

STATUS REPORT-IMPLEMENTATION OF PURCHASE OF SERVICE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS-OPM

March 18, 2014; Updated: April 20, 2016

Introduction and Table of Contents

In April 2013, the Purchase of Service (POS) Contracting Project Efficiency Office, established by Secretary Barnes here at OPM, issued its report recommending business process and organizational changes related to POS health and human service contracting. The focus of these POS contracting changes continues to be on streamlining, standardizing, automating and reducing costs and paperwork for both state agencies and non-profit providers. Some of the specific outcomes to be achieved through the recommendations include improved timeliness of contract executions, more efficient and effective payment and reporting processes and-- most critically—a shift towards a stronger focus on performance and client outcomes.

Since April 2013, the six state POS agencies who were part of the project office have been working on implementing the recommendations in the April 2013 report. The purpose of this document is to summarize the status of these implementation efforts by agency. The following Table of Contents identifies the major categories of recommended changes to POS contracting included in the report. It should be noted that since the project office was created, some new POS agencies have been established through agency reorganizations and consolidations, specifically the Department of Rehabilitation Services, Housing, Aging and the Office of Early Childhood. While these departments were not part of the project office, the recommendations in this report apply to these new departments and the Central Contracts Unit (CCU) in the Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services. The CCU is handling the administrative and fiscal aspects of the POS contracts of these new agencies.

Note: The initial update from state agencies regarding the implementation of the report's recommendations was completed in March 2014. These updates are included in this report as well as the April 2016 updates. *The April 2016 updates are highlighted in bold and italicized font.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

A.	<u>Uniform Chart of Accounts and Financial Reporting</u>	2
B.	<u>Enterprise Contracts Management System</u>	2
C.	<u>Creation of Central Contracts Unit for New POS Agencies</u>	3
D.	<u>Timely Contract Executions</u>	3
E.	<u>Organizational Structure -Model Contracts Unit</u>	5
F.	<u>Contract Structure</u>	8
G.	<u>Electronic Processes (interim steps before contracts management system)</u>	9
H.	<u>Payment Processes</u>	10
I.	<u>Training</u>	12
J.	<u>Program and Client Outcomes and Data Collection Systems</u>	15
K.	<u>OPM and Office of Attorney General Recommendations</u>	18

STATUS REPORT-IMPLEMENTATION OF PURCHASE OF SERVICE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS-OPM

March 18, 2014; Updated: April 20, 2016

A. Uniform Chart of Accounts and Financial Reporting

1. OPM shall coordinate and oversee development of **a standardized and more streamlined chart of accounts and electronic budget/reporting templates** for mandatory use by all human service agencies. Such process should include OPM staff and contract experts from the human service agencies, as well as consultation with private provider representatives. Implementation date: contracts commencing 7/1/14, with full implementation for contracts commencing 7/1/15.

2016 update: OPM established a work group of State POS agencies to develop a Uniform Chart of Accounts and a standardized electronic workbook (created by DPH) for use by State agencies and providers in the development of budgets and financial reports for budget-based POS programs. Attachment A tracks the progress of the 9 POS agencies in implementing the workbook (note: DDS programs do not utilize workbook).

2. **One Budget per Program**: Provider contract budgets will be consolidated to ensure that each funded program contains only one budget per funding period except where otherwise required by federal funding authorities.

STATUS 2014: The report found that DCF, DOC, DDS, and DMHAS follow the recommended practice. The DPH and DSS responses follow:

- ***DPH is implementing this recommendation with the understanding that it cannot apply universally because DPH has some restricted funding that cannot be co-mingled with other funds given certain Federal grant requirements. However, a majority of DPH contractor budget reporting documents can and will be revised as contracts are renewed or amended. 2016 update – DPH completed a full implementation of consolidated budgets in contracts starting in the 2015 fiscal year. As stated above however this does not affect those contracts that have a need to have separated budgets and expenditure tracking due to targeted use of certain restricted funds or those that have non-primary funding with a very different period of performance.***

DSS will identify extent to which it currently using multiple budgets per funding period per program and reasons why by April 17, with work plan develop for those without justification by May 9, 2014. 2016 update - DSS does follow recommended “one budget per program” practice except when, based on the program, the budget differs and may have more than one budget per funding period. An example would include federal funding requirements, restrictions, etc.

B. Enterprise Contracts Management System

1. OPM shall evaluate, purchase/design, and implement **a web-based contract management system for use by all human service agencies**. Such system should support contract assembly, provider interaction, electronic interfacing, and web-based budgeting, data and report submission, budget revisions, and year-end processing.

2016 update: OPM is working with the team at Core-CT and State POS agencies to determine if the web-based contract management system could be implemented in Core-CT as part of the Core-CT’s upgrade of its financial management module.

STATUS REPORT-IMPLEMENTATION OF PURCHASE OF SERVICE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS-OPM

March 18, 2014; Updated: April 20, 2016

C. Creation of Central Contracts Unit for New POS Agencies

1. **Create shared-serviced central contracts unit** in DMHAS to handle contracting functions for the State Department on Aging, Department of Housing, Department of Rehabilitation Services and the Office of Early Childhood.

2016 update: The CCU is now handling many of the POS administrative, financial and contract management functions for these new agencies as well as some of the capital projects funded through DSS.

D. Timely Contract Executions

Updated with 2015 information

	<u>DCF</u>	<u>DOC</u>	<u>DDS</u>	<u>DMHAS</u>	<u>DPH</u>
% of Contracts Executed at least 15 days prior to Start Date	FY11: 52%	FY11: 0%	FY11: 99%	FY11: 100%	FY11: 0%
	FY12: 50%	FY12: 74%	FY12: 100%	FY12: 62%	FY12: 25%
(*% at or prior to start date- FY13, FY14 & FY15)	FY13: 49% (73%*)	FY13: 0% (0%*)	FY13: 39% (92%*)	FY13: 92% (100%*)	FY13: 0% (0%*)
	FY14: 0% (36%*)	FY14: 18% (36%*)	FY14: 30% (80%*)	FY14: 0% (0%*)	FY14: 21% (21%*)
	FY15: 44% (78%)	FY15: 20% (25%)	FY15: 62% (85%)	FY15: 0% (0%)	FY15: 40% (49%)
	<u>DSS</u>	<u>SDA**</u>	<u>OEC**</u>	<u>DOH**</u>	<u>DORS**</u>
% of Contracts Executed at least 15 days prior to Start Date	FY11: 1%	FY11: N/A	FY11: N/A	FY11: N/A	FY11: N/A
	FY12: 12%	FY12: N/A	FY12: N/A	FY12: N/A	FY12: N/A
	FY13: 0% (2%*)	FY13: N/A	FY13: N/A	FY13: N/A	FY13: N/A
(*% executed prior to start date-FY13, FY14 & FY15)	FY14: 0% (1%*)	FY14: 0% (0%*)	FY14: 0% (0%*)	FY14: 74 % (100%*)	FY14: 0 % (11%*)
	FY15: 9% (31%)	FY15: 0% (71%)	FY15: 0% (16%)	FY15: 0% (0%)	FY15: 34% (87%)

