

SFY 2014 OhioMHAS Maternal Opiate Medical Supports (MOMS) Application

Applicant	Total Technical Score
Application Title	Amount Requested
Reviewer (Print Name)	Date
Reviewer's Signature	

Instructions

The following point values (0 – 5) will be used to rate each application on technical criteria for required components of the MOMS project. Do not create your own score (e. g., 1.5, etc.). Please rate each technical criterion on the quality of applicants' responses.

Point Value	Explanation
0	Does Not Meet. Application does not comply with the requirements. Document the shortfall or what is missing in the response.
1	Weak. Application does not substantially meet the requirements. Document the shortfalls or what is missing in the response.
2	Moderate. Application meets most of the requirements, however, is weak in some areas.
3	Meets. Application generally meets the requirements.
4	Strong. Application exceeds requirement.
5	Greatly Exceeds. Application significantly exceeds requirements.

Each section and subsections 3A through 3P of the pilot project plan ask for specific information. The responses must be provided in the section and subsection in which the information was solicited. Please do not give points if the response is provided in another section or subsection.

Please multiply the weights by your rating score, and then add the points for each section to calculate a total technical score. Please add scores from all of the sections on the back page and provide the total technical score for the entire application. Please bring the completed forms and the applications with you for the reviewers' meeting on December 17, 2013.

3A. Applicant			
Technical Criteria	Weight	Rating (0-5)	Technical Score
Do the applicant's philosophy, mission and history align with the purpose and functions of the proposed MOMS PROJECT?	5		
Was the applicant's experience in starting and operating an addictions treatment program generally successful?	15		
Does the applicant have at least two years of experience in treating opioid dependence in pregnant women using FDA-approved medications (including buprenorphine or methadone) for opioid dependence and other addictions services?	10		
Is the applicant an Opioid Treatment Program (OTP)? If not, does the applicant plan on obtaining the certification(s) or does the applicant present a workable means of providing for medical services, including the dispensing or administration of medications?	20		
Does the applicant's description of its capabilities to fulfill the services and activities proposed indicate a well-developed and workable plan?	10		
Applicant Technical Score	60		

Reviewer's notes/comments (optional)

3B. Geographic Location and Accessibility			
Technical Criteria	Weight	Rating (0-5)	Technical Score
Are the primary and alternative proposed locations of the MOMS project identified?	5		
Did applicant provide a reasonable explanation as to why the communities were selected in order to reach target participants?	10		
Are the locations reasonably accessible for the targeted client populations?	5		
Will the applicant have co-located services (e.g., addiction treatment staff and physicians for the baby and mother)?	10		
Geographic Location and Accessibility Technical Score	30		

Reviewer's notes/comments (optional)

3C. Collaboration			
Technical Criteria	Weight	Rating (0-5)	Technical Score
Did the applicant provide a reasonable plan and commitment to establish on-going communication with the local Alcohol, Drug Addiction and Mental Health Services Board?	10		
Did the applicant provide a reasonable plan and commitment to establish on-going communication with the local child public services agency (child welfare), including referral protocols?	10		
Did the applicant provide a reasonable plan and commitment to establish on-going communication with the local legal system?	10		
Did the applicant provide a reasonable plan and commitment to establish care coordination with all treatment providers for the mother and child?	10		
Did the applicant discuss their approaches for linkage with local mutual aid service committees and access to peer-based recovery support, where available?	10		
Collaboration Technical Score	50		

Reviewer's notes/comments (optional)

3D. Staffing Description			
Technical Criteria	Weight	Rating (0-5)	Technical Score
Does the applicant document how proposed project staff reflects ethnic, cultural and racial relevance to the target population?	5		
Was the clinical staff to client ratio identified and does the ratio seem reasonable?	5		
Did the applicant provide strong and convincing strategies it will employ to ensure that the pilot project will maintain qualified physician(s)?	15		
Was a Table of Organization provided for the provider/applicant?	5		
Were the following job descriptions provided for those that will be directly involved in the project, and were the job descriptions appropriate for implementation of the pilot project: Medical Director, healthcare professionals functioning under the Medical Director's direct supervision, clinical supervisor, project manager and other key staff?	10		
Staffing Description Technical Score	40		

Reviewer's notes/comments (optional)

3E. Participant Recruitment			
Technical Criteria	Weight	Rating (0-5)	Technical Score
Does the applicant offer a reasonable strategy to recruit and serve a minimum of 75 pregnant women who are addicted to prescription opioids and/or heroin and will be followed successfully until the end of treatment?	20		
Did the applicant describe reasonable criteria for participant inclusion?	10		
Does applicant provide reasonable strategies to recruit participants of different racial/ethnic backgrounds?	10		
Are the specified recruitment locations likely to reach the target population(s)?	10		
Is there an adequate plan to engage women as early as possible, but no later than the end of the second trimester?	20		
Is the applicant partnering with other organizations or providers in its recruitment efforts?	5		
Did the applicant describe participant barriers and offer a reasonable strategy for addressing these barriers?	15		
Will the applicant be providing informational materials through appropriate distribution channels to assist with recruitment?	5		
Did the applicant provide an adequate plan for serving or referring women who are not able to be part of the program, e.g., women in the third trimester?	5		
Participant Recruitment Technical Score	100		

Reviewer's notes/comments (optional)

3F. Clinical Services			
Technical Criteria	Weight	Rating (0-5)	Technical Score
Does the applicant propose to provide an appropriate array of prevention, treatment, and recovery services and levels of care for the targeted population(s) of mothers and infants?	20		
Do the services to be offered adequately focus on the family as a unit of service and support engagement and retention?	5		
Does the applicant propose to provide or refer women to relevant education or health promotion services, e.g. prenatal education related to child birth and child care, nutrition counseling, tobacco cessation services?	20		
Does the applicant propose an appropriate protocol for identifying and treating cases of NAS?	20		
Does the applicant propose to use appropriate evidence-based practice(s) for targeted participant group(s) that will strengthen the pilot project?	15		
Does the applicant propose to offer appropriate types of recovery supports?	10		
Were the FDA-approved medication assisted treatment (MAT) medications which will be offered identified?	10		
Did the application provide an effective description of how MAT medications will complement the delivery of treatment services?	20		
Did the applicant provide a strong and compelling explanation as to why participants will or will not be finished with MAT medications before they are successfully discharged from treatment?	10		
Did the applicant propose an adequate plan for transitioning clients into aftercare and receipt of ongoing services (e.g., post-treatment recovery check-ups) regardless of discharge status?	10		
Clinical Services Technical Score	140		

Reviewer's notes/comments (optional)

3G. Vocational, Job Placement and Ancillary Service Provisions			
Technical Criteria	Weight	Rating (0-5)	Technical Score
Did the applicant propose to provide an appropriate array of vocational and job placement services that appear to be comprehensive, reasonable and achievable based on the described availability of local resources and the abilities of the participants?	15		
Did the applicant identify the provider staff responsible for providing vocational and job placement services and, if applicable, identify the local vocational and job placement service providers with which it plans to partner and the location(s) where the services will be provided?	5		
Did the applicant propose to provide a comprehensive list of ancillary services (i.e., primary care, housing, mental health, education, transportation, food, clothing, etc.)?	10		
Did the applicant provide a reasonable plan for how it will effectively monitor referrals to ancillary service providers to ensure that participants are able to access and receive these services?	10		
Vocational, Job Placement and Ancillary Services Technical Score	40		

Reviewer's notes/comments (optional)

3H. Project Plan for Success			
Technical Criteria	Weight	Rating (0-5)	Technical Score
Did the applicant identify appropriate critical success factors for a project of this size, scope and complexity?	10		
Did the applicant identify barriers to previous implementation efforts and provide a plan for addressing those barriers?	5		
Did the applicant provide a thorough description of how it has applied lessons learned from those efforts to improve service delivery?	5		
Has the applicant demonstrated that it has a comprehensive, coordinated and integrated service system in place to accommodate the complex needs of the women and family members, including existing MOUs with key agencies and organizations?	15		
Did the applicant discuss reasonable approaches for linkage with local mutual aid service committees and access to peer-based recovery support, where available?	5		
Project Plan for Success Technical Score	40		

Reviewer's notes/comments (optional)

3I. Participant Retention			
Technical Criteria	Weight	Rating (0-5)	Technical Score
Does the applicant have a reasonable and detailed participant retention strategy (e.g., pre- and postpartum health care services, medication compliance, family/kinship and spiritual support)?	20		
Does the applicant discuss specific techniques their organization/their partner organizations will use to make sure that participants follow through with prevention, treatment and recovery services?	15		
Did the applicant develop standardized criteria that will help monitor retention and indicate how they know when a client has lost interest in the program?	15		
Was an adequate plan provided to re-engage drop outs during the duration of the MOMS project?	10		
Participant Retention Technical Score	60		

Reviewer's notes/comments (optional)

3J. Monitoring and Continuous Quality Improvement			
Technical Criteria	Weight	Rating (0-5)	Technical Score
Did the applicant offer a reasonable plan for monitoring project operations and outcomes to provide immediate feedback about project problems, issues and progress?	15		
Did the applicant present a comprehensive plan for how data will be used to assure the quality of standard care, implement rapid-cycle quality improvements, and meet project goals?	15		
Monitoring and Continuous Quality Improvement Technical Score	30		

Reviewer's notes/comments (optional)

3K. Data Collection and Reporting			
Technical Criteria	Weight	Rating (0-5)	Technical Score
Did the applicant state its commitment to provide data for an independent evaluation of the project and demonstrate its ability to collect basic data like gestational age and birth weight for infants and other medical and programmatic data during the intervention period?	20		
Data Collection and Reporting Technical Score	20		

Reviewer's notes/comments (optional)

3L. Cooperation with Quality Improvement and Evidence Based Practices			
Technical Criteria	Weight	Rating (0-5)	Technical Score
Did the applicant demonstrate a commitment to cooperate and collaborate with ODMHAS and ODM selected QI and subject matter experts?	20		
Did the applicant agree to participate in a QI collaborative using an approach based on the Institute for Healthcare Improvement (IHI) Rapid Cycle Quality Improvement mode?	20		
Cooperation with Quality Improvement and Evidence Based Practices Technical Score	40		

Reviewer's notes/comments (optional)

3M. Implementation Work Plan			
Technical Criteria	Weight	Rating (0-5)	Technical Score
Did the applicant submit a detailed, credible and timely project schedule and plan (timeline) for establishing the MOMS pilot project from initiation to the opening of the center for patient treatment?	20		
Did the applicant's work plan include appropriate measurable objectives, milestones, tasks, responsible parties and key interventions?	20		
Implementation Timeline Technical Score	40		

Reviewer's notes/comments (optional)

3N. State Support and MOMS Project Sustainability			
Technical Criteria	Weight	Rating (0-5)	Technical Score
Is the description of state support (i.e. financial, technical assistance, etc.) that is required to implement the project realistic and reasonable?	10		
Is the requested length of time needed for state support realistic and reasonable?	10		
Does the applicant offer a comprehensive plan for accessing local and regional stakeholders, including Medicaid Managed Care Plans, for long term sustainability?	20		
Does applicant describe a reasonable plan for taking steps to achieve stakeholder support?	10		
State Support and MOMS Project Sustainability Technical Score	50		

Reviewer's notes/comments (optional)

30. Business Plan			
Technical Criteria	Weight	Rating (0-5)	Technical Score
Was a budget narrative presented along with a detailed budget plan that include costs, financial supports, etc.? (Appendix)	10		
Does the applicant propose a reasonable business plan to sustain the project after it has ended?	10		
Are the cost projections to initially establish the program realistic and reasonable?	10		
Are the cost projections to sustain MOMS realistic and reasonable?	10		
Does the proposed business plan project requirements for State financial support?	10		
Were revenue projections from all sources such as Medicaid, private insurance and self-pay provided?	10		
Did the applicant propose a reasonable plan for monitoring the use of funds?	10		
Were all contracts and/or agreements referenced in the project budget and budget narrative provided in this section as required by the GFA and did they identify the service(s) or deliverables, the party or entity with whom/which the applicant will contract, and the hourly cost for services, or total cost for deliverables?	10		
Business Plan Technical Score	80		

Reviewer's notes/comments (optional)

3P. Letters of Support			
Technical Criteria	Weight	Rating (0-5)	Technical Score
Were strong letters of support written by the entities from which the applicant receives its referrals provided?	10		
Were strong letters of commitment written by the entities with which the applicant will be partnered, including Medicaid Managed Care Plans, that detailed their role(s) in the project?	20		
Are these entities reflective of all possible entities that will assist with the MOMS project?	10		
Letters of Support Technical Score	40		

Reviewer's notes/comments (optional)

Score Sheet

Section		Weight	Total Possible Weighted Points	Evaluator Technical Score
3A.	Applicant	60	300	
3B.	Geographic Location and Accessibility	30	150	
3C.	Collaboration	50	250	
3D.	Staffing Description	40	200	
3E.	Participant Recruitment	100	500	
3F.	Clinical Services	140	700	
3G.	Vocational, Job Placement and Ancillary Service Provisions	40	200	
3H.	Project Plan for Success	40	200	
3I.	Participant Retention	60	300	
3J.	Monitoring and Continuous Quality Improvement	30	150	
3K.	Data Collection and Reporting	20	100	
3L.	Cooperation with Quality Improvement and Evidence based Practices	40	200	
3M.	Implementation Work Plan	40	200	
3N.	State Support of and MOMS Project Sustainability	50	250	
3O.	Business Plan	80	400	
3P.	Letters of Support	40	200	
Total Technical Score		860	4300	