

# Memphis TGA

## Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism

### August 2013

#### PURPOSE

The Federal Health Resources Services Administration (HRSA) requires that Part A Planning Groups 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 Group, assess the effectiveness, either directly or through contractual agreements of the services offered in meeting the identified needs.”

In June and July 2013, the Memphis Area Ryan White Planning Group conducted the Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism for FY12 and portions of FY13. The surveys were sent to the Ryan White Part A Service Providers and the Ryan White Planning Group. Collaboration between the Grantee (Ryan White Part A Office/Shelby County Division of Community Services) and the Planning Group is essential to the overall effectiveness of the administrative mechanism. Data and survey responses were gathered from both the Service Providers and the Planning Group to assess the following areas:

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

The results of the assessment process and recommendations of the Part A funded Providers and Planning Group are used in conjunction with the Grantee response as a section of the Part A grant application for FY2014.

#### METHODS

The Evaluation and Assessment Committee of the Planning Group has the responsibility of ensuring that an Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism is completed each year. The Planning Group Coordinator worked with the Committee to implement the survey, gather and analyze the data requested from the Service Providers and Planning Group 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, FY2011 and FY 2012. The Evaluation and Assessment Committee reviewed the survey and minor changes were made to 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-two (32) Planning Group Members and up to two representatives for a total of thirty-seven (37) staff members at various Service Provider. The total number of participants to complete the survey was twenty-seven (27) Planning Group members and twenty-two (22) 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 GROUP SURVEY RESULTS

The report is summarized according to the six (6) identified focus areas of the assessment. Data provided by the Planning Group 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%
FY13	66.00%	26.34%	4.75%	0.00%	2.86%

\*NR=Not Reported in previous reports

Questions about the planning process were sent to Full and Alternate members of the Planning Group. Twenty-seven members completed questions relative to the Grantee and Planning Group interactions with directing and understanding services as well as community participation. Results from FY10 through FY12 show steady improvements in the planning process, with a slight drop in FY13. Overall, 66.00% of the members “fully/always” agreed with the planning process between the Grantee and the Planning Group. When asked about PLWHA participation during the needs assessment and planning process, 63.00% of members stated there was “fully/always” a high level of involvement compared to 71.40% last year. There was also a decrease from 71.40% in 2012 to 57.70% in 2013 of people “fully/always” agreeing that opportunities are available for participation from the general community in planning for HIV services in the TGA. However, a majority of members, 76.9%, “fully/always” agreed that the Planning Group and the Grantee work together to refine the standards of care for funded service categories.

### Information and Reporting to Planning Group:

	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	69.40%	26.94%	2.44%	0.40%	0.80%
FY11	67.40%	30.00%	1.70%	0.00%	0.90%
FY12	86.40%	11.40%	0.70%	0.00%	1.40%
FY13	83.60%	11.92%	3.72%	0.00%	0.74%

\*NR=Not Reported in previous reports

The survey asked the Planning Group 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 Group stated that 83.60% of the information reported or requested is “fully/always” given in a timely manner. Results show that 85.20% “fully/always” agreed that the Grantee has made efforts to have at least one representative, excluding the Planning Group Support Staff, at the Planning Group and committee meetings to answer questions, give updates, etc. Members were asked about the overall responsive of the Grantee to the Planning Group and allowed write-in comments. Of the 17 members responding to the question, comments provided are as follows:

%	Comments on Responsive of the Grantee
6%	OK
12%	Exceptional/Excellent
47%	(Very) Responsive
17%	(Very) Good
17%	Other Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “The Grantee is not at all with the consumer”</li> <li>• “One a scale of one to ten (ten being the highest), I would give the Grantee a 7 on responsiveness”</li> <li>• “The Grantee is always very responsive in a timely manner”</li> </ul>

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%
FY13	73.70%	6.48%	1.75%	0.00%	18.07%

