



Strategic Planning Committee
Behavioral Science Research Corp.
2121 Ponce de Leon Boulevard, Suite 240, Coral Gables, FL 33134
April 12, 2024 Minutes

#	Members	Present	Absent	Guests	
1	Cardwell, Joanna	x		Marquez, Jamie	
2	Hunter, Tabitha		x	Medina, Jesus	
3	Machado, Angela	x		Valle-Schwenk, Carla	
4	Mooss, Angela		x	Williams, Stephen	
5	Poblete, Karen		x	Staff	
6	Sheehan, Diana M.		x	Bontempo, Christina	
7	Singh, Hardeep	x		Ladner, Robert	
Quorum = 3					

Note: All documents referenced in these minutes are on file and were accessible to members and the public prior to (and during) the meeting, at www.aidsnet.org/the-partnership#strategicplanning1.

I. Call to Order

Committee Vice Chair, Angela Machado called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

II. Introductions

Members, guests, and staff introduced themselves, and Ms. Machado identified Behavioral Science Research Corp. (BSR) staff as the resource persons.

III. Housekeeping/Meeting Rules

Ms. Machado reviewed the *Meeting Housekeeping* PowerPoint, which includes general reminders, code of conduct, people-first language, and meeting participation best practices.

IV. Floor Open to the Public

Ms. Machado opened the floor to the public with the following statement:

Pursuant to Florida Sunshine Law, I want to provide the public with a reasonable opportunity to be heard on any item on our agenda today. If there is anyone who wishes to be heard, I invite you to speak now. Each person will be given three minutes to speak. Please begin by stating your name and address for the record before you talk about your concerns. BSR has a dedicated telephone line as well as a general email address for statements to be read into the record. No statements were received via the telephone line or email.

There were no comments, so the floor was then closed.

V. Review/Approve Agenda

Members reviewed the agenda and approved it with no changes.

Motion to approve the agenda as presented.

Moved: Joanna Cardwell

Seconded: Hardeep Singh

Motion: Passed

VI. Review the Minutes of March 8, 2024

Members reviewed the minutes of March 8, 2024, and approved the minutes with no changes.

Motion to approve the minutes of March 8, 2024 as presented.

Moved: Hardeep Singh

Seconded: Joanne Cardwell

Motion: Passed

VII. Reports

▪ **Membership**

Ms. Machado announced that member and former Vice Chair, Dr. Angela Mooss, will have completed her six-year term at the end of this month. Members thanked her for her service.

Stephanie Stonestreet submitted an application for membership. Ms. Stonestreet introduced herself and stated her interest in membership. Members voted to accept Ms. Stonestreet as a new member.

Motion to approve Stephanie Stonestreet as a new member of the Strategic Planning Committee.

Moved: Hardeep Singh

Seconded: Joanna Cardwell

Motion: Passed

There are still many vacancies on the Partnership and Committees; however, staff announced the Community Coalition will put forward several candidates at the May 13 Partnership meeting.

▪ **Partnership Report to the Committee**

The Partnership report for March 18, 2024, was posted online. Members re-elected Alecia Tramel-McIntyre as Chair and Harold McIntyre as Vice Chair and reviewed the motion from Strategic Planning to seek guidance from HRSA on the schedule of surveys for the Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism. That item will be addressed later in the meeting.

VIII. Standing Business

▪ **Assessment of the Recipient Administrative Mechanism (AAM)**

□ **Response from HRSA re Request on Surveys and Reporting**

Last month, members put forward the motion, “for BSR staff to request guidance from our HRSA Project Officer to assess implementing a two-year AAM rapid cycle to allow for survey administration one year and follow up on an action plan resulting from the survey results in the next year.” The legislation requires an evaluation to assess the Recipient in rapidly dispersing funds and responding to Planning Council directives each year. Therefore, members agreed to maintain the previous survey structure and add follow up questions, specifically for gathering feedback on “disagree” or “strongly disagree” responses. Members also agreed to establish an action plan for tracking the progress of issues raised by survey responses.

□ **2024 Action Plan and Draft Surveys Review**

Staff will draft the action plan and revised surveys based on today's meeting feedback for review in May; included in these minutes as:

- Attachment #1: AAM FY2024 Partnership Member Survey
- Attachment #2: AAM FY2024 Ryan White Program Subrecipient Survey
- Attachment #3: 2024 Action Plan

□ **Updates to 2024 Schedule of Meetings and Agenda Topics**

Members received an updated schedule indicating the revised timing and activities around the AAM. Staff will correct a typo; no other changes were indicated. Members had previously voted to accept the schedule with the AAM changes; no further action was needed.

