

FUNDED PARTNER ACTIVITY REPORT

SFY 2017-18: FIRST QUARTER PERFORMANCE (July – Sept.)

AND YEAR-TO-DATE UPDATES ON OTHER MATTERS

Compiled November 2, 2017

Updated November 7, 2017

For most of the Funded Partners, the scope of this report only includes events that have occurred since July 1, 2017 as that marked the beginning of the newest contract cycle. For Funded Partners operating on a different contract cycle (i.e., Caregiver Assessment & Support in Placer, Sacramento & Yolo; Caregiver Respite in Placer, Sacramento, Sutter & Yuba; Home Meds in Placer, Grandparent Services in Sacramento; and, Transportation Vouchers in Yolo) the scope of this report includes events that occurred from State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-15 to date.

I. OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT

In 2015, members of JPEC had several discussions about how the Agency might recognize Outstanding Achievement among Funded Partners. At least three different types/categories of recognition were identified: 1) Outstanding Impact on Clients, 2) Outstanding Community Education, and 3) Outstanding Enhancement of an Aging Services Network. It was agreed that there should be an ongoing, open-ended nomination process through which both organizations and individuals could be nominated in one or more categories as follows:

- a) A Nomination Form is submitted by an AAA4 Staff, Advisory Council or Governing Board member who does not have a direct relationship to the nominee.
- b) JPEC reviews the nomination and decides whether to recommend acceptance from the Governing Board.
- c) The Governing Board reviews the nomination and votes on whether to accept the nomination.
- d) If accepted, a formal presentation is made to the recipient along with a certificate/award/proclamation.

II. OPEN MATTERS

The following program remains on ~~Watch~~ status due to under performance at Year End for SFY 2016-17:

- i) ~~Dignity Health, Transportation Vouchers (Yolo)~~

III. UPDATE on NEW PROVIDERS/PROGRAMS

The names of the new Funded Partners/Programs are underlined in the First Quarter Performance Chart. Wherever a county is being served by a new provider, the name of that county is also underlined. Wherever a new service is being provided, the name of that service is underlined. (Dignity Health is only underlined because the award amount is not fixed.)

Caring Choices' new Title III-B Respite program in Yuba-Sutter (rows #7 & #9) was doing start-up activities during the first quarter; therefore, there was no scope for that time period.

Community Legal began serving Nevada, Sutter & Yuba counties during the first quarter (#11, #13-14); they did numerous outreach activities and did begin recording service units.

FREED became the Senior I&A provider for the Yuba-Sutter area on July 1st; they expect call volume to steadily increase throughout the fiscal year.

Personalized HomeCare's initial focus was on screening and prioritizing existing Personal Care clients in Placer and Sacramento counties.

Aided by a smooth transition, Seniors First had a strong start with their Home Delivered Meals program in Placer County.

IV. IMPACTED SERVICES

The 2017-19 RFP established new procedures regarding Wait Lists. AAA4 Staff needs to provide further guidance to all Funded Partners before information in this category can be captured and reported consistently.

V. QUALITY ASSURANCE

This year, AAA4 is using student interns to conduct anonymous, "secret shopper" phone calls to Funded Partners. Designated Focal Points and Senior Information & Assistance providers are among the first batch of organizations being contacted. For your review, the results of a recent telephone survey of Yuba-Sutter MOW clients is included with this packet.

VI. COMPLIANCE (Not including Units of Service)

At this time, there are no compliance concerns from AAA4 data, contract or fiscal staff.

VII. 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 Funded Partner 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 results for the First Quarter of the current SFY (July 1, 2017 through September 30, 2017).

The Performance Chart also lists award amounts and costs per unit for each line item as appropriate. The “Annual Award” is also referred to as the contracted award amount; it is the maximum dollar amount the Funded Partner can request from AAA4 in reimbursements during the term of the contract agreement. Funded Partners usually expend all of the available funds by June 30.

In most circumstances, the Annual Award is less than the Total Program Budget because most the Funded Partner is required to supply matching funds (cash or in-kind) and because AAA4 resources alone are often insufficient to operate a successful service.

The “Annual Cost per Unit” 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. Funded Partners 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 Annual Cost per Unit is shown as a flat rate, based on the assumption the program will provide ALL of the contracted units. If the 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 performance is above 100%, then the Funded Partner operated at a lower Cost per 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 performance is below 100%, then the Funded Partner operated at a higher Cost per 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.

