CALIFORNIA HEALTH FACILITIES FINANCING AUTHORITY

California Health Access Model Program of 2012

Process for Reviewing Letters of Interest

Information item – March 28, 2013

Agenda Item #8

At the last board meeting, staff agreed to provide all members with a draft of the proposed process to be employed during the review of any Letters of Interest submitted by interested parties for the new grant program, the California Health Access Model Program (CHAMP).

Staff now attaches drafts of the proposed Review Checklists for your consideration. Staff plans to discuss these checklists in more detail during the Authority meeting and will entertain all questions and suggestions as may then occur.

As a reminder, CHAMP is designed to support innovative methods of delivery health care services more effectively, and to improve access and health outcomes for vulnerable populations and communities by bringing services, including preventive services, to individuals where they live or congregate.

CHAMP regulations were approved by the Office of Administrative Law and rendered effective February 7, 2013. On February 14, 2013, staff electronically notified no less than 902 possible interested parties of the Letter of Interest opportunity to participate in the initial phase of CHAMP which intends to fund one or more demonstration projects, up to a combined total of \$1.5 million. The deadline to submit a Letter of Interest is April 15, 2013. The Authority's deadline to identify those who will be invited to submit an application is June 14, 2013 and applicants will then have 60 days to submit an application. Staff held an information webinar on March 7, 2013 and therein discussed both the process and substantive expectations for the Letter of Interest phase.

California Health Access Model Program (CHAMP) REVIEW CHECKLISTS

App	licant(s)						
Amo	ount Requested	\$					
Revi	ewer's Name				Rev	iew Date:	
						ACCEPT	
	CHAMP REV	EW: INITIAL SCAN OF	LETTER OF	INTEREST			
						DECLINE	
		(a co	adami navia.				No 🗖
		Seco	ndary review	w recommended:		Yes 🗖	
Red	ceived by deadline		🖵 Yes	🖵 No	Date		
Lim	nited to 10 pages		🛛 Yes	🖵 No			
L			1				
Inc	ludes some information	on that addresses the f	ollowing red	uired information	า		
(No	ote: This is not a qualit	ative evaluation)				Acce	ptable
1.	Amount of grant fun	ds requested.				Yes	🗖 No
2.	Description of how g	rant funds are propose	ed to be use	d.		Yes	🗖 No
3.	Description of the De	emonstration Project.				Yes	🗖 No
4.	Description of phas	es and projected tim	eline for th	ne Demonstration	า	🗖 Yes	🗖 No
		at a minimum, cur					
		ccess of the model, an	d timing of	the completion o	f		
	the Demonstration P	-					
5.	Information that de Applicant requireme	scribes how the Intere	ested Party	meets the Eligible	9	Yes	🖵 No
6.		escribes how the prop	nosed Dem	onstration Project	+	🗆 Yes	D No
0.		requirements for an E		-			
7.		by an individual autho	-			🖵 Yes	🛛 No
	and Partnership atte	esting to the accuracy	of the infor	mation contained	t		
		erest and the Applicar					
		thority's requirements	it awarded	a Demonstration	ר		
	Project grant.						



w:

INITIAL SCAN OF LETTER OF INTEREST

Notes:

Review Results:

Manager Initials:

Date:



CHAMP REVIEW: REVIEW OF APPLICANT ELIGIBILITY

ELIGIBLE 🛛

NOT ELIGIBLE

Secondary review recommended:

Yes 🖬 🛛 No 🗖

1)	Are any of the applicants:		
	a. A nonprofit or public health facility?	🖵 Yes	🗖 No
	b. An association that represents nonprofit health care facilities or providers of Health Care Services?	C Yes	🛛 No
	c. A health care advocacy organization that represents underserved or medically Vulnerable Populations or Communities? or	C Yes	🗖 No
	d. A nonprofit or public institution of higher education or other nonprofit or public research entity?	C Yes	🛛 No
	e. None of the above	🖵 Yes	🗖 No
2)	Are any of the following entities an applicant?		
	a. For profit entities and associations or organizations that represent them.	C Yes	🖵 No
	b. National and out-of-state entities, unless such entities have an established and significant presence within California, as determined by the Authority, and further only if such entities can demonstrate that the Demonstration Project is located in California and that all grant funds will be expended in California.	C Yes	□ No
	c. A health facility that has had tax-exempt bonds issued by the Authority on its behalf, unless such health facility qualifies as a "small and rural hospital" pursuant to section 124840 of the Health and Safety Code.	C Yes	□ No
3)	Has the Applicant demonstrated the following?		
	a. It complies with subdivisions (a) and (b) of CHAMP Regulation Section 7102? [Questions 1 and 2]	C Yes	🛛 No
	b. It has a track record of success in coordinating and managing grant-funded projects? and	C Yes	🛛 No
	Explain		



CHAMP REVIEW: REVIEW OF APPLICANT ELIGIBILITY (Continued)

C.	It or a partner participating with the Applicant on the Demonstration Project has an established track record of successful projects and partnerships designed to change systems and policies to improve health care delivery.	The Yes	□ No
	Explain		



CHAMP - Secondary Review Results: REVIEW OF APPLICANT ELIGIBILITY

Notes:

Review Results:

Initials: Date:



	EW: DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ELIGIBILITY	ELI	IGIBLE		
IVIP REV		NC	DT ELIGI	BLE	
	Secondary review recommended:	Ye	es 🗖	No 🗖	
(a)	Does the proposed Demonstration Project include the following elements:				
	 (1) an innovative model of Health Care Service delivery is currently demonstrating and evaluating; 	it	🖵 Yes	🛛 No	
	Explain				
	 (2) community or institutional settings in which the Heal Care Service will be demonstrated; 	th	🖵 Yes	🛛 No	
	Explain				
	(3) specific, Vulnerable Populations or Communities white the Health Care Service is designed to benefit;	ch	🖵 Yes	🛛 No	
	Explain				
	(4) evidence that the Demonstration Project is underward to the extent that demonstration sites are current delivering care and collecting data under the mod being demonstrated, and that goals for the Demonstration Project can be substantially achieve within eighteen months after a grant is awarded;	ly el ne	Tes Yes	☐ No	
	Explain				
	(5) a focus on prevention and early intervention within continuum of quality health care that includes disea management;		C Yes	No	



CHAMP REVIEW: DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ELIGIBILITY (Continued)

(6) a strong evaluation and/or research plan to measure improved access and/or health outcomes and to assess the cost-effectiveness of the model;	🗆 Yes 🗔 N
Explain	
(7) financial support that, in addition to a grant that may be awarded by the Authority, will be sufficient to complete an evaluation that analyzes the results of the Demonstration Project and reaches conclusions regarding the replication of the Health Care Service	Yes N
delivery model; Explain	
(8) potential opportunities to replicate the model in multiple communities in California and to leverage	Yes N
additional funding to support replication and sustainability of the model if the outcomes of the	
Demonstration Project warrant expansion; and	
Demonstration Project warrant expansion; and Explain	
	Yes N
 Explain (9) a Partnership that collectively has the capacity to develop, implement, and evaluate the Demonstration Project, and promote and assist with the replication of the model. The Partnership may include, but need not be limited to: (A) nonprofit and/or public health facilities to provide services at demonstration locations; (B) institutions of higher education or other research institutions to provide or guide research and/or 	Yes N
 Explain (9) a Partnership that collectively has the capacity to develop, implement, and evaluate the Demonstration Project, and promote and assist with the replication of the model. The Partnership may include, but need not be limited to: (A) nonprofit and/or public health facilities to provide services at demonstration locations; (B) institutions of higher education or other research 	Yes N



CHAMP – Secondary Review Results: **DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ELIGIBILITY**

Notes:

Review Results:

Initials: Date:

