Adopted: August 22, 1991
Amended: August 29, 1996
Proposed Amendment: January 26, 2006
j:mandates/reconsideration/2004 statutes/sb1895-handicapped/psgs/4282psgsamend

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES

~~Sections 60000-60200~~
~~Title 2, California Code of Regulations, Division 9~~
~~Chapter 1747, Statutes of 1984~~
~~Chapter 1274, Statutes of 1985~~

Government Code Sections 7570-7588

Statutes 1984, Chapter 1747 (Assem. Bill No. 3632);
Statutes 1985, Chapter 1274 (Assem. Bill No. 882)

California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Sections 60000-60610 (Emergency Regulations filed December 31, 1985, designated effective January 1, 1986 (Register 86, No. 1) and refiled June 30, 1986, designated effective July 12, 1986 (Register 86, No. 28))

Handicapped and Disabled Students (CSM 4282)

I. SUMMARY OF MANDATE

Chapter 1747 of the Statutes of 1984 added Chapter 26, commencing with section 7570, to Division 7 of Title 1 of the Government code (Gov. Code).

Chapter 1274 of the Statutes of 1985 amended sections 7572, 7572.5, 7575, 7576, 7579, 7582, and 7587 of, amended and repealed 7583 of, added section 7586.5 and 7586.7 to, and repealed 7574 of, the Gov. Code, and amended section 5651 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

To the extent that Gov. Code section 7572 and section 60040, Title 2, Code of California Regulations, require county participation in the mental health assessment for "individuals with exceptional needs," such legislation and regulations impose a new program or higher level of service upon a county. Furthermore, any related county participation on the expanded "Individualized Education Program" (IEP) team and case management services for "individuals with exceptional needs" who are designated as "seriously emotionally disturbed," pursuant to subdivisions (a), (b), and (c) of Gov. Code section 7572.5 and their implementing regulations, impose a new program or higher level of service upon a county.

The aforementioned mandatory county participation in the IEP process is not subject to the Short-Doyle Act, and accordingly, such costs related thereto are costs mandated by the state and are fully reimbursable within the meaning of section 6, article XIIIB of the California Constitution.

The provisions of Welfare and Institutions Code section 5651, subdivision (g), result in a higher level of service within the county Short-Doyle program because the mental health services, pursuant to Gov. Code sections 7571 and 7576 and their implementing regulations, must be included in the county Short-Doyle annual plan. Such services include psychotherapy and other mental health services provided to "individuals with exceptional needs," including those designated as "seriously emotionally disturbed," and required in such individual's IEP.

Such mental health services are subject to the current cost sharing formula of the Short-Doyle Act, through which the state provides ninety (90) percent of the total costs of the Short-Doyle program, and the county is required to provide the remaining ten (10) percent of the funds. Accordingly, only ten (10) percent of such program costs are reimbursable within the meaning of section 6, article XIIIB of the California Constitution as costs mandated by the state, because the Short-Doyle Act currently provides counties ninety (90) percent of the costs of furnishing those mental health services set forth in Gov. Code section 7571 and 7576 and their implementing regulations, and described in the county's Short-Doyle annual plan pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 5651, subdivision (g).

II. COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES' DECISIONS

The Commission on State Mandates, at its April 26, 1990 hearing, adopted a Statement of Decision that determined that County participation in the IEP process is a state mandated program and any costs related thereto are fully reimbursable. Furthermore, any mental health treatment required by an IEP is subject to the Short-Doyle cost sharing formula. Consequently, only the county's Short-Doyle share (i.e., ten percent) of the mental health treatment costs will be reimbursed as costs mandated by the state.

Statutes 2004, chapter 493 (Sen. Bill No. 1895) directed the Commission to reconsider the 1990 Statement of Decision and parameters and guidelines for this program. On May 26, 2005, the Commission adopted a Statement of Decision on reconsideration of Handicapped and Disabled Students (04-RL-4282-10). The Commission found that the 1990 Statement of Decision correctly concluded that the test claim legislation imposes a reimbursable state-mandated program on counties pursuant to article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution. The Commission determined, however, that the 1990 Statement of Decision does not fully identify all of the activities mandated by the statutes and regulations pled in the test claim or the offsetting revenue applicable to the claim. Thus, the Commission, on reconsideration, identified the activities expressly required by the test claim legislation and the offsetting revenue that must be identified and deducted from the costs claimed. The Commission's Statement of Decision on reconsideration has a period of reimbursement beginning July 1, 2004.