****Part of DMHAS CCU starting in FY14**

STATUS REPORT-IMPLEMENTATION OF PURCHASE OF SERVICE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS-OPM

March 18, 2014; Updated: April 20, 2016

Report Recommendations

1. OPM shall require agency accountability regarding timeframes for approving commencement and completion of annual contract development and execution processes. **95% of contracts shall be executed at least fifteen days prior to contract commencement.** The process improvements recommended for each agency in this report & Lean process improvement techniques should be implemented to ensure timeliness.

2016 update: On 10/31/13, OPM issued a policy formalizing 95% standard monitoring of agency contract execution dates & gives OPM the ability to require agencies to submit contract requests to OPM in a manner that ensures sufficient lead time for timely contract execution.

2. An identified source of delays in contract development for majority of agencies involves funding identification/allocation and contract request/approval processes.
 - a) **Contract Funding Approval:** The agency's budget unit shall be responsible for verifying availability of contract funds and notification to program and contract units of overall funding amounts. Program units in coordination with the contract units shall be responsible for funding allocation to specific contracts and/or providers. A major issue, however, is that funding approvals need to be provided with sufficient lead time to allow for the timely (i.e., at least 15 days prior to the contract commencement date) development and execution of contracts. This is a significant source of delay for some agencies.
 - b) **Electronic Routing & Approvals:** Intra-agency approval process shall rely on electronic routing/approvals; eliminate manual, paper processes.
3. **DPH and DSS: Modify Fiscal's role in Funding Determination.** Fiscal should share Spending Plan information with Programs and Contract Unit. Programs should make the determination as to how to allocate those dollars (spending plan development), submit to Contracts Unit, and Contract Unit should ensure that the dollars are utilized in accordance with the figures provided by Fiscal. DSS: Modify Contract request document to include all information required for Contract staff to solely complete OPM requests.
 - **2016 update DSS - Fiscal provides program staff with funding allocations based on the budget. Program staff develops spending plan approved by fiscal shared with program and contract staff. Program staff enters a draft of OPM request which is reviewed by contract staff to ensure dollars align with spending plan then it is submitted to OPM.**
 - **2016 Update DPH – The Department follows this process for adjustments to state funds imposed by the legislature or Office of the Governor and renewal contracts. Due, however, to the variability in performance requirements, redistribution of funds in accordance with population needs, constantly changing performance objectives, and/or changed federal grant requirements this is not possible with initial allocation of funds, whether state or federal. Only the program staff who continually monitor provider performance, population demographics, grant requirements, and administer RFPs are in a position to determine how funds should initially be distributed to qualified providers. Even when distributions are determined by the Fiscal Office, the Department's program staff have the final say in accepting or altering those distributions based on the previously mentioned factors.**

STATUS REPORT-IMPLEMENTATION OF PURCHASE OF SERVICE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS-OPM

March 18, 2014; Updated: April 20, 2016

2014 STATUS OF EFFORTS TO IMPROVE TIMELINESS REPORTED

- **DCF:** Held Lean event 8/2013 to identify/eliminate non-value added activities in contract processes, decrease lead time & start contract renewal by 3/1
- **DOC:** As statewide budget forms are implemented, timeliness should improve as time it takes for DOC & providers to prepare budgets should decrease.
- **DMHAS:** Changes made to the internal Pre-approval Request process to enable 50% of the staff involved to access the requests electronically & enter approval on-line directly into database. Discussed with IT staff possibility of total on-line system for electronic processing/approval by 6/30/14.
- **DPH:** Redesigned contracting process by convening work groups & by using the Lean Initiative in June 2013. Many redundant steps/forms were eliminated. The new contracting process was rolled out on 8/31/2013, starting with finalizing an electronic system of receiving internal contract information and expenditure reports from providers, moving staff to the contracting unit from the fiscal unit, and creating work teams with specific job duties. Lean meetings continue to be scheduled with the goal of reviewing the new process to ensure revised procedures are in place by 8/2013. DPH established an electronic internal form (e-DAR) to establish a contract. Roles/processes re: funding determination have been modified. The Department is preparing to conduct an evaluation of the new process effectiveness in early 2014.
- **DSS:** Ability to reach target contingent upon successful implementation of Lean recommendations, restructuring of responsibilities and additional staff. Need commitment from all areas to achieve. Begin 10/1/13-measure compliance for 10/1 contracts and again for 1/1 contracts; develop compliance expectations as restructure is implemented. Significant improved compliance for 7/1/14 contracts and full compliance for 10/1/14 contracts. (**Report recommendation:** Modify OPM request document to allow Contracts to solely complete. **DSS Response:** Done. Also: internal approvals are electronic)

E. Organizational Structure -Model Contracts Unit

Budget management re: certifying funding availability is primarily a **fiscal office** responsibility, with **program units** responsible for program development/monitoring re scope of services, grant applications, initial budgets, service delivery methods and monitoring provider performance and program outcome measures. **The recommended roles for Central Contracts Unit are as follows:**

1. **Contract development and execution:** Liaison with OPM, Attorney General's Office, State Auditors and providers for fiscal/administrative matters.
2. **Development of Contract Budgets:** Contracts and Program staff will collaboratively oversee development of final contract/provider budgets.
3. **Review & Approval of Financial Reports/Budget Revisions:** Contract units, in consultation with program staff, reviews/approves reports/revisions.
4. **Authorizing Payments:** Payment authorization shall be the responsibility of the contract unit, in consultation with program staff. Human service agencies shall eliminate program/fiscal review and/or approval of payment requests.
5. **Year-End Reconciliation/Single Audit:** Contract staff responsible for oversight of fiscal year-end reconciliation & single audit review.

STATUS REPORT-IMPLEMENTATION OF PURCHASE OF SERVICE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS-OPM

March 18, 2014; Updated: April 20, 2016

6. **Personal Service Agreements & Memorandum of Understandings (PSAs, MOUs):** Should be handled by agency's POS Contracts Unit.