IX. New Business

▪ **2024 Annual Report**

Members agreed to maintain the layout and data elements of the 2023 Annual Report and review updates at their next meeting. The color scheme will be updated to differentiate the 2022 version from the 2023 version.

X. Announcements and Open Discussion

Staff announced the April 25 Prevention Committee meeting will include presentations on Project T-SHARP and HPTN 096: Building Equity Through Advocacy; and advised there are opportunities for presentations to the Prevention Committee if anyone has a topic of interest. Staff announced the April 17 Needs Assessment training and the complete schedule of Needs Assessment meetings, and included flyers in the meeting presentation.

XI. Next Meeting

Ms. Machado announced the next meeting is scheduled for May 10, 2024, at BSR Corp.

XII. Adjournment

Ms. Machado adjourned the meeting at 11:53 a.m.

Miami-Dade HIV/AIDS Partnership Member Survey
REVIEW VERSION FOR SPC MEMBERS

The Assessment of the Recipient Administrative Mechanism (AAM) is a Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA)-mandated evaluation, and a major activity of the Miami-Dade HIV/AIDS Partnership Strategic Planning Committee.

This AAM survey covers the activities of the Ryan White Program grant Recipient: The Miami-Dade County Office of Management and Budget-Grants Coordination, during the Ryan White Program (RWP) Fiscal Year FY 2023-2024: March 1, 2023-February 29, 2024.

All Miami-Dade HIV/AIDS Partnership members who were appointed prior to February 2024, must complete this survey, no later than May 31, 2024.

A separate survey will be distributed to Ryan White Program Part A/MAI-funded subrecipients addressing these issues and other concerns. If you are a Partnership member and you represent a subrecipient, you are asked to complete two surveys.

Responses are tallied and reported in aggregate form without identifying information.

Thank you!

* 1. Please enter your First and Last Name (Your name is required for tracking responses and will not be included in the final report.)

Name

* 2. The Miami-Dade County Office of Management and Budget-Grants Coordination (“the Recipient”) kept the Partnership well informed of policies, procedures, and updates from HRSA which impact the Ryan White Program.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

3. For a rating of "**Disagree**" or "**Strongly Disagree**" to the statement: *The Miami-Dade County Office of Management and Budget-Grants Coordination (“the Recipient”) kept the Partnership well informed of policies, procedures, and updates from HRSA which impact the Ryan White Program*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 4. I understand the information presented on the Recipient’s Ryan White Program Part A/Minority AIDS Initiative (MAI) expenditure reports. (See Reports, above).

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

Part A Expenditure Report (End of Year Summary)

Minority AIDS Initiative Expenditure Report (End of Year Summary)

5. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *I understand the information presented on the Recipient's Ryan White Program Part A/Minority AIDS Initiative (MAI) expenditure reports*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 6. The Recipient followed the Partnership's recommendations for service priorities and resource allocations. (See Reports, below).

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

Part A Expenditure Report (End of Year Summary)

Minority AIDS Initiative Expenditure Report (End of Year Summary)

7. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The Recipient followed the Partnership's recommendations for service priorities and resource allocations*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 8. The Recipient effectively administered Part A/MAI funds according to priorities set by the Partnership. (See Reports, below).

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

Part A Expenditure Report (End of Year Summary)

Minority AIDS Initiative Expenditure Report (End of Year Summary)

9. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The Recipient effectively administered Part A/MAI funds according to priorities set by the Partnership*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 10. The Recipient communicated clearly to the Partnership on expenditure changes related to the Part A/MAI sweeps/reallocation process. (See Reports, below).