III. ELIGIBLE CLAIMANTS

All counties

IV. PERIOD OF REIMBURSEMENT

Section 17557 of the Gov. Code states that a test claim must be submitted on or before December 31 following a given fiscal year to establish eligibility for that year. The test

claim for this mandate was filed on August 17, 1987, all costs incurred on or after July 1, 1986, through and including June 30, 2004, are reimbursable.

Costs incurred beginning July 1, 2004, shall be claimed under the parameters and guidelines for the Commission's decision on reconsideration, *Handicapped and Disabled Students* (04-Rl-4282-10).

Actual costs for one fiscal year should be included in each claim, and estimated costs for the subsequent year may be included on the same claim, if applicable, pursuant to Government Code section 17561.

If the total costs for a given fiscal year do not exceed $200[1], no reimbursement shall be allowed, except as otherwise allowed by Gov. Code section 17564.

V. REIMBURSABLE COSTS

A. One Hundred (100) percent of any costs related to IEP Participation, Assessment, and Case Management:

1. The scope of the mandate is one hundred (100) percent reimbursement, except that for individuals billed to Medi-Cal only, the Federal Financing Participation portion (FFP) for these activities should be deducted from reimbursable activities not subject to the Short-Doyle Act.

2. For each eligible claimant, the following cost items are one hundred (100) percent reimbursable (Gov. Code, section 7572, subd. (d)(1)):

   a. Whenever an LEA refers an individual suspected of being an 'individual with exceptional needs' to the local mental health department, mental health assessment and recommendation by qualified mental health professionals in conformance with assessment procedures set forth in Article 2 (commencing with section 56320) of Chapter 4 of part 30 of Division 4 of the Education Code, and regulations developed by the State Department of Mental Health, in consultation with the State Department of Education, including but not limited to the following mandated services:

      i. interview with the child and family,

      ii. collateral interviews, as necessary,

      iii. review of the records,

      iv. observation of the child at school, and

      v. psychological testing and/or psychiatric assessment, as necessary.

   b. Review and discussion of mental health assessment and recommendation with parent and appropriate IEP team members. (Government Code section 7572, subd. (d)(1)).

   c. Attendance by the mental health professional who conducted the assessment at IEP meetings, when requested. (Government Code section 7572, subd. (d)(1)).

[1] Beginning September 30, 2002, claims must exceed $1000. (Stats. 2002, ch. 1124.)

d. Review by claimant's mental health professional of any independent assessment(s) submitted by the IEP team. (Government Code section 7572, subd. (d)(2)).

e. When the written mental health assessment report provided by the local mental health program determines that an 'individual with special needs' is 'seriously emotionally disturbed', and any member of the IEP team recommends residential placement based upon relevant assessment information, inclusion of the claimant's mental health professional on that individual's expanded IEP team.

f. When the IEP prescribes residential placement for an 'individual with exceptional needs' who is 'seriously emotionally disturbed,' claimant's mental health personnel's identification of out-of-home placement, case management, six month review of IEP, and expanded IEP responsibilities. (Government Code section 7572.5).

g. Required participation in due process procedures, including but not limited to due process hearings.

3. One hundred (100) percent of any administrative costs related to IEP Participation, Assessment, and Case Management, whether direct or indirect.

B. Ten (10) percent of any costs related to mental health treatment services rendered under the Short-Doyle Act :

1. The scope of the mandate is ten (10) percent reimbursement.

2. For each eligible claimant, the following cost items, for the provision of mental health services when required by a child's individualized education program, are ten (10) percent reimbursable (Government Code 7576):

a. Individual therapy,

b. Collateral therapy and contacts,

c. Group therapy,

d. Day treatment, and

e. Mental health portion of residential treatment in excess of the State Department of Social Services payment for the residential placement.

3. Ten (10) percent of any administrative costs related to mental health treatment services rendered under the Short-Doyle Act, whether direct or indirect.

VI. CLAIM PREPARATION

There are two satisfactory methods of submitting claims for reimbursement of increased costs incurred to comply with the mandate:

A. Actual Increased Costs Method. To claim under the Actual Increased Costs Method, report actual increased costs incurred for each of the following expense categories in the format specified by the State Controller's claiming instructions. Attach supporting schedules as necessary:

1. Employee Salaries and Benefits: Show the classification of the employees involved, mandated functions performed, number of hours devoted to the function, and hourly rates and benefits.

2. Services and supplies: Include only expenditures which can be identified as a direct cost resulting from the mandate. List cost of materials acquired which have been consumed or expended specifically for the purpose of this mandate.

3. Direct Administrative Costs:

   a. One hundred (100) percent of any direct administrative costs related to IEP Participation, Assessment, and Case Management.

   b. Ten (10) percent of any direct administrative costs related to mental health treatment rendered under the Short-Doyle Act.

4. Indirect Administrative and Overhead Costs: To the extent that reimbursable indirect costs have not already been reimbursed by DMH from categorical funding sources, they may be claimed under this method in either of the two following ways prescribed in the State Controller's claiming instructions:

   a. Ten (10) percent of related direct labor, excluding fringe benefits. This method may not result in a total combined reimbursement from DMH and SCO for program indirect costs which exceeds ten (10) percent of total program direct labor costs, excluding fringe benefits.

   OR if an indirect cost rate greater than ten (10) percent is being claimed,

   b. By preparation of an "Indirect Cost Rate Proposal" (ICRP) in full compliance with Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-87 (OMB A-87). Note that OMB A-87 was revised as of May 17, 1995, and that while OMB A-87 is based on the concept of full allocation of indirect costs, it recognizes that in addition to its restrictions, there may be state laws or state regulations which further restrict allowability of costs. Additionally, if more than one department is involved in the mandated program; each department must have its own ICRP. Under this method, total reimbursement for program indirect costs from combined DMH and SCO sources must not exceed the total for those items as computed in the ICRP(s).

B. Cost Report Method. Under this claiming method the mandate reimbursement claim is still submitted on the State Controller's claiming forms in accordance with the claiming instructions. A complete copy of the annual cost report including all supporting schedules attached to the cost report as filed with DMH must also be filed with the claim forms submitted to the State Controller.

1. To the extent that reimbursable indirect costs have not already been reimbursed by DMH from categorical funding sources, they may be claimed under this method in either of the two following ways prescribed in the State Controller's claiming instructions:

   a. Ten (10) percent of related direct labor, excluding fringe benefits. This method may not result in a total combined reimbursement from DMH and SCO for

program indirect costs which exceeds ten (10) percent of total program direct labor costs, excluding fringe benefits.

OR if an indirect cost rate greater than ten (10) percent is being claimed,

b. By preparation of an "Indirect Cost Rate Proposal" (ICRP) in full compliance with Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-87 (OMB A-87). Note that OMB A-87 was revised as of May 17, 1995, and that while OMB A-87 is based on the concept of full allocation of indirect costs, it recognizes that in addition to its restrictions, there may be state laws or state regulations which further restrict allowability of costs. Additionally, if more than one department is involved in the mandated program; each department must have its own ICRP. Under this method, total reimbursement for program indirect costs from combined DMH and SCO sources must not exceed the total for those items as computed in the ICRP(s).

VII. SUPPORTING DATA

For auditing purposes, all costs claimed must be traceable to source documents and/or worksheets that show evidence of the validity of such costs. Pursuant to Government Code section 17558.5, subdivision (a), a reimbursement claim for actual costs filed by a local agency or school district is subject to audit by the State Controller no later than two years after the end of the calendar year in which the reimbursement claim is filed or last amended. However, if no funds are appropriated for the program for the fiscal year for which the claim is made, the time for the State Controller to initiate an audit shall commence to run from the date of initial payment of the claim.

VIII. OFFSETTING SAVINGS AND OTHER REIMBURSEMENTS

A. Any offsetting savings the claimant experiences as a direct result of this statute must be deducted from the costs claimed.

B. The following reimbursements for this mandate shall be deducted from the claim:

1. Any direct payments (categorical funding) received from the State which are specifically allocated to this program; and
2. Any other reimbursement for this mandate (excluding Short-Doyle funding, private insurance payments, and Medi-Cal payments), which is received from any source, e.g. federal, state, etc.

IX. REQUIRED CERTIFICATION

An authorized representative of the claimant will be required to provide a certification of claim, as specified in the State Controller's claiming instructions, for those costs mandated by the state contained herein.