

SERVICE PROVIDER ACTIVITY REPORT

SFY 2016-17: YEAR-END PERFORMANCE (July - June)

AND YEAR-TO-DATE UPDATES ON OTHER MATTERS

Compiled July 26, 2017

Updated July 28, 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.

I. **OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT**

AAA4 Staff recommend that methods for recognizing Outstanding Achievement among Funded Partners be addressed at the next meeting.

II. **OPEN MATTERS**

ONGOING: MULTIPLE CATEGORIES & PROVIDERS

The following programs remain on **Watch** status due to inconsistent performance:

- i) AAA4, Employment (Yuba-Sutter)
- ii) Tahoe Transportation District, Transportation (Placer)
- iii) FREED, Home Repair/Modification (Sierra)

RESOLVED: ResCare HomeCare, Personal Care (Sacramento)

JPEC met twice to discuss complaints and grievances regarding this program. ResCare HomeCare's contract expired on June 30, 2017, and they were not awarded funds under the 2017-19 RFP. Active clients were transitioned to the new provider of Personal Care services: Personalized Homecare.

RESOLVED: California Caregivers, Personal Care (Sacramento)

This provider ended service on October 14. Final payment was made.

RESOLVED: MULTIPLE CATEGORIES & PROVIDERS

In May, the Governing Board accepted JPEC's recommendation to remove the following programs from Watch Status.

- i) AAA4, Employment (Placer)
- ii) Caring Choices, Health Promotion – Home Meds (Placer)
- iii) Cordova Neighborhood Church, Caregiver Respite (Sacramento)
- iv) Legal Services of Northern CA: Mother Lode, Legal (Nevada)
- v) Legal Services of Northern CA, Legal (Sacramento)
- vi) Lilliput, Grandparent Community Education (Sacramento)
- vii) Paratransit: Gold Country LIFT, Transportation (Nevada)
- viii) PIRS, Home Repair/Modification (Placer)

III. UPDATE on NEW PROVIDERS/PROGRAMS

In three circumstances, the results of the 2017-19 RFP necessitated transitioning active clients from one Funded Partner to another on July 1, 2017. These new Funded Partners are scheduled to address JPEC at the July 26 meeting.

Additional provider/program changes will be addressed at the First Quarter JPEC meeting for SFY 2017-18.

IV. IMPACTED SERVICES

No report at this time. New procedures will take effect in SFY 2017-18.

V. COMPLIANCE (Not including Units of Service)

At this time, data, contract and fiscal staff report all AAA4-funded service providers have completed SFY 2016-17 in compliance.

No Funded Partners currently have executed service contracts for SFY 2017-18; therefore, none could be out of compliance as of yet.

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, year-end results for the current State Fiscal Year (July 1, 2016 through June 30, 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-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-end performance is above 100%, then the provider operated 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-end performance is below 100%, then the provider operated 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

A few former clients of ResCare HomeCare have experienced difficulties adjusting to a new provider and new homecare workers. However, those matters have been addressed promptly by Personalized Homecare in coordination with AAA4 staff. None of the concerns have risen to the level of a formal complaint.

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 ⁴	<p>ONGOING: Three programs are already on Watch Status due to inconsistent performance. The FREED, Home Repair (#39) and the AAA4, Employment (#46) programs are now in an acceptable range. Staff suggests these two be removed from Watch.</p> <p>The Tahoe Transportation District program (#31) has well exceeded its scope over the past six months, finishing the year at 153%. Their year-end performance in Nevada County (#30) is even higher at 202%. If all other factors remain equal, Staff suggest this program’s scope under the 2017-19 RFP be increased via contract negotiation.</p>	<p>Accept the Staff suggestion (7-0).</p>
B ⁴	<p>The FREED Transportation Voucher program finished the year below-range in both Yuba (#23) and Sutter (#22) County. This program was not active in July or August. Staff will make a suggestion during the JPEC meeting. Upon receiving corrected performance figures, Staff suggested no action be taken at this time.</p>	<p>Accept the Staff suggestion (7-0).</p>

Item	A4 Staff Suggestions for JPEC action <i>(continued)</i>	JPEC Recommendation
C ⁴	Due to the active RFP for Transportation services in Yolo County, Staff withhold any recommendation pertaining to Dignity Health’s program (#58).	Place this program on Watch Status (7-0).
D ⁴	<p>The following additional programs finished the year above-range.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #4 Community Link – 211, Senior I&A • #7 Dine Around Town, Congregate Meal Vouchers • #11 Nevada 2-1-1, Senior I&A • #20 & #21 Caring Choices, Caregiver Respite • #25 LSNC: Mother Lode, Legal Advice/Counseling • #26 & #27 Meals on Wheels by ACC, HDM • #49, #52 & #55 Del Oro CRC, Caregiver Assessment • #61 Inc. Seniors of Sierra County, Congregate Meals <p>If all other factors remain equal, Staff suggest scopes be increased via contract negotiation for #7, #11, #49 & #55 due to the relatively high scale of the above-range performance.</p> <p>Staff suggest no action be taken on the balance of programs listed in this item.</p>	Accept the Staff suggestion (7-0).
E ⁴	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.	Accept the Staff suggestion (7-0).
F ⁴	<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>	The Chair requested a full presentation on the Elder Abuse Prevention program at the next JPEC meeting.

Meeting Notes:

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

A4 Staff present: Will Tift (liaison), Pam Miller, Laura Mills, Nancy Vasquez, Maggie Borowiak, Mike Selland, Carrie Wagner, Teja Payne, Yvonne Pacheco, Gina Barringer.

Programs Represented: Seniors First, Personalized Homecare, FREED Center for Independent Living & Tahoe Transportation District.