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

Part A Expenditure Report (End of Year Summary)

Minority AIDS Initiative Expenditure Report (End of Year Summary)

11. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The Recipient communicated clearly to the Partnership on expenditure changes related to the Part A/MAI sweeps/reallocation process*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 12. The Recipient responded to inquiries, requests, and problem-solving needs from the Partnership, including those related to the Partnership's Needs Assessment (Priority Setting and Resource Allocations) in a timely manner.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

13. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The Recipient responded to inquiries, requests, and problem-solving needs from the Partnership, including those related to the Partnership's Needs Assessment (Priority Setting and Resource Allocations) in a timely manner*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 14. Based on Needs Assessment data, HIV/AIDS services funded by Part A/MAI were directed toward the demographic population(s) of greatest need.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

15. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *Based on Needs Assessment data, HIV/AIDS services funded by Part A/MAI were directed toward the demographic population(s) of greatest need*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 16. Based on Needs Assessment data, HIV/AIDS services funded by Part A/MAI were directed toward the geographic area(s) of greatest need.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

17. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *Based on Needs Assessment data, HIV/AIDS services funded by Part A/MAI were directed toward the geographic area(s) of greatest need*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 18. The Recipient's staff was courteous and respectful.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

19. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The Recipient's staff was courteous and respectful*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 20. Behavioral Science Research Corp. (BSR), the Recipient's HIV planning council staff support contractor, responded to inquiries, requests, and problem-solving needs from the Partnership.

Strongly agree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly disagree

Neither agree nor disagree

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

21. For a rating of "[Disagree](#)" or "[Strongly Disagree](#)" to the statement: *Behavioral Science Research Corp. (BSR), the Recipient's HIV planning council staff support contractor, responded to inquiries, requests, and problem-solving needs from the Partnership*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

22. OPTIONAL: Additional comments/suggestions regarding the Recipient, BSR, and/or other matters.

Ryan White Program Part A/MAI Subrecipient Survey
REVIEW VERSION FOR SPC MEMBERS

The Assessment of the Recipient Administrative Mechanism (AAM) is a Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA)-mandated evaluation, and a major activity of the Miami-Dade HIV/AIDS Partnership Strategic Planning Committee.

This AAM survey covers the activities of the Ryan White Program grant Recipient: The Miami-Dade County Office of Management and Budget-Grants Coordination, during the Ryan White Program (RWP) *Fiscal Year FY 2023-2024: March 1, 2023-February 29, 2024.*

All Ryan White Program Part A/MAI-funded subrecipients must complete this survey, *no later than May 31, 2024.*

A separate survey will be distributed to Miami-Dade HIV/AIDS Partnership members addressing these issues and other concerns. If you represent both a subrecipient AND are a Partnership member, you are asked to complete two surveys.

Responses are tallied and reported in aggregate form without identifying information.

Thank you!

* 1. Please enter your Organization's Name

Organization

* 2. Please enter the First and Last Name and Title of the primary person completing this survey. (This is required for tracking responses and will not be included in the final report.)

You will have the option in Statement #3 to include additional people who are helping to complete the survey.

First and last name of primary person completing this survey

Title of primary person completing this survey

How many years have you been with your organization?

3. OPTIONAL: Please enter the First and Last Name(s) and Title(s) of additional people who are helping to complete the survey.

First and last name of additional person completing survey (1)

Title of additional person completing survey (1)

How many years have you been with your organization (1)?

First and last name of additional person completing survey (2)

Title of additional person completing survey (2)

How many years have you been with your organization (2)?

* 4. The Miami-Dade County Office of Management and Budget-Grants Coordination (“the Recipient”) conducted a fair contract negotiation process with our organization.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

5. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The Miami-Dade County Office of Management and Budget-Grants Coordination (“the Recipient”) conducted a fair contract negotiation process with our organization*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 6. The Recipient sent award notifications/letters to our organization in a timely manner.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

7. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The Recipient sent award notifications/letters to our organization in a timely manner*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 8. The Recipient executed our organization’s contract in a timely manner.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

9. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The Recipient executed our organization’s contract in a timely manner*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 10. Please indicate the date of your FY 2023-2024 contract execution.

11. For contact execution later than March 15, 2023, please provide details explaining the delay(s).

* 12. There were no significant differences between billed versus reimbursed amounts for our organization that were not discussed prior to any disallowance.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

13. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *There were no significant differences between billed versus reimbursed amounts for our organization that were not discussed prior to any disallowance*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 14. The Recipient contacted our organization to review utilization and expenditures that were not on target.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

15. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The Recipient contacted our organization to review utilization and expenditures that were not on target*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 16. The Recipient reviewed our organization’s service utilization and reimbursement requests submissions in a timely manner.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

17. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The Recipient reviewed our organization's service utilization and reimbursement requests submissions in a timely manner*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 18. The Recipient provided payment to our organization within 30 days of submission of complete and accurate invoices.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

19. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The Recipient provided payment to our organization within 30 days of submission of complete and accurate invoices*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 20. The Recipient clearly explained any holds or disallowances on reimbursement requests.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

21. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The Recipient clearly explained any holds or disallowances on reimbursement requests*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 22. When/if our organization requested programmatic and/or fiscal technical assistance or training, it was provided in a timely manner.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

23. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *When/if our organization requested programmatic and/or fiscal technical assistance or training, it was provided in a timely manner*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 24. The Recipient provided our organization with a clear explanation of Ryan White Program reporting requirements (i.e., Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Services Report (RSR), Annual Progress Report, client eligibility screening, etc.).

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

25. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The Recipient provided our organization with a clear explanation of Ryan White Program reporting requirements (i.e., Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Services Report (RSR), Annual Progress Report, client eligibility screening, etc.)*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 26. Communication between the Recipient and our organization has been timely.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

27. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *Communication between the Recipient and our organization has been timely*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 28. Communication between the Recipient and our organization has been effective.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

29. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *Communication between the Recipient and our organization has been effective*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 30. The Recipient informed our organization of reallocation processes (sweeps) to identify unmet needs or service gaps, and the requirements of a spending plan in order to adjust our organization's budget during the contract year.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

31. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The Recipient informed our organization of reallocation processes (sweeps) to identify unmet needs or service gaps, and the requirements of a spending plan in order to adjust our organization's budget during the contract year*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 32. The Recipient kept our organization well informed of Miami-Dade HIV/AIDS Partnership decisions that impact Ryan White Program subrecipients (e.g., approval of or changes to service definitions, notice of Prescription Drug Formulary changes, updates to Allowable Medical Conditions, changes to billable services, etc.).

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

33. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The Recipient kept our organization well informed of Miami-Dade HIV/AIDS Partnership decisions that impact Ryan White Program subrecipients (e.g., approval of or changes to service definitions, notice of Prescription Drug Formulary changes, updates to Allowable Medical Conditions, changes to billable services, etc.)*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 34. When contract non-compliance issues were raised, the Recipient provided adequate time for remediation specific to the issue.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

35. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *When contract non-compliance issues were raised, the Recipient provided adequate time for remediation specific to the issue*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 36. In response to our requests, the Recipient provided guidance and clarification to our organization for any program-related document, reporting requirement, or other requested items, in a timely manner.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

37. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *In response to our requests, the Recipient provided guidance and clarification to our organization for any program-related document, reporting requirement, or other requested items, in a timely manner,* please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 38. The Recipient responded adequately to inquiries, requests, and problem-solving needs from our organization.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

39. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The Recipient responded adequately to inquiries, requests, and problem-solving needs from our organization,* please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 40. The Recipient's staff was courteous and respectful.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

41. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The Recipient's staff was courteous and respectful*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 42. Behavioral Science Research Corp. (BSR), the Recipient's Ryan White Program Clinical Quality Management contractor, responded adequately to inquiries, requests, and problem-solving from our organization.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

43. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *Behavioral Science Research Corp. (BSR), the Recipient's Ryan White Program Clinical Quality Management contractor, responded adequately to inquiries, requests, and problem-solving from our organization*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 44. The Groupware Technologies, LLC (GTL) Provide® Enterprise Miami (PE Miami) client data management system is reliable.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

45. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The Groupware Technologies, LLC (GTL) Provide® Enterprise Miami (PE Miami) client data management system is reliable*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 46. The PE Miami client database system is easy to use.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable.

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

47. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The PE Miami client database system is easy to use*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 48. The PE Miami client database system generates organization-specific data in an efficient and user-friendly manner.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

49. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The PE Miami client database system generates organization-specific data in an efficient and user-friendly manner*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

* 50. The PE Miami client database system vendor, Groupware Technologies, responds promptly and adequately to inquiries, data requests, and system trouble-shooting.

- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Not applicable

Comments: Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions (optional)

51. For a rating of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to the statement: *The PE Miami client database system vendor, Groupware Technologies, responds promptly and adequately to inquiries, data requests, and system trouble-shooting*, please explain your concern and suggest a solution to the problem.

52. OPTIONAL: Additional comments/suggestions regarding the Recipient, BSR, PE Miami, Groupware Technologies, and/or other matters.