

# Memphis TGA

## Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism

### August 2014

#### 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 2014, the Memphis Area Ryan White Planning Group conducted the Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism for FY13 and portions of FY14. The surveys were sent to the Ryan White Part A Service Providers and the HIV-Care and Prevention Group (H-CAP). Collaboration between the Grantee (Ryan White Part A Office/Shelby County Division of Community Services) and H-CAP 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 FY2015.

#### METHODS

The Evaluation and Assessment Committee of H-CAP has the responsibility of ensuring that an Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism is completed each year. The Planning Group Manager 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, FY 2012 and FY 2013. The Evaluation and Assessment Committee reviewed the survey and minor changes were made to the questions from previous surveys. The Committee felt that the questions were relevant and focused on the six areas for feedback. The survey was sent to Thirty-one (31) Planning Group Members and up to two representatives at the 17 Service Providers for FY2013. The total number of participants to complete the survey was twenty-seven (27) Planning Group members and twenty-two (22) Service Providers representing each funded agency. 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%
FY14	71.20	23.65%	0.48%	0.00%	3.80%

\*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. However FY14 shows improvements. Overall, 71.20% 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, 62.23% of members stated there was “fully/always” a high level of involvement compared to 63.00% last year. There was an increase from 57.00% in 2013 to 62.96% in 2014 of people “fully/always” agreeing that opportunities are available for participation from the general community in planning for HIV services in the TGA. When asked about the Planning Group and the Grantee working together to refine the standards of care for funded service categories, 74.07%, agreed, which decreased from the 76.90% that “fully/always” agreed in 2013.

### 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%
FY14	90.28%	5.98%	0.00%	0.00%	3.73%

\*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 90.28% of the information reported or requested is “fully/always” given in a timely manner. Results show that 88.89% “fully/always” agreed the Grantee has made efforts to have at least one representative, including the Planning Group Support Staff, at the Planning Group and committee meetings to answer questions, give updates, etc. Members were asked about the overall responsiveness of the Grantee to the

Planning Group and allowed write-in comments. Of the 22 members responding to the question, comments provided are as follows:

%	Comments on Responsiveness of the Grantee
14%	Exceptional/Excellent
66%	(Very) Responsive
5%	(Very) Good
10%	OK
5%	Other Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “First time attending meetings”</li> </ul>

Overall, a majority of the respondents feel reporting, level of communication and responsiveness to requests has 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%
FY14	75.00%	6.06%	0.00%	0.76%	18.18%

\*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 FY14. 75.00% were “fully/always” satisfied with the process compared to 73.70% in FY13. Of the three questions regarding the RFP expectations, 86.36% “fully/always” agreed that the grantee conducts a competitive selection process and 86.36% “fully/always” agreed the RFP clearly states their expectations of care and performance. However, 45.45% “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%
FY14	84.00%	12.00%	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 FY14. 84.00% of the Providers surveyed indicated they “fully/always” agreed with the distribution of funds from the Grantee compared to 71.00% in FY13 and 69.34% in FY12. When asked specifically about the Grantee’s ability to process invoices within two weeks of submission, 65.00% of Service Providers stated this was “fully/always” done, there has been a slight drop compared to the 80.00% in FY13. 85.00% “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%
FY14	93.33%	3.33%	0.00%	0.00%	3.33%

\*NR=Not Reported in previous reports

Service Providers see a consistent response satisfaction in contract monitoring from FY10-FY14. The rising response of “fully/always”, from 61.50% to 93.33%, over past years demonstrates approval with the monitoring process. More specifically, results show 100.00% agreed that the Grantee “fully/always” conducted site visits. 95.00% 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%
FY14	85.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%

\*NR=Not Reported in previous reports

Service Providers remain pleased with the continued improvement in the area of communication and assistance from FY10-FY14. 85.00% 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 FY14

	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A Little Satisfied	Not At All Satisfied	Rating Average
The RFP and Procurement process	89.47%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%	3.89
Reporting	94.44%	5.56%	0.00%	0.00%	3.94
Reimbursement	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.00
Contract Monitoring	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.00
Communication with Providers	89.47%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%	3.89
Technical Assistance to Providers	94.12%	5.88%	0.00%	0.00%	3.94

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

## 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. "I think the Grantee realizes that the Planning Council must meet much more frequently toward the end of the fiscal year to re-distribute funds among service categories as needed."

- Planning Group**

2. N/A

- **Communication**  
**Provider**

1. "Everyone at the Grantee's office has been very professional, helpful and kind."
2. The Grantee should consider disseminating the data presentation that Planning Council members see to those of us who aren't on the Planning Council

- Planning Group**

3. "The Grantee is very responsive and actively work to answer all questions."

- **Education**  
**Provider**

1. The Grantee should provide technical assistance specifically related to a providers service category

- Planning Group**

2. "It's been a pleasure to learn the process."

- **Miscellaneous**  
**Planning Group**

1. "The TGA need new providers and get Mississippi going so we can have more funds for Memphis."
2. "Recruit youth to be more reflective of the regions epidemic and be sure to include needs in the assessment"
3. "I do not agree with the voting question proposed at the end of the meeting on 6/25/14. Many providers and consumers make sacrifices to attend required meetings. Participation in the data presentation in order to vote is not new. It was also included in the email. If changes are requested it should be addressed at the proper time and place."

- Providers**

4. "Provide in writing any additional funding opportunities in a grant year. Also include deadlines."
5. "Grantee is doing a fantastic job keeping providers informed and involved."

# APPENDIX B. PLANNING GROUP AND PROVIDER AND 2014 SURVEY RESULTS

Summary of Survey Monkey Results - 2014								
Planning Group Members								
Question #	Planning Process	N=	Response Rate R=33 R=33	Fully/ always	Partly/ usually	Slightly/r arely	Not at all/never	N/A - Don't Know
1	PG & Grantee - assess unmet need & service gaps	27	87.00%	55.56%	40.74%	0.00%	0.00%	3.70%
2	Assessment & Planning process - opportunity for gen community participation	27	87.00%	62.96%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	3.70%
3	High level of PLWHA participation	27	87.00%	62.23%	23.08%	3.85%	0.00%	3.85%
4	PG provides Grantee -- priority service categories and allocations for each	27	87.00%	81.48%	14.81%	0.00%	0.00%	3.70%
5	clear directives on how to meet the priorities & other factors to consider in procurement	27	87.00%	73.08%	23.08%	0.00%	0.00%	3.85%
6	clear direction on when & how to reallocate funds to avoid carryover	27	87.00%	75.00%	20.83%	0.00%	0.00%	4.17%
7	Clear allocations and directives for use of carryover funds	27	87.00%	85.19%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	3.70%
8	PG & Grantee - develop & refine Stds of Care	27	87.00%	74.07%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	3.70%
				<b>71.20%</b>	<b>23.65%</b>	<b>0.48%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>3.80%</b>
Information and Reporting to Planning Council								
9	Grantee provides PG - summary data reports and financial info within 60 days	27	87.00%	88.89%	7.41%	0.00%	0.00%	3.70%
10	Monthly reports on service utilization and expenditures by service category	27	87.00%	92.59%	3.70%	0.00%	0.00%	3.70%
11	year-end summary of expenditures, utilization, unit cost/demograph by service category	27	87.00%	92.59%	3.70%	0.00%	0.00%	3.70%
12	other info and analysis for decision making	27	87.00%	88.46%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	3.85%
13	Grantee has somebody at each meeting (not PG staff)	27	87.00%	88.89%	7.41%	0.00%	0.00%	3.70%
				<b>90.28%</b>	<b>5.98%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>3.73%</b>
14	How responsive was the Grantee to PL requests during the year? VG=10; Good=3; Fair=1							
Providers								
Procurement Process								
1	Grantee conducts an open and competitive procurement process	22	100.0%	86.36%	4.55%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%
2	RFP clear re expectations, HRSA P&P, Stds of Care, expected performance measures, rptg requirements	22	100.0%	86.36%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	4.55%
3	disseminates info widely re availability of funds	22	100.0%	77.27%	13.64%	0.00%	4.55%	4.55%
4	allow at least 30 days to respond to competitive solicitations	22	100.0%	86.36%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	13.64%
5	selection criteria provide reasonable consideration to new providers	22	100.0%	68.18%	4.55%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%
6	Grantee provides feedback to each bidder	22	100.0%	45.45%	4.55%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%
				<b>75.00%</b>	<b>6.06%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.76%</b>	<b>18.18%</b>
Distribution of Funds								
7	Contracts - clear definition for each funded service category	22	100.0%	95.00%	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
8	Contracts - initiated & signed prior to new service period - reasonable grace period	22	100.0%	85.00%	15.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
9	Payments - within 45 days of submission of complete, accurate invoices	22	100.0%	80.00%	15.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%
10	Grantee processes invoices within 2 weeks of submission	22	100.0%	65.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%
11	Grantee modified existing systems to respond to needs of service providers	22	100.0%	95.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%
				<b>84.00%</b>	<b>12.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>4.00%</b>
Contract Monitoring								
12	Site visits --Grantee conducts at least 1x/year to assess contractor performance	22	100.0%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
13	Grantee uses standardized review process and info gathering tools	22	100.0%	95.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%
14	Providers get 2 week advance notice and advised about documentation to have on hand	22	100.0%	85.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%
				<b>93.33%</b>	<b>3.33%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>3.33%</b>
Communication and Assistance								
15	TA -- Grantee provides to help providers with financial mgmt, data collection, other reporting requirements	22	100.0%	90.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
16	Grantee responds within 5 days to requests for info or assistance	22	100.0%	80.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%
				<b>85.00%</b>	<b>10.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>5.00%</b>
How satisfied were you with?								
19	RFP and Procurement process			Very	Moderately	A Little	Not at All	Rating Average
	Reporting			89.47%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%	3.89
	Reimbursements			94.44%	5.56%	0.00%	0.00%	3.94
	Contract monitoring			100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4
	Communications with providers			100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4
	TA to providers			89.47%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%	3.89
				94.12%	5.88%	0.00%	0.00%	3.6

**APPENDIX C. OVERALL SATISFACTION COMPARISON RESULTS FY08-FY14**

**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
FY14	89.47%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%	3.89
<u>Reporting</u>					
FY08	NR*	NR	NR	NR	NR
FY09	NR63	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
FY14	94.44%	5.56%	0.00%	0.00%	3.94
<u>Reimbursement</u>					
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
FY14	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.00
<u>Contract Monitoring</u>					
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
FY14	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.00
<u>Communications with Providers</u>					
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
FY 14	89.47%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%	3.89
<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
FY 14	94.12%	5.88%	0.00%	0.00%	3.60

**Planning Group Summary**

<b><u>Planning Process</u></b>	<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%
FY14	72.07%	23.65%	0.48%	0.00%	3.79%
<b><u>Information and Reporting To Planning Group</u></b>					
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%
FY14	90.28%	5.98%	0.00%	0.00%	3.73%

\*NR=Not Reported in previous reports