Received via e-mail from Health Quality Partners

Feedback on Proposed Navigator Program Funding and Scope of Work Changes

Slides referenced below are from "Navigator Program Funding and Scope of Work Discussion" presentation on February 8, 2019.

1. [In response to slide 4, #1 & #2] Grant amounts tied to prior year productivity/performance make sense as long as there is some flexibility. It would be important for grantees to weigh-in on realistic goals based on local conditions and changing environments that impact the enrollment projection.

2. [In response to slide 4, #3] It is confusing that the over/under goal adjustments have been determined to be +/- $30 per effectuated enrollment, when the grant award calculation has not been set. $30 when the per effectuation rate is $155 (Benchmark 1, Slide 10) or $175 (Benchmark 4 at 7hrs, Slide 14) is less of an impact than if the effectuation rate is $82 (Benchmark 2, slide 11).

3. [In response to slide 4, #5] Many community-based organizations that are Navigator grantees conduct deliberate and targeted outreach. There may be a way to build in some flexibility to the under-goal performance strategy to "earn-back" the payment adjustment so that organizations can use the outreach strategy that makes the most sense. For some it would be social media (e.g. grantees that work with young invincibles), others it may be leveraging their position as working with people when they have health concerns (e.g. health centers) or hosting events (e.g. grantees in rural areas).

4. [In response to slide 4, #5 (2)] If the social-earned media piece is included in future funding models, it would be important to know how much could be earned back, and what the expectations would be in terms of evaluation metrics. With the current information available, it is hard to evaluate how this component would factor in deciding on goals and funding levels to apply for.

5. [In response to slide 19] Yes, there should be separate earned/social media goals for OE versus SEP.