

**Assessment of the Ryan White Program Recipient Administrative Mechanism (AAM) – FY 2023 (March 1, 2023 – February 29, 2024)
Findings and Next Steps**

This report includes FY 2023 AAM Report general comments and suggestions, and concerns and solutions related to “Disagree,” and “Strongly disagree,” responses; and therefore, not all statements are included. Statements are numbered to correspond with their number in the final report.

Strategic Planning Committee members are asked to provide feedback to Partnership and Recipient Staff for process improvement.

2024 PARTNERSHIP AAM SURVEY RESULTS

2. I understand the information presented on the Recipient’s Ryan White Program Part A/Minority AIDS Initiative (MAI) expenditure reports:

	2024 (n=15)	2023 (n=19)	2021 (n=25)	2020 (n=24)	2019 (n=22)
Strongly agree	93%	74%	68%	71%	67%
Agree	7%	21%	32%	29%	13%
Neither agree nor disagree	0%	5%	0%	0%	20%
Disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

- I understand some things but not all.
 - *Recipient response: At any time the information is not clear, please reach out to BSR staff or to Recipient staff for assistance in better understanding the information presented. We also welcome suggestions on how we can make the reports more user friendly. We also provide BSR with Top Line Summaries (highlights) of the information presented that they post on the Partnership’s website (www.aidsnet.org) under meeting documents.*

5. The Recipient communicated clearly to the Partnership on expenditure changes related to the Part A/MAI sweeps/reallocation process:

	2024 (n=15)	2023 (n=19)	2021 (n=25)	2020 (n=24)	2019 (n=22)
Strongly agree	80%	89%	68%	75%	73%
Agree	20%	5%	24%	25%	20%
Neither agree nor disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%
Disagree	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%
Strongly disagree	0%	5%	4%	0%	0%

- Don't understand all of this for Recipients.
 - *Recipient response: Please let us know what we can do better to ensure all members understand the Reallocations/Sweeps process. This process helps our program provide quality services to address medical and supportive needs of program-eligible people with HIV in our community, while utilizing all resources within our purview and maximizing expenditures.*

DRAFT

PART A/MAI SUBRECIPIENT SURVEY RESULTS

GENERAL COMMENTS

- I am glad to have access to a product like PE, but all systems are imperfect.
 - *Recipient response: Thank you for your comment. If you have suggestions to improve the PE Miami data management system, please send comments by email to Carla.ValleSchwenk@miamidade.gov.*

- It is often difficult to communicate with managed care plans that serve our mutual patients/clients. Perhaps the Recipient or BSR can facilitate conversations with these managed care plans so organizations have a point of contact. For managed care plans that we are not in-network with, it is also difficult to substantiate payer of last resort without a relationship with that payer. This has led to services that are not billable to the Recipient. We suggest clarifying how to handle these situations to establish the Recipient as payor of last resort.
 - *Recipient response: Thank you for your feedback. Please contact the Program Administrator by phone (305-375-3546) or by email (Carla.ValleSchwenk@miamidade.gov) to provide additional context for this issue and to discuss possible next steps.*

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

	2024 (n=17)	2023 (n=16)	2021 (n=16)	2020 (n=13)	2019 (n=13)
Strongly agree	71%	44%	63%	67%	50%
Agree	29%	44%	37%	33%	43%
Neither agree nor disagree	0%	12%	0%	0%	7%
Disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Not applicable	0%	0%			

- Award notifications are sent on a timely manner, maybe it would be interesting when awards are sent and documents are needed to send to the recipients a calendar invite on the deadline?
 - *Recipient response: Thank you for the suggestion. We will review the feasibility of including this recommendation in the next round of award notifications and reporting requirements.*

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

	2024 (n=17)	2023 (n=16)	2021 (n=16)	2020 (n=13)	2019 (n=13)
Strongly agree	18%	25%	44%	42%	38%
Agree	24%	63%	31%	50%	62%
Neither agree nor disagree	24%	0%	19%	8%	0%
Disagree	18%	12%	6%	0%	0%
Strongly disagree	12%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Not applicable	6%	0%			

- Our FY23 was not executed until December 2023.