\*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 to FY13. With 22 (59.50%) of the Service Providers responding to the question, 73.70% were “fully/always” satisfied with the process compared to 63.35% in FY11. Of the three questions regarding the RFP expectations, 90.50% “fully/always” agreed that the grantee conducts a competitive selection process and 90.00% “fully/always” agreed the RFP clearly states their expectations of care and performance. However, only 47.40% “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%
FY13	71.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.00%

\*NR=Not Reported in previous reports

The Grantee has made great progress in addressing concerns on reporting and reimbursements over the year. Responses continue to improve from FY10 to FY13. 71.00% of the Providers surveyed indicated they “fully/always” agreed with the distribution of funds from the Grantee compared to 69.34% in FY12 and 46.56% in FY11. When asked specifically about the Grantee’s ability to process invoices within two weeks of submission, 80.00% of Service Providers stated this was “fully/always” done, compared to 46.70% in FY12. Yet, only 55.00% “fully/always” agreed that the contracts between the Grantee and provider agencies were signed prior to the start of a new service period.

**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%
FY13	88.17%	6.77%	0.00%	0.00%	5.10%

\*NR=Not Reported in previous reports

Service Providers see a consistent response satisfaction in contract monitoring from FY12-FY13. The rising response of “fully/always”, from 61.50% to 88.17%, over past years demonstrates approval with the monitoring process. More specifically, results show 90.00% agreed that the Grantee “fully/always” conducted site visits. 89.50% 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%
FY13	72.50%	22.50%	0.00%	2.50%	2.50%

\*NR=Not Reported in previous reports

Service Providers remain pleased with the continued improvement in the area of communication and assistance from FY10-FY13. 72.50% 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 FY13

	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A Little Satisfied	Not At All Satisfied	Rating Average
The RFP and Procurement process	73.70%	26.30%	0.00%	0.00%	3.74
Reporting	68.40%	31.60%	0.00%	0.00%	3.68
Reimbursement	68.40%	31.60%	0.00%	0.00%	3.68
Contract Monitoring	78.90%	21.10%	0.00%	0.00%	3.79
Communication with Providers	78.90%	21.10%	0.00%	0.00%	3.79
Technical Assistance to Providers	84.20%	15.80%	0.00%	0.00%	3.84

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 Evaluation and Assessment Committee recommends the Grantee provide continuous updates on how the Affordable Care Act will impact the provision of Ryan White medical and supportive services.

## APPENDIX A. SUMMARY OF PROVIDER AND PLANNING GROUP COMMENTS

Comments from Service Providers and Planning Group 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 is doing a fantastic job. The improvements over the years are getting better and better for the providers”
2. “The Grantee has a strong commitment to the Ryan White programming and funding.”
3. “The Grantee pays close attention to funding issues and shifts funds as appropriate.”
4. “The Grantee was always available for our questions”

#### Planning Group

5. “The planning group should request information in a more timely and informed manner.”
6. “The Grantee should be more anticipatory of certain requests for information.”

### ➤ **Communication**

#### Provider

1. The Grantee listens and responds 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 informed of changes with the grant.”
4. Provider relations with the Grantee continue to improve.
5. The Grantee provides updates from ongoing events that affect the Ryan White part A program.

#### Planning Group

6. The Grantee and Planning Group should come together as a group before the meeting.
7. “The Grantee should really listen to what consumers are saying.”

### ➤ **Education**

#### Provider

1. The Grantee continues to offer Technical Assistance (TA) to providers.
2. “The Grantee has a well informed staff”
3. “Continue working/sharing with other agencies”

#### Planning Group

4. “The Grantee should delegate and mentor Planning Group members to take initiative and leadership.”
5. “If applicable, the planning group should consider sharing information to grantees if they aren’t involved in the planning group.”

### ➤ **Miscellaneous**

#### Planning Group

1. The Planning Group and Providers are doing a great job, and should continue the good work.
2. “The Planning Group should take more responsibility for the work of the Planning Group rather than always relying on staff.”