Report Findings re organization of contract functions: Agency reflects recommended role for Central Contracts Unit? **Yes, No or partially**

<u>Contract Activity</u>	<u>DCF</u>	<u>DOC</u>	<u>DDS</u>	<u>DMHAS</u>	<u>DPH</u>	<u>DSS</u>
1. Contract Development and Execution	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2. Contract Budgets	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial*	Partial*
3. Review and Approval of Financial Reports/Budget Revisions	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (No '14)	No*
4. Authorizing Payments	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (No '14)	No*
5. Responsibility for Year-End Reconciliation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (No '14)	No*
6. POS's, PSA's and MOU's handled by Central Contracts Unit	Yes	Yes	Yes(No '14)	Yes(No '14)	Yes	Yes
<u>Contract Activity—Handled by CCU</u>	<u>SDA</u>	<u>OEC</u>	<u>DOH</u>	<u>DORS</u>		
1. Contract Development and Execution	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
2. Contract Budgets	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial		
3. Review and Approval of Financial Reports/Budget Revisions	No*	No*	No*	No*		
4. Authorizing Payments	No	No	No	No		
5. Responsibility for Year-End Reconciliation	No	No	No	No		
6. POS's, PSA's and MOU's handled by Central Contracts Unit	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		

*Agencies reviewing for potential changes

Status: 2014, 2016

DDS: Using current staffing classifications/FTE's, consolidate agency's two POS contracting units into a centralized unit. Eliminate role of East Hartford Business Office in contract processing; centralize all contracting functions including B-3.

Agency Response 2014: The FY2014 budget transfers the Birth to Three division to a new Office of Early Childhood for July 1, 2015. DDS will monitor the recommendations of the Birth to Three feasibility study to determine the next course of action. DDS will analyze the recommendation of consolidating the role of the East Hartford Business office into a centralized unit during FY2014.

2016 update: DDS continues to shift position resources from the decentralized field locations to the central Contracting Unit. DDS implemented a simplified lean event this fiscal year which has resulted in transferring all PSA development and non-POS contracting to the Operations Center. DDS will continue to implement the recommendation of the LEAN event to develop one standard PSA request form for regional submission. B-3 transferred to OEC in 2014.

DMHAS: 1. Move POS Contracting Spending Plan to HSCU or increase and spending plan expertise in the Budget Office through cross-training of staff; 2) Modify the role of Program in budget/financial oversight (use as resources, but not required review/approvers); and 3) Merge POS and PSA contracting functions. *Agency Response 2014:* 1) In SFY2014 the Budget Office will cross-train specific staff in the development/maintenance of the spending plan database; 2) funding renewal application process being looked at as result of the Lean process; and 3) POS and PSA contract units into one contract unit by 6/30/14.

STATUS REPORT-IMPLEMENTATION OF PURCHASE OF SERVICE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS-OPM

March 18, 2014; Updated: April 20, 2016

2016 Update: 1. DMHAS has established bi-weekly meetings between Budget and Contracts and has implemented bi-annual Spending Plan/Contract reconciliations to ensure accuracy and maximize knowledge base of staff. 2. Program staff no longer review/approve contract budgets or financial reports, but continue to be utilized as needed as resources for Contract staff. 3. As of 10/1/15, the 2 separate DMHAS contracting units have been merged with 1 staff member overseeing all contracting functions for the Department & all staff receiving mandatory bi-weekly training on all contracting aspects.

DPH: Restructure contracting functions to give CGMS responsibility of financial development/monitoring and Program staff responsibility for Scope of Service development & program monitoring. Eliminate Fiscal Office review of financial reports.

Agency Response 2014: The Department reorganized contracting processes so that CGMS staff have full financial monitoring responsibilities. Program staff have responsibility for Program monitoring.

2016 update: The Contract Review and Audit function was moved into the Contract Section at the beginning of the 2015 fiscal year and all contract financial monitoring and reviews are performed within the Contract Section. The Contract Section leads and oversees the contract budget development process but Program staff are involved in the budget development and are ultimately responsible for approval of requested budgetary distributions.

DSS: Restructure contracting functions to give Contract Unit staff responsibility, working with program staff, of financial development/monitoring and Program staff responsibility for Scope of Service & program monitoring.

Agency Response 2014: DSS agrees that all of the current contracting functions, including those related to the financial development, payment and monitoring of POS contracts need to be reviewed and revised to improve contract development, monitoring, and payment timeliness. The Division of Financial Services is responsible for the financial aspects and monitoring as they relate to overall agency budgets, payment and purchasing activities. The Program Division is responsible for implementation, contract performance, and financial management of individual contractor performance. In addition, the Program Area has oversight of the contractors' budgets, achievement of program outcomes, and overall program compliance. Contract Administration staff, working with Program Staff provide support in the development of the overall contract, including the contract budget, and provides support, if requested in the review of contract financials. Current staffing levels in the Program Division have not been able to fully support the expected performance of those financial duties related to contract development and financial monitoring. Current staffing levels in the Contract Administration Unit limit the amount of financial support that can currently be provided.

Next Steps: (1)The Director and Associate Director of the Division of Financial Services have committed to a review of the funding and payment processes for POS contracts and to restructure the role of the Division of Financial Services in the funding approval and payment processes for POS contracts. (2) The Deputy Commissioner of Administration has submitted a justification for the addition of staff to the Contract Administration Unit. The addition of staff, coupled with the transfer of contracts from DORs; SDA and OEC to the Central Contract Processing Unit will allow Contract Administration staff to increase the level of support related to the financial review and monitoring; (3) the Deputy Commissioner of Programs along with the Director of Integrated Services have committed to review the role of their fiscal staff and their current POS contracts process to ensure that it aligns with the Contract Administration LEAN project; (4)Deputy Commissioners of Administration and Programs, will meet to identify "financial" contract tasks and the alignment of those tasks with Programs and/or Contract Administration. Timeline: Present through June 30, 2014; Implementation: beginning 7/1/14.

2016 update: Contract Unit is not responsible for financial monitoring of the contract. The Contract Unit has implemented tripartite meetings with Fiscal, Program, and Contract Staff to facilitate unity in the process. However, the Contract Unit Staff prepares UCOA Workbook based on Fiscal and Program approved budgets and spending plans. We consistently review our processes and where we can share responsibility for different functions.

STATUS REPORT-IMPLEMENTATION OF PURCHASE OF SERVICE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS-OPM

March 18, 2014; Updated: April 20, 2016

F. Contract Structure

Efficiencies can be created by standardizing contract language, consolidating State agency programs provided by providers under one contract and by contracts with longer-terms.

Report Recommendations:

1. **Scopes of Service** (Human Service Contracts): Agencies shall develop and implement OAG pre-approved scopes of service in cases where such use improves timeliness of contract execution and programmatic oversight. (Note: With pre-approved scope of services, individual contracts do not need to be reviewed by OAG).
2. **Contract Consolidation:** Agencies shall implement consolidated contracts to maximize efficiency for both state agencies and provider entities. Agencies utilizing more than 3 separate contracts with the same provider shall analyze those contracts for consolidation and shall submit their findings/level of adherence to OPM with their annual consolidation report. Increasing the contract period of performance (see 3 below) and allowing different periods of performance for programs within the consolidated contract would help enable greater consolidation of contracts. Issues remain to be addressed as part of implementing such changes.
3. **Contract Period of Performance:** Where possible agencies shall implement contracts with contract terms of up 8 years.

Metrics 2012 and 2015

Area	DCF	DOC	DDS	DMHAS	DPH	DSS
% of Contracts with OAG Part I Pre-approved Scopes of Service	2012: 100% 2015: 100%	2012: 0% 2015: 0%	2012: 86% 2015: 87%	2012: 100% 2015: 75.2%	2012: 36% 2015: 31.2%	2012: 40% 2015: 57.5%
% of Consolidated Contracts ; Average # of Contracts per Provider	2012: 99%; 1 2015: 100%; 1	2012: 90%; 1.1 2015: 96%; 1.04	2012: 91%; 1.1 2015: 89%; 1.12	2012: 81%; 1.29 2015: 88%; 1.62	2012: 55%; 1.9 2015: 64%; 1.76	2012: 47%; 2.35 2015: 65%; 1.65
Period of Performance: % POS Contracts 3 or more years	2012: 99% 2015: 92%	2012: 97% 2015: 96%	2012: 32% 2015: 96%	2012: 0% 2015: 95.5%	2012: 84% 2015: 86%	2012: 61% 2015: 44%

Metrics 2015

Area	SDA	OEC	DOH	DORS
% of Contracts with OAG Part I Pre-approved Scopes of Service	9.3%	76.2%	70.0%	57.1%
% of Consolidated Contracts ; Average # of Contracts per Provider	62.5%; 2.25	78.9%; 1.33	70.1%; 1.49	57.1%; 1.62
Contract Period of Performance: % of POS Contracts 3 or more years	75.9%	46.8%	30.0%	86.8%

STATUS REPORT-IMPLEMENTATION OF PURCHASE OF SERVICE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS-OPM

March 18, 2014; Updated: April 20, 2016

G. Electronic Processes *(interim steps prior to implementation of contracts management system)*

Report Recommendations:

1. Electronic Contract Assembly: Agencies shall implement electronic contract assembly software to assist with contract execution process & contract assembly.
2. Electronic Contract Submittals: Agencies shall implement electronic processes for contract transmittal to/receipt from providers during signature/execution process (i.e., PDF/E-mail).
3. Reduced Number of Hard Copy Contracts: Agencies shall eliminate hard-copy storage of contracts in multiple locations/units. The contract unit maintains one original, hard-copy master file for as long as original, hard-copy signatures are a requirement by the Office of the Attorney General.
4. Electronic Reports, Absent Signature: Contract periodic reports will be accepted electronically, absent signature, eliminating requirements for submission of hard-copy, original, signed financial reports/budget revisions.
5. Electronic Contracts Library: Agencies shall implement electronic contracts library that all agency staff can access to view active, executed contracts.

Area	DCF	DOC	DDS	DMHAS	DPH
Electronic Contract Assembly	Yes (No '14)	No	Partial (Yes '14)	Partial	Yes
Electronic Contract Submittals	Yes (In process '14)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Reduced Number of Hard Copy Contracts	Yes (Only 1 '14)	Yes	Yes	Yes (In process '14)	Yes (In process '14)
Electronic Reports, Absent Signature	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (In process '14)
Electronic Contracts Library	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Area	DSS	SDA	OEC	DOH	DORS
Electronic Contract Assembly	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Electronic Contract Submittals	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Reduced Number of Hard Copy Contracts	Yes (In process '14)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Electronic Reports, Absent Signature	Being reviewed	Partial	Partial	Partial	Partial
Electronic Contracts Library	Yes (In process '14)	Yes	No	No	Yes

STATUS REPORT-IMPLEMENTATION OF PURCHASE OF SERVICE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS-OPM

March 18, 2014; Updated: April 20, 2016

H. Payment Processes

System-wide Report Recommendations (Note-timely execution of contracts is a critical element of timely payments):

1. Streamlined Payment Processes: Human service agencies will decouple payment releases from receipt and acceptance of financial and/or programmatic reports wherever possible and appropriate. Any requirement for submission of invoices or documentation from the provider prior to payment shall be eliminated. The process improvement identified for agency and Lean process improvement techniques, as needed, should be implemented.

2016 Update for new agencies: Follow suggested practice?

- **SDA: In the process of reviewing their current payment practices to provide streamlining, where possible, across multiple funding sources.**
- **DOH: Yes**
- **OEC: LEAN event scheduled for May, 2016 to streamline multiple inherited payment processes. The CCU staff will be participating in this LEAN event with the OEC staff.**
- **DORS: Most contract payments are fee for service and processed through System 7 at DORS. All other contract payments have been streamlined in accordance with the contract language.**

2. Basis for Payments: Payments, to the extent allowed by funding sources, shall be made to providers quarterly, prospectively; based solely on receipt of state agency allotment. SDA: Contract language provides the ability to pay prospectively, when funding is available and allowable by funding source. Fee for service contracts are paid based on the language for each service type.

2016 Update for New Agencies: Follow suggested practice?

- **SDA, DOH, OEC and DORS: Contract language provides the ability to pay prospectively, when funding is available and allowable by funding source. Fee for service contracts are paid based on the language for each service type.**

3. Payment Standards:
 - a) A single CORE Purchase Order shall be created and tied to the CORE Contract, for the life of the contract. Contract unit staff shall, upon receipt of quarterly OPM allotment and availability of funding in Account/SID, provide payment information to fiscal accounts payable unit.
 - b) Agencies/OPM shall implement process to categorize CORE payment information by contract type to improve correlation of CORE report output.

2016 Update for New Agencies: Follow suggested practice?

- **SDA, DOH, OEC and DORS: (a) Yes (b) Yes**

STATUS REPORT-IMPLEMENTATION OF PURCHASE OF SERVICE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS-OPM

March 18, 2014; Updated: April 20, 2016

Payment Processes for POS agencies:

Issue	DCF	DOC	DDS	DMHAS	DPH	DSS
Report found need for improvements in agency's payment processes	No	No	No	No	Yes*	Yes*

(*Agency reviewing/developing/implementing actions to address-see below)

DPH Recommendations:

1. Restructure contracting functions: To give CGMS staff the responsibility of financial development/monitoring and Program staff responsibility for Scope of Service development and program monitoring. Eliminate fiscal office review of any contract-related financial report.
2. Eliminate submission of financial reports by SID and financial reports from subcontractors: Financial reports should be submitted by program. This is auditor tested & accepted at other agencies. In making changes, federal award expenditures by agencies must remain in compliance with OMB Circular A-133.
3. Completely restructure payment process: Eliminating fiscal office review and approval.
4. Eliminate contractual language that ties payments to report submission to the extent allowed: Part II language in the POS contract already allows for payment withholding if reports are late. DPH should explore quarterly/prospective payments wherever possible.
5. Apply Lean process improvement techniques: As appropriate, with respect to above recommendations.

STATUS:

DPH: 2014

- *Many payments were decoupled from acceptance of reports and expansion of that process continues with implementation of the 12 Point Efficiency Plan and the Lean Process. Instances will remain due to federal funding requirements that dictate the allowable payment conditions.*
- *DPH will eliminate the need for separation of Budgets & Expenditure Reports by SID beginning in March of 2014, except in the case of restricted funds. The elimination of multiple budgets reduces the number of required Expenditure Reports and results in expedited Financial Report review.*
- *The DPH payment process has been streamlined through internal review and implementation of Lean Initiatives. PO's are created only once in the system for the entire contract amount when contract is initiated, not each time a payment is made. This change reduced the time it takes in issuing payments by 50%. Also, the Contract Unit is only authorizer of contract payments. Fiscal no longer reviews/approves payment requests*
- *Fiscal office no longer responsible for review of Expense Reports prior to payment. CGMS responsible for review/approval with Program input.*

2016 update:

- ***The Contract Section, in collaboration with the Program Units is responsible for all financial monitoring performed on contracts.***
- ***All funding streams on contracts have been merged into a single budget and managed through the Uniform Chart of Accounts (UCOA Workbook). Frequency of subcontractor reports has been reduced but not eliminated because the Departments subcontractors often perform the majority of work on a contract or are subject to required financial monitoring compliant with federal grant requirements.***
- ***The Contract Section reviews, approves and initiates all payment however the payments are completed by the Accounts Payable Unit which resides in the Department's Fiscal Office.***

STATUS REPORT-IMPLEMENTATION OF PURCHASE OF SERVICE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS-OPM

March 18, 2014; Updated: April 20, 2016

- *The Department always provides prospective payment except where inappropriate and where possible payments are independent of report submission. At strategic intervals though payments are associated with reports to allow for withholding of funds due to inadequate contractor performance or funding redistributions.*
- *Contract Section has had two independent reviews of Lean process results to fine tune processes & achieve further improvement.*

DSS Recommendations:

1. Completely restructure business payment processes (using Lean process) and eliminate contract language tying payments to report submission. Part II contract language allows for payment withholding if reports are late. Explore implementing of quarterly/prospective payments wherever possible.

STATUS:

DSS: 2014: 11/4 to 11/13/13: *Involved staff participated in Lean process to review processes, contract language and Core-CT roles to identify & implement efficiencies. Need to coordinate with Lean recommendations re moving to DMHAS-type contracts unit. Work to implement payment basis and process changes, as allowed by funding sources, by 3/1/14 in time for 7/1/14 contracts.*

2016 update: *Due to the recent LEAN event, Division of Fiscal Services has restructured the provider/contractor payment process to an electronic process. However, depending on programmatic reporting needs (ex. Federally Funded), reports must be submitted by the provider/contractor in order to demonstrate services have been provided/rendered so that payment may be processed.*

I. Training - Report Recommendations

1. OPM shall coordinate and oversee development of mandatory standardized, contract-specific, training for staff assigned to contracting units (as promulgated by OPM Procurement Standards and required per state statute). Such training curriculum will include contracting standards and policies required by the Office of State Ethics, Freedom of Information Commission, State Elections Enforcement Commission, Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, Office of the Attorney General, Department of Administrative Services & any other state agency as deemed relevant.

2016 update: *As 1st step, OPM developed and posted training document on OPM Procurement Standards.*

2. Training for contract unit staff is a mandatory requirement per OPM Procurement Standards (Section I H.3) and Connecticut General Statutes ([Chapter 62, 4e-5](#)). Additionally, training for agency staff responsible for ancillary contracting functions (i.e., program staff), and training for provider staff enhances the efficiency/efficacy of the contracting process.
 - a) **Contract Unit Professional Development:** Agencies shall provide professional development opportunities to enhance staff skill-sets.
 - b) **Cross Training:** Agencies shall develop inter-unit, cross-training tools to increase staff knowledge regarding contract development/oversight & programs.

STATUS REPORT-IMPLEMENTATION OF PURCHASE OF SERVICE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS-OPM

March 18, 2014; Updated: April 20, 2016

- c) **Provider Training:** Agencies shall develop collaborative training opportunities for provider staff to cover topics such as competitive procurement, contract development, and financial and programmatic report submission, etc.
3. Each POS Agency: Implementation of required training for Contracts staff in collaboration with the Office of State Ethics, Freedom of Information Commission, State Elections Enforcement Commission, Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, Office of the Attorney General, DAS and any other state agency involved with contracting. Curriculums should be developed in accordance with OPM Procurement and Connecticut Statutes.
 4. DCF: Provide cross- training & expand staff's knowledge in areas outside their job functions. Institute formal provider training for contracting process.
 5. DSS: Explore cross-training within contract unit staff between the procurement side and contract side.

Agency Responses 2014:

- **DCF:** Have approached POS contracting agencies to collaborate on identifying training needs and resources specific to statutory and regulatory processes. Target completion date for training plan is December 1; implementation could begin in January 2014.
- **DOC:** As part of the review of the contracting functions, roles, responsibilities and the resources needed to fulfill its contracting needs and obligations, DOC Fiscal Services will identify training needs. Based on this assessment a training plan will be developed and training resources identified. Target completion date for training plan: 7/1/14. Plan also dependent on guidance/materials from OPM as outlined in number 1. Above.
- **DDS:** DDS will work with other state POS contracting agencies to develop a statewide standard training curriculum specific to statutory and regulatory processes.
- **DMHAS:** By 6/30/14 the Department will: review contract staff training needs and plan/implement specific training opportunities to address the needs; institute periodic (quarterly) informational/training meetings with Local Mental Health Authority contract staff to increase staff knowledge of contracting processes; and develop and implement a plan to provide training opportunities for provider staff on such topics as required reporting, use of reporting forms, etc. OPM and the other POS agencies should organize this training as a joint effort to avoid duplication of efforts.
- **DPH:** As a result of the reorganization of CGMS staff into distinct teams, training has been and continues to be provided for staff to aid their transition into new rolls. Written training curricula and formal procedure and process guidance is being developed to serve as resource tools for staff and to facilitate recurrent staff training. Staff are also being encouraged to take State of Connecticut In-Service professional development courses focused on improving writing/language skills, contracting writing, and use of computerized management tools.
- **DSS:** Provide "Contracting Boot Camp" for all DSS staff involved in contracting in collaboration with OAG, DAS, OPM, & CHRO and with assistance of UConn OSD/outside groups to coincide with effective date of new structure (1/1/14-3/31/14). Work with OPM to offer "Town Meeting" discussion of best practices with all POS agencies. DSS has already implemented webinar for providers re Competitive Procurement and internal staff for Contract Development. Looking to expand use of webinars. Agency cross-training ongoing; expand once revised Contracts Unit properly staffed.

STATUS REPORT-IMPLEMENTATION OF PURCHASE OF SERVICE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS-OPM

March 18, 2014; Updated: April 20, 2016

Agency Responses 2016:

- **DCF:** *The DCF Contracts Unit provided the Department's program staff (PDOCS) with a comprehensive 4 day training on: service and program development, Memorandums of Agreement and Understanding, RFPs, Scopes of Service, Site Visits, Amendments, Renewals, Personal Service Agreements, etc. The DCF Contracts Unit program managers also attended a 5 day Results Based Accountability (RBA) training which led to revisions to all POS contracts to include RBA performance measures. Contract staff are encouraged to attend training which will improve their skill sets. Staff attend Excel, Word and CORE training in any area of interest. Staff are also given the opportunity to receive cross training in Purchasing and Accounts Payable. Provider training has been given to those providers who have had staff turnover or requested training. Written information regarding DCF's contract process is also available.*
- **DOC:** *Biennial strategic planning process used; annual performance report reviewed with contractors. DOC plans to optimize contracts unit by increasing its focus on the administrative, fiscal, and contracting functions related to provider contracts, and migrating tasks currently performed by the unit not within these categories to more appropriate staff. DOC will continue its emphasis on collaboration and customer service to ensure that program staff are able to focus their time more productively on program and client outcomes.*
- **DDS:** *DDS holds an annual contract managers day in which all the regional and central office fiscal and contracting staff attend. Topics have included procurement and contracting processes, ethical standards, quality enhancement and team building exercises. The department is looking at restructuring staff positions and locations in order to better utilize resources and to maximize cross training. The Department holds quarterly provider orientation training to all new providers and executive staff. This training includes abuse and neglect, incident reporting, procurement, and individual planning and oversight.*
- **DMHAS:** *As of January 1, 2016, DMHAS has instituted a mandatory 4 hour bi-weekly Contracts Training Module for all Contracts Unit staff. This training is comprehensive across all disciplines of contract development and processing. Additionally, as of October 1, 2015, the Contracts Unit has been coordinating training sessions with each individual Unit/Division in the Agency. These training sessions target the specific Unit/Division and are tailored to the specific contracting needs of each Unit/Division. DMHAS has also begun offering internal CORE Training to Contracts staff. Staff have completed 3 half-day training sessions, with additional sessions scheduled through 6/30/16.*
- **DPH:** *1) The Contract Section has developed a seven module training program for new employees which is also used as a refresher as needed for existing employees. Using this training process two staff from the Department's Fiscal Office have been cross-trained on contract functions in an effort to have back-up staffing available in urgent situations. 2) The Contract Section routinely performs Provider training on targeted contract activities that are identified as problem areas. Much of the recent provider training has focused on proper use of UCOA and associated workbook, however, general overview training of contract process was provided to all new local health department and district directors in September, 2015.*
- **DSS:** *Contract Professional Development - DSS facilitated a super circular training by program staff and opened the training to all agencies. Cross Training – DSS has crossed trained Procurement Staff in the contracting process. Provider Training –*

STATUS REPORT-IMPLEMENTATION OF PURCHASE OF SERVICE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS-OPM

March 18, 2014; Updated: April 20, 2016

Contracting Unit Staff prepared a UCOA workbook step-by-step tutorial. In addition, contract staff has developed a powerpoint presentation but has not been launched. Procurement staff held a webinar for our providers on “how to respond to a request for proposals” and continues to provide guidance and instructions with each procurement process. DSS Contract and Procurement Staff have attended DAS training and most recently attended an in-service seminar held by the State Contracting Standards Review board covering procurement processes. See above. However, contract staff jobs specs limit procurement functions. DSS will continue to look at cross-training as feasible.

- *SDA: The CCU provided UCOA training for both the SDA staff and their contractors. SDA staff attended UCOA information session conducted by DSS; SDA provided fiscal training, specific to the payment process and financial reporting for AAAs (SDA contractors) with CCU staff present; SDA held meeting for AAAs with a DSS procurement representative, on the topic of competitive procurement; SDA held FOI workshop for SDA staff with a representative from FOI Commissioner.*
- *DOH: The CCU provided UCOA training for DOH staff and their contractors. DOH held an annual ethics training for all employees in 2014 and 2015. Additional trainings will be in February 2016. DOH staff regularly communicate with CHRO concerning agency responsibilities. Two staff are trained in monthly SEEC reporting compliance. The DOH FOI Officer ordinarily attends the annual FOI conference. A second attorney on staff is also familiar with the agency’s FOI requirements. DOH expects to issue agency-specific FOI guidance to all employees in 2016. DOH legal staff are in regular communication with the OAG regarding state contracting requirements. DOH’s OAG liaison receives notice of changes in OAG policy and similar matters and disseminates them to appropriate staff.*
- *OEC: The CCU provided multiple trainings on the UCOA for both the OEC staff and their contractors.*
- *DORS: The CCU provided UCOA training to both DORS staff and their contractors. Contract staff have taken advantage of professional development opportunities and cross training has occurred to increase staff knowledge regarding contract development and programmatic oversight. In addition, provider staff has received training in financial and programmatic report submission.*

J. Program and Client Outcomes and Data Collection Systems- Report Recommendations

As required by state statute, and as promulgated by OPM, agency staff must ensure the programmatic and financial efficacy of contracted programs. Agency contract processes should support an emphasis on programmatic outcomes.

- 1) **Financial and Programmatic Reporting and Data Analysis:** Agencies shall develop a coordinated administrative and programmatic oversight component that includes administrative oversight, fiscal/programmatic reporting & data analysis performed collaboratively by program & contracts.

STATUS:

- **DCF:** Program managers in Central, Regional offices and contract staff meeting to define roles for program leads; site visits are part of that role. Site visits are currently conducted in residential programs and many other service types. Site visits protocols will be developed this fall and implemented for each program as completed. Recently completed hiring of Grants & Contracts Specialists in all 6 regions to provide front-line assistance with fiscal/programmatic oversight. **2016 updated: The DCF Contract Unit developed, in collaboration with PDOCs, licensing, and Regional Office staff, the TIER classification system, a tool designed to enhance the Department’s ability to evaluate contracted programs and create opportunities for ongoing Quality Improvement at a program and system**

STATUS REPORT-IMPLEMENTATION OF PURCHASE OF SERVICE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS-OPM

March 18, 2014; Updated: April 20, 2016

level. In addition to the TIER, this collaboration designed templates for Service Development Plans and Corrective Action Plans oversee program improvement in programs needing more attention.

- **DOC:** Biannual strategic planning process used; annual performance report reviewed with contractors. DOC plans to optimize contracts unit by increasing its focus on the administrative, fiscal and contracting functions re provider contracts and migrating tasks currently performed by the unit not within these categories to more appropriate staff. DOC will continue its emphasis on collaboration and customer service to ensure that program staff are able to focus their time more productively on program and client outcomes.
2016 updated: Same as previous.
- **DDS:** Biannual performance meetings held with providers; one is program focused and tied to the DDS certification process with second meeting fiscally focused. DDS has a Quality Service Review System that reviews a series of indicators. Quality Monitors routinely make site visits to program locations; QSR data and other data used to monitor agency performance. Case Managers, resource managers or any DDS personnel can conduct a QSR visit & all this data is used to inform annual Performance meeting. Based on QSR & Provider's own quality data, the Provider submits Continuous Quality Improvement Plan for region review/approval.
2016: No additional update.
- **DMHAS:** Fiscal and programmatic oversight occurs: 1) upon review of Grant Applications at or before onset of the fiscal year; 2) when quarterly provider "**report cards**" are released by the Evaluation, Quality, Management and Improvement (EQMI) Division. The report cards document provider performance across contract outcome measures; and 3) when annual fiscal audits reviewed. Results of reviews shared across Divisions. **2016: No additional update.**
- **DPH:** Have consolidated most administrative/fiscal responsibilities within CGMS allowing Programs to focus on Program monitoring/performance outcomes, resulting in a closer working relationship between the Program Staff & CGMS. More attention needed as DPH proceeds with process changes to develop universal standards and/or procedures for Programmatic monitoring.
2016: No additional update.
- **DSS:** Agree and is currently working on restructure of Contract staff to align with Program and Fiscal. **2016 update: DSS has instituted collaborative tripartite (Fiscal, Contract, and Program Staff) efforts in contract administration.**
- **SDA:** **2016 update: For the SCSEP (Older Worker) program, SDA began providing regular reviews and analysis of expenditure data and corresponding program performance data.**
- **DOH:** **2016 update: Fiscal and programmatic oversight occurs 1) upon review of Grant Applications at or before onset of the fiscal year and 2) when annual fiscal audits are reviewed. DOH is instituting a policy that programmatic and fiscal reviewers monitor programs together so the DOH staff has a full understanding of the programs the agency funds.**
- **OEC:** **2016 update: Fiscal reviews are conducted each quarter with Division Directors and the Director of Fiscal Operations to review fiscal and programmatic activity and to ensure contracted and operating obligations are met and are aligned with the agency's prescribed budget. Programs and contractors also use the UCOA each quarter to ensure contracted budgets and performance criteria are being met to determine payments to the contractor.**
- **DORS:** **2016 update: Contract language has been modified to include components that reference administrative oversight, fiscal/programmatic reporting & data analysis and programmatic outcomes. Contract procedures have been modified to place an emphasis on programmatic outcomes to ensure programmatic and financial efficacy.**

STATUS REPORT-IMPLEMENTATION OF PURCHASE OF SERVICE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS-OPM

March 18, 2014; Updated: April 20, 2016

- 2) **Management of Service Level Data:** Agencies shall develop and implement protocols for the compilation, aggregation and electronic storage of financial, statistical and programmatic data to measure the provider's ability to meet contractual performance obligations.

STATUS:

- **DCF:** Continues to expand its web-based data system for contract outcome management. **2016 update: We've had significant development work completed by the vendor, but have not been able to implement a new release to add programs due to funding constraints since the last update. Once funded, we will be adding an additional 7 programs to the system with the next release. Unless additional funding can be secured, we do not expect to be able to accomplish this release before October 2016.**
- **DOC:** Manually tracks and compiles provider utilization, statistical and performance data; enterprise web-based contracts management solution for POS agency should allow for electronic data collection and aggregation. **2016 update: Same as previous.**
- **DDS:** Continues to develop an electronic folder on a common drive. There are 4 Main Sections (Contracts, Budgets, Fiscal Reporting, and Quality Performance), with multiple sub-Sections within each main Section. Provider specific information is stored in the sections for each fiscal year. **2016 update: Posts the quality Service Review indicators on line under the Provider Profile available to the public. The indicators compare the Provider to a Statewide Comparison. DDS is working with BIZNET to develop a paperless POS contract with an electronic signature. Proposed implementation is for the FY2017 POS Contract.**
- **DMHAS:** EQMI Division oversees electronic submission, storage and reporting re provider data. Aggregate data shared with providers quarterly along with statewide averages for most performance measures. Quarterly provider report cards sent to providers; soon will be on DMHAS website. **2016 update: Reports are published on the DMHAS website.**
- **DPH:** Many Program Units collect service level data, with most in electronic systems that consolidate/manage the data. Many such systems are dictated by funding authorities and involve direct access to standardized reports. Some Units also electronically consolidate, manage and report on performance outcomes. Reports are then forwarded to providers to assist with quality improvement. Expenditure data is electronically collected in CGMS data system. Future goal is to integrate data from these multiple sources to standardize reporting capabilities. **2016 update: No additional update.**
- **DSS:** Contract staff working with Program staff through Deputy Commissioner Singleton to develop a contract dashboard. Dashboard will serve as a reporting tool that documents financial and programmatic performance of Contractors. Currently working with CSBG contracts as pilot. **2016 update: Every program unit maintains their internal protocols for the compilation, aggregation and electronic storage of financial, statistical and programmatic data to measure the provider's ability to meet contractual performance obligations. The Department has recently created and instituted a new Contract Management System which has various reporting processes and ongoing enhancements/improvements continue.**
- **SDA:** **2016 update: For the SCSEP (Older Worker) program, SDA began providing regular reviews and analysis of expenditure data and corresponding program performance data.**
- **DOH:** **2016 update: Uses the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) for the collection of programmatic data. DOH reviews this data on a quarterly or more often basis, if needed. In addition, DOH has an internal shared server where all fiscal reports are stored. DOH is currently working with DMHAS to create a shared server between agencies to make the review of fiscal reports between the Central Contracts Unit and DOH easier. The CCU currently assists in the review of all financial reports.**

STATUS REPORT-IMPLEMENTATION OF PURCHASE OF SERVICE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS-OPM

March 18, 2014; Updated: April 20, 2016

- **OEC: 2016 update:** *The Early Childhood Information System (ECIS) is being developed to collect child data that will help ensure that complete and accurate data is collected, linked to, and coordinated with the K-12 data system, in particular, so that quality assessments and longitudinal analyses of early care and education programs can be performed and student progress can be monitored. The Birth to Three program is supported by a data system (SPIDER) that collects and reports child service and billing data that is tied to the child's Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP). Child Care licensing information is collected in e-licensing. The licensing status of each program as well as information on each program's national accreditation is collected in the OEC's Workforce Registry. Subsequent development of the Early Childhood Information System will integrate this data with child-level data allowing the OEC to link information across children, settings, and workforce.*
- **DORS: 2016 update:** *Protocols have been implemented for the compilation, aggregation and electronic storage of financial, statistical and programmatic data to measure provider's ability to meet contractual performance requirements.*

K. OPM and Office of Attorney General Recommendations

1. **Job Duties/Classifications:** OPM shall coordinate and oversee evaluation of the duties required to develop, implement and oversee human service contracts. The evaluation will: include DAS staff and human service contract experts from the human service agencies; determine proper job descriptions and classifications for staff assigned to the human service contract units; and staffing level guidelines for human service contract units.

2016 UPDATE: *The work with DAS/DMHAS on the organization of Central Contracts Unit involved the appropriate classifications related to a central contract unit.*

2. **OPM Approvals:** OPM shall evaluate requirements for submission/approval of Procurement Plans, Spending Plans and OPM Contract Requests to eliminate redundancy, and streamline processes. **2016 Update:** *Procurement Plans done every three years as required. Spending plans generally not required to be submitted to OPM, unless requested by OPM Budget Analyst.*
3. **OAG Review/Approval.** As legal counsel for the human service agencies, the OAG is responsible for representing agencies in any contractual dispute. As such, the OAG has a need for input into how contracts are developed; involvement shouldn't unduly hinder or slow contract process.
 - a) **Electronic Signatures:** OAG working with OPM shall identify/evaluate the legal requirements and ramifications of electronic contract signatures.
 - b) **Standardized Reviews:** OAG shall develop standardized protocols for review and approval of human service contracts to ensure that contracts and scope of service pre-approvals from each agency are reviewed and processed in accordance with the same requirements and standards.
 - c) **Streamlined Processes:** OAG, OPM & agencies shall identify streamlined/efficient agency processes to avoid redundancies & promote timely contract execution.

2016 UPDATE: *Meet periodically with OAG. Enterprise contracts management system offers best opportunity for improvements.*

ATTACHMENT A

POS Agencies Number of Contracts and Providers using the Uniform Chart of Accounts as of 9/30/15

<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>TOTAL NUMBER OF BUDGET BASED POS CONTRACTS</u>	<u>TOTAL NUMBER OF BUDGET BASED CONTRACTS USING UCOA</u>	<u>% OF BUDGET BASED CONTRACTS USING THE UCOA</u>	<u>TOTAL NUMBER OF PROVIDERS WITH A BUDGET BASED CONTRACT*</u>	<u>TOTAL NUMBER OF PROVIDERS WITH A BUDGET BASED CONTRACT USING UCOA</u>	<u>% OF PROVIDERS WITH A BUDGET BASED CONTRACT USING UCOA</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>	<u>Excel Version</u>
DCF	118	106	90%	118	106	90%	Deadline for remaining 12 providers to transition over to the new workbook was October 1, 2015. AS of October 26, 2015 ~ 7 out of 12 have transitioned.	2013
DPH	265	375	100%	275	185	67%	UCOA used for PSA as well as POS Contracts. %	2010 & 2013
DMHAS	183	183	100%	153	153	100%	N/A	2010
DSS	155	29	19%	323	29	9%		2010
DOC	39	30	77%	36	28	78%	DOC considers the UCO A to be inappropriate for the remainign contracts/providers based on contract amount and/or term	2007
CCU								
OEC	92	27	29%	92	27	29%	OEC contracts are multi-year and we are initiating UCOA when contracts expire.	2010
DORS	6	6	100%	6	6	100%		2010
HOUSING	72	66	92%	69	64	93%		2007
AGING	46	16	35%	46	16	35%	OEC contracts are multi-year and we are initiating UCOA when contracts expire	2010
Subtotal CCU	216	115	53%	213	113	53%		
Grand Total:	976	838	86%	1118	614	55%		

*providers are duplicated across all agencies

Housing Notes

66=72 minus JDA contract and 5 EFPP
 69= 72minus 3 duplicate providers
 64=69 minus JDA contract and 4 EFPP(1 provider duplicate)

SDA Notes

HAP=3
 SFA=1
 ELD=7
 OMB=1
 SCS=4

OEC Notes

Birth To 3 =1
 CCQ = 2
 FEI=4
 HES =5
 MIECHV=8
 NFN=7