 - *Recipient response: Thank you for the comment. Several competing assignments affected timely execution of contracts in FY 2023. Fourteen of 18 FY 2023 contracts were executed by October 31st; with only two executed in July. One subrecipient received their contract documents to be signed at the end of September but did not return the signed documents until January 2024, even after multiple inquiries and reminders. Please also see below.*

- Much improved over previous years!

 - *Recipient response: Thank you for acknowledging the improvements – streamlining internal processes, using a 100% electronic process, using templates, etc. However, we still need to do better. It is important to note that through our improvement efforts thus far, in FY 2024, 12 of 18 contracts were executed by July 31, 2024. One contract remains on hold because the agency has not passed the due diligence review. As the most needed component to ensure improvement in this area, our office anticipates hiring new staff by the end of this calendar year to focus on more timely contract development and execution for FY 2025. Until then, we will review and approve the remaining FY 2024 contracts as soon as possible.*

- We appreciate the fact that the contracts are executed as timely as possible, sometimes, subrecipients delay returning documents which also delays the process. I would suggest if there is a delay as an agreement between parties, that billing and sweeps, should be re-considered and re-scheduled, otherwise this also causes confusion and additional delays.

 - *Recipient response: Thank you for acknowledging the challenges. Continuing to submit monthly invoices in a timely manner, even while contract execution is pending, helps with our expenditure projections to determine if we will be able to spend down our Part A and MAI awards by the end of the grant fiscal year, as well as for determining if we have available resources to address unmet needs and service gaps. Prior year expenditure patterns are also reviewed. Before making any reductions to contract amounts, our fiscal team communicates directly with subrecipient program and fiscal staff to share recommended reduction amounts and give the subrecipient the opportunity to agree to the proposed reduction or to provide justification for another reduction amount or no reduction. Results of this analysis (in the aggregate by service category) are provided to*

the planning council to make decisions on reallocations/sweeps by service category and funding type to address unmet needs and service gaps.

Concerns and solutions related to “Disagree” and “Strongly disagree” responses:

- [Contract executed on] June 10, 2024.
 - *Recipient response: Thank you for the response. See also the comments above.*
- For FY 2023-2024, the contract execution was completed on 07/26/2023, five months after the beginning of program services. The Recipient was open to communications and our concerns and rectified for FY 24-25.
 - *Recipient response: Thank you for the response. See also the comments above.*
- Our FY23 contract was not executed until December 2023. This impacted payments and our finance operations. Suggestion to execute earlier in the FY.
 - *Recipient response: Thank you for the response. See also the comments above.*
- “Concern” assumes too much. Municipal contracting is normally arduous.
 - *Recipient response: Thank you for the comment. Unfortunately, this is indeed an arduous process. There are numerous local, state, and federal requirements to address before a contract can be approved for execution. We continuously look for ways to improve and streamline the processes.*
- Contract executed far beyond fiscal year start date.
 - *Recipient response: Thank you for the response. See also the comments above.*

5. Please indicate the date of your FY 2023-2024 contract execution. (Question added in 2024.)

NOTE: The dates submitted as answers are available for review, but are not included in this report since they did not align with the dates on record with the Recipient.

The Recipient provided FY 2023 and FY 2024 contract execution dates as of August 2024, as noted in the table below.

There are 18 contracts indicated because this table includes the Administration/Clinical Quality Management contract, which does not count toward the survey responses.

Contract Execution Dates in Chronological Order FY 2023 and FY 2024				
#	FY 2023		#	FY 2024
1	July 26, 2023		1	April 26, 2024
2	July 26, 2023		2	May 16, 2024
3	August 8, 2023		3	May 30, 2024
4	August 16, 2023		4	June 10, 2024
5	August 16, 2023		5	June 10, 2024
6	August 25, 2023		6	June 10, 2024
7	September 13, 2023		7	June 10, 2024
8	September 13, 2023		8	July 12, 2024
9	September 13, 2023		9	July 22, 2024
10	September 13, 2023		10	July 25, 2024
11	October 19, 2023		11	July 25, 2024
12	October 26, 2023		12	August 1, 2024
13	November 21, 2023		13	August 15, 2024
14	October 16, 2023		14	August 21, 2024
15	October 20, 2023		15	Pending
16	December 22, 2023		16	Pending
17	December 26, 2023		17	Pending
18	January 26, 2024 (contract sent to agency to sign at the end of September; returned signed in January)		18	Pending

NOTE: Responses to statement #6, #8, and #10, below, are shown in the table, however, as noted in the *Contract Execution Dates in Chronological Order* table, above, it should be noted that contract execution dates submitted by subrecipients did not match the Recipient’s official record of contract execution dates.

