

# Memphis TGA

## Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism

### October 2017

#### 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 September 2017, the Memphis Area Ryan White Planning Group conducted the Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism for FY17. The surveys were sent to the Ryan White Part A subrecipients and the HIV-Care and Prevention Group (H-CAP) members. Collaboration between the Recipient (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 subrecipients 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 subrecipients and Planning Group members are used in conjunction with the Recipient’s response as a section of the Part A grant application for FY2018.

#### 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 subrecipients and Planning Group members. The Evaluation and Assessment Committee selected Survey Monkey as the tool to gather anonymous responses from respondents on how they perceive the effectiveness and efficiency of the Part A program and rate the Administrative Mechanism in the six areas. The survey was sent to 31 Planning Group Members and up to two representatives at the 17 each subrecipient for FY2017. The total number of participants to complete the survey was sixteen (16) Planning Group members and sixteen (16) subrecipients. 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). In addition to the surveys, documents outlining the RFP and contracting procedures and timeline, financial reports, as well as Planning Group minutes and relevant documents were used to prepare this report.

## 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 is 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%
FY15	88.20%	11.18%	0.62%	0.00%	0.00%
FY16	66.67%	23.61%	5.56%	0.00%	4.17%
FY17	75.00%	18.75%	6.25%	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 Group. Sixteen members completed questions relative to the Recipient and Planning Group interactions with directing and understanding services as well as community participation. Results from previous years show steady improvements in the planning process; however, FY17 shows higher marks than FY16 but balances itself with FY15 and years prior for fully/always. Overall, 75.00% of the members “fully/always” agreed that specific required elements are included within the planning process between the Grantee and the Planning Group. In spite of this increase in fully/always, there was an increase, 6.25%, of the Planning Group who said they slightly/rarely agreed. Included in this survey there were several comments from Planning Group members which indicate a common belief that there has been significant improvement in engagement of PLWHA in the planning process. One specific anonymous comment “Ensured that the voice of the consumer was heard and respected” is representative of growth from previous years and gives opportunity for both the Planning Group and Grantee to ensure that we continue to keep consumers equipped with the necessary foundational information to be able to maintain the morale around consumers being able to meaningfully participate in the process. Based on review of Planning Group documents from the past year, the Planning Group still has some challenges in being mindful of ensuring overall membership, clearly understands terminology used in meetings.

### 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%
FY15	89.57%	9.56%	0.87%	0.00%	0.00%
FY16	80.55%	18.05%	0.00%	0.00%	1.39%

FY17	92.86%	0.00%	7.14%	00.00%	00.00%
------	--------	-------	-------	--------	--------

\*NR=Not Reported in previous reports

The survey asked the Planning Group about the Recipient’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 92.86% of the information reported or requested is “fully/always” given in a timely manner. Results show that 84.62% “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, as well as what they felt that the Recipient did the best and could improve on in future years. There were several comments regarding the Recipient’s increased communication as strengths. Surveys indicate that opportunities for growth include outreach into new areas of the TGA and increase in new providers in the more rural areas. 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%
FY15	69.98%	6.83%	1.11%	2.22%	20.16%
FY16	66.42%	16.78%	1.96%	0.00%	14.83%
FY17	81.25%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%

\*NR=Not Reported in previous reports

There were six (6) questions directed at the RFP and procurement process for subrecipients to answer in the survey. While the overall response of subrecipients completing the survey mentioned responses relative to the Procurement process improved since FY10, there was a increase from FY16 to FY17 by 14.83%. The most marked areas where this improvement is evident were around the questions of whether new subrecipients have been identified and whether feedback is provided to each respondent to the RFP.. Also, there is no evidence based on records that respondents to the RFP are given written feedback related to the quality of proposals other than whether or not they were selected.

### 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%
FY15	77.90%	13.91%	4.00%	0.00%	4.19%
FY16	80.00%	17.65%	0.00%	0.00%	2.35%
FY17	93.33%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

\*NR=Not Reported in previous reports

The Recipients has made great progress in addressing concerns on reporting and reimbursements over the years. Responses continue to improve since FY08, the number of respondents who are “fully/always” satisfied with the process has increased from FY16 to FY17 by 13.33%. When asked specifically about the Recipient’s ability to process invoices within two weeks of submission, 50.00% of subrecipients stated this was “fully/always” done, there has been a significant decrease from FY16.

**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%
FY15	95.55%	2.22%	0.00%	0.00%	2.22%
FY16	86.03%	7.96%	0.00%	0.00%	6.00%
FY17	93.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%

\*NR=Not Reported in previous reports

Subrecipients see a consistent response satisfaction in contract monitoring from FY10-FY17. The rising response of “fully/always”, from 61.50% to 93.33%, over past years demonstrates approval with the monitoring process. There was an increase from FY16 to FY17 from 83.03% to 93.33%. More specifically, results show 93.33% agreed that the Recipient “fully/always” conducted site visits. 80.00% of services providers “fully/always” agreed that the Recipient 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%
FY15	93.33%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY16	76.47%	23.533%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY17	73.33%	26.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

\*NR=Not Reported in previous reports

Subrecipient remain pleased with the continued improvement in the area of communication and assistance from FY10-FY17. There was a 3.14% decline in the fully/always section of communication and assistance. Moreover anonymous service providers noted the Recipient “Assisted in all aspects of the project from data collection to reporting” and “They (Recipient) are very good with getting back to us and answering our questions or concerns.

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

Based on the information provided through review of the surveys and supporting documentation for the Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism, there are four categories of recommendations for system improvements for the Memphis TGA Ryan White Part A Program. These categories include PLWHA Engagement, Capacity Building for New Service Providers, Planning Group Membership and Training, and Service Provider Training and Technical Assistance.

### PLWHA Engagement

- Increase opportunities for trainings related to fundamental concepts necessary to understand the Ryan White system, specifically terminology and logic behind reallocations
- Increase membership from PLWHA from more rural parts of the TGA (particularly North MS)
- Increase membership among HIV positive women

### Capacity Building for New Service Providers

- Identify existing community based organizations currently providing related services and encourage participation in RFP process, especially in rural Tennessee, Mississippi and Arkansas counties
- Identify opportunities for creating easier systems for RFP process, contracting and reimbursement that could encourage participation of new, smaller organizations
- Provide written feedback for all respondents to RFP, including those unsuccessful responses, to encourage future applications

### Planning Group Membership and Training

- Increased recruitment of Planning Group members to ensure required membership
- Development of structured trainings from non-grantee sources relevant to committee needs during committee meetings (i.e., HOPWA and other community resources that may impact population served)
- Increased training for Planning Group sand Grantee staff related to Planning Council requirements
- Ongoing specialized training and technical assistance for consumer membership of Planning Group

### Service Provider Training and Technical Assistance

- Increase opportunities for clinical training and workshops for service providers in multiple forms (in person, webinar, telephone)
- Identify potential service expansion opportunities for providers to serve more people

## APPENDIX A. PLANNING GROUP 2017 SURVEY RESULTS

### Planning Group Summary of Survey Monkey Results – 2017

Question #	Planning Process	N=	Response Rate R=16	Fully/ Always	Partly/ Usually	Slightly/ Rarely	Not At All/Never	N/A – Don't Know
1	PG & Grantee-assess unmet need & service gaps	16	100%	75.00%	18.75%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%
2	Assessment & Planning process – opportunity for gen community participation	16	100%	87.50%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%	6.25%
3	High level of PLWHA participation	16	100%	87.50%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%	6.25%
5	clear directives on how to meet the priorities & other factors to consider in procurement	16	100%	87.50%	0.00%	6.25%	0.00%	6.25%
				<b>84.37%</b>	<b>7.81%</b>	<b>3.13%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>4.69%</b>

Question #	Information and Reporting to Planning Council	N=	Response Rate R=16	Fully/ Always	Partly/ Usually	Slightly/ Rarely	Not At All/Never	N/A – Don't Know
6	clear direction on when & how to reallocate funds to avoid carryover	16	100%	92.86%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%
7	Clear allocations and directives for use of carryover funds	16	100%	92.86%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.14%
8	PG & Grantee – develop & refine Standards of Care	16	100%	85.71%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
9	Grantee provides PG – summary data reports and financial info within 60 days	16	100%	84.62%	15.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
				<b>89.01%</b>	<b>7.41%</b>	<b>1.79%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>1.79%</b>

**APPENDIX A. PLANNING GROUP AND PROVIDER AND 2017 SURVEY RESULTS**

**Subrecipients  
Summary of Survey Monkey Results – 2017**

Question #	Procurement Process	N=	Response Rate R=16	Fully/ Always	Partly/ Usually	Slightly/ Rarely	Not At All/Never	N/A – Don't Know
1	Grantee conducts an open and competitive procurement process	16	94.0%	81.25%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%
2	RFP clear re expectations, HRSA P&P, Stds of Care, expected performance	16	94.0%	93.75%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
3	measures, rptg requirements disseminates info wisely re availability of funds	16	94.0%	93.75%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.25%
4	opportunities to identify new providers and enhance capacity for RFP*	16	94.0%	75.00%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%
5	selection criteria provide reasonable consideration to new providers	16	94.0%	60.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%
6	Grantee provides feedback to each bidder	16	94.0%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%
				<b>75.63%</b>	<b>11.66%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>12.71%</b>

Question #	Distribution of Funds	N=	Response Rate R=16	Fully/ Always	Partly/ Usually	Slightly/ Rarely	Not At All/Never	N/A – Don't Know
7	Contracts – clear definition for each funded service category	16	94.0%	93.33%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
8	Contracts – initiated & signed prior to new service period –	16	94.0%	78.57%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	7.14%
9	Payments – within 30 days of submission of complete, accurate invoices	16	94.0%	60.00%	26.67%	0.00%	0.00%	13.33%
10	Grantee processes invoices within 2 weeks of submission	16	94.0%	50.00%	28.57%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%
11	Grantee modified existing systems to respond to needs of service providers	16	94.0%	78.57%	21.43%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
				<b>72.09%</b>	<b>19.52%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>8.38%</b>

**Contract Monitoring**

**12** Site visits – Grantee conducts at least 1x/year to assess contractor performance

**13** Grantee uses standardized review Process and info gathering tools

**14** Providers get 2 week advance notice and advised about documentation to have on hand

N=	Response Rate R=16	Fully/ Always	Partly/ Usually	Slightly/ Rarely	Not At All/Never	N/A – Don't Know
16	94.0%	93.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%
16	94.0%	80.00%	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%
16	94.0%	86.67%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%
		<b>86.66%</b>	<b>6.66%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>6.67%</b>

**Communication and Assistance**

**16** Grantee responds within 5 days to requests for info or assistance

N=	Response Rate R=16	Fully/ Always	Partly/ Usually	Slightly/ Rarely	Not At All/Never	N/A – Don't Know
16	94.0%	73.33%	26.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
		<b>73.33%</b>	<b>26.67%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>