

CLARKE COUNTY CPMT MEETING MINUTES**June 25, 2024****Attendees**

Nadia Acosta	CSA Coordinator
Jennifer Parker	DSS Representative
Frank Moore	CCPS Representative
Jerry Stollings	CSU Representative and CPMT Chair
Tavan Mair	Private Provider Representative
Leea Shirley	VDH Representative and CPMT Vice Chair
Denise Acker	CSB Representative
David Ash	Parent Representative

Absent

Terri Catlett	BOS Representative
---------------	--------------------

Virtual

Mr. Jerry Stollings called the meeting to order at 2:01PM. Ms. Nadia Acosta stated that the agenda needed to be amended as the date of the next meeting was incorrect (listed as June 25, 2024 instead of July 23, 2024) and that another emergency funding request had come in after publication of the packet and agenda, causing two cases to be reviewed instead of one. Mr. David Ash made a motion to approve the agenda as amended, and Ms. Leea Shirley seconded. All members voted in favor.

Old Business:

1. Ms. Shirley made a motion to approve the May 28, 2024, CPMT minutes. Ms. Denise Acker seconded the motion. All members voted in favor.
2. Mr. Frank Moore reported that as of 06/24/2024, Clarke County Public Schools had appointed a new interim superintendent. There were no other agency updates.

New Business:

1. Ms. Stephanie Bacote, the Program Audit Manager with the Office of Children's Services, presented the draft report of Clarke County CSA's program audit. Ms. Bacote stated that due to Clarke County CSA's program size, the audit process begins with Clarke County CSA completing a self-assessment workbook that the Office of Children's Services (hereafter referred to as OCS) auditor then validates. Ms. Bacote reported that the self-assessment workbook only goes over state policy compliance, and not local

Children's Services Act
Clarke County, Virginia

policy compliance, as local policy differs by county. Ms. Bacote reported that the self-assessment workbook completed by Clarke County CSA only documented a lack of utilization review but did not list this lack of utilization review as significant. Ms. Bacote stated that as utilization review is required by the Code of Virginia, the lack of utilization review was a significant lack of compliance. Ms. Bacote then reported that she had chosen 6 case files from the Clarke County CSA program to go over. Ms. Bacote reported that in all 6 case files there was missing documentation which had both a fiscal impact and a non-fiscal impact. Ms. Bacote reported on the missing documents that had a fiscal impact first. The fiscal impact was \$17,444.97. In 5 out of the 6 cases reviewed, Ms. Bacote noticed services that were funded but not mentioned in the service plan. In 3 out of the 6 cases reviewed, Ms. Bacote noticed that there was not enough documentation to establish a child's eligibility, either through a Child In Need of Services (CHINS) determination or an IEP. In 2 out of the 6 cases reviewed, Ms. Bacote noticed there were no consents to exchange information/releases of information. In 1 out of the 6 cases reviewed, Ms. Bacote noted that a transaction was recorded with the wrong expenditure category causing the locality to overpay by \$773.36. Ms. Bacote then reported on the missing documents that did not have a fiscal impact. Ms. Bacote reported that in all of the cases there was no utilization review completed; Ms. Bacote reported that Clarke County CSA had previously reported this in the self-assessment workbook. Ms. Bacote reported that there were no co-pay screenings completed for parents in the cases that required a co-pay screening. Ms. Bacote reported that the Individual and Family Service Plans (IFSPs) were missing discharge plans and duration of services requested. Ms. Shirley stated that Clarke County CPMT does not see IFSPs and asked how to ensure that this issue was completed. Ms. Bacote responded that her recommendation was to have periodic internal reviews of the IFSPs done either by CPMT or by a subcommittee of CPMT. Ms. Bacote reported that the service name descriptions were miscoded in 2 cases. Ms. Bacote reported that Continuous Quality Improvement was missing from the CPMT minutes and packets she had reviewed; Ms. Bacote stated that the OCS website had a section specifically for Continuous Quality Improvement data as reported to them and recommended CPMT make use of that. Ms. Bacote reported that the strategic plan for Clarke County CSA was out of date. Ms. Bacote then moved on to the recommendations to correct the mistakes and noncompliance noted by the audit. Ms. Bacote first recommended to use the tools and data on the OCS website as much as possible. Ms. Bacote also recommended going over existing internal controls and finding those internal controls' deficiencies. Ms. Bacote recommended reviewing funding policies and the sources of funding policies. Finally, Ms. Bacote went over the next steps for the Clarke County CSA audit. Ms. Bacote stated that Clarke County CPMT would be given the chance to submit comments on the audit results and gave two options for the due date: either two weeks after this CPMT meeting (July 9th), or 7 days after July's CPMT meeting (July 30th). All members voted to add a section to compile comments to the

Children's Services Act
Clarke County, Virginia

agenda for July's CPMT meeting and to request July 30th as the due date for CPMT's comments. Ms. Bacote stated that after the final report was published, a Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) would be due to OCS around the end of August, and the report and the QIP would then be sent to OCS executive team, who would then issue a decision on the report and the QIP. Ms. Bacote reported that should Clarke County CPMT disagree with the executive team's decision, there would be a method of appeal available. Ms. Bacote reported that after the audit was completed, Clarke County CPMT would receive a survey on the audit process and encouraged Clarke County CPMT to complete the audit once it was sent out. Ms. Bacote then left the meeting.

Ms. Parker stated that in previous localities that she had been a CSA Coordinator for, IFSPs had been brought to CPMT for review and for signing; however, current policy at Clarke County was that IFSPs were not brought to CPMT and identifying information such as names was left off the cases for vote on funding authorization. Both Ms. Parker and Ms. Acker expressed concern at the missing consents to exchange information. Mr. Ash, Ms. Acker, and Ms. Shirley all stated that they felt that not enough information was presented to CPMT for vote on funding authorization at this time. Mr. Stollings stated that deficiencies in documentation had already been noted and were in the process of being corrected. Mr. Stollings stated that Ms. Acosta had requested a new IFSP with significantly more information to be implemented as of 03/01/2024. Ms. Parker reported that she had collaborated with Ms. Acosta to create an up-to-date "Case Manager Checklist" of required documentation for all cases coming to FAPT and that this Case Manager Checklist was on the case manager portal for all case managers to access. Ms. Acker asked how CPMT was to ensure that each child met eligibility criteria. Ms. Parker stated that in her opinion it was the job of FAPT to ensure that each child met eligibility criteria before having the case sent to CPMT for funding authorization. Mr. Stollings stated that in his observation, the biggest concerns for CPMT to focus on were utilization review and utilization management, review of eligibility, and strategic planning. Ms. Parker stated that it would be a good idea to do a random sampling of case files to ensure all eligibility documentation was in place. Mr. Stollings stated in his position, he and his staff went through a self-audit every year and suggested that every CPMT member take 2 or 3 case files to review and then have all the findings compiled for presentation at September's CPMT meeting. Ms. Shirley suggested that all funding authorization requests be sent out prior to CPMT to allow for time to review. Mr. Ash and Mr. Moore suggested that the agenda and packet be updated to include sections with Continuous Quality Improvement language to ensure CPMT was meeting that CQI requirements.

2. All members reviewed the strategic plan. Some minor edits to make wording clear and ensure continuity were made. Ms. Shirley made a motion to approve the strategic plan as amended, and Ms. Parker seconded. All members voted in favor.

3. Mr. Stollings stated that he believed it would be appropriate to combine the next two sections of the meeting into one section. Ms. Acosta reported that the FAPT parent representative had resigned. Ms. Acosta stated that she would request the Public Information Officer to advertise the position of FAPT parent representative on the Clarke County CSA website, and that she had already asked the school social worker if the school social worker knew of any appropriate candidates for the parent representative position. Mr. Moore stated that Ms. Acosta had also reached out to him as well. Ms. Parker recommended sending a flyer advertising the position to the Clarke County Parent Teacher Organization (PTO). Ms. Acker and Mr. Moore stated that as Clarke County CSA has had trouble recruiting and maintaining a parent representative to FAPT, they believed a stipend for the parent representative to attend meetings was appropriate. Ms. Parker stated that she and Ms. Acosta would get together to work out the budget for a stipend, but mentioned that any stipend over \$600 total for the fiscal year would require a 1099 tax form be sent to the parent representative as well. Mr. Stollings stated that he thought it would be appropriate to authorize a stipend fund of up to \$50 per FAPT meeting that the parent representative attended and then narrow the actual stipend once a parent representative had been recruited. Ms. Shirley made a motion to approve a stipend for the FAPT parent representative of up to \$50 per FAPT meeting attended, and Ms. Parker seconded the motion. All members voted in favor.