Rewording of these statements and/or further instructions may be necessary for future surveys.

6. For contract execution later than March 15, 2023, were there internal factors within your organization that led to delays? (Question added in 2024.)

	% (n=17)
Yes	35%
No	47%
N/A - Our contract was executed prior to March 15, 2023.	18%

7. Please explain the internal factors within your organization that led to delays of contract execution. (Question added in 2024.)

- Board minutes accepting contract and corporate resolution delays submission of paperwork.

 - Recipient response: Comment noted. This item is needed annually. To help mitigate delays, we will include a reminder in the provisional award letter rather than waiting to request it during the due diligence review and contract execution steps.*
- Trying to obtain all of the necessary documents.

 - Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you.*
- Due to the internal routing process for documents, everything requested was submitted 2 days after the due date.

 - Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you.*
- Obtaining required signatures

 - Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you.*
- Close-out of fiscal year 23-24 and program site monitoring response tasks were all required around the same time as contract execution. Additionally, we had another site monitoring from another agency during this period of time.

 - Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you.*
- Office of Research Administration has several checks prior to executing a contract.

 - Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you.*

8. For contract execution later than March 15, 2023, were there external factors with the Recipient that led to delays? (Question added in 2024.)

	% (n=17)
Yes	41%
No	35%
N/A - Our contract was executed prior to March 15, 2023.	24%

9. Please explain the external factors with the Recipient that led to delays of contract execution. (Question added in 2024.)

- We received renewal documents via email on 9/17/2023.

 - *Recipient response: This comment is not clear to us. Please provide additional context and clarity by email to Carla.ValleSchwenk@miamidade.gov, or to remain anonymous please provide more detail through BSR. Thank you.*
- I am able to describe, not explain, external factors. These relate to delays in obtaining approval for the allocated amounts assigned to our agency and municipal leadership signoff. Based on communications received at the time (updates) OMB seemed to be on top of their portion of the process.

 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you.*
- 1. NoA [Notice of Award] was received late; 2. The due diligence tasks takes time to be completed.

 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you. For context, the FY 2023 provisional award letters for the local contracting process were issued February 17, 2023. The corresponding final Notice of Award (NoA) from HRSA was received on April 5, 2023. For FY 2024, the provisional award letters were issued January 5, 2024, but the final NoA was not received until May 23, 2024. The due diligence review process is lengthy. We must ensure the organization is in good standing after reviewing several local, state, and federal contracting requirements. To assist in this process, we will consider including the review templates with the provisional award letters for transparency and for subrecipients to address potential issues in advance.*
- Revisions to the contract language after 3/15/24.

 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you. We will try to ensure the contract template is reviewed and approved by the County Attorney's Office prior to March 1st each year. Necessary changes would then be addressed through amendments.*
- As mentioned before, delays from subrecipients delays the flow as well. In addition, we know County staff is limited.

 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you. We are working on increasing staffing in this area.*

10. Did delays in contract execution cause service disruptions or organizational disruptions? (*Question added in 2024.*)

	% (n=17)
Yes	24%
No	59%
N/A - Our contract was executed prior to March 15, 2023.	18%

11. Please detail service disruptions or organizational disruptions resulting from delayed contract execution. (*Question added in 2024.*)

- Organizationally, we needed to make sure funding allocations were available for operational needs and keep reserves in place while expansions were also being implemented.

 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. We appreciate your team’s patience and willingness to continue providing services to clients. We sincerely apologize for the related organizational disruptions.*

- Ryan White CM Supervisor trying to complete Quarterly report for Broward. Clients calling and/or stopping by the office. Numerous documents to be completed by both counties.

 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. Notably, there are staffing constraints at the Recipient and Subrecipient levels. We will keep this in mind as our requests and reporting deadlines are communicated.*

- The organization required having financial reserves to carry programs while completing expansions of facilities affecting budgetary constraints.

