

STATE/COUNTY PROCEDURES WORKGROUP SUMMARY

Organizer: CDSS' Adult Programs, Quality Assurance Bureau
Location: HHS Data Center, 9323 Tech Center Drive, Suite 100, Sacramento, CA
Date: February 15, 2005
Time: 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Various state and county staff attended the meeting (see attached) and received the following documents upon signing in: Agenda, Charter, State/County Workgroup Target Dates, QA Initiative Future Workgroup Dates & Times, Brainstorming Document - Components of a QA System, Welfare and Institutions Code Section 12305.71, and a copy of the PowerPoint slides entitled, "IHSS County Review Process."

Brian Koepp, Chief of the Adult Programs Quality Assurance Bureau, commenced the meeting by welcoming attendees, providing an overall focus to the workgroup, and making introductions.

The overall focus included a discussion of the Charter for the State and County Procedures Workgroup, including its purpose, structure, membership, and decision-making process.

Quality Assurance Bureau Presentation:

Martha Bracha, Manager, Adult Program Quality Assurance Bureau, then gave a PowerPoint presentation on the current IHSS County Review Process and distributed the following forms used in the review process: IHSS Case Assessment checklist, Special Terms and Conditions of Approval, Modified Case Review, and Red Flags for Home Visit.

Break.

Following the break, Brian introduced the two county presenters and explained that each would be making a brief presentation on their particular county's QA process.

Los Angeles County Presentation:

Clarence Shaw, Los Angeles County (LA), gave a PowerPoint presentation on LA's QA process and provided attendees with a copy of the PowerPoint slides. The following questions were then asked and answered:

Q: Does LA's case review include home visits?

A: Yes. LA's QA staff make unannounced visits and sit through interview with SW and take notes.

Q: Does the supervisor review cases?

A: Yes. Approximately 10% of them.

Q: Do new Social Workers receive more review?

A: Yes.

Q: How did LA get staff to buy-in to the program?

A: District offices were told that in order to continue receiving federal dollars LA had to be in compliance and reducing costs means hiring additional staff.

Q: Does LA have guidelines for staff to move numbers?

A: No. We shared the review documents with managers, showed them empirical data, laid out the picture and they bought in.

Q: How many SW staff are in the QA team?

A: Three SW supervisors and 1 admin.

Q: How many cases are reviewed?

A: 3 to 4 per year at the district office. Caseload too high to do more. 100 per month per reviewer (mostly done in office).

Q: What is the purpose of your observation?

A: SW training. We look at things like, was the SW professional? Was the medication looked at?

Q: How are recipient and provider fraud uncovered?

A: Normal fraud procedures (fraud referral form).

San Diego County Presentation:

Donna Brace, San Diego County, then gave a PowerPoint Presentation on the QA/QC Practices in San Diego County and provided attendees with a copy of the PowerPoint slides. Ms. Brace stated that San Diego keeps the language non-judgmental in the review process and offers positive feedback to workers. Following the presentation, she answered the following questions:

Q: How is the positive feedback presented to the worker?

A: Printed in the narrative.

Q: Are San Diego's targets based on trends?

A: We tried to find trends but this has changed over time and the program has not caught up (i.e., with PCSP we looked at coding).

Q: Does staff have access to CMIPS?

A: Yes. We have our own computer program that includes CMIPS.

Q: How much time is spent in a typical phone review?

A: 20 minutes. There are 10-15 questions asked based on confirming information in the SOC 293.

Q: Would you provide a copy of your telephone script?

A: Yes.

Q: Does San Diego also perform field reviews?

A: Yes. As part of the regular assessment process.

Brainstorming:

Following the county presentations, Brian led the workgroup in a brainstorming discussion to solicit input on the components of a QA system. Limited input was given. Brian requested that attendees continue thinking of QA components and compile for the next meeting. The following questions were then asked and answered:

Q: How are the counties going to be reporting?

A: This will be decided by the workgroup. The state will likely be required to report state's activity.

Q: When will the state start evaluation of the Terms and Conditions for the award of IHSS?

A: The state is working with DHS to determine. The final piece is not signed off yet. Will look at counties to ensure this takes place.

Q: Should all cases be Medi-Cal eligible?

A: Yes.

Q: Shouldn't this workgroup re-write the regulations for the QA portion?

A: We will most likely draft the language for the regulation workgroup.

Q: Will the regulation workgroup have a sub-committee?

A: Probably.

The meeting was then concluded with a discussion of the Workgroup target dates and a request that attendees bring best practices to adopt for all counties to the next meeting on March 8, 2005 (same location). Any questions or comments should be emailed to Brian.Koepp@dss.ca.gov by March 4, 2005.

ATTENDEES AT THE STATE/COUNTY WORKGROUP MEETING ON 2/15/05

Name	Organization
Brase, Donna	San Diego Co. IHSS
Coontz, Norman	California DHS
Rehm, Sharon	Sacramento Co. IHSS
Klopp, Guy	Sacramento Co. IHSS
Valencia, Florida	Sacramento Co. IHSS
Mcinturf, Melody	Sacramento Co. IHSS
Thompson, Becky	Yolo County IHSS
Jossey, Clint	Contra Costa County IHSS
Oddo, Jarrett	Sacramento Co. IHSS
Bettis, Bert	Sacramento Co. IHSS
Shaw, Clarence	Los Angeles County DPSS
Baughman, Tom	Butte County IHSS
Cole, Irene	Monterey County IHSS
Schwartz, Kathleen	Sacramento Co. DHHS
Nazaro, Nancy	H S A Ventura County
Chea, Sumbo	Stanislaus County IHSS