Financial Report:

Ms. Acosta presented the pool reimbursement report for May 2024 and the financial report. Ms. Brenda Bennett, director of Joint Administrative Services and fiscal agent for Clarke County CSA, attended. Ms. Shirley stated that there was an approximately \$300,000 difference between what had been encumbered in FY24 and what was actually spent; Ms. Shirley stated that this was a very large difference and wanted to know what the difference was from. Ms. Bennett stated that to the best of her knowledge, Ms. Acosta had been up to date about requesting unused purchase orders be unencumbered. Ms. Bennett reported that some payments for invoices had already been made in June totaling around \$52,000; Ms. Bennett stated that if the second check run was similar to the first, that would lower the difference between encumbrances and actual expenditures. Ms. Acosta and Ms. Parker reported that there were several vendors who had to be reminded to submit invoices. Mr. Moore asked if there was a certain date by which Clarke County CSA would not pay an invoice. Ms. Acosta responded that per the service contract for Clarke County CSA, the vendors had 45 days from the end of the service period to send an invoice before Clarke County CSA reserved the right to refuse payment due to a late bill. Ms. Acosta also stated that any invoices for FY24 had a hard cut-off date of September 30th, but that she was already reaching out to vendors to ensure invoices were sent in on time. There were no other questions from the team.

Closed Session:

See attachment A for completed form detailing the motion to enter closed session, vote on the items discussed, and certify the discussion in closed session.

Consent Agenda:

The consent agenda with 12 cases and 2 emergency funding requests was reviewed. Ms. Shirley made a motion to approve the cases as discussed in closed session and deny funding for case #357's request for therapeutic mentoring and parent mentoring, case #382's request for childcare due to lack of provider, case #381's request for outpatient therapy, and case #356's request for a non-therapeutic summer camp. Ms. Acker seconded the motion. All members voted in favor.

Mr. Moore made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Parker seconded the motion. All members voted in favor.

Next Meeting: July 23, 2024

Closed Meeting Motions and Certification

At 03:52 PM, Denise Acker

moved to convene in closed session to discuss ,as permitted by VA Code §2.2-3711(A)(4).

2.2-3711(A)(4)—The protection of the privacy of individuals in personal matters not related to public business.

The motion carried by the following vote:

	MOTION BY	SECOND	ABSENT/ABSTAIN	AYE	NAY
<i>Denise Acker</i>	✓				
<i>Jerry Stollings</i>				✓	
<i>Tavan Mair</i>				✓	
<i>Frank Moore</i>				✓	
<i>Jennifer Parker</i>				✓	
<i>Leea Shirley</i>		✓			
<i>Terri Catlett</i>			✓		
<i>David Ash</i>				✓	

At 4:33, with the members of the Clarke County Community Policy and Management Team being assembled within the designated meeting place with open doors and in the presence of members of the public and/or the media desiring to attend, moved to reconvene in open session. The motion carried as follows:

	MOTION BY	SECOND	ABSENT/ABSTAIN	AYE	NAY
<i>Denise Acker</i>	✓				
<i>Jerry Stollings</i>				✓	

<i>Tavan Mair</i>				✓	
<i>Frank Moore</i>				✓	
<i>Jennifer Parker</i>				✓	
<i>Leea Shirley</i>		✓			
<i>Terri Catlett</i>			✓		
<i>David Ash</i>				✓	

Jerry Stollings further moved to execute the following Certification of Closed Session:

CERTIFICATION OF CLOSED SESSION

WHEREAS, the Clarke County Community Policy and Management Team has convened a closed meeting on October 24, 2023, pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

WHEREAS, Section 2.2-3700 of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Clarke County Community Policy and Management Team that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Clarke County Community Policy and Management Team hereby certifies that, to the best of each members knowledge, (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which the certification applies, and (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed or considered by the [public body name]. The motion was approved by the following roll-call vote:

	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	REASON FOR NAY VOTE
<i>Denise Acker</i>	✓			
<i>Jerry Stollings</i>	✓			
<i>Tavan Mair</i>	✓			
<i>Frank Moore</i>	✓			
<i>Jennifer Parker</i>	✓			
<i>Leea Shirley</i>	✓			
<i>Terri Catlett</i>			✓	
<i>David Ash</i>	✓			

The aforesaid Motion and Certificate were adopted in open meeting at a public meeting held on October 24, 2023 of the Clarke County Community Policy and Management Team by roll-call vote as shown above. The Certificate was adopted immediately after the closed meeting at a reconvened open meeting.



Chair



Date