 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. We appreciate your team’s patience and willingness to continue providing services to clients. We sincerely apologize for the related organizational disruptions.*

- There were no service disruptions. We had disruptions in properly recording our finances for providing RW Part A services.

 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. We appreciate your team’s patience and willingness to continue providing services to clients. We sincerely apologize for the related organizational disruptions.*

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

	2024 (n=17)	2023 (n=16)	2021 (n=16)	2020 (n=13)	2019 (n=13)
Strongly agree	59%	50%	56%	75%	46%
Agree	18%	44%	44%	25%	46%
Neither agree nor disagree	18%	0%	0%	0%	8%
Disagree	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Not applicable	0%	6%			

- The process is normally to disallow line items first and then allow organization to contest the disallowance.
 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you. It is recommended that subrecipients review program requirements and limitations then review previous disallowances to identify and/or understand reoccurring issues to prevent future disallowances. As required by the federal Uniform Guidance and as reflected in the signed certification on each invoice, it is the subrecipient’s responsibility to review invoices thoroughly for completeness and accuracy before submitting them for reimbursement.*

Concerns and solutions related to “Disagree” and “Strongly disagree” responses:

- There were differences.
 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you.*

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

	2024 (n=17)	2023 (n=16)	2021 (n=16)	2020 (n=13)	2019 (n=13)
Strongly agree	41%	38%	44%	58%	42%
Agree	47%	50%	50%	42%	50%
Neither agree nor disagree	6%	6%	6%	0%	0%
Disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Not applicable	6%	6%	0%	0%	8%

- We are contacted to reduce spending, but discussion about utilization and expenditures occur only when sub-recipient reaches out. Maybe reviewing patient volume and un-billables, with the agencies to provide additional support.
 - *Recipient response: Thank you for your feedback. Our team will review this comment further to determine ways to provide additional support in this area. Subrecipient program and/or fiscal staff who are authorized with a Contract Management role in PE Miami should be regularly reviewing the unbillables report to determine if items are truly unbillable (i.e., do not meet program guidelines) or if an override request is warranted.*

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

	2024 (n=17)	2023 (n=16)	2021 (n=16)	2020 (n=13)	2019 (n=13)
Strongly agree	59%	44%	63%	67%	67%
Agree	35%	50%	37%	33%	33%
Neither agree nor disagree	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%
Disagree	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Not applicable	0%	0%			

Concerns and solutions related to “Disagree” and “Strongly disagree” responses:

- Reimbursements not timely.
 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you. For context, please note that reimbursement requests can only be processed once the contract is executed. Once we have an executed contract, more than 90% of the reimbursement requests are processed in 25 days or less.*

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

	2024 (n=17)	2023 (n=16)	2021 (n=16)	2020 (n=13)	2019 (n=13)
Strongly agree	35%	32%	56%	58%	42%
Agree	35%	50%	38%	42%	50%
Neither agree nor disagree	18%	6%	6%	0%	8%
Disagree	12%	12%	0%	0%	0%
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Not applicable	0%	0%			

- We did not receive payment until the contract was executed, which was delayed.
 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you. For context, please note that reimbursement requests can only be processed once the contract is executed. Once we have an executed contract, more than 90% of the reimbursement requests are processed in 25 days or less.*

Concerns and solutions related to “Disagree” and “Strongly disagree” responses:

- Payment process takes more than 30 days, often.
 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. Please see above. Thank you.*
- We were not paid for invoices until our contract was executed, which was delayed until December 26, 2023.
 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you. We are striving to execute contracts in a more timely manner.*

19. Communication between the Recipient and our organization has been effective.

	2024 (n=17)	2023 (n=16)	2021 (n=16)	2020 (n=13)	2019 (n=13)
Strongly agree	53%	50%	69%	75%	55%
Agree	35%	50%	25%	25%	45%
Neither agree nor disagree	12%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Disagree	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Not applicable	0%	0%			

- Received conflicting instructions on reporting completion.

 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. Additional context is requested so that we may improve in this area, ensuring that our instructions are clear and timely. Please send a related email to Carla.ValleSchwenk@miamidade.gov, or to remain anonymous please provide more detail through BSR. Thank you.*

- Sometimes with staff turnover at our agency, we have to repeat sometimes the same questions, maybe having a FAQ on their website could allow to avoid some of that repetition that puts the recipient to answer similar concerns multiple times.

