

---

# APPENDIX H

---

## Research methodology

---

### Summary of Methodologies

This evaluation was conducted according to statutory requirements and professional standards and methods for governmental audits. The research was conducted from July through December 2005.

#### **General Methodology**

To compile basic information about House Bill 59 (2002), the Substance Abuse Division and relevant system information, we reviewed relevant statutes, rules, professional literature, legislative history, agency and provider literature, agency budget requests, previous studies and reports from 1961 to 2005, and other information. To gain further understanding, we interviewed a variety of past and present state agency officials and managers as well as other persons knowledgeable about the system. We interviewed direct care service providers from around the state, including substance abuse only and combination substance abuse/mental health providers.

#### **Substance Abuse Division, DOC and DFS produced documents and electronic data**

We requested state agency documents and electronic data to gather specific cost, client assessment, service, and demographic information on each agency's population as they relate to substance abuse. We obtained copies of payment procedures and other financial documentation from the Substance Abuse Division. In addition, we obtained data from each agency's data management systems in order to analyze placement numbers and services for FY '99 – '05. We analyzed each agency's data by individual according to age, gender, placement type, length of stay while in placement, and by provider and service categories.

Since the Division was the agency we engaged for this evaluation, we chose to use Division data and documentation as a baseline for comparing information from DOC and DFS. However, due to incomplete data fields in the Division's system, the Wyoming Client Information System (WCIS), little analysis could be done with other agencies required to plan and coordinate substance abuse services in the state.

#### **Contract Review**

The Division provided a list of over 300 contract documents, which included all formal agreements

entered by the Division: contracts, contract amendments, bid waivers, award letters, requests for proposals (RFPs), and memoranda of understanding (MOUs). To review the Division's contracting practices, primarily for contracts with direct care prevention and treatment providers, we conducted a contract review of 24 service contracts and 16 professional services and consulting contracts. Rather than taking a random sample, we chose to review contracts with providers, both large and small, representing most areas of the state, covering the majority of state-funded substance abuse clients.

We chose FY '05 contracts since providers must submit an application to provide services at the beginning of state budget cycle. Our review focused on the Division's own rule requirements regarding a letter of intent, contract application and signed contracts. We considered these three documents as a single "contract unit" from which to gauge the Division's assurances for services needed and quantity and quality of care. We also used best practices for performance-based service contracting from the National State Auditors Association and the Office of Federal Procurement Policy to help standardize each reviewer's interpretation/definition of the required elements.

We examined each of 54 items mandated by Division rules. Each item was noted as *present* if the information was present in the file regardless of quality or format. Due to inconsistencies in how complete providers' applications were, limited quality analysis of the contracts was feasible. We entered information obtained through this review into an Excel spreadsheet for analysis.