VIII. NEXT STEPS

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

The AAA4 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 Funded Partners.

Item	AAA4 Staff Suggestions for JPEC action	JPEC Recommendation
A ¹	<p>ONGOING: As of July 1, 2017 and per explicit AAA4 Governing Board approval, Dignity Health has continued operating their Transportation Voucher program on a short-term, temporary basis to prevent a gap in service in Yolo County. Watch status remains in effect because the program is essentially operating in the fourth year of the 2014 RFP cycle.</p> <p>At this time, Staff suggest Watch status remain in effect because the normal timeline and process for July voucher distribution were disrupted via the temporary extension.</p>	<p>Accept the Staff suggestion (5-0).</p>

Item	AAA4 Staff Suggestions for JPEC action	JPEC Recommendation
B ¹	<p>For various reasons, Q1 performance figures for the following programs remain <i>tentative</i> at this time:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #2 AAA4 Senior I&A*, Senior I&A • #8 Caring Choices, Caregiver Respite • #18 County of Sacramento, Peer Counseling • #23 Del Oro, Caregiver Case Management • #31 FREED, Home Repair/Modification • #33 FREED, Home Repair/Modification • #41 Inc. Seniors of Sierra County, Congregate Meals <p>Staff are withholding suggestions until the final figures are determined.</p>	No Action Necessary.
C ¹	<p>Community Legal's performance in the three additional counties it now serves has been slower than expected. Nevada (#11) is at 75%, there were no (0%) advice/counseling hours in Sutter (#13), and Yuba (#14) ended the first quarter at 60% of scope.</p> <p>Because these are new programs that should be expected to start the year slowly, Staff suggest no action be taken at this time.</p>	Accept the Staff suggestion (7-0).
D ¹	<p>Although Cordova Neighborhood Church (#17) is substantially above range at 150% of scope for Q1, their Year-to-Date figure is close to 25% after the first quarter which suggests their pace is sustainable.</p> <p>Staff suggest no action be taken at this time.</p>	Accept the Staff suggestion (7-0).
E ¹	<p>Del Oro Caregiver Resource Center is well above range for Caregiver Assessment in both Placer (#19) and Sacramento (#22) yet well below range in Yolo (#25).</p> <p>Staff suggest these programs be placed on Watch Status.</p>	Accept the Staff suggestion (7-0).
F ¹	<p>Although the Mature Edge Job Readiness Program* is well below scope in Sacramento (#52) at 59%, the YTD percentage is above 25% which suggests their annual pace is on track.</p> <p>Staff suggest no action be taken at this time.</p>	Accept the Staff suggestion (7-0).
G ¹	<p>Meals on Wheels by ACC (#57) is notably above range at 139%.</p> <p>Because this program is operating at maximum capacity but unable to fully meet the demand for home delivered meals, staff suggest no action be taken at this time.</p>	Accept the Staff suggestion (7-0).
H ¹	<p>Sierra Senior Services is well above range (150%) for MOW in Nevada County (#70).</p> <p>Staff suggest this program be placed on Watch Status.</p>	Take No Action at this time (7-0).

Item	AAA4 Staff Suggestions for JPEC action	JPEC Recommendation
I ¹	The Tahoe Transportation District (#73-74) is well below range in Nevada (28%) and Placer (58%). Staff suggest these programs be placed on Watch Status.	Take No Action at this time (4-1).
J ¹	Personalized HomeCare is below range in Sacramento (#62) and well below range in Placer (#61). Staff suggested these programs be placed on Watch Status.	Accept the Staff suggestion (3-0).
K ¹	As to the balance of programs from row #1 through row #80 that have not been cited in this table above, Staff suggest no action be taken at this time.	Accept the Staff suggestion (7-0).

Meeting Notes:

Committee Members present: Becky Bowen (Chair), Nancy Pennebaker (Vice Chair), Benjamin Eagleton, Maxine Milner-Krugman, Alice Moore, Wallace “Wally” Pearce & Elizabeth “Liz” Yeh.

A4 Staff present: Will Tift (liaison), Nancy Vasquez, Carrie Wagner, Linda Berry, Teja Payne & Cindy Reigert.

Programs Represented: Community Legal, Meals on Wheels by ACC, Personalized HomeCare, Stanford Settlement & Tahoe Transportation District.