 - *Recipient response: Excellent suggestion. We will work to develop a related Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) resource for our County webpage. It would be helpful if the person who made the comment provided some questions to get the FAQ started. Please send a related email to Carla.ValleSchwenk@miamidade.gov, or to remain anonymous please provide the questions through BSR. Thank you.*

20. 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.

	2024 (n=17)	2023 (n=16)	2021 (n=16)	2020 (n=13)	2019 (n=13)
Strongly agree	65%	63%	69%	75%	45%
Agree	35%	37%	31%	25%	55%
Neither agree nor disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Not applicable	0%	0%			

- As mentioned before, if there is a delay in contract execution, sweeps should also be delayed, as agencies might have a lag in billing and agencies might lose an opportunity
 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you. However, with multiple tasks related to addressing unmet need and maximizing resources, it is not always feasible to delay the reallocations/sweeps process. Our improvement in this area will need to come from completing the contract execution process timelier; in which, as noted above, we have made significant progress.*

21. 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.).

	2024 (n=17)	2023 (n=16)	2021 (n=16)	2020 (n=13)	2019 (n=13)
Strongly agree	65%	63%	75%	67%	36%
Agree	29%	31%	25%	33%	55%
Neither agree nor disagree	6%	6%	0%	0%	9%
Disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Not applicable	0%	0%			

- The website needs to be updated, although emails and information is on-going, sometimes is easier to go on the website and look at updated information.
 - *Recipient response: Noted and agreed. Once contracts are fully executed, we will work on updating the website. Thank you.*

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

	2024 (n=17)	2023 (n=16)	2021 (n=16)	2020 (n=13)	2019 (n=13)
Strongly agree	41%	30%	56%	75%	36%
Agree	41%	44%	25%	17%	36%
Neither agree nor disagree	0%	13%	0%	0%	18%
Disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%
Strongly disagree	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Not applicable	12%	13%	19%	8%	0%

Concerns and solutions related to “Disagree” and “Strongly disagree” responses:

- Not allowed adequate time and unreasonable requests during monitoring.
 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. However, it would be helpful to know what the task was, what the deadline was, and what amount of time would be recommended as adequate. Also, it would be helpful to know what requests were unreasonable during the required monitoring process. As previously noted, this is a complex system with many local, state, and federal requirements. Sometimes requests or due dates (especially for federal reporting or annual monitoring requirements) cannot be waived or delayed. However, we can do better in communicating the requirements and any urgencies. Please send additional comments or suggestions by email or to remain anonymous please provide more detail through BSR. Thank you.*

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

	2024 (n=17)	2023 (n=16)	2021 (n=16)	2020 (n=13)	2019 (n=13)
Strongly agree	35%	12%	57%	58%	45%
Agree	41%	69%	31%	34%	27%
Neither agree nor disagree	12%	0%	0%	0%	9%
Disagree	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Not applicable	12%	19%	6%	8%	18%

- It would be great if virtual workshops or TA meetings were held to discuss changes in HHS/HRSA guidelines.
 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you. Please contact Carla Valle-Schwenk, Program Administrator (by email to Carla.ValleSchwenk@miamidade.gov), or your assigned Contracts Officer to request technical assistance. We will develop a TA session or connect you with an appropriate external TA provider or workshop.*

DRAFT

NOTE: The ACMS database was replaced by PE Miami in 2021; responses related to ACMS are not included in this report.

28. The Provide® Enterprise Miami (PE Miami) client database system is reliable.

	2024 (n=17)	2023 (n=16)	2021 (n=16)
Strongly agree	18%	6%	19%
Agree	59%	81%	69%
Neither agree nor disagree	24%	6%	12%
Disagree	0%	6%	0%
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%
Not applicable	0%	0%	

- The system has a robust platform, but reporting from it, is not reliable and is needed for agencies to track utilization and billing, which also requires access. Is a great billing tool, but not an effective system.
 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. We are regularly making improvements to PE Miami. Please send specific recommendations or suggestions by email to Carla.ValleSchwenk@miamidade.gov, or to remain anonymous please provide feedback through BSR. Thank you.*
 - *Groupware Technologies response: We appreciate your comments about Provide Enterprise and ways the system can be improved upon. We look forward to working through this feedback with Miami-Dade County to further enhance the system to meet the needs of our users. Thank you!*

