manually change the moment expiration date of affected individuals
- A committee member stated that the option 3 (above) is more of a “band-aid” fix until the system is reconfigured or changed. Shortening the quarter does not take care of the issue and perhaps we need to change the SMAA manual to allow for crossing fiscal years.
- Another committee member stated that many TSPs do not return to the LEA in the next fiscal year. PCG responded that in other states, using 5 calendar days avoids this problem because if a moment happens on 5/30, it will always expire on 6/5.
- PCG stated that SMAA manual changes (regarding calendars) were being discussed with DHCS (Tony Teresi). PCG further stated that a concern of CMS would be the length of time a participant has to respond to their random moment.

6.8 Will the PCG system allow for LECs to respond to a moment (for a participant on leave) before the actual moment arrives?

PCG stated that this would not be allowed. It is a CMS directive that moments should not be answered before an actual moment happens.

6.9 PCG 24 hour response time and communication (with LECs).

- The committee discussed the importance of timely responses from PCG. PCG asked if there were any LECs that were not receiving responses within 24 hours from PCG. A few LECs responded that in a few instances after calling the help desk, a response was not provided within 24 hours. PCG stated that in a few instances, responses might have been delayed due to staff travel, etc. However,

the help desk and the email box are regularly monitored, and PCG does their best to respond within a 24-hour timeframe.

- Based on PCG's monitoring of their own response time, questions/issues from LECs/LGAs were responded to within 24 hours 95% of the time.
- The committee discussed the importance of PCG communicating regularly with their LEC clients.
- PCG agreed on the importance of communication and they discussed their newly issued "April-June RMTS Bulletin" as a format to assist in communication. A committee member asked what the frequency of this bulletin would be (monthly, quarterly?). PCG responded that they had not committed to a frequency of bulletin publication. It would depend on what is going on with the RMTS/MAA Program, but they would like to provide the bulletin monthly at a minimum.
- A committee member stated that the LECs need a timeframe listing when software development updates would happen. PCG stated that as previously discussed, the SCLC (Systems/Software Development Life Cycle) is a consideration in developmental changes and although we would like changes to happen quicker, it often takes some time to develop, test and implement a change.

6.10 When providing SSP guidance or tips, please include all CALEC contractors.

- A committee member suggested that when PCG receives system operation questions from LECs/LGAs, they should provide their responses to all LECs/LGAs. PCG stated that they would agree to respond to all LECs/LGAs if the question or the issue affects the entire group. PCG further stated that when they receive a questions from one LEC with a "cc" including other LECs, PCG would respond to "all".
- PCG asked that each LEC provide PCG with an updated LEC Coordinator roster, so that PCG could include all LEC users on updates to information that affects all LECs.
- The committee discussed the following software issues:
 - Moment notifications that were previously sent out 5 calendar days in advance are now going out 5 student days in advance.
 - MAA Coordinators can still only view upcoming moments 5 calendar days in advance. This should be changed to 5 student days in the next quarter.
 - The email sent to TSPs one hour in advance of their moment used to say a second email will be coming – this has been corrected.
 - A suggestion was made to change the training screen where a sample moment is shown to include verbiage to "scroll forward" so that a participant will move forward to the actual moment. PCG stated that this "fix" would be given to the developers.
 - A committee member suggested that PCG add a note to the TSP that their "clarifying question" will expire in 5 student attendance days. Another suggestion was to add an icon next to the TSP name to indicate that a clarifying question was answered.
 - A committee member asked PCG about fixing the "queued" moment reminders and late notices to reflect email address changes. PCG stated that this would be fixed soon (anticipate fix in 15/16). Notifications will be "queued" the night before they are sent out.

