

Houston Area HIV Services Ryan White Planning Council
Assessment of the Local Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Administrative Mechanism
Assessment Checklist

(Quality Assurance Committee approved 05-14-14)

Background

The Ryan White CARE Act requires local Planning Councils to “[a]ssess the efficiency of the administrative mechanism in rapidly allocating funds to the areas of greatest need within the eligible area” (Ryan White Part A [formerly Title I] *Manual*, Section V, Chapter 1, Page 4). To meet this mandate, a time-specific documented observation of the local procurement, expenditure, and reimbursement process for Ryan White funds is conducted by the local Planning Councils (*Manual*, Section VI, Chapter 1, Page 7). The observation process is not intended to evaluate either the local administrative agencies for Ryan White funds or the individual service providers funded by Ryan White (*Manual*, Section VI, Chapter 1, Page 8). Instead, it produces information about the procurement, expenditure, and reimbursement process for the local *system* of Ryan White funding that can be used for overall quality assurance purposes.

Process

In the Houston eligible area, an assessment of the local administrative mechanism is performed for each Fiscal Year of Ryan White funding using a written checklist of specific data points. Taken together, the information generated by the checklist is intended to measure the overall efficacy of the local procurement, reimbursement, and contract monitoring processes of the administrative agents for (1) Ryan White Part A and Minority AIDS Initiative (MAI) funds; and (2) Ryan White Part B and State Services (SS) funds. The checklist is reviewed and approved annually by the Quality Assurance Committee of the Houston Area HIV Services Ryan White Planning Council, and application of the checklist, including data collection, review, analysis and reporting, is performed by the Ryan White Planning Council Office of Support in collaboration with the administrative agents for the funds. All data and documents reviewed in the process are publicly available.

Checklist

The checklist for the assessment of the administrative mechanism for the Houston eligible area is attached below. The following acronyms are used in the checklist:

AA:	Administrative Agent
DSHS:	Texas Department of State Health Services
FY:	Fiscal Year (The FY to be assessed for Part A, B, and MAI will be the immediate prior FY, ending February 28 [Part A and MAI] and March 31 [Part B]; the FY to be assessed for SS will be one FY prior to the immediate prior FY, ending August 31)
MAI:	Minority AIDS Initiative
MOU:	Memorandum of Understanding (between the AAs and the Planning Council)
NGA:	Notice of Grant Award
PC:	Ryan White Planning Council
RFP:	Request for Proposals
SOC:	Standards of Care
SS:	State Services

Checklist for the Assessment of the Ryan White Administrative Mechanism in the Houston Area (Quality Assurance Committee approved 05-14-14)

Intent of the Measure	Data Point to Measure	Method of Measurement	Data Source
Section I: Procurement/Request for Proposals Process			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To assess the timeliness of the AA in authorizing contracted agencies to provide services 	Time between receipt of NGA or funding contract by the AA and when contracts are executed with funded service providers	a) How much time elapsed between receipt of the NGA or funding contract by the AA and contract execution with funded service providers (i.e., 30, 60, 90 days)?	Part A/MAI: (1) NGA; and (2) Commissioner's Court Agendas Part B/SS: (1) DSHS Contract Face Sheet; and (2) Contract Tracking Sheet
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To assess the timeliness of the AA in procuring funds to contracted agencies to provide services 	Time between receipt of NGA or funding contract by the AA and when funds are procured to contracted service providers	b) What percentage of the grant award was procured by the: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 st quarter? <input type="checkbox"/> 2 nd quarter? <input type="checkbox"/> 3 rd quarter?	Year-to-date and year-end FY Procurement Reports provided by AA to PC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To assess if the AA awarded funds to service categories as designed by the PC 	Comparison of the list of service categories awarded funds by the AA to the list of allocations made by the PC	c) Did the awarding of funds in specific categories match the allocations established by the PC at the: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 st quarter? <input type="checkbox"/> 2 nd quarter? <input type="checkbox"/> 3 rd quarter?	Year-to-date and year-end FY Procurement Reports provided by AA to PC Final PC Allocations Worksheet
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To assess if the AAs make potential bidders aware of the grant award process 	Confirmation of communication by the AAs to potential bidders specific to the grant award process	d) Does the AA have a grant award process which: <input type="checkbox"/> Provides bidders with information on applying for grants? <input type="checkbox"/> Offers a bidder's conference?	RFP Courtesy Notices for Pre-Bid Conferences
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To assess if the AAs are requesting bids for service category definitions approved by the PC 	Confirmation of communication by the AAs to potential bidders specific to PC products	e) Does the RFP incorporate service category definitions that are consistent with those defined by the PC?	RFP
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To assess if the AAs are procuring funds in alignment with allocations 	Comparison of final amounts procured and total amounts allocated in each service category	f) At the end of the award process, were there still unobligated funds?	Year-end FY Procurement Reports provided by AA to PC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To assess if the AAs are dispersing all available funds for services and, if not, are unspent funds within the limits allowed by the funder 	Review of final spending amounts for each service category	g) At the end of the year, were there unspent funds? If so, in which service categories?	Year-end FY Procurement Reports provided by AA to PC

Checklist for the Assessment of the Ryan White Administrative Mechanism in the Houston Area (Quality Assurance Committee approved 05-14-14)

Intent of the Measure	Data Point to Measure	Method of Measurement	Data Source
Section I: Procurement/Request for Proposals Process (con't)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To assess if the AAs are making the PC aware of the procurement process 	Confirmation of communication by the AAs to the PC specific to procurement results	h) Does the AA have a method of communicating back to the PC the results of the procurement process?	MOU PC Agendas
Section II: Reimbursement Process			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To assess the timeliness of the AA in reimbursing contracted agencies for services provided 	Time elapsed between receipt of an accurate contractor reimbursement request or invoice and the issuance of payment by the AA	a) 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? b) What percent of contractors were paid by the AA after submission of an accurate contractor reimbursement request or invoice: <input type="checkbox"/> Within 20 days? <input type="checkbox"/> Within 35 days? <input type="checkbox"/> Within 50 days?	Annual Contractor Reimbursement Report
Section III: Contract Monitoring Process			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To assess if the AA is monitoring adherence by contracted agencies to PC quality standards 	Confirmation of use of adopted SOC in contract monitoring activities	a) Does the AA use the SOC as part of the contract monitoring process?	RFP Policy and Procedure for Performing Site Visits Quality Management Plan