29. The PE Miami client database system is easy to use.

	2024 (n=17)	2023 (n=16)	2021 (n=16)
Strongly agree	12%	13%	12%
Agree	65%	68%	63%
Neither agree nor disagree	18%	13%	19%
Disagree	0%	6%	6%
Strongly disagree	6%	0%	0%
Not applicable.	0%	0%	

- For example the client acuity assessment is poorly worded and once completed does not have meaningful use. Another example is you can rewrite a progress note, you can change the minutes, but you cannot change the code.

 - *Recipient response: Thank you for your feedback. We will review this further in our regular meetings with Groupware Technologies LLC's programming and support team.*
 - *Groupware Technologies response: Thank you for your feedback! Keep in mind that any time you run into items in Provide that do not seem to meet your expectations or could be improved upon, we would always encourage users to reach out to Miami-Dade County or our Help Desk team (Provide.Help@grouptech.com), who we work with regularly to make the system better for all. Any and all feedback is welcomed!*

- It is not user-friendly, data reporting is limited, and information requires roles to have access, not to mention, that in certain instances data entered can't be validated.

 - *Recipient response: Thank you for your feedback. We will review this further in our regular meetings with Groupware Technologies LLC's programming and support team. However, as a security feature of the system, some user access features are restricted or limited and require special functions or roles. If any system user feels they should have access to other features, they should communicate that to their supervisor who can in turn contact the County Ryan White Program Administrator for possible updates to the user's profile.*
 - *Groupware Technologies response: We appreciate your feedback in regards to reporting and the security roles within Provide. As mentioned by Miami-Dade County in their response, many sections of the Provide system are restricted based on roles due to the sensitive nature of the data housed within the database. If you run into a scenario where you feel you should have access to a particular section in Provide, but do not, feel free to reach out to our Help Desk (Provide.Help@grouptech.com). They are always willing to help with these cases and work regularly with Miami-Dade County to ensure the process is smooth and effective.*

Concerns and solutions related to “Disagree” and “Strongly disagree” responses:

- Is a system that not only it requires staff to follow to many steps, but also is only a billing tool, which needs an extra training for staff to fully understand how to follow each step. It is not user friendly. The only solution would be to streamline data entry and ensure that based on the role, it ensures to work in a seamless flow. Example Case Manager should be able to have an initial quick view to see eligibility, then when saved, intake or documentation, then, document provides with a checkbox to click on billing and then a review of the notes and submits. It should have a flow to limit errors and support the documentation or actions performed.
 - *Recipient response: Thank you for your feedback. We will review the comments and suggestions further during our regular calls with Groupware Technologies LLC.*
 - *Groupware Technologies response: Thank you for your valuable feedback! We’re always looking for ways to improve the system to make it easy-to-use, yet highly effective. Groupware Technologies and Miami-Dade County are constantly working toward that goal and encourage you to share any and all feedback with the county and with us (Provide.Help@grouptech.com).*

DRAFT

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

	2024 (n=17)	2023 (n=16)	2021 (n=16)
Strongly agree	12%	6%	19%
Agree	59%	81%	56%
Neither agree nor disagree	18%	13%	19%
Disagree	12%	0%	6%
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%
Not applicable	0%	0%	

- It generates specific data but is not user friendly.
 - *Recipient response: Thank you for your feedback. We will review the comment and previous suggestions further during our regular calls with Groupware Technologies LLC.*
 - *Groupware Technologies response: We appreciate your feedback! We're always looking for ways to improve the system to be more user friendly to our user base. We would encourage you to share your specific feedback with Miami-Dade County or with us directly at Provide.Help@grouptech.com.*

- Efficient and user-friendly are separate characteristics. It is efficient, but less user friendly.
 - *Recipient response: Thank you for your feedback. We will work on improving efficiency and use of the system.*
 - *Groupware Technologies response: Thank you for your feedback! If you have any thoughts or ideas on ways we can improve the system to be more user friendly, I would recommend reaching out to Miami-Dade County or us directly at Provide.Help@grouptech.com. Thanks!*

