

Evaluation of the Administrative Mechanism

Portland Area HIV Services Planning Council

September 2024

2023-2024 Evaluation of the Administrative Mechanism

Evaluation Chair: Greg Fowler

Evaluation Committee: Steven Davies, Robb Lawrence, Scott Moore, Diane Quiring

HGAP Staff Evaluation Liaisons: Jonathan Basilio and Aubrey Daquiz

Grantee and Coordinator Review Dates: 8/26/24, 8/28/24, 9/3/24

Executive Summary:

Results: The HIV Grant Administration and Planning (HGAP) Grantee of Multnomah County has met or exceeded expectations for: upholding the duties of distribution of funds accordingly to the priorities established by the Planning Council (PC); using fair and equitable procurement process; and ensuring that the PC truly represents our HIV/AIDS community, and are informed and knowledgeable of both the background and most up-to-date information to make informed decisions around HIV care and support services.

Background:

The Ryan White Care Act mandates that the PC “assess the efficiency of the administrative mechanism in terms of rapidly allocating funds to areas of greatest need within the eligible area and, at the discretion of the PC, assess the effectiveness, either directly or through contractual arrangements, of the services offered in meeting the identified needs.”

In addition, the Portland Transitional Grant Area (TGA) considers the following factors:

- The Grantee must distribute funds according to the priorities established by the PC.
- The Grantee’s procurement process for Ryan White Part A provides utilization of a “fair, open, standard, and consistent process.”
- The Grantee provides communication regarding HIV/AIDS treatment and funding issues.
- The Grantee responds in a timely manner to PC’s requests for data needed to complete the Council’s required processes.

It should be noted that the Evaluation Committee in the performance of its duties does not:

- Conduct a detailed evaluation of the recipients or of specific providers
- Act as a thorough auditor, but rather, as a reviewer.

Requirements:

- A. The Grantee will have an efficient administrative mechanism to rapidly allocate funds to the areas of greatest need within the TGA*

and, at the discretion of the PC, assess the effectiveness, either directly or through contractual arrangements, of the services offered in meeting the identified needs.

The Program Specialist has continued to work closely with the County team to minimize delays. Four-year contracts are in place with FY23-24 constituting year-one.

Documents reviewed: 2023 Evaluation of the Administrative Mechanism; HGAP Contracts time study

Findings: Funds were allocated within the 90 day guideline; the average number of days from the date of award to the date sent to contracts specialist was 76 days, an increase from the previous year. This is considered the contract negotiation time between HGAP and Sub-Recipients. The overall time from Contract Specialist to fully-executed contract was 12 days on average in 2024. This is a decrease from 2023 (see table below).

Days for Contract Execution	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Award to Contract Specialist	34	52	45	60	76
Contract Specialist to Execution	101	88	72	58	12
Total Days	135	140	117	118	88
Partial Notice of Award Date (?)	2/10/20	1/25/21	1/19/22	1/20/23	1/30/24

B. The Grantee must distribute funds according to the priorities established by the PC.

Documents reviewed: 2023 Evaluation of Administrative Mechanism; FY23-24 Scorecards; PC23-24 Evaluations, FY23-24 Carryover Request

Findings: The Grantee allocated 100% of the services grant award as directed by the PC for the 23-24 Grant Year and resulted in 96% of services funds being spent.

For comparison, the percentage of service funds being spent in previous years were as follows:

- 22-23: 94%
- 21-22: 98%
- 20-21: 98%

The grantee participates in ongoing discussions with service providers if spending or deliverables are not on track. Biannual score cards are

prepared and used to evaluate fiscal and program performance for each service category. These score cards are discussed at PC meetings twice a year including the annual PSRA process. HGAP presented spending updates throughout the year during PC meetings. The FY23-24 carryover spending plan to be used in FY24-25 was submitted to PC and approved on 06/04/24. In addition, HRSA HAB approved our carryover request on 07/22/24.

Processes for allocation, re-allocation and carryover decisions continue to streamline. HGAP provides good notation on decisions made for tracking purposes, and provides a positive setting for a simple consensus process to function well. Transitioning back to more in-person Planning Council and Operation Committee meetings by HGAP team has been instrumental in supporting a successful planning year that helps increase engagement and still allows for flexibility for a range of participation preferences. HGAP continues to apply client-centered strategies to help ensure that the deliverables are met while ensuring that the consumers, subrecipients, and other providers/community advocates can actively participate.

C. The Grantee's procurement process for Part A providers utilizes a "fair, open, standard and consistent process."

Documents reviewed: Multnomah County contracts and procurement rules (Oregon State Public Contracting Code)

Findings: The Grantee adheres to the Multnomah County procurement rules. The process is fair, open, standard and consistent. All contracts more than \$150,000 in a five to seven year period must be awarded through a Request for a Proposal that is directed by the Purchasing Department. Proposals are reviewed by a panel that operates under the purview of the Purchasing Department.

This panel must consist of a minimum of three evaluators. No more than one third of the committee can be from the initiating program. At least one evaluator shall be from a non-County organization and there must be at least one BIPOC evaluator. Panelists review the strengths and weaknesses of the proposals against stated criteria published in the request for proposal.

In 2022, a Request for Programmatic Qualifications (RFPQ) was completed for interested and qualified Service Providers. The RFPQ typically occurs every five years. This year HGAP worked with County Procurement to ensure potential applicants could apply for funding under all service categories at one time. This year's process was made broad in hopes of engaging more potential providers, as well as decreasing the administrative burden to potential providers who may be interested in applying to multiple opportunities. In order to

ensure diversity, equity, and inclusion at the Sub-Recipient level, proposals in 2022 had to respond to questions related to both culturally-specific services and access needs (see Attachment 11)

D. The Grantee provides the PC with program monitoring and fiscal information.

Documents Reviewed: 2023-24 PC Evaluations; FY23-24 scorecards; PC Work Plan & Meeting Minutes

Findings: The grantee has adequately provided the PC with fiscal and programmatic information throughout the year including engaging in a semiannual review using score cards, a graphic representation of program utilization and fiscal data. HGAP has prepared PC members for meetings by sending out agendas, preparation materials, and background information via email or hard copy (as needed) often in advance. However, with HGAP staff and management turnover and transitions, Planning Council leadership had more questions than usual and some data were provided later than preferred. Spending updates were also provided throughout the year at Planning Council meetings. Separately, HGAP also holds quarterly meetings with subrecipients to see if the process is going smoothly for them or if there are any issues that we need to address as a system.

E. The Grantee provides communication regarding HIV/AIDS treatment and funding issues. **Documents Reviewed:** FY23-24 PC Evaluation Results

Findings: The Grantee provided a variety of presentations throughout the year that included panel discussions by experts from the HIV community, HIV/AIDS treatment updates, epidemiology and trends in HIV/AIDS at local, state and national levels including those in funding. Discussions included Program Updates for Part A and Part B funding, Medical Case Management information, a panel on care for persons who were incarcerated or justice-involved, Housing panel, and activities for community building. There were acknowledgements for National HIV/AIDS Awareness throughout the year along with local data presented.

F. The Grantee responds in a timely manner to PC requests for data needed to complete the Council's required processes.

Documents Reviewed: FY23-24 PC Evaluation Results

Findings: The Grantee generally responds to the Council's requests within a timely manner for additional data and sends this data via email or hard copy to members (as needed), despite the aforementioned increase in requests and staff transitions. Often these are provided to members in advance accompanied by the agenda. The Grantee uses a

variety of presentation tools to provide support and data necessary for the council to review data, undertake analysis and arrive at solutions. Contingency planning using three scenarios (flat funding, 3% decrease, and incremental increases up to 3%) is useful for quickly allocating funds once the notice of award is received. Any final notice of award with an increase or decrease of 3% or more is taken back to the Planning Council for decisions of how to allocate funds. Score cards are utilized to visually identify program progress in relationship to service delivery and monies spent to date. The RFPQ will be re-evaluated ahead of the call in 2027.

G. The Grantee holds contractors to the current HRSA Ryan White (RW) Part A program service definitions for all HRSA RW Part A service categories and the Portland TGA Planning Council guidance for the services funded within the Portland TGA.

H. HGAP completed an analysis of PC evaluations throughout the Planning Council year. Please see the results below. The EC recognizes the value of PC evaluation trends.

	We met the objectives for this meeting.		The environment was safe for me to ask questions and express my views.	
Yes	107	82%	126	96%
Somewhat	21	16%	5	4%
No	3	2%	0	0%
	131	100%	131	100%

	There was enough time to discuss all agenda items.		Staff were available to answer questions	
Yes	74	56%	93	85%
Somewhat	30	23%	15	14%
No	27	21%	1	1%
	131	100%	109	100%

Documents Reviewed: FY23-24 Program Guidance; FY23-24 Service Standards; Program Site Visit Survey

Findings: Program guidance was reviewed in terms of service delivery and contractual obligations. Overall program guidance is being followed sufficiently. HGAP monitors providers annually per HRSA’s requirement. HRSA gave a waiver for site visits for FY20-21 and FY21-22, but were completed in FY22-23.

Actions Taken for 2023-2024 Recommendations

1. *HGAP should continue its outreach to agencies who may be interested in providing services to Ryan White populations and Council members who could participate in those outreach efforts. This includes agencies serving crossover populations that are creating new culturally-specific organizations (and collaborations between existing agencies) (e.g., Behavioral Health Resource Networks [BHRNs] and Joint Office of Homeless Services [JOHS] Supportive Housing Services [SHS]).*

The HGAP Team met with the Joint Office of Homeless Services on a regular basis, specifically, to address our data concerns for clients in both HUD HMIS and Ryan White CAREWare. These meetings include a representative that administers the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS grants and any relevant database contractors.

The current Part A Provider network includes Substance Use Providers who contract with agencies like Bridges-to-Care Substance Use housing. An additional Part A Provider is an active member of the Behavioral Health Resource Network support by Measure 110 funding. During the FY23-24 grant year, a list of BHRN partners was pulled as a potential outreach list for both PC Members and HGAP staff.

2. *The Recommendations from the PC Learning Collaborative should be presented more accurately to Ops and the Council, and work should continue towards fully implementing the recruitment and retention plan to engage new members and existing members. We recommend that HGAP continue to support the Membership committee with recruitment tools, including pamphlets, flyers, and YouTube videos.*

The Planning Council has continued to engage in recruitment and retention efforts with support from HGAP staff. However, due to leadership and staff turnover on the HGAP team and the broader Multnomah County team, both PC and HGAP efforts were intentionally refocused towards ensuring that that critical grant and funding requirement were met and that hiring occurred in a timely manner with Council member participation.

3. *HGAP should help evaluate current Membership status and assist Ops and Membership in increasing Membership Committee ranks, prioritizing Membership outreach (through incentives, etc.), and making it a priority to have a full Council. This might include supporting more in-person Council meetings since those can help build community with current members, and could help recruit members who prefer to*

meeting in-person.

Despite the refocused efforts mentioned above, Membership still recruited 7 applicants and onboarded 5 as members to the Planning Council this year with support from HGAP. HGAP also supported increased in-person meetings from 1 in 2022-2023, to 3 this year.

- 4. The Evaluation Committee recommends that HGAP supports Operations to review the functions of the Evaluation Committee. It is the recommendation of this Committee that the Evaluation Committee be seated and functioning throughout the year in order to properly evaluate and make recommendations.*

HGAP staff has supported the Operations (Ops) Committee by attending meeting(s) to discuss the specific grant requirement of the Evaluation Committee and how that might complement broader Evaluation activities of the Operations Committee or Council. The Operations Committee has discussed this, and has yet to vote on whether to convene the Committee beyond the current scope. This will be discussed and decided on at the September 2024 Ops meeting.

New Recommendations for FY24-25

Recommendation #1

The Evaluation Committee recommends improvements in the bi-annual client experience survey (CES) to represent a true random sample of the persons living with HIV population. The CES should reflect all the communities and demographics accessing services, specifically ensuring surveying of populations most impacted by HIV. Multiple methods should be used to outreach to smaller subpopulations with unique needs.

Recommendation #2

The Evaluation Committee recommends HGAP include trending service data on PC scorecards. The PC scorecards should also include additional narrative specific to programmatic performance and the context for service delivery.

Recommendation #3

When carryover and re-allocation funds are requested, the Operations

committee should be more involved and informed with this process, as this is a continuation of the yearly allocation process which is the Council's responsibility.

Recommendation #4

HGAP should continue its outreach to agencies who may be interested in providing services to Ryan White populations and Council members who could participate in those outreach efforts. This includes agencies serving crossover populations that are creating new culturally-specific organizations (and collaborations between existing agencies) (e.g., Behavioral Health Resource Networks [BHRNs] and Joint Office of Homeless Services [JOHS] Supportive Housing Services [SHS]) to help ensure more diversity in applicants for the 2027 RFPQ.

Recommendation #5

The Evaluation Committee recommends that HGAP continue to work with Ops to examine the work plan and workflow to help ensure we are meeting objectives related to decision-making more efficiently.

- The Ops Committee (with support from HGAP and PC staff) should be reminded that often there is not enough time to cover all items. We should jointly look into ways to streamline meetings to ensure there is adequate time for the decision-making process while still ensuring that members are given adequate information for the decision making process. (56% reported yes-enough time and 23% somewhat-enough time)
- PC staff should complete an analysis of how well the PC membership reflects the TGA demographics and represents required membership categories to more closely track areas we are doing well or which can be improved upon.

Documents Reviewed

1. 2023-24 PC Meeting Evals
2. FY22-23 Evaluation of the Administrative Mechanism Report
3. FY23-24 Program Guidance
4. FY23-24 Carryover Request table
5. FY23-24 Service Standards
6. 2023-2024 PC Work Plan
7. Scorecards for Planning Council
8. FY23-24 Total Part A Award
9. 2023-2024 Client Experience Survey Report
10. 2023-2024 Qualitative Data one-pager