

GRANTEE ASSESSMENT

Review of SF DPH HIV Health Services

Mandated by the Health Resources and Services Administration

- Evaluate the grantee on
 - Efficiency
 - Provider selection
 - Provider payment
 - Provider monitoring
 - Addressing Planning Council priorities

Methodology

- Provider Survey
 - Anonymity
 - Online form
 - 12 respondents
- Council Member Interviews
 - Phone and Zoom
 - 4 respondents
- DPH Interview
 - Phone
 - 1 respondent

Council member question topics

- Support for planning council
 - Quantitative
 - Annual ARIES report
 - Annual service summary sheets update
- Carry forward allocation process?
 - Open
 - Collaborative
- Areas of improvement

Council member response themes

- Unanimously positive
- Grantee provides a high level of support to council
 - Information-sharing is particularly strong

“They're very thoughtful in how they break down the information to make it digestible and understandable. They also always make themselves available either before a meeting or after a meeting to discuss whatever issue is of concern.”

“They attempt to follow up and provide really full answers to any concerns that people have.”

“It would be great if DPH could provide a little more support to the Council staff to recruit people living with HIV . . . When you mention DPH in the city and among providers, there's a lot of respect, and that could be translated into maybe combining outreach efforts.”



Provider question topics

- Support for providers
- Responsiveness
- Invoice processing
- Clarity of program monitoring expectations
- Program familiarity
- Technical assistance with budget and contracts
- RFPs
- Contract award process

Provider response themes

- Generally positive
- High marks
 - Level of support
 - Responsiveness
 - Clarity of program monitoring expectations
- Lower satisfaction
 - Writing quality of RFPs
 - Program monitor familiarity with their programs

Question	2024 Average Response	2019 Average Response	Change
How supportive do you feel HIV Health Services (HHS) has been to you as a provider and to your programs?	4.50	4.14	+0.36
How responsive do you feel the grantee/HHS is to your questions or requests for information?	4.42	4.28	+0.14
How well has the grantee ensured ongoing processing of invoices (even in years when significant reductions in grant funding occurred or were anticipated)?	4.33	3.57	+0.76
In terms of the process of program monitoring, are you clear on the expectations prior to the site visit and monitoring?	4.42	3.71	+0.71

Question	2024 Average Response	2019 Average Response	Change
How familiar with your program and its community impact was your program monitor during your most recent site visit?	4.17	-	-
In regard to the development of your HHS contract and budget documents, how would you describe the level of technical assistance and support provided by your assigned Program Manager from the Business Office of Contract Development & Technical Assistance?	4.25	3.85	+0.4
How well written are the Requests for Proposals (RFPs), and do you feel they provide clear direction?	3.92	3.6	+0.32
Do you feel the grantee's process of awarding contracts for services is fair and accurate?	4.33	4	+0.33

“I think the grantee/HHS has come a LONG way over the years to become more responsive and transparent with providers. I appreciate this relationship so much.”

“Could use more support leading up to the program monitoring, would like to have HHS staff reach out more often rather than just around the time for program monitoring.”

“The budget and invoicing process is extremely complicated. But the people and support are superb.”



Grantee question topics

- DPH efficiency
- Timely reimbursement for services
- RFP process fairness and efficiency
- Contract monitoring fairness and efficiency
- Support for providers
- Support for council
- Carry forward process

Grantee response themes

- Emphasized high performance of their small team
- Noted many forms of technical support to providers

“I do feel that DPH and HHS is efficient because we have multiple funding sources, many providers funded, and a very small administrative office that handles a variety of needs for funding to get to the provider.”

“We're able to assist our providers with training on how to use ARIES. We are doing 2.5 hour trainings online where we give a lot of hands-on assistance. We also have a helpline available.”

“We're starting trainings to support a lot of our providers. We just had a motivational interviewing training last week. We're bringing in new topics that are of interest.”

Conclusions

- Providers and council members consider the grantee highly responsive and supportive.
- Council members emphasized the value of grantee's presence at council proceedings, as well as their willingness to find answers to council questions even when doing so requires significant extra effort.
- Some providers reported low levels of satisfaction with the quality of RFPs.
- Some providers indicated that the program monitors did not have a high degree of familiarity with their programs.
- The grantee self-assessed the administrative mechanism as very efficient.