#### Providers

3. Providers would like to see “more visibility in the community” and obtain “outside grants to meet the needs of the community.”





**APPENDIX C. OVERALL SATISFACTION COMPARISON RESULTS FY08-FY 13**

**Provider Results**

<u>The RFP &amp; Procurement Process</u>	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A Little Satisfied	Not At All Satisfied	Rating Average
FY08	12.50%	25.00%	25.00%	37.50%	2.13
FY09	30.00%	70.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.00
FY10	39.10%	56.50%	4.30%	0.00%	3.35
FY11	36.40%	63.60%	0.00%	0.00%	3.36
FY12	60.00%	33.30%	6.70%	0.00%	3.53
FY13	73.70%	26.30%	0.00%	0.00%	3.74
<b><u>Reporting</u></b>					
FY08	NR*	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY09	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY10	30.40%	60.90%	0.00%	8.70%	3.13
FY11	36.40%	63.60%	0.00%	0.00%	3.36
FY12	66.70%	26.70%	0.00%	6.70%	3.53
FY13	68.40%	31.60%	0.00%	0.00%	3.68
<b><u>Reimbursement</u></b>					
FY08	0.00%	42.90%	14.30%	42.90%	2.00
FY09	0.00%	60.00%	10.00%	30.00%	2.30
FY10	13.00%	60.90%	8.70%	17.40%	2.70
FY11	45.50%	54.50%	0.00%	10.00%	3.45
FY12	73.30%	26.70%	0.00%	0.00%	3.73
FY13	68.40%	31.60%	0.00%	0.00%	3.68
<b><u>Contract Monitoring</u></b>					
FY08	28.60%	42.90%	14.30%	14.30%	2.86
FY09	30.00%	50.00%	20.00%	0.00%	3.10
FY10	39.10%	47.80%	13.00%	0.00%	3.26
FY11	72.70%	27.30%	0.00%	0.00%	3.73
FY12	66.70%	26.70%	0.00%	6.70%	3.53
FY13	78.90%	21.10%	0.00%	0.00%	3.79
<b><u>Communications with Providers</u></b>					
FY08					
FY09	40.00%	40.00%	20.00%	0.00%	3.20
FY10	47.80%	43.50%	8.70%	0.00%	3.39
FY11	70.00%	30.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.70
FY12	80.00%	13.30%	6.70%	0.00%	3.73
FY13	78.90%	21.10%	0.00%	0.00%	3.79
<b><u>Technical Assistance to Providers</u></b>					
FY08	NR*	NR	NR	NR	NR

FY09	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY10	34.80%	47.80%	13.00%	4.30%	3.13
FY11	72.70%	27.30%	0.00%	0.00%	3.73
FY12	66.70%	26.70%	6.70%	0.00%	3.60
FY13	84.20%	15.80%	0.00%	0.00%	3.84
<b>Planning Group Summary</b>					
<u>Planning Process</u>	<b>Very Satisfied</b>	<b>Moderately Satisfied</b>	<b>A Little Satisfied</b>	<b>Not At All Satisfied</b>	<b>N/A- Don't Know</b>
FY08	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY09	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY10	65.50%	30.40%	3.10%	0.30%	0.80%
FY11	69.70%	25.30%	1.50%	2.00%	NR
FY12	69.63%	28.13%	2.25%	0.00%	0.00%
FY13	66.00%	26.34%	4.75%	0.00%	2.86%
<u>Information and Reporting to Planning Group</u>					
FY08	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY09	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY10	46.30%	41.50%	12.20%	0.00%	0.00%
FY11	67.40%	30.00%	1.70%	0.00%	0.90%
FY12	86.40%	11.40%	0.70%	0.00%	1.40%
FY13	83.60%	11.92%	3.72%	0.00%	0.74%

\*NR=Not Reported in previous reports