7.0 LEC Committee Business

7.1 **Software development proposals—discuss to see if there are any other ideas and if there are other consortiums interested in splitting the cost.**

Andrea Tennyson reported that she received the following new suggestions for software development:

- Addition of navigation button added to top of the screen when multiple pages are involved.
- Allow LEA Coordinator to receive notification that a clarifying question was sent to the TSP on the day it is sent rather than 3 days later. PCG stated that this change would require communication with their development department.
- Revert to color coding of moments originally included in the RMTS software that went away in the last software update. The color-coding of “pink” for expiring moments and “blue” for upcoming moments was appreciated by local MAA Coordinators. PCG stated that they made changes in the last update based on what was determined to be aesthetically correct and appealing to end users.

7.1.1 **A report that can be run that will show individual LEA compliance rates.**

PCG stated that a LEC could view each LEA’s individual home page to review compliance or a combination of all individual screens is available as the LEA Compliance Report.

7.1.2 **A report to show the percentages in each code at any given point.**

The development of this report is pending DHCS directive (see item #6.5). PCG is waiting for DHCS to define what constitutes an “invalid” moment.

7.1.3 **For the compliance report, it would great to have the expiration date of the moments.**

PCG will need to communicate with developers regarding this report addition.

7.2 **Regional LEC Updates/RMTS Implementation**

The committee discussed how RMTS implementation was progressing in each region and the committee shared best practices.

7.3 **LEC Co Chair and Recorder Nominations**

- Sharon Battaglia (Region 1) was nominated for the position of LEC Co-Chair to begin a term of 2-years on July 1, 2015. Sharon accepted the nomination.
- Rosalee Hormuth (Region 9) was nominated for the position of LEC Recorder to begin a term of 2-years on July 1, 2015. Rosalee accepted the nomination.

7.4 **PCG/DHCS User Group**

The committee discussed the importance of LEC input in all PCG/DHCS meetings. Each consortia or stand-alone LEC will select one person to represent their “RMTS Universe” on this workgroup (see the last three bullets in item #6.1).

8.0 **LEA Medi-Cal Billing Option Ad-Hoc Workgroup – Update (Janice)**

- CRCS (Cost and Reimbursement Comparison Schedule) for 09/10, 10/11, and 11/12 are almost complete. DHCS is starting to review 2012/13 CRCS forms.
- DHCS plans to do limited field reviews in the upcoming year.

- With the implementation of the Cost and Reimbursement Comparison Schedule (CRCS) three years ago, the State Audits & Investigation (A&I) Department hired additional auditors resulting in a \$650,000 program cost increase. A&I gave a presentation to the workgroup on the current \$650,000 funding cap and proposed that the cap be increased to \$820,000. A&I stated that the cap increase was necessary because auditor salaries have increased and because A&I exceeded the cap by over \$27,000 (for the first time) last year. The \$27,000 excess was paid by the State General Fund.
- LEAs expressed concern about the additional funding request from A&I especially now that the CRCS backlog from prior years had been cleared. The workgroup requested further analysis from A&I regarding the cap increase for a presentation at the June meeting.
- Effective 7/1/15, the 92506 Speech-Language Pathology (SLP) Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) code would be terminated and CPT codes 92521-24 and 92557 would be implemented. LEAs must make sure they detail exactly what the SLP is doing during an assessment. Because of the difficulty in updating vendor software to reflect this change, DHCS may accept both codes through 12/31/15, with the expected implementation of the new CPT codes on January 1, 2016.

9.0 LEA Medi-Cal Billing RMTS Committee – Update (Rosalee)

- The LEA Medi-Cal Billing Option Program RMTS Implementation Advisory Group (IAG) was formed by DHCS to discuss using the RMTS methodology in the LEA Medi-Cal Billing Program. The group held their first meeting on February 25, 2015, with subsequent meetings on March 19th and April 8th.
- DHCS will post IAG meeting summaries on their website.
- In the future, perhaps we could discuss the IAG meeting summaries at LEC Committee meetings. LEC members could then provide input to the two LEC members that are currently a part of the RMTS advisory group.

10.0 Adjourn

*The next LEC Committee Meeting is **Thursday, June 4, 2015** at:*

**Yolo County Office of Education
1280 Santa Anita Court
Woodland, California 95776-6127
Phone: (530) 668-6700**