- Reports are not easy to obtain.
 - *Recipient response: Thank you for your feedback. We will review the comment further during our regular calls with Groupware Technologies LLC. Please provide further details of the reports you are trying to run and what challenges you are encountering while running the report. Send these comments by email to Carla.ValleSchwenk@miamidade.gov or through BSR, if you wish to remain anonymous.*
 - *Groupware Technologies response: Thank you for your feedback! We look forward to working with Carla at Miami-Dade County to better serve you and your reporting needs in Provide!*

Concerns and solutions related to “Disagree” and “Strongly disagree” responses:

- Process is cumbersome and lacks option for organization to pull individual reports.
 - *Recipient response: Thank you for your feedback. We will review the comment further during our regular calls with Groupware Technologies LLC. Please provide further details of the reports you are trying to run and what challenges you are encountering while running the report. Send these comments by email to Carla.ValleSchwenk@miamidade.gov or through BSR, if you wish to remain anonymous.*
 - *Groupware Technologies response: Thank you for your response. We’re always looking for ways to improve our system to better meet the needs of our users. Groupware Technologies and Miami-Dade County meet regularly to discuss these matters and we look forward to working through your feedback.*

- Is not user friendly, which is why, the recipient and BSR allocate a staff to have full access and run reports in SqUEL [SQL or Sequel], that requires experience. Need to allow for a better access to reporting.
 - *Recipient response: Thank you for your feedback. Please note that BSR allocates a staff person to analyze data for the planning council and for the clinical quality management process. BSR’s analyst is doing special queries using raw data. PE Miami has many report templates but understanding the best template to use for the data you need can be challenging. It is also important to note that reports are based on point-in-time data: a report run today could be different from the report results from yesterday, as the system updates the data nightly. We will review the comment further during our regular calls with Groupware Technologies LLC. Please provide further details of the reports you are trying to write and what challenges you are encountering while running the report. Send these comments by email to Carla.ValleSchwenk@miamidade.gov or through BSR, if you wish to remain anonymous.*
 - *Groupware Technologies response: Thank you for sharing your feedback and we look forward to working with Miami-Dade County to further meet your reporting needs. If you ever have questions about running reports or need assistance with finding specific information in the system, please feel free to reach out to us directly at Provide.Help@grouptech.com. Our Help Desk team is always willing to help in any way we can and to provide feedback to the County if new functionality or reports are needed.*

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

	2024 (n=17)	2023 (n=16)	2021 (n=16)
Strongly agree	24%	0%	19%
Agree	24%	63%	56%
Neither agree nor disagree	41%	6%	25%
Disagree	12%	31%	0%
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%
Not applicable	0%	0%	

- This is variable.
 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you.*
 - *Groupware Technologies response: Thanks for your response! We are always working to improve our Help Desk experience and hope to continue to better serve you into the future.*
- They take too long to respond and sometimes solutions are not proper, so another request needs to be asked.
 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you. We will discuss the comment with Groupware Technologies LLC's programming and support team to identify where they can improve in this area.*
 - *Groupware Technologies response: Thank you for your feedback and we apologize for any negative experience you may have had reaching out to us for assistance. We are always working towards improving our Help Desk experience and we hope to improve upon your interactions with us into the future.*

Concerns and solutions related to “Disagree” and “Strongly disagree” responses:

- Disagree.
 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you.*
 - *Groupware Technologies response: Thank you for your feedback and we apologize for the negative experience you may have had with our Help Desk. We are always looking for ways to improve our Help Desk experiences and welcome any additional feedback you may have. Feel free to reach out to Provide.Help@grouptech.com with you feedback and we will be happy to work with you.*

- Tickets take a long time to process or respond.
 - *Recipient response: Comment noted. Thank you. We will discuss the comment with Groupware Technologies LLC's programming and support team to identify where they can improve in this area.*
 - *Groupware Technologies response: Thank you for your feedback and we apologize for the negative experience! We do our absolute best to respond to and resolve Help Desk Tickets as fast as possible, and we are always working toward improving the Help Desk experience at Groupware Technologies. We hope to better serve you in the future with any requests you send our way!*

DRAFT