



MICHELLE BAASS
DIRECTOR

State of California—Health and Human Services Agency
Department of Health Care Services



GAVIN NEWSOM
GOVERNOR

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES (DHCS)
California Children's Services (CCS)
Monitoring and Oversight Workgroup
June 30, 2022
12 p.m. – 4 p.m.**

MEETING SUMMARY

CCS Monitoring and Oversight Workgroup Members Attended:

Alicia Emanuel; Anna Leach-Proffer; Beverly Eldridge; Dawn Pacheco; Eileen (Chris) McSorley; Francis Chan, MD; Hannah Awai, MD; Heidi Merchen; Janet Peck; Jody Martin; Kathryn Smith; Katie Schlageter; Lori Gardner; Lorri McKey, Mary Doyle, MD; Meredith Wolfe; Michelle Gibbons; Michelle Laba, MD; Mike Odeh; Nancy Netherland; Norma Williams; Susan Skotzke; Tanesha Castaneda

CCS Monitoring and Oversight Workgroup Members that Did Not Attend:

Farrah McDaid-Ting; Guillermina (Mina) Andres; Holly Henry; Katherine Barresi; Kristen Dimou; Pip Marks; Richard Chinnock, MD; Teresa Jurado

DHCS Staff Attended: Ami Lovato, Annette Lee, Barbara Sasaki, Joseph Billingsley, Julie Ota, Katie Ramsey, Michael Luu, Sabrina Atoyebi, Susan Philip

DHCS Consultants, Sellers Dorsey Attended: Alex Kanemaru, Marisa Luera, Meredith Wurden, Sarah Brooks

Public Attended: 36

CCS Monitoring and Oversight Workgroup Materials: Agenda, Slide Deck, CMS Net Data Dictionary

I. Welcome and Meeting Information
Sarah Brooks, DHCS Consultant with Sellers Dorsey

Welcomed members and shared meeting information

Alex Kanemaru, DHCS Consultant with Sellers Dorsey

Reviewed housekeeping items

II. Roll Call
Sarah Brooks

Conducted roll call of CCS Monitoring and Oversight Workgroup members, DHCS staff, and the Sellers Dorsey team

III. May Meeting Summary
Sarah Brooks

Provided May meeting summary and highlighted workgroup feedback that was incorporated into this presentation and discussion

IV. Assumptions and Parking Lot
Meredith Wurden, DHCS Consultant with Sellers Dorsey

Reviewed the updated assumptions based on the May meeting

Sabrina Atoyebi, Branch Chief
Medical Operations

Reviewed the updated parking lot based on the May meeting

Summary of Discussion:

- Members discussed the importance of reliable data, including Whole Child Model (WCM) dashboard and CCS data at large as we begin to move forward
 - **Response:** If members have specific items for consideration as we go further into the metrics and standards discussion, please share them so we can incorporate it into our discussion
- Members inquired about the CCS County Administrator quarterly meetings
 - **Action Item:** Workgroup members to send contact information to ccsprogram@dhcs.ca.gov to receive an invitation to the quarterly CCS administrators meeting

V. Landscape Review and Gap Analysis

Meredith Wurden

Reviewed CCS documents and relevant materials, goal of the landscape review, and provided a summary of the reporting requirements tool

Summary of Discussion:

- Members commented case management needs a clear definition and the Children's Regional Integrated Service System (CRISS) definition and tool is a good starting place; however, it needs to be analyzed for relevancy regarding this project
 - **DHCS Response:** The definition for case management is being reviewed in the Enhanced Care Management (ECM) stakeholder meetings and will keep this as a top priority, additional resources were shared: [CalAIM Enhanced Care Management Policy Guide \(2022\)](#)
- Members discussed the need for standardized charting, flagging within CMS Net, and clear expectations for counties
 - **Response:** This will be discussed in terms of where there may be gaps

VI. Compliance Framework and Program

Marisa Luera, DHCS Consultant with Sellers Dorsey

Discussed the compliance framework, compliance program best practices, historical and existing oversight activities, and prioritization process

Summary of Discussion:

- Members asked where family engagement is included in the compliance program
 - **Response:** One of the key assumptions is that this process is family and member centric. As the compliance program is further developed, this will be discussed.
- Members expressed there is currently no way to report in CMS Net if outreach to families was conducted
 - **Response:** This will be considered and discussed throughout this process
- Members commented that it is important to monitor and track CCS appeals, and this should be included in a periodic survey
 - **Response:** DHCS and Sellers Dorsey will take this into consideration
- Members suggested consideration of how the prioritization could be segmented, including into eligibility/services and administrative responsibilities/eligibility/case management

- **Response:** This will be considered and discussed throughout this process
- Members commented training related to staff development and education within the state guidelines would be beneficial

VII. Break
Sarah Brooks

A 10-minute break commenced

VIII. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Development
Katie Ramsey, Chief
County Compliance Unit

Reviewed the MOU structure, roles and responsibilities, resources, and roles and responsibilities example

Sarah Brooks

Posed specific questions regarding the MOU for the group to consider

Summary of Discussion:

- Members commented that High Risk Infant Follow-up (HRIF) needs to be included in the roles and responsibilities chart
 - **Action Item:** HRIF will be included in the roles and responsibilities chart moving forward
- Members suggested adding to the chart, under dependent counties, service authorization requests
 - **Response:** This will be considered and discussed throughout this process
- Members relayed there was previously best practices conferences and CMS Net trainings
 - **Action Item:** Medical Operations is currently in the process of reinstating some of these trainings
- Members inquired about transition to adulthood
 - **Response:** This is being tracked
- Members stated that managed care plans are now responsible for maintenance and transportation
 - **Action Item:** Sellers Dorsey will incorporate this into the table

IX. Compliance Metrics and Standards
Meredith Wurden

Overview of compliance metrics and standards, metric types, existing CCS performance measures, and data sources

Summary of Discussion:

- Members expressed there was previously a sub-workgroup that created and vetted clinical outcome measures
 - **Action Item:** DHCS and Sellers Dorsey to review the outcome measures previously developed
- Members commented the existing determination of CCS eligibility measure is difficult for some counties because of the way data is collected and reported in CMS Net
 - **Response:** This will be considered and discussed throughout this process
- Members mentioned the concept of having a baseline year for reporting data for established metrics
 - **Response:** This will be considered and discussed in further detail throughout this process
- Members identified that Family Participation needs to be clearly defined
 - **Response:** This will be considered and discussed in further detail throughout this process
- Members commented the Transition Planning should be reviewed at a CCS Advisory Group meeting
 - **Action Item:** This will be discussed at a subsequent CCS Advisory Group meeting
- Members mentioned that the Specialty Care Center measure is outside of some counties' control
 - **Response:** Further discussion on this measure will be conducted at a subsequent workgroup meeting
- Members shared comments about the performance measure being out of date and suggested they be relevant to the program with attainable outcomes or, possible reframing of measures
 - **Action Item:** DHCS will break down the performance measure comments and bullet the main points

X. Public Comment
Sarah Brooks

No public comments received

XI. Next Steps
Sarah Brooks

Provided information on next steps and relayed contact information regarding questions or feedback:

Meeting adjourned at 3:11 p.m.