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PASSPORT ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY
STAFFING ADEQUACY
**Problem Statement**

- ODA sub recipients (PAAs) assert that, via the individual annual coordinated monitoring reviews, staffing shortages result in their inability to achieve desired outcomes (compliance).

- Staffing shortages have been identified in 3 primary functional areas in the PAA business operations (Medicaid waiver) in particular: 1) Screening/ assessment; 2) case management; and 3) provider network management.

**Opportunity Statement**

- The project is a prospect where information can be gathered to determine: the accuracy of this assertion; whether a problem exists; how to help ODA and the PAAs with next steps and possible solutions.

**Scope**

- First Step: Secure consistent data
- Last Step: Provide information and recommendations for ODA and the PAA Network
PROJECT GOALS

Benefits

- **VALIDATE** – Assertions being made via the annual monitoring process and offer solutions.
- **COMPLETE PICTURE** - Better information which will lend to a better command of the PAA landscape

Goal Statement

- **BETTER DATA** - To have more real-time, consistent, systematic, and regularly recurring PAA staffing and corresponding output data.
- **STANDARIZE** - the manner by which this data is collected (templates).

Leveraging Opportunities

- **PREVENTION** - Understand weakness/ gaps beforehand in the effort to prevent errors from occurring.
- **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE** - Take a proactive approach in helping the PAAs self-identify issues and assisting the PAAs with solutions in analysis, and to improve and control performance versus reacting after errors occur.
- **INFORMED DECISION MAKING** – In workforce and strategic planning.
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ODA AND OHIO’S AGING NETWORK

- **ODA** - Responsible for oversight of the operations of its programs, grants, and supported activities. This involves monitoring Ohio’s Areas Agencies on Aging (AAAs) and PASSPORT Administrative Agencies (PAAAs) for their compliance with state and federal laws and policies that govern these programs.

- **ODA** - Serves as a policy-making agency that distributes most of its $440 million in annual funding to these agencies. Together, ODA and these Agencies make up Ohio’s Aging Network.

- **AAAs** - Respond to the needs of elders in the communities they serve by establishing partnerships through the creation and implementation of plans based on the population and resources in their communities and by organizing and coordinating services and supports.

- **PAAAs** - Administer home and community-based waiver provisions to individuals who meet financial and non-financial eligibility requirements.

- **AAAs/PAAAs** - Work in concert to provide a system of services and supports to meet the needs of Ohio’s elders.
CAUSE AND EFFECT

PROBLEM: NON-COMPLIANCE

INTERNAL CONTROLS
- Monitoring
- Control Activities
- Business Intelligence

STAFFING TURNOVER
- Pay
- Managed Care
- Other Opportunities

PROGRAM EVALUATION
- Analysis of Results
- Operational Definitions
- Monitoring Frequency

TRAINING
- New Staff
- Monitoring Performance
- Consistent Expectations

MONITORING PROGRAM EVALUATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>KEY PROCESS DRIVERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCREENING/ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>• Information, referral and assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preadmission Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In-person assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>• Consumer Care Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consumer Service Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVIDER NETWORK MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>• Provider Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provider Annual Structural Compliance Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provider TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provider Disciplinary Actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HIGH LEVEL PROCESS - SIPOC

SUPPLIERS
- INQUIRIES
- APPLICANTS
- CONSUMERS
- CAREGIVERS
- FAMILIES
- PAA AGENCIES
- ODA
- MEDICAID
- CDJFS
- HOSPITALS
- ASSISTED LIVING
- NURSING FACILITIES
- SISTER AGENCIES
- PROVIDERS

INPUTS
- SCREENS
- PARS
- ASSESSMENTS
- CARE PLANNING
- SERVICE PLANNING
- PROVIDER CERTIFICATIONS
- PROVIDER ANNUAL STRUCTURAL COMPLIANCE REVIEWS
- PROVIDER DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS

PROCESS
- REQUESTS / ALERTS RECEIVED
- MANAGE WORKLOADS
- DOCUMENT
- PERFORM FUNCTIONS / WORK
- MONITOR PERFORMANCE
- RESULTING OUTPUTS / OUTCOMES

OUTPUTS
- INFORMATION
- REFERRALS
- ENROLLMENTS
- ENROLLMENTS
- DISENROLLMENTS
- NEW PROVIDERS
- PROVIDER MONITORING
- PROVIDER COMPLIANCE
- PROVIDER QUALITY

CUSTOMERS
- OHIOS ELDER POPULATION
- CAREGIVERS AND FAMILIES
- WAIVER CONSUMERS
- PROVIDERS
- PAAs
- SISTER AGENCIES
- OBM
- CMS
- ACL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DATA COLLECTION PLAN</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggregate and review annual coordinated monitoring data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Staffing data – 13 PAAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Monitoring data – 13 PAAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Compliance data – 13 PAAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Query management reports from ODA Enterprise System (PIMS Database)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Staffing and outputs produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilize data from ODA Fiscal Division</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time study data in corresponding functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fiscal data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT TOOLS

- DMAIC
- Fishbone (Ishikawa) / Cause & Effect Diagram
- Summary Tables
- Bar Charts
- Control Charts
- Brainstorming
- Voices (Business, Process, Employee, Customer)
- Critical to Quality (CTQ)
- Poke Yoke Form
- Takt time (Staffing calculator)
AGENCY LINES OF BUSINESS

Total Agency Staff and Staff Performing ODA FUNDED WORK (2016)

- # of AAA/PAA staff
- Total ODA Lines of Business
# AGENCY STAFF BREAKDOWN 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAA/PAA</th>
<th>Total Agency Staff 2016</th>
<th>2016 # of Screening &amp; Assessment Staff</th>
<th>2016 # of Case Management Staff</th>
<th>2016 # of Provider Network Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAA/PAA-1</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA/PAA-2</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA/PAA-3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA/PAA-4</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA/PAA-5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA/PAA-6</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA/PAA-7</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA/PAA-8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA/PAA-9</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA/PAA-10A</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA/PAA-10B</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA/PAA-11</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAA-CSS</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2015.5</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>409.5</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Staffing Inadequacy Trends in Screening/Assessment**

**Reported by the PAA: 2014 - 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total # of PAAs</th>
<th>Not Adequate 2016</th>
<th>Not Adequate 2015</th>
<th>Not Adequate 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening &amp; Assessment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider Network Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAA Functional Areas Identified as Having Inadequate Staffing
Daily Screening Production by PAA FTE Equivalent, Mean, and Standard Deviation

- Mean (Average): 37.1
- SD-Upper: 64.1
- SD-Lower: 10.0

PAA Agencies

- Full-Time Employees (FTE) at PAA
- Daily Screening Production by Entire PAA FTES
- Mean (Average): 37.1
- SD-Upper: 64.1
- SD-Lower: 10.0
SCREENING BELL CURVE

Daily Screening Production by PAA FTE Staff
Standard Normal Distribution

LCL = -44.20
UCL = 118.40
CASE MANAGEMENT STAFFING

Staffing Inadequacy Trends in Case Management
Reported by the PAA: 2014 - 2016

PAA Functional Areas Identified as Having Inadequate Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Area</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening &amp; Assessment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider Network Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph showing the staffing inadequacies in case management from 2014 to 2016.
PAA Case Management Staffing: Ideal Target vs. Actual in 2016

- **PAA Case Management Staffing**
- **Ideal Staffing Target** vs. **Actual Staffing Size**

- **Mean**
  - **Ideal Staffing Target**: 28.44
  - **Actual Staffing Size**: 26.68

- **PAA-CSS**
  - **Ideal Staffing Target**: 16.65
  - **Actual Staffing Size**: 14.85

- **PAA-11**
  - **Ideal Staffing Target**: 11.31
  - **Actual Staffing Size**: 14.78

- **PAA-10B**
  - **Ideal Staffing Target**: 26.95
  - **Actual Staffing Size**: 20.91

- **PAA-10A**
  - **Ideal Staffing Target**: 29.80
  - **Actual Staffing Size**: 33.05

- **PAA-9**
  - **Ideal Staffing Target**: 40.07
  - **Actual Staffing Size**: 39.46

- **PAA-8**
  - **Ideal Staffing Target**: 17.25
  - **Actual Staffing Size**: 16.63

- **PAA-7**
  - **Ideal Staffing Target**: 67.94
  - **Actual Staffing Size**: 68.30

- **PAA-6**
  - **Ideal Staffing Target**: 19.36
  - **Actual Staffing Size**: 18.85

- **PAA-5**
  - **Ideal Staffing Target**: 35.44
  - **Actual Staffing Size**: 35.30

- **PAA-4**
  - **Ideal Staffing Target**: 35.44
  - **Actual Staffing Size**: 35.44

- **PAA-3**
  - **Ideal Staffing Target**: 23.58
  - **Actual Staffing Size**: 15.85

- **PAA-2**
  - **Ideal Staffing Target**: 18.02
  - **Actual Staffing Size**: 18.02

- **PAA-1**
  - **Ideal Staffing Target**: 15.56
  - **Actual Staffing Size**: 15.56
Average Caseload Ratio and Number of PAA Case Manager FTEs
## DMAIC Overview

### Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Define problem</th>
<th>Measure problem</th>
<th>Root Causes</th>
<th>Implement Solutions</th>
<th>Maintain Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• PAAs assert Inadequate staffing; and ODA unsure if staffing is really the problem</td>
<td>• Assess data sources</td>
<td>• Review monitoring data</td>
<td>• Collect and develop ratios for outputs (x’s) in relation to staff.</td>
<td>• Control Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review of ODA processes</td>
<td>• Identify sources</td>
<td>• Ensure operational definitions are clear.</td>
<td>• Timeline for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review of PAA expectations</td>
<td>• Verify</td>
<td>• Revise data collection mechanism (regularly vs. annually)</td>
<td>• Process to ensure review and evaluation of results, including communication to PAAs regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review monitoring data</td>
<td>• Discuss internally and externally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultation with other ODA Divisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tools Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>CTQ</th>
<th>Charter</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Graphical Displays</th>
<th>Fishbone</th>
<th>Review data secured</th>
<th>Statistical analysis</th>
<th>Poke Yoke</th>
<th>Optimal settings</th>
<th>Use Takt tool</th>
<th>Implementation plan</th>
<th>Change Management</th>
<th>Control Plans</th>
<th>Capability analysis</th>
<th>Control Charts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fishbone</td>
<td>Review data secured</td>
<td>Statistical analysis</td>
<td>Poke Yoke</td>
<td>Optimal settings</td>
<td>Use Takt tool</td>
<td>Implementation plan</td>
<td>Change Management</td>
<td>Control Plans</td>
<td>Capability analysis</td>
<td>Control Charts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WHAT DID WE LEARN?

What we do know:

- Agency staffing via annual monitoring.
- FTE work charged to various functions monthly.
- Production that is occurring (numbers of outputs processed/produced).
- What is happening, but not why.
WHAT DID WE LEARN?

What we do not know:

- Some unknown variables such as average time it takes to perform functions.
  - What is average time to perform functions?
  - Are functions being performed consistently?
  - Are functions discrete or are other work functions being performed?
  - Are outputs being recorded correctly?
  - Is work performed efficiently and effectively?
What do we need to do:

- Reduce unknown variables
- Clarify operational standards and definitions
- Collect Data Systematically and Regularly
- Analyze Information Frequently
- Discuss Opportunities for Improvement with PAAs Frequently
- Control Process Issues
- Opportunities for increased oversight
- Contingency Plans in place when staffing is not optimal
## Implementation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERNAL BRIEFING</td>
<td>DIVISION FOR COMMUNITY LIVING FISCAL DIVISION EXECUTIVE STAFF</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIEF PAAs</td>
<td>PCD AND FISCAL</td>
<td>August 2017</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA COLLECTION FORM (Poke Yoke)</td>
<td>PCD Monitoring</td>
<td>January 2018</td>
<td>In development July-November, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNAL REVIEW PROCESS</td>
<td>PCD MONITORING AND FISCAL DIVISIONS</td>
<td>January 2018</td>
<td>In development July-November, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARIFY OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS</td>
<td>DIVISION FOR COMMUNITY LIVING</td>
<td>OCTOBER 2017</td>
<td>Pending. Changes occurring in screening process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

### STEP I  STAFFING OVERVIEW

### TO-BE STATE: COMPREHENSIVE SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES IN SCREENING PREVIOUS MONTH</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME STAFF</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF PART-TIME STAFF</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>INTERMITENT/ CONTRACT STAFF</th>
<th>SUPERVISOR/ STAFF RATIO</th>
<th>TOTAL FTE EQUIVALENT CHARGED TO SCREENING PREVIOUS MONTH</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>REASONS FOR DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

### STEP II  STAFFING WIDGET DATA

**TO-BE STATE: WIDGETS PERFORMED PER FTE EQUIVALENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL FTE EQUIVALENT CHARGED TO SCREENING PREVIOUS MONTH</th>
<th># OF SCREENS PERFORMED PREVIOUS MONTH (VIA PAA MONTHLY ACTIVITY REPORT)</th>
<th>RATIO WIDGETS TO STAFF</th>
<th>49 PER FTE EQUIVALENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>49 PER FTE EQUIVALENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

- **STEP II  STAFFING WIDGET DATA**
- **TO-BE STATE: WIDGETS PERFORMED PER FTE EQUIVALENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL FTE EQUIVALENT CHARGED TO SCREENING PREVIOUS MONTH</th>
<th>PASSPORT ENDING CASELOAD (PREVIOUS MONTH – VIA PAA MONTHLY ACTIVITY REPORT)</th>
<th>PASSPORT 1:60 RATIO</th>
<th>ASSISTED LIVING ENDING CASELOAD (PREVIOUS MONTH – VIA PAA MONTHLY ACTIVITY REPORT)</th>
<th>ASSISTED LIVING 1:60 RATIO</th>
<th>FTE TARGET (DIFFERENCE COLUMN A – COLUMN E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

- **STEP III**  STAFFING CALCULATOR (TAKT TIME)

- **TO-BE STATE: WIDGETS PERFORMED PER FTE EQUIVALENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL FTE EQUIVALENT CHARGED TO SCREENING PREVIOUS MONTH</th>
<th># OF SCREENS PERFORMED PREVIOUS MONTH (VIA PAA MONTHLY ACTIVITY REPORT)</th>
<th>AVERAGE TIMEFRAME PERFORMED PER SCREEN IN MINUTES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF WORKDAYS INCLUDED IN PREVIOUS MONTH</th>
<th>TOTAL AVERAGE HOURS SPENT ON SCREENING PER FTE EQUIVALENT PER DAY</th>
<th>TOTAL minutes spent on Screen per month per Agency</th>
<th>MINUTES WORK IN A MONTH ON SCREENS PER FTE EQUIVALENT</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF FTE EQUIVALENTS NEEDED TO COMPLETE SCREENING WORKLOAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45000</td>
<td>7920</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table above outlines the calculation for staffing needs based on the Takt Time method. The values are derived from the previous month's activity report.*
## Implementation Plan

- **STEP IV  FUNCTIONAL AREA TURNOVER RATE**

- **TO-BE STATE: TURNOVER RATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL # OF EMPLOYEES IN SCREENING FUNCTIONAL AREA (FROM COLUMN A) FROM PREVIOUS MONTH</th>
<th>TOTAL # OF EMPLOYEES WHO LEFT SCREENING FUNCTIONAL AREA IN PREVIOUS MONTH</th>
<th>MONTHLY TURNOVER RATE (PERCENTAGE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TOTAL WHO LEFT / TOTAL IN FUNCTIONAL AREA * 100 = %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Project Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Screening</th>
<th>PAR</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Case Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redirected Hours</td>
<td>PROPOSED 43,680 ANNUALