

SERVICE PROVIDER ACTIVITY REPORT

SFY 2016-17: THIRD QUARTER PERFORMANCE (July - March)

AND YEAR-TO-DATE UPDATES ON OTHER MATTERS

Compiled May 1, 2017

The scope of this report includes events that occurred during State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-15, 15-16 and 16-17 to date; it will also include future events that occur between now and the end of each provider's full contract cycle.

The Mid-Year JPEC meeting was canceled due to scheduling difficulties arising from limited membership. Any matters that were open after Governing Board approval of the First Quarter Recommendations in November remain open.

I. **OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT**

Until a new Sanction Policy is adopted, the method for recognizing Outstanding Achievement among service providers has been postponed.

II. **OPEN MATTERS**

NEW: ResCare HomeCare, Personal Care (Sacramento)

See Section VII Quality Assurance below.

ONGOING: California Caregivers, Personal Care (Sacramento)

This provider ended service on October 14. Final payment has not been made as the number of service hours provided remains in question.

ONGOING: Caring Choices, Health Promotion – Home Meds (Placer)

Per Governing Board action due to severe underperformance, this program was subject to consideration for an immediate reduction in award if 100% of the scope of service for SFY 2016-17 was not met or exceeded by December 31, 2016. The provider finished 2016 at exactly 100%. Watch Status remains in effect.

ONGOING: MULTIPLE CATEGORIES & PROVIDERS (part 1 of 2)

The following programs remain on **Watch** status due to below-range performance dating back to the end of the fourth quarter of SFY 2015-16:

- i) AAA4, Employment (Placer)
- ii) AAA4, Employment (Yuba-Sutter)
- iii) Cordova Neighborhood Church, Caregiver Respite (Sacramento)
- iv) Legal Services of Northern CA: Mother Lode, Legal (Nevada)
- v) Tahoe Transportation District, Transportation (Placer)

ONGOING: MULTIPLE CATEGORIES & PROVIDERS (part 2 of 2)

The following programs remain on **Watch** status due to above-range performance dating back to the end of the fourth quarter of SFY 2015-16:

- i) FREED, Home Repair/Modification (Sierra)
- ii) Legal Services of Northern CA, Legal (Sacramento)
- iii) Lilliput, Grandparent Community Education (Sacramento)
- iv) Paratransit: Gold Country LIFT, Transportation (Nevada)
- v) PIRS, Home Repair/Modification (Placer)

RESOLVED: Legal Advice & Counseling (Sierra)

Previously, a gap in service existed in Sierra County. Community Legal, a nonprofit legal firm based in Nevada County, began providing legal services to residents of Sierra in February.

III. UPDATE on NEW PROVIDERS/PROGRAMS

This fiscal year, AAA4 will introduce DEEP, the Diabetes Education and Empowerment Program, in Sacramento County. This is a national, evidence-based program being funded under Title III-D. The program “aims to educate older adults who have diabetes or pre-diabetes to manage their disease and/or prevent progression.” Thus far, AAA4 has contracted with the Health Services Advisory Group (HSAG) and coordinated with Stanford Settlement Community Center to implement a pilot series in May of 2017.

IV. IMPACTED SERVICES

No report at this time.

V. COMPLIANCE (Not including Units of Service)

Data, contract and fiscal staff report all active, AAA4-funded service providers are currently in compliance.

VI. PERFORMANCE (Units of Service Only)

Initially, the number of service units to be provided during the contract period are set by successful RFP applicants or renegotiated between AAA4 staff and the service provider before a contract is executed. In accordance with past direction from JPEC, just three classifications have been used to sort performance levels for individual programs:

125% or More =	Above-Range Performance
86% – 124% =	Within-Range Performance
85% or Less =	Below-Range Performance

The figures in the attached chart are the cumulative, third quarter results for the current State Fiscal Year (July 1, 2016 through March, 31 2017).

The Performance Chart also lists award amounts and costs per unit for each line item as appropriate. The “A4 Annual Award” is also referred to as the contracted award amount; it is the maximum dollar amount the service provider can request in reimbursements during the term of the contract agreement. Service providers usually expend all of the available funds by June 30.

In most circumstances, the A4 Annual Award is less than the Total Program Budget because most funded programs require the provider to supply matching funds (cash or in-kind) and because A4 resources alone are often insufficient to operate a successful service.

The “A4 Annual Cost/Unit @ 100% of Goal” is simply the maximum annual award divided by the total number of units the program has agreed to provide during the fiscal year. It can also be thought of as the average rate Area 4 has agreed to pay for services; however, it is important to keep in mind these are NOT performance-based contracts. Service providers are reimbursed for their allowable costs, not for the number of units they provide – hence the need for simultaneous monitoring of program performance and spending.

Again, the A4 Annual Cost/Unit is shown as a flat rate, based on the assumption the program will provide all of the contracted units. If the year-to-date or year-end performance for a particular program happens to be exactly 100%, then the units were provided exactly as planned. Precision can be very difficult to achieve, so some degree of variance is expected.

When year-to-date or year-end performance is above 100%, then the provider has been operating at a lower A4 cost/unit than originally

negotiated. This might indicate a conservative scope of service or better-than-expected efficiencies; it might also indicate cost-cutting measures or a dilution of service quality. Thus, significant above-range performance is not necessarily a sign of positive outcomes.

Conversely, when year-to-date or year-end performance is below 100%, then the provider has been operating at a higher A4 cost/unit than originally negotiated. This might indicate an optimistic scope of service or unexpected losses of efficiency; it might also indicate an investment of resources or an enhancement in service quality. Thus, significant below-range performance does not necessarily suggest an undesirable outcome.

VII. QUALITY ASSURANCE

In December 2016, a Sacramento client of ResCare HomeCare contacted AAA4 to complain about the services she was receiving through the AAA4 grant. Three months later, the same client contacted AAA4 again to say she had been dropped from the program in December as a result (in her view) of making too many complaints about the quality of service but was now (after 90 days without care) going to be getting help via IHSS. This individual has chosen not to file a formal grievance and has not given AAA4 consent to use her name.

In March 2017, a different Sacramento client of ResCare HomeCare contacted AAA4 to complain about the services she was receiving through the grant. This individual did file a formal grievance on March 16 (see attachment). After determining that at least 5 additional callers (none of whom felt comfortable identifying themselves) had contacted AAA4's Information & Assistance person over the same time period with complaints about ResCare HomeCare that were of a similar nature, a phone meeting was scheduled between management at AAA4 and management at ResCare's local office.

Subsequently, ResCare has taken specific actions to remedy the situation. Nevertheless, the complainant has not yet chosen to withdraw her grievance, and she has expressed an interest in attending the JPEC meeting. At this point, AAA4 does not have reason to believe concerns exist in Placer County (where ResCare has been providing the same service under contract with AAA4 since 2014); however, no direct inquiries have been made.

It is now incumbent upon AAA4 (via this program evaluation process) to consider corrective action for any past improprieties in the delivery of

service, to seek to resolve any ongoing concerns and to take steps to avoid any additional issues going forward.

VIII. NEXT STEPS

The recommendations made by JPEC will be noted below and sent to the Governing Board. Affected service providers are welcome to attend either or both meetings and will have an opportunity to briefly speak prior to votes being cast.

The A4 Staff suggestions below are based upon relevant information available at the time, and Staff suggestions are subject to change. Members of JPEC are not obligated to accept suggestions from staff or requests from service providers.

Item	A4 Staff Suggestions for JPEC action	JPEC Recommendation
A ³	NEW: As described above, several complaints and a formal grievance have been made from Sacramento County residents regarding the provision of Personal Care services by ResCare HomeCare (#15 & #16). Neither the extent of past concerns nor the existence of ongoing concerns are fully known at this point. Minimally, staff suggest this program be placed on Probation through June 30, 2017 and that said status remain in effect until the provider is reevaluated by JPEC (tentatively July 28, 2017). Additional recommendations may be made during the JPEC meeting.	
B ³	ONGOING: AAA4 is withholding final payment to California Caregivers (#2) pending reconciliation of the number of hours of personal care services actually provided. No further action is necessary.	
C ³	ONGOING: The Caring Choices Health Promotion – HomeMeds program in Placer County (#3) was required to meet or exceed 100% of their scope by December 31, 2016. That requirement was met, they finished the third quarter at 108% of scope and monthly performance seems to have stabilized. Staff suggest Watch Status be removed.	

Continued on Next Page

Item	A4 Staff Suggestions for JPEC action (<i>continued</i>)	JPEC Recommendation
D ³	<p>ONGOING: Five programs are already on Watch status due to <u>below-range</u> performance. The Cordova Neighborhood Church, Caregiver Respite (#3), Legal Services of Northern CA: Mother Lode, Legal (#24) and AAA4, Employment (#43) programs have returned to an acceptable range. Staff suggests these three be removed from Watch.</p> <p>The Tahoe Transportation District program (#31) is now slightly above range at 133%. Staff suggest this program remain on Watch due to unstable performance.</p> <p>The AAA4, Employment program (#46) has not yet conducted activities in the Yuba-Sutter area. Staff suggest this program remain on Watch pending the outcome of said activities.</p>	
E ³	<p>ONGOING: Five programs are already on Watch status due to above-range performance. The Legal Services of Northern CA, Legal Hotline (#9), Paratransit: Gold Country LIFT (#12), PIRS, Home Repair/Modification (#13) and Lilliput, Grandparent Community Education (#64) programs have returned to an acceptable range. Staff suggest these four be removed from Watch.</p> <p>The FREED, Home Repair/Modification program (#39) is well below range at 33%. Staff suggest this program remain on Watch.</p>	
F ³	<p>Through the third quarter, the following programs have transitioned from within-range to <u>below-range</u> performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #22 FREED, Transportation • #42 AAA4, Employment • #58 Dignity Health, Transportation Vouchers <p>Staff will make suggestions for each of these programs during the JPEC meeting.</p>	

Continued on Next Page

Item	A4 Staff Suggestions for JPEC action (<i>continued</i>)	JPEC Recommendation
G ³	<p>Through the third quarter, the following programs have transitioned from within-range to above-range performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #4 Community Link – 211, Information & Assistance • #7 Dine Around Town, Congregate Meal Vouchers • #11 Nevada County 211, Information & Assistance • #20 Caring Choices, Caregiver Respite • #25 LSNC: Mother Lode, Legal • #26 Meals on Wheels by ACC, Home Delivered Meals • #30 & #31 Tahoe Transportation District, Transport • #38 FREED, Home Repair • #48 ACC Senior Services, Caregiver Case Management • #49, #52 & #55 Del Oro, Caregiver Assessment • #50 Del Oro, Caregiver Case Management • #61 Inc. Seniors of Sierra County, Congregate Meals • #66 LSNC: Yolo, Legal <p>Staff will make suggestions for each of these programs during the JPEC meeting.</p>	
H ³	<p>As to the balance of programs from row #1 through row #71 that have not been cited in this table above, Staff suggest no action be taken at this time.</p>	
I ³	<p>The programs listed in rows #701 through #909 are shown for informational purposes only.</p> <p>Legal providers cannot control the demand for legal representation; therefore, AAA4 tracks but does not evaluate providers on that service unit.</p> <p>Primary performance measures for Ombudsman and HICAP Services are directly monitored and evaluated by the State of California.</p>	
J ³		

Meeting Notes:

Committee Members present:

A4 Staff present:

Programs Represented: