

Select originating cluster

Mary Lee Fay
Authorized Signature

Number: SPD-IM-04-090
Issue Date: 09/29/04

Topic: Other

Subject: AAA Program Review Work Group

Applies to (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> All DHS employees
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Area Agencies on Aging
<input type="checkbox"/> Children, Adults and Families
<input type="checkbox"/> County DD Program Managers | <input type="checkbox"/> County Mental Health Directors
<input type="checkbox"/> Health Services
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Seniors and People with Disabilities
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): |
|---|---|

Message: Attached are the minutes from the first meeting of the AAA Program Review Work Group. The focus of the group is to identify the goals for conducting routine program reviews of OAA and OPI programs, standards for review, outcomes and protocols. Following is the schedule and location of upcoming meetings.

Nutrition Sub-committee: October 6, 2004 from 9:00 am to 4:00 pm at Lance Council of Governments, 1015 Willamette St, Eugene. (It will cost \$5 for parking in the nearby parking garage.)

Work Group (2nd meeting): October 21, 2004 from 9:00 am to 12:00 pm at Mid-Willamette Valley Senior Services Agency, 3410 Cherry Ave. NE, Salem.

If you have any questions about this information, contact:

Contact(s):	Mary Lee Fay Lee Girard		
Phone:	503-945-9787 503-947-1199	Fax:	503-947-4245
E-mail:	Marylee.Fay@state.or.us Lee.A.Girard@state.or.us		

AAA Program Review Work Group

August 24, 2004

Mid-Willamette Valley SSA Office

Purpose of Meeting:

This meeting was held to discuss the anticipated review of Older Americans Act (OAA) Programs by Seniors and People with Disabilities (SPD). SPD staff from the State Unit on Aging (SUA) were present as well as representatives from several Area Agency on Aging (AAA) offices from around the state. SPD has assembled some draft program monitoring tools and distributed those to the AAAs as a starting point for discussion.

Present:

Terry Duffin, AoA Region X
Eva Mabbot, CAPECO AAA
Cheryl Wells, MWVSSA
Jayne Froeming, MCOA
Grady Tarbutton, Washington
County DAVS
Don Bruland, RVCOG
Rhonda Buedefelt, SPD
Lee Girard, SPD
Janay Haas, SPD
Mary Lee Fay, SPD

Ted Stevens, LCOG S&DS
Carrie Legg, CAPECO AAA
Carol Husfloen, MCOA
Jeff Hill, Washington County DAVS
Connie Prentice, Washington County
DAVS
Berta Varble, RVCOG
Amy Evenson, SPD
Judy Bowen, SPD
Kathryn Labadie, SPD

Minutes

Introduction by Mary Lee Fay:

The work group meeting was facilitated by Mary Lee Fay. Mary Lee's introductory statement noted the purpose of program monitoring and expressed AoA's expectations around better accountability. SPD feels program reviews are important mechanisms for allowing us to get good sense of how things are working in each local area and provide technical assistance. The purpose of this workgroup is to develop a framework for the completion of program reviews and develop clear expectations from both the AAA offices and SPD for these reviews. We hope to discuss today the procedures for program reviews originating from central office and develop a system for how these are accomplished. We would also like to discuss

those program monitoring items that are finite, meaning SPD must perform this key element in the review, and which are negotiable.

AoA Perspective by Terry Duffin:

Terry Duffin provided AoA's perspective on program reviews, indicating that AoA has certain expectations and parameters around program monitoring. Terry also stressed the flexibility in the monitoring processes. Terry referenced OAA Section 202 in discussing AoA's expectations around program monitoring and evaluation. Section 202 states that the SUA is expected to evaluate all programs, their impact and effectiveness and whether the programs are reaching the target audience.

AoA has not done any recent monitoring of states. However, this could change in the near future, as AoA sets aside 1% of the budget each year for monitoring purposes. Currently, AoA is contracting the monitoring piece out and in October 2005 there will most likely be some evaluation around the nation. It is good that Oregon is beginning to look at development of program monitoring. The monitoring done by AoA's contractor will most likely include a self assessment survey sent out to each state and/or region. This monitoring will be a vehicle for reporting back to Congress on the status of OAA programs.

The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) stresses the importance of measuring outcomes rather than outputs. Currently, the NAPIS State Program Report (SPR) looks at the outputs of the OAA programs, however it never addresses the specific outcomes in terms of client impact and community involvement at the local levels. This is where program monitoring can impact the GPRA goals, by showing the outcomes of the OAA programs.

The OAA Section 305 also speaks to the states' responsibilities for planning, administration, and evaluation of the Area Agencies on Aging related to programs provided in the area. Section 307 of the Act references area plans and the need for the state to evaluate programs (periodic review) using a uniform procedure to evaluate effectiveness.

(One person asked where to get a copy of the Older Americans Act with the 2000 revisions. The SUA will send a link to the Unofficial OAA compilation with these minutes. Terry Duffin clarified that AoA does not have any authority to do any rule pointing, as this must be done by the

Authorizing Committee, however the unofficial compilation of the OAA can be used by states.)

Lee Girard discussed the documents that AoA had provided to SPD which included sample monitoring tools from Idaho and Washington. Idaho initially reviewed each OAA program using these tools to get a handle on some issues that were occurring in that state, but in the future they may only monitor specific OAA programs in some sort of rotating schedule.

Terry points out that the OAA is going to be reauthorized this year. He urged AAAs to discuss this with congress persons or representatives in order to make improvements in the system. For instance, contributions from users are now considered program income and cannot be used as match for federal funds. If something like this is an issue for you, you may want to take this up with the OAA reauthorization process and contact your congress person or representatives to make sure this issue is addressed.

Terry also noted that the Oregon SUA staff of 5 is much smaller than other states, for instance Idaho has 14 SUA staff and Washington has approximately 10 staff. Since AoA Region X only has 3 staff for the entire region, when they do monitor, they will look only at specific issues.

Currently, AoA has not issued any guidance on state reviews of local AAA offices. AoA leaves the procedures and standards for monitoring up to the states. AoA may come out with some direction in the future.

Terry also mentioned that a major state audit of a western state showed significant problems in all AAA offices regarding the billing of both OAA and Title XIX programs simultaneously for the same service (this is not allowed). AoA is concerned about this development and encourages our monitoring to include this aspect as an element for monitoring. AoA would like to avoid occurrences such as this. AoA wants to also ensure fiscal accountability and efficiency in use of OAA monies. The effectiveness and use of money is also a consideration for internal controls in doing a monitoring review. AoA may start sampling programs around the state in order to get a sense of how things are going in the OAA programs.

The AoA Regional Office thinks it is important to look at new ways of doing business and creating supplemental funding streams. Program monitoring can be one way of looking at those things that are new and innovate ways of

doing business and we can begin to look at things we've never done in the past to serve clients. OAA programs have seen decline in services in the congregate nutrition program, while there has been increased demand in Family Caregiver Support program and home delivered meals. In terms of fiscal accountability, Oregon may want to look at how services are delivered and efficiency. Performance based contracting does not typically talk about increasing fiscal efficiency, which equates to serving more clients and providing more services, however, gains in efficiency are a good thing to note.

Quality is another area for consideration in monitoring. A quality satisfaction instrument may be offered by AoA in the next 6 months. AoA is using this form as a vehicle for feedback on quality. AoA would recommend that a quality satisfaction instrument be used in program monitoring.

AoA hopes that monitoring will be developed by states to accommodate local differences and networks that exist in that state. Monitoring should be relevant and necessary. It should help the network better together at all levels.

Berta Varble stated that she would like to see AoA lighted up on the match requirement of 25% for Family Caregiver Support Program and allow the match requirements to be consistent with the rest of the Act. **Terry** suggests this as one item to bring up with the OAA reauthorization.

Kathy Labadie asked whether the sampling that AoA is planning will be contracted out or done in house. **Terry** indicates this will be done by the national contractor.

Janay pointed out that the Legal Services Associate had been able to participate in a process of monitoring and it turned out to be an exciting process sharing experience.

Group Discussion:

Mary Lee Fay discussed that the state has the responsibility to find out how services are being provided. Suggested taking a look at the areas where AoA has expressed some level of priorities, for instance in nutrition, Family Caregiver Support Program, and legal services. We should pay special attention to these hot topics first and then move to other programs that do

not have as much exposure right now. **Terry** recommended that all IIIB services and supportive services also be on the top of our priorities list. SPD will look at broad categories of information that demonstrates program performance, rather than minute details.

Berta indicated that when she first saw the monitoring and evaluation draft documents, she was scared, but she knows it is a good starting point now, having had a chance to talk with Amy and Judy when they came out for a site visit this month. She feels better about the process now. She is eager to figure out where we go from here on monitoring tools and is especially concerned about the Information and Assistance (I&A) monitoring.

Mary Lee agreed that the monitoring tools and processes must work for everyone in order to be successful. Standards are different than best practices and we will work towards weeding out best practices from our standards to help make the standards more concise.

Terry had some instruments that were used in the past for self assessment that would be sent to the state, which would then complete the survey and return to AoA. AoA would then do a sampling on those responses to get a sense of where problem areas are or to be sure to provide technical assistance in key areas to those who need it. This approach would help minimize time spent on site doing review if you can narrow your scope of review.

Don Bruland stated that he'd like to see the workgroup make a decision on how we balance quality and quantity. Don suggests that the state should look at local area process and whether it involved the appropriate people to ensure balance. The planning process should look at standards to ensure that we don't set the bar so high that we cannot effectively serve clients. Involve the advisory councils and other local area partners in setting standards.

Mary Lee asked whether there is a program with a national focus and wondered whether the balance could be found at the national level. The nutrition program might be an example of a national program, but it has other standards that are not going to be related to the other OAA programs, so perhaps it is not a good example of this.

Lee thinks that the nutrition program might be a good example. The SUA is not meeting OAA standards with regards to the composition of the SUA team because we do not have a nutritionist on staff.

Ted Stevens pointed out that sometimes standards end up being excessive, for instance in the nutrition program standards recently issued by SPD which is over 50 pages long for a relatively simple program. Having to meet excessive standards drains money and resources from the program when it should be serving people. Nutrition is just one program and 50 pages for that program alone seems excessive.

Grady Tarbutton indicated that Washington County DAVS used to have a program standard for each program. What we really need to do is to find out what the key things we need to measure are and draft standards around those key elements. Keep it simple. Focus on demonstrating the strengths of the program. Look at what we do well and what we do in general. Help to strengthen public view.

Don says that we need to look at what the outcomes are for the programs. For example, on meals, we should look at whether the client is basically satisfied with the quality of the meals. The quality of the meal will have an impact on the quantity of participants and meals and whether new people would be referred to the program. Quality equals quantity.

Ted suggests the group review expectations and standards, then determine the process for monitoring. He hopes we could spend maybe 2-3 meetings on standards and then go on to the process of monitoring.

Mary Lee says the process is the easy part and the monitoring is relatively easy too, just a little more time consuming. Mary Lee suggests taking an item and then listing the important issues. Then look at the standards and draft monitoring tools. There are lots of good things in these documents. We just need to hash out which things are mandatory and which are just best practices.

Lee expressed concerns that reviewing the standards first could delay the development and implementation of the monitoring process for 3-4 years and AoA is urging monitoring right now. We haven't monitored in years.

Berta suggests that starting with the nutrition standards and then working towards other programs would be a good way to start. Berta reminds the group that we are doing field visits which are helpful and a type of monitoring visit.

Ted expresses concern with moving forward with monitoring right now when we do not have standards by which the AAA's will be measured/monitored. We need to spend time doing standards.

Amy Evenson pointed out that the SUA and AAA offices have already started on a draft OAA Program Manual and OPI Manual that could be a basis for the standards. Perhaps the standards and these program manuals could be converged into one document that contains a set of best practices and performance measures/standards for each program. The draft was done prior to the 2000 OAA amendments so we would need to revisit it to see if there are any changes, plus the documents were never finalized, so we may need a workgroup to help get these documents finalized.

Mary Lee indicates that field reviews or site visits would be a good way to do some monitoring while we are in the process of developing finalized standards for the OAA & OPI programs. Once those are finalized, then real program monitoring scheduled can be developed and procedures implemented. In the meantime, the SUA staff will continue to go around the state to get to know how things are done at the local level and get a sense of the local areas strengths and weaknesses. The SUA will continue to offer technical assistance around any aspect that requires assistance following a site visit. This will be a good way to build relationships with SUA staff and the AAA offices. **Berta** found the field visits to be helpful to RVCOG.

Lee discussed setting some groundwork expectations and proposed to start this process with nutrition program standards since those are the most complete segment of the OAA program manuals that we have. Next month we can look at the nutrition program together as a group. Lee is concerned that the nutrition standards review could take more like 6 months rather than one month due to the complexity of the DRI information. **Terry** can give us examples of how other states are handling the DRI implementations.

Mary Lee would like to see us address through monitoring the "pulse of the state." She thinks identifying at least 5 key elements and then stating if these thresholds are missed, the program is in jeopardy. We want to have a

monitoring tool that says yes the program is functioning and it is functioning well. Then we can look at the state as a whole and see what is happening around the state and look for top indicators for nutrition services.

Lee indicates that the Family Caregiver Support Program has a self assessment component that is targeted towards possible needs for technical assistance. Lee recommends starting with the draft tools and then working our way backwards towards the standards. The group seemed happy about that idea.

The group adjourned for lunch and during that time, individuals reviewed the nutrition monitoring tool and identified areas for improvement.

Brainstorming Session:

List the most important categories from the monitoring tool which are key indicators of the nutrition program:

- ✓ Nutritional value/quality
- ✓ Safety and sanitation
- ✓ Number of people served/outreach effort
- ✓ Accessibility
- ✓ Client Satisfaction/suggestions/innovation
- ✓ Eligibility
- ✓ Number of meals served
- ✓ Coordination and collaboration
- ✓ Fiscal and program controls, including eligibility
- ✓ Resource development
- ✓ Targeting

There will need to be some reasonableness checks for standards so that smaller AAA offices do not have to meet unrealistic requirements set forth in the standards.

The group was then asked to rank the list above in order to get the top 3 categories of importance to the group regarding the nutrition program. The top 3 items of importance were:

1. Nutritional Value
2. Safety and Sanitation
3. Fiscal and Program Eligibility

Mary Lee indicates that SPD will want to know what AAA offices are working on and how offices are tracking information. There are different ways to measure quality, for instance, client satisfaction could measure quality. If we proceed to the next workgroup, these items noted above should be the key areas we look at for developing standards.

The group decided to walk through the process one time so we could get an idea or example of what the next step would be. The group chose to expand on item 1 listed above:

1. Nutritional Value/Quality
 - Client satisfaction—both social and nutritional
 - Approved Menu is use/DRI's are adhered to/site visits are made
 - Innovative was to do business—methods of serving meals and menu options
 - Ability to meet special dietary needs

(other ideas that came up, but which were discarded because they appeared to be more along the lines of other items in #'s 2& 3 of the list rather than a subset of #1.)

Next Steps:

There will be two types of meetings forthcoming;

- Large Group—to work on standards and key monitoring elements identified by small group
- Small Group—program managers and other staff with program specific knowledge will meet to go over standards and identify areas of interest to report back to the large group.

The Small Group meeting will be held on 10/6/0 at 1015 Willamette, Eugene, OR from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Mary Lee Fay, Judy Bowen, Eva Mabbot, Don Bruland, Berta Varble, Sandy Karsten, and Carol Husfloen have volunteered (or been volunteered) for attendance in the small group.

The Large Group meeting will be held on 10/21/04 from 9:00 a.m.-12:00:p.m. at Mid Willamette Valley SSA office on Cherry Avenue in Salem. The large group meeting will look at Family Caregiver Support Program draft monitoring tools and try to identify important factors.