MINUTES
Prevention
Financial Workgroup

March 30, 2022
1:00-3:00 pm CST
Teleconference/Zoom

In Attendance

Michelle Brink-Gluhosky, Marisa Draper, Linda Colhoff-Glover, Kara Graveman, Jason Simmons, Amy Warwick, Akber Sakib, Michelle Spies, Laura Schaeffer, Doug Dix, Tiffany Wolfgang, Stacy Bruels, Shaina Smykle

Absent: Gaven Schweitzer, Jason Lillich

Welcome and Introductions

- Tiffany Wolfgang welcomed the group.

Review and Approve Minutes

- After the workgroup spent time reading through the meeting minutes from 01/25/2022, Kara Graveman made the motion to approve the minutes. Minutes were approved.

Potential Model

- Stacy Bruels provided a review of the primary prevention direct service delivery components the workgroup is currently discussing and an overview of the SFY22 contracts for the substance abuse block grant and middle school meth general funds. This totaled just under $2.4 million for primary prevention activities. She also provided an overview of current reimbursement rates, actual provider costs, administrative costs, and the difference between prevention and substance use disorder treatment rates.
- Tiffany Wolfgang reviewed the intent to streamline billing, to reduce the burden on agency and state staff while maintaining data integrity, to cover costs for the services delivered, and to move towards one uniform rate. She also provided an overview of what will be discussed in the potential model and an average of comparable salaries of direct services staff. The workgroup discussed how the average comparable salaries is the average of all the salaries provided from the survey and is always changing which makes it a tough number to quantify.
- Michelle Spies raised the question about the difference between a member and a non-member of an organization renting out a facility and how this causes differences in rental rates. She asked if they are captured in this model since rental rates are currently billed separately in the resource development category. It was discussed that this type of rent is different than the rent that would be included as part of the model. The rent included as part of the model is the office space for agency staff.

- Tiffany Wolfgang reviewed the potential rate model from steps 1-8. The model is different than the structure for treatment since it factors in the majority of staff time and there is less non-billable time, then also factoring in salary, benefits, operational costs, and an indirect rate. Step 4 of the model layered in $7,500 per FTE for operational expenses including rent/occupancy/depreciation/insurance, utilities/telephone, subscriptions/registrations, printing materials/marketing/promotional, incentives, and professional services and fees. The survey results showed an average of $3,641 per FTE; however in review, DSS felt the survey did not capture all costs, so the amount was inflated to $7,500. Concerns were raised by the workgroup members indicating that the $7,500 does not fully capture the costs per FTE.
- The workgroup also discussed the indirect rate added on. Agencies expressed concern that the indirect rate applied here was too low compared to their actual indirect costs. For example, Volunteers of America, indicate their federally negotiated indirect cost rate agreement is closer to 15%
- In this potential model, 90% of staff time would be billable; this included deducting off time for paid holidays. Workgroup members expressed concern that staff are not able to have 90% of their staff time be billable due to agency staff meetings, break times, and similar non-billable prevention activities. The potential model reviewed and existing rates are not interchangeable due to the potential model factoring in more staff time being billable and since components can be billed outside of the rate.
- Meals/mileage, curriculums, evaluations, meals/snacks for events, national organization memberships, and speaker fees would be billed separately from the rate in this model.
- Stacy Bruels reviewed proposed changes for staff time driving to provide prevention services, training time, and time entering data into the prevention billing system. Marisa Draper posed the question, is it possible to calculate a general travel time within the rate? Doug Dix shared it is difficult to find an average because you'd not only need average time, but also average miles and frequency of travel that varies by provider. Linda Colhoff-Glover proposed the question of how this would be billed, and it was decided there would need to be more discussion on the specifics of the billing process.
- Stacy Bruels reviewed a proposed list of items that providers could bill separate from the 15-min. unit rate with this potential model. During the discussion of meals at a coalition meeting, Linda Colhoff-Glover indicated there could be an issue with this with providers that need to give the kitchen a final number of meals prior to the meeting. Sometimes things come up and people cannot attend the meeting, so she asked if they would be able to bill for all of it or only reimbursed for the number who attended? It was decided more discussion needs to take place on this to provide a solid answer.
- The workgroup inquired about how other states reimburse for their prevention services. Other states primarily grant funds out to prevention coalitions. Discussion took place on granting funds through a subrecipient model and what is required of providers when utilizing a model like this. The majority of the workgroup did not support a grant agreement due to the amount of additional paperwork and documentation required. The workgroup concurred it would be better to continue the conversation and build on the potential model presented to ensure costs are covered.
- Tiffany Wolfgang summarized the discussion on the proposed model. The workgroup's feedback was that this workgroup will continue to work on this model and collect more information to become comfortable with the rates this model encompasses; further discussion needs to occur on the salary, operational costs, indirect costs, and billable time. There will be no changes to rates in SFY23 and possibly SFY24. DSS staff are discussing processes that could change for SFY23, not including any rate changes. Tiffany Wolfgang reiterated no changes will be in effect until this workgroup is consulted. During this summary, Kara Graveman indicated it could be helpful to have someone's

exact contract to use as an example to see the model more realistically applied. She indicated Action for the Betterment of the Community's (ABC) contract could be utilized.

Annual Reporting

- Tiffany Wolfgang discussed collecting better cost information through annual reporting and there is a need to have more conversations on how to better collect this information.

Next Steps

- DSS will conduct internal discussions on a process to collect more information via survey. This will include information on operating expenses, non-billable time, and other categories as identified through discussion.
- With the goal of having this workgroup and model finalized by early fall 2022, discussion took place on possibly reconvening in early June 2022. DSS will provide information to this workgroup on possible times for an additional meeting after the state team meets to discuss processes and timelines.

Public Comment

- Kelli Rumpza indicated she agrees with the discussions during this workgroup. She agrees that the gaps in information need to be filled and likes the idea of having an example contract used with this potential model to make the vision clearer.