

EVALUATION COMMITTEE May 22, 2018 Minutes		
Charge: Evaluates whether sub-recipient services coincide with set service priorities, and evaluates the performance of the Administrative Agency and the Planning Council according to the goals of the Council.		
MEMBERS PRESENT		
Gary Benecke, Chair Tom Emanuele LaShaun Shaw	Del Wilson, Vice Chair Leonardo Zea Darius Ahmadi	Louise Weston-Ferrill Cristopher Burke Helen E. Turner, CCC Liaison
MEMBERS ABSENT		
Jonathan Thorne	Louvenia Freeman	Phillip Scheldt
RWPC STAFF PRESENT		
Justin M. Henry, RWPC Health Planner	Glenda Blackmon-Johnson, RWPC Program Manager	Annie Sawyer-Williams, RWPC Coordinator
GRANTS MANAGEMENT STAFF PRESENT		
Angi Jones, Quality Assurance Advisor	Kima Letcher, Program Manager	Thomas Reed, Data Analyst
OTHERS PRESENT		
Jennifer Kendrick, DCHD Parkland		

- I. **Call to Order:** Gary Benecke, Evaluation Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:07 PM.
- II. **Certification of Quorum:** Quorum was established by Justin M. Henry, Ryan White Planning Council (RWPC) Health Planner, and certified by Gary Benecke.
- III. **Introductions and Announcements:**
 - a. Ms. Turner announced she will be attending a HIV Summit in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
 - b. Mr. Benecke thanked those who supported the Resource Center’s Open House.
- IV. **Approval of April 24, 2018 Minutes:** *Darius Ahmadi motioned to approve the April 24, 2018 minutes. Leonardo Zea seconded the motion. The motion passed with one abstention.*
- V. **Office of Support Report:** Mr. Henry announced that the Texas HIV Syndicate will be meeting in Austin, TX on June 4-5, 2018 to discuss the state’s Ending the Epidemic plan.
- VI. **FY2017 Evaluation of the Administrative Mechanism (Committee Recommendations):** Mr. Benecke announced that Mr. Henry will review the report and asked the committee to review the document for discussion at next month’s committee meeting. Upon completion of the Evaluation of the Administrative Mechanism (EAM), he would like to ask the Administrative Agency (AA) what improvements were made to the process and if the process has changed so that everyone understands it better.

The Purpose of the Evaluation - The C.A.R.E Act requires the RWPC 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 arrangements, of the services offered in meeting the identified needs.*” This language was not changed in the revised Treatment Extension Act.

The committee is evaluating the 1st extension for the FY2016 Request for Proposal (RFP). The goal is to see how efficiently the mechanism functions for the fund procurement, reimbursement, and contract monitoring processes in the Dallas EMA.

Methodology - *In the Dallas Eligible Metropolitan Area, an assessment of the local administrative mechanism was performed by administering surveys to Ryan White sub-recipients, Planning Council members, and a representative of the Administrative Agency (AA) to gather perception on various aspects of the program such as the reimbursement process, program monitoring, quality management, technical assistance for sub-recipients, and fiscal compliance. While valuable information was obtained, the assessment did not allow for a completely objective picture of the efficacy of the existing mechanism for the grant year. Therefore, the Planning Council decided to adopt a method originating from the Houston EMA and modified it to the Dallas EMA.*

The checklist for the assessment of the administrative mechanism for the Dallas EMA was modified and approved by the Evaluation Committee and the RWPC.

Results of the Assessment (Questions are as follows):

Section 1: Procurement/Request for Proposals Process

1. How much time elapsed between the receipt of the NGA or funding contract by the AA and contract execution with funded service providers (i.e., 30, 60, 90 days)?
2. What percentage of the grant award was procured?
3. Did the awarding of funds in specific categories match the allocations established by the PC?
The committee reviewed the expenditure report and the contingency Allocations Plan
4. Does the AA have a grant award process?
5. Does the RFP incorporate service category definitions that are consistent with those defined by the PC?
6. At the end of the award process, were there still unobligated funds?
7. At the end of the year, where there unspent funds? If so, in which service categories?
8. Does the AA have a method of communicating back to the PC the results of the procurement process?
The committee discussed the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the AA and the PC regarding revised the drafted MOU and the timeframe for completion.

Section 2: Reimbursement Process

9. What is the average number of days that elapsed between receipt of an accurate contractor reimbursement request or invoice and the issuance of payment by the AA?
10. What percent of contractors were paid by the AA after submission of an accurate contractor reimbursement request or invoice?

Section 3: Contract Monitoring Process

11. Does the AA use the Standard of Care (SOC) a part of the contract monitoring process?

Conclusions

The Ryan White Planning Council of the Dallas Area continually strives to effectively collaborates with the AA to meet the need of people living with HIV (PLWH) in the service area. A key component of this collaboration lies in how effective the administrative mechanism functions in readily allocating funds to the areas of greatest need within the eligible area, and the effectiveness of the services offered in meeting the identified needs.

Recommendations to the AA from the FY2016 EAM were included.

Ms. Blackmon-Johnson questioned if the committee would need the timelines, dates, and court order for each Notice of Grant Award (NGA)? Mr. Benecke stated that in order to evaluate it correctly, the committee would need that information.

VII. Evaluation of the Ryan White Planning Council (Ryan White Planning Council Primer): The committee reviewed and discussed the new Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Part A Planning Council Primer.

Roles/Duties of the CEO, Recipient, and Planning Council

Evaluation of Services: Performance, Outcomes, and Cost-Effectiveness which is optional for the RWPC. Mr. Benecke stated within the Planning Council roles and responsibilities the evaluation committee is charged with the assessment of the efficiency of the administrative mechanism, the development of service standards, and the evaluation of program effectiveness. The committee discussed the definition of the program and its effectiveness which is done through the needs assessment process. Ms. Blackmon-Johnson stated the program effectiveness is to be looked at comprehensively. She noted the RWPC will review the data and outcomes evaluating the effectiveness of the RW program as it relates to the National HIV/AIDS Strategy (NHAS) goals and the Integrated Plan's goals and look at the RW program effectiveness as a whole.

The committee discussed the Needs Assessment survey and Mr. Ahmadi expressed that the results are showing the same needs and that cost effectiveness should be evaluated to see if the funds are being allocated correctly. Mr. Benecke stated members can attend the Allocations Committee meeting to have a better understanding of the process.

Mr. Benecke referenced an excerpt from the RWPC Primer "*The planning council also evaluates how providers are selected and paid, so that funds are made available efficiently where they are most needed.*" Ms. Blackmon-Johnson stated that from a provider stand point, bringing in new providers can be done through the recommendation process. The recommendations can also go to the procurement department regarding new providers. The recommendation process allows the council to have a combination of things from the evaluation stand point or evaluation of data for more providers.

The committee had a brief discussion regarding the work of the other standing committees. Ms. Blackmon-Johnson noted that the work being produced in the different committees is what makes the Planning Council (PC) come together as a whole. Mr. Ahmadi feels the RWPC needs an outside entity to determine if they are doing a good job and are staying on track. It was stated that the council has to evaluate if the services impact the life of the people who received them. Mr. Henry stated within the RWPC meetings that instead of presenting monthly reports, the RWPC should focus on developing strategies and making sure what is being done is effective. The committee discussed members of the council stepping up and bringing up issues that need to go forward. Mr. Benecke referenced the RWPC primer "*The planning council also has the right to provide directives to the recipient on how best meet the service priorities is has identified. It may direct the recipient to fund services in particular parts of the EMA or TGA (such as outlying counties), or to use specific service models.*" Mr. Benecke stated the paragraph deals with issues overall.

Mr. Benecke suggested continuing the dialogue at the next committee meeting.

The committee requested a copy of the letter that was submitted to the Department of State Health Services (DSHS) regarding the Food Bank SOC.

VIII. **New Business:** N/A

IX. **Adjournment:** *Tom Emanuele motioned to adjourn. Leonardo Zea seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously*

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 PM.

Submitted by:

Annie Sawyer-Williams, RWPC Coordinator

Date

Draft Certified by:

Justin M. Henry, RWPC Health Planner

Date

Final Approval by:

**Gary Benecke, CHAIRPERSON or
Del Wilson, Vice-Chairperson**

Date

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING
Tuesday, June 26, 2018 3:00 PM
Hickman Conference Room, 2nd floor
Dallas County Health and Human Services Building
2377 N. Stemmons Freeway, Dallas, TX 75207