

Memphis TGA

Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism

August 2012

PURPOSE

The Federal Health Resources Services Administration (HRSA) requires that Part A Planning Councils conduct an Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism on a yearly basis. In accordance with the 2006 Ryan White Treatment Modernization Act (Section 2602), this process is to “assess the efficiency of the administrative mechanism in rapidly allocating funds to the areas of greatest need within the eligible area, and at the discretion of the Planning Council, assess the effectiveness, either directly or through contractual agreements of the services offered in meeting the identified needs.”

In June and July 2012, the Memphis Area Ryan White Planning Council conducted the Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism for FY11 and portions of FY12. The surveys were sent to the Ryan White Part A Service Providers and the Ryan White Planning Council. Collaboration between the Grantee (Ryan White Part A Office/Shelby County Division of Community Services) and the Planning Council is essential to the overall effectiveness of the administrative mechanism. Data and survey responses were gathered from both the Service Providers and the Planning Council to assess the following areas:

- Planning Process
- RFP and Procurement Process
- Distribution of Funds
- Contractor Monitoring
- Information and Reporting to the Planning Council
- Communication and Assistance

The results of the assessment process and recommendations of the Part A funded Providers and Planning Council are used in conjunction with the Grantee response as a section of the Part A grant application for FY2013.

METHODS

The Evaluation and Assessment Committee of the Planning Council has the responsibility of ensuring that an Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism is completed each year. The Planning Council Coordinator worked with the Committee to implement the survey, gather and analyze the data requested from the Service Providers and Planning Council members. The Evaluation and Assessment Committee selected Survey Monkey as the tool to gather anonymous responses from recipients on how they perceive the effectiveness and efficiency of the Part A program and rate the Administrative Mechanism in the six areas. Survey Monkey, an internet tool, was used to assess the Administrative Mechanism for FY2008, FY2009, FY2010 and FY 2011. The Evaluation and Assessment Committee reviewed the survey and a minor change was made to one of the questions from previous provider surveys. The Committee felt that the questions were relevant and focused on the six areas for feedback. The survey was sent to Thirty-three (33) Planning Council Members and up to two representatives for a total of twenty-one (21) staff members at various Service Provider. The total number of participants to complete the survey was thirty (30) Planning Council members and fifteen (15) Service Providers. The Evaluation and Assessment Committee was given an aggregate summary of the results and an overall summary of the Survey Monkey findings which are included as part of this report (see Appendix B and C).

PLANNING COUNCIL SURVEY RESULTS

The report is summarized according to the six (6) identified focus areas of the assessment. Data provided by the Planning Council members and general knowledge of various processes within the Part A system are all used to develop this section.

Planning Process:

	Fully/Always	Partly/Usually	Slightly/rarely	Not at all/never	N/A/ Don't Know
FY08	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY09	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY10	66.34%	29.63%	3.01%	0.25%	0.75%
FY11	69.69%	25.30%	1.50%	2.03%	1.50%
FY12	69.63%	28.13%	2.25%	0.00%	0.00%

*NR=Not Reported in previous reports

Questions about the planning process were sent to Full and Alternate members of the Planning Council. Twenty-eight members completed questions relative to the Grantee and Planning Council interactions with directing and understanding services as well as community participation. Results from FY10 through FY12 show steadily improvements in the planning process. Overall, 69.6% of the members “fully/always” agreed with the planning process between the Grantee and the Planning Council. When asked about PLWHA participation during the needs assessment and planning process, 71.4% of members stated there was “fully/always” a high level of involvement. There was also general agreement, 71.4%, that opportunities are available for participation from the general community in planning for HIV services in the TGA. Additionally, a majority of members “fully/always” agreed that the Planning Council and the Grantee work together to refine the standards of care for funded service categories.

Information and Reporting to Planning Council:

	Fully/Always	Partly/Usually	Slightly/rarely	Not at all/never	N/A/ Don't Know
FY08	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY09	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY10	69.4%	26.94%	2.44%	0.40%	0.80%
FY11	67.4%	30.0%	1.7%	0.00%	0.90%
FY12	86.4%	11.4%	0.7%	0.00%	1.40%

*NR=Not Reported in previous reports

The survey asked the Planning Council about the Grantee’s responsiveness during the past year to service utilization, expenditures and other data needed in the decision-making process. Overall, the Planning Council stated that 86.4% of the information reported or requested is “fully/always” given in a timely manner. Results show that 82.1% “fully/always” agreed that the Grantee has made efforts to have at least one representative, excluding the Planning Council Support Staff, at the Planning Council and committee meetings to answer questions, give updates, etc. Members were asked about the overall responsive of the Grantee to the Planning Council and allowed write-in comments. Of the 20 members responding to the question, comments provided are as follows:

Comments on Responsive of the Grantee	
5%	OK
10%	Exceptional/Excellent
40%	(Very) Responsive
25%	(Very) Good
4%	Always helpful and accessible
14.3%	Other Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The Grantee always respond in a timely manner and I’m very appreciative of that.” • The Grantee makes every effort to be responsive to request of Planning Council, however, can do a better job at anticipating information needed.” • The Grantee made themselves available for issues that the Planning Council had and requests were always addressed.” • The Grantee answered all requests by the Planning Council in a timely fashion. In some instances, the Grantee was proactive in anticipating some of the Planning Council’s needs.”

Overall, a majority of the respondents feel reporting, level of communication and responsiveness to requests have been “fully/always” met by the Grantee. Recommendations for improvements are listed in the *Summary of Recommendation* section of the report.

SERVICE PROVIDER SURVEY RESULTS

The RFP and Procurement Process:

	Fully/Always	Partly/Usually	Slightly/Rarely	Not At All/Never	Not Applicable Don’t Know
FY08	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY09	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY10	50.62%	24.05%	3.70%	0.62%	20.97%
FY11	68.17%	21.23%	0.00%	0.00%	10.62%
FY12	73.35%	10.00%	2.22%	0.00%	14.45%

*NR=Not Reported in previous reports

There were six (6) questions directed at the RFP and procurement process for Service Providers to answer in the survey. The overall response of Service Providers completing the survey mentioned responses relative to the Procurement process improved from FY10 and FY12. With 15 (71.4%) of the Service Providers responding to the question, 73.3% were “fully/always” satisfied with the process compared to 68.2% in FY11. Of the three questions regarding the RFP expectations, widely dissemination of information about availability of funding and competitive solicitation, 86.7% of respondents answered each question separately and agreed these actions were “fully/always” included in the RFP and procurement process. Only 40% “fully/always” agreed that the Grantee provided feedback to each bidder.

Distribution of Funds

	Fully/Always	Partly/Usually	Slightly/Rarely	Not At All/Never	Not Applicable Don't Know
FY08	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY09	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY10	23.84%	42.32%	12.30%	7.68%	13.86%
FY11	46.56%	33.28%	7.28%	1.82%	11.10%
FY12	69.34%	26.66%	1.34%	0.00%	2.66%

*NR=Not Reported in previous reports

The Grantee has made great progress in addressing concerns on reporting and reimbursements over the year. Improvements have been consistent from FY10 to FY12. About 69.3% of the Providers surveyed indicated they were “fully/always” agreed with the distribution of funds from the Grantee compared to 46.6% in FY11. However, when asked specifically about the Grantee’s ability to process invoices within two weeks of submission, only 46.7% of Service Providers stated this was “fully/always” done.

Contract Monitoring:

	Fully/Always	Partly/Usually	Slightly/Rarely	Not At All/Never	Not Applicable Don't Know
FY08	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY09	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY10	61.50%	15.40%	5.10%	1.27%	16.67%
FY11	78.17%	18.50%	0.00%	0.00%	3.33%
FY12	88.90%	8.90%	0.00%	0.00%	2.23%

*NR=Not Reported in previous reports

Service Providers continue to see improvement in contract monitoring from FY10-FY12. The rising response of “fully/always”, from 61.5% to 88.9%, over past years demonstrates satisfaction with the monitoring process. More specifically, results show 93.3% agreed that the Grantee “fully/always” conducted site visits. 86.7% of services providers “fully/always” agreed that the Grantee use a standardized review processes and gives advance notice of various documentations to have on hand for a site visit.

Communication and Assistance:

	Fully/Always	Partly/Usually	Slightly/Rarely	Not At All/Never	Not Applicable Don't Know
FY08	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY09	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY10	40.00%	40.00%	10.00%	0.00%	10.00%
FY11	50.00%	40.95%	9.10%	0.00%	0.00%
FY12	73.30%	26.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

*NR=Not Reported in previous reports

Service Providers were pleased with the continued improvement in the area of communication and assistance over past years. 73.3% in FY12 noted that the Grantee continues to do a great job in fostering communication, technical assistance and responding to request in order to assist with providing quality services to clients.

SERVICE PROVIDER OVERALL SATISFACTION SUMMARY FOR FY12

	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A Little Satisfied	Not At All Satisfied	Rating Average
The RFP and Procurement process	60.0%	33.3%	6.7%	0%	3.53
Reporting	66.7%	26.7%	0%	6.7%	3.53
Reimbursement	73.3%	26.7%	0%	0%	3.73
Contract Monitoring	66.7%	26.7%	0.0%	6.7%	3.53
Communication with Providers	80.0%	13.3%	6.7%	0%	3.73
Technical Assistance to Providers	66.7%	26.7%	6.7%	0%	3.60

Overall, the assessment based on Service Providers responses showed strong satisfaction with all areas of the relationship with the Grantee and the provision of HIV services in the Memphis TGA. Every category indicated a plurality of “very satisfied.”

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

1. The Grantee is doing an excellent job overall. Service Providers and the Planning Council recommend continued effort in keeping the lines of communication open and clear.
2. Service Providers note an improvement in the invoice processing. The Grantee should continue building upon this strength and ensure timely processing of all invoices.
3. We continue to see requests for technical assistance (TA). The Evaluation and Assessment Committee recognizes that this is an on-going need as the processes and laws associated with the Ryan White Legislation Act change or are modified. We encourage the Grantee to respond quickly to TA requests to ensure we have excellent delivery of services to our TGA.
4. The Evaluation and Assessment Committee recommend that the Grantee continue to explore new opportunities to include communities impacted by HIV to be part of the Ryan White service process.
5. The Grantee needs to ensure proper feedback is given to each agency that respond to the RFP in a timely matter.
6. The Grantee should work effectively in processing invoices within 2 weeks of being submitted.

APPENDIX A. SUMMARY OF PROVIDER AND PLANNING COUNCIL COMMENTS

Comments from Service Providers and Planning Council members are categorized into four areas below. Comments not containing quotations may have been paraphrased and are representative of a large number of responses. Comments in quotes have been included to illustrate specific concerns that are unique in comparison to the more common paraphrased content.

- Accountability and Reporting
- Communication
- Education
- Miscellaneous

- **Accountability and Reporting**
Provider

1. “The Grantee provides all the support and information necessary to facilitate programs.”
2. “Excellent work by Grantee's office. The processes get refined year after year. Your hard work shows and we certainly appreciate it.”
3. “Great job by grantees office. Staff continues to be responsive and helpful to providers.”
4. The Grantee ensure payments/reimbursements are made on time.
The Grantee has improved the invoice process; the process has been accurate and very timely.

- **Communication**
Provider

1. The Grantee response to questions and concerns in a very timely manner.
2. The Grantee is clear and consistent with feedback on the process update.
3. “We are kept informed with changes.”
4. Provider relations with the Grantee continues to improve.
5. The Grantee provides updates from ongoing events that affect the Ryan White part A program.

- **Planning Council**

6. “The Grantee should strive to use basic language in explaining financial aspects to unaligned members.”
7. “Anticipate the data needs of Planning Council members and indicate limitations of the data presented.”

- **Education**
Provider

1. The Grantee continues to offer Technical Assistance (TA) to providers.

- **Planning Council**

2. “Develop trend data over several years to identify utilization to aid the Planning Council with making priority decisions.”
3. “Continue to offer training and educational sessions to explain the reports presented by the Grantee.”

- **Miscellaneous**

- **Planning Council**

1. “I believe that the Planning Council and Grantee are doing the best that they can in order to provide information for Consumers and the public. However, I also believe that a lot of the pressure that can be seen is not a strike against the administrative mechanism but that patience is also necessary in order to get things done properly.”
2. “Strengthen input from consumers in focus groups (Needs Assessment). Currently a convenience sample is used that results in highly motivated clients to participate. This strategy of holding a central

meeting and inviting consumers to participate, results in inadvertent elimination of consumers that struggle with engagement to care. Holding these groups at FFL on food pantry day, at their clinics, etc may make enhance their participation in focus groups.”

APPENDIX B. PLANNING COUNCIL AND PROVIDER AND 2012 SURVEY RESULTS

Summary of Survey Monkey Results - 2012								
Planning Council Members								
Question #	Planning Process	N=	Response					N/A - Don't Know
			Rate R=33	Fully/ always	Partly/ usually	Slightly/rarely	Not at all/never	
			R=33					
1	PC & Grantee - assess unmet need & service gaps	28	84.8%	67.90%	32.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
2	Assessment & Planning process - opportunity for gen community participation	28	84.8%	71.40%	28.60%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
3	High level of PLWHA participation	28	84.8%	71.40%	25.00%	3.60%	0.00%	0.00%
4	PC provides Grantee -- priority service categories and allocations for each	28	84.8%	75.00%	21.40%	3.60%	0.00%	0.00%
5	clear directives on how to meet the priorities & other factors to consider in procurement	28	84.8%	57.10%	39.30%	3.60%	0.00%	0.00%
6	clear direction on when & how to reallocate funds to avoid carryover	28	84.8%	71.40%	25.00%	3.60%	0.00%	0.00%
7	Clear allocations and directives for use of carryover funds	28	84.8%	71.40%	25.00%	3.60%	0.00%	0.00%
8	PC & Grantee - develop & refine Stds of Care	28	84.8%	71.40%	28.60%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
				69.63%	28.13%	2.25%	0.00%	0.00%
	Information and Reporting to Planning Council	28	84.8%					
9	Grantee provides PC - summary data reports and financial info within 60 days	28	84.8%	82.1%	17.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
10	Monthly reports on service utilization and expenditures by service category	28	84.8%	89.3%	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	year-end summary of expenditures, utilization, unit cost/demograph by service category	28	84.8%	89.3%	7.1%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%
12	other info and analysis for decision making	28	84.8%	89.3%	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
13	Grantee has somebody at each meeting (not PC staff)	28	84.8%	82.1%	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%
				86.4%	11.4%	0.7%	0.0%	1.4%
14	How responsive was the Grantee to PL requests during the year? VG=10; Good=3; Fair=1							
Providers								
	Procurement Process	N=	R=15	Fully/ always	Partly/ usually	Slightly/rarely	Not at all/never	N/A - Don't Know
1	Grantee conducts an open and competitive procurement process	15	100.0%	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
2	RFP clear re expectations, HRSA P&P, Stds of Care, expected performance measures, rptg requirements	15	100.0%	86.70%	6.70%	0.00%	0.00%	6.70%
3	disseminates info widely re availability of funds	15	100.0%	86.70%	6.70%	0.00%	0.00%	6.70%
4	allow at least 30 days to respond to competitive solicitations	15	100.0%	66.70%	13.30%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%
5	selection criteria provide reasonable consideration to new providers	15	100.0%	80.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%
6	Grantee provides feedback to each bidder	15	100.0%	40.00%	13.30%	13.30%	0.00%	33.30%
				73.35%	10.00%	2.22%	0.00%	14.45%
	Distribution of Funds							
7	Contracts - clear definition for each funded service category	15	100.0%	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
8	Contracts - initiated & signed prior to new service period - reasonable grace period	15	100.0%	60.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
9	Payments - within 45 days of submission of complete, accurate invoices	15	100.0%	73.30%	26.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
10	Grantee processes invoices within 2 weeks of submission	15	100.0%	46.70%	33.30%	6.70%	0.00%	13.30%
11	Grantee modified existing systems to respond to needs of service providers	15	100.0%	86.70%	13.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
				69.34%	26.66%	1.34%	0.00%	2.66%
	Contract Monitoring							
12	Site visits --Grantee conducts at least 1x/year to assess contractor performance	15	100.0%	93.30%	6.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
13	Grantee uses standardized review process and info gathering tools	15	100.0%	86.70%	6.70%	0.00%	0.00%	6.70%
14	Providers get 2 week advance notice and advised about documentation to have on hand	15	100.0%	86.70%	13.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
				88.90%	8.90%	0.00%	0.00%	2.23%
	Communication and Assistance							
15	TA -- Grantee provides to help providers with financial mgmt, data collection, other reporting requirements	15	100.0%	73.30%	26.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
16	Grantee responds within 5 days to requests for info or assistance	15	100.0%	73.30%	26.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
				73.30%	26.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	How satisfied were you with?			Very	Moderately	A Little	Not at All	Rating Average
19	RFP and Procurement process			60.00%	33.30%	6.70%	0.00%	3.53
	Reporting			66.70%	26.70%	0.00%	6.70%	3.53
	Reimbursements			73.00%	26.70%	0.00%	0.00%	3.73
	Contract monitoring			66.70%	26.70%	0.00%	6.70%	3.53
	Communications with providers			80.00%	13.30%	6.70%	0.00%	3.73
	TA to providers			66.70%	26.70%	6.70%	0.00%	3.6

APPENDIX C. OVERALL SATISFACTION COMPARISON RESULTS FY08-FY 12

Provider Results

<u>The RFP & Procurement Process</u>	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A Little Satisfied	Not At All Satisfied	Rating Average
FY08	12.5%	25%	25%	37.5%	2.13
FY09	30%	70%	0%	0%	3.00
FY10	39.1%	56.5%	4.3%	0%	3.35
FY11	36.4%	63.6%	0%	0%	3.36
FY12	60.0%	33.3%	6.7%	0%	3.53
<u>Reporting</u>					
FY08	NR*	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY09	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY10	30.4%	60.9%	0%	8.7%	3.13
FY11	36.4%	63.6%	0%	0%	3.36
FY12	66.7%	26.7%	0.0%	6.7%	3.53
<u>Reimbursement</u>					
FY08	0	42.9%	14.3%	42.9%	2.00
FY09	0	60%	10%	30%	2.30
FY10	13.0%	60.9%	8.7%	17.4%	2.70
FY11	45.5%	54.5%	0%	10%	3.45
FY12	73.3%	26.7%	0%	0%	3.73
<u>Contract Monitoring</u>					
FY08	28.6%	42.9%	14.3%	14.3%	2.86
FY09	30%	50%	20%	0%	3.10
FY10	39.1%	47.8%	13.0%	0%	3.26
FY11	72.7%	27.3%	0%	0%	3.73
FY12	66.7%	26.7%	0.0%	6.7%	3.53
<u>Communications with Providers</u>					
FY08					
FY09	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	0%	3.20
FY10	47.8%	43.5%	8.7%	0%	3.39
FY11	70.0%	30.0%	0%	0%	3.70
FY12	80.0%	13.3%	6.7%	0%	3.73
<u>Technical Assistance to Providers</u>					
FY08	NR*	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY09	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY10	34.8%	47.8%	13.0%	4.3%	3.13
FY11	72.7%	27.3%	0%	0%	3.73
FY12	66.7%	26.7%	6.7%	0%	3.60

Planning Council Summary

<u>Planning Process</u>	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A Little Satisfied	Not At All Satisfied	N/A- Don't Know
FY08	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY09	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY10	65.5%	30.4%	3.1%	0.3%	0.8%
FY11	69.7%	25.3%	1.5%	2.0%	NR
FY12	69.3%	28.13%	2.25%	0.0%	1.50%
<u>Information and Reporting to Planning Council</u>					
FY08	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY09	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY10	46.3%	41.5%	12.2%	0.0%	0.0%
FY11	67.4%	30.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.9%
FY12	86.4%	11.4%	0.7%	0.0%	1.4%

*NR=Not Reported in previous reports