SUMMARY OF THE STATE/COUNTY PROCEDURES WORKGROUP

Organizer: CDSS Adult Programs, Quality Assurance Bureau
Location: Health & Human Services Data Center, 9323 Tech Center Drive,
            Conference Room 2, Sacramento, CA
Date: May 10, 2005
Time: 10:00 am to 1:00 pm

The meeting was attended by county and state staff, union representatives, public authority representatives, and advocacy groups. Attendees signed in and received an Agenda and a document listing the data elements for county desk reviews.

Brian Koepp, Chief, Quality Assurance Bureau (QAB), commenced the meeting by welcoming attendees and making introductions. Brian then recapped the previous meeting and discussed the goals for this meeting, which included breaking into three discussion groups and then rotating among groups to allow participants to provide input to each group.

Martha Bracha, Manager, QA Operations Support Unit, briefly described each of the following breakout groups: 1) Role of County QA Staff and State; 2) Case Sample Selection; and 3) Case Review Forms. Martha then introduced Magali Williams, Los Angeles County (LA) QA staff, and Donna Brase, San Diego County QA staff, to discuss their respective county's case sample selection process.

Magali Williams stated that LA selects cases for QA review using CMIPS data. The data is then analyzed, using Excel, to obtain a random sample. Approximately two to three percent of LA's 146,000 cases are reviewed on a quarterly basis by three QA staff in the areas of uniformity, protective supervision, documentation, assessed hours, paid PCSP, etc. In addition, focused case reviews are conducted. The areas to be addressed by focused case reviews are determined by county management.

Donna Brase stated that San Diego performs reviews on a quarterly rotation schedule so that all social workers' cases are reviewed. Cases are randomly selected and each QA staff member performs 15 desk/phone reviews, 10 desk/field reviews, and 30 targeted reviews (PCSP, coding, proration, etc.) per month.

The breakout groups were then formed and instructed to select a scriber. So that all participants could have an opportunity to provide input in all three breakout sessions, they were instructed to rotate among groups. The breakout groups identified the following issues:

Role of County QA Staff and State

- County must perform desk reviews
- Targeted case reviews may be based on home visit findings, death match results, other data match results, the CMIPS over 300 hours report, etc.
- State must provide direction to counties regarding death match reports and other data matches.

- Identify and report third-party liability
- County to monitor supportive services and fraud
- County must develop plan for targeted case review by July 1, 2005
- State and County to perform joint case reviews
- County should have flexibility in performing routine, scheduled reviews
- County pre-review activities may include:
  - Potential fraud cases
  - Broader county level data using CMIPS
  - Evaluate data for county and compare to state averages
- Develop process that is broad enough to fit the needs of all counties
- Onsite county review activities
  - Come up with a plan
  - Case sampling based on size of QA staff and could be targeted or random
- Written report to State (without placing unnecessary burden on counties – suggest quarterly) to include:
  - Number of cases reviewed
  - Description of specialized (target) reviews
  - Findings of QI projects/corrective actions initiated
  - Cases to ALJ
  - Fraud referrals
  - Results of data match reviews
- Fair hearing review
  - Pre-review
  - Testify
  - Work with appeal staff
  - Implement or re-hearing
- Quality improvement
- Build bridges with others (public authority advisory boards, etc.)
- Education and training
  - Shadowing staff dealing with special groups
  - Write reports
  - Determine specific areas to address
  - Interface with APS
  - Advocate with nurses and others
  - Resolve differences in services with consumers and IPs

Case Sample Selection

- Test for significance
- Over sample because of duplication
- Companion cases – review together?
- Statistical validity for county as a whole
- How do you pull home visit subset? Recent face-to-face? Recent assessment?
- Use check digit number of identification to pull sample
- True random sampling vs. sampling within caseloads – identify trends among workers, units, etc.

- Concern of looking at over/under assessments
- Authorization trends by culture
- What's the universe? (Active clients, all clients assessed in past X days, cases in each caseload, etc.)
- Can cases be pulled again once reviewed?
- Provider enrollment, payroll, consumer case options
- Minimum standards must be applicable to all sized counties

Case Review Forms

- Is it desirable to standardize the application process statewide?
- QA staff do not need to review the Medi-Cal application
- Will the state/QA mandate the use of certain forms and give counties flexibility to add to the mandated forms?
- Should we use the same form for assessment and reassessment?
- Combine language and civil rights into one category to facilitate tracking data on population demographics (this is also done by CMIPS).
- Do we need a new paramedical form each time a provider is changed?
- Fingerprinting – need to clarify requirements
- State should develop criteria for what is considered sufficient documentation
- Need to standardize the provider enrollment form
- Develop client/provider information acknowledgment form that includes hours, services, responsibilities, share of cost, etc.
- Will the Able and Available Spouse form change with the waiver?
- Tie functional hours to hours assessed
- Provide counties with data elements (forms list) for desk review
- Is confidentiality of assessment or other forms an issue?
- QA reviews should provide positive feedback as well as negative.
- Public authority involvement with background checks
- Should QA staff review medical evaluations?
- SIP program? (SIP counties)
- Request QA-related forms and information for desk review

Brian concluded the meeting thanking all in attendance and announcing that the June 7, 2005 meeting would be cancelled due to workload issues. The group agreed to meet on July 12, 2005. This will allow time to process the input received, put together a draft county review document, and provide summaries of the various workgroups prior to the next meeting.

Changes were made to L:\CStone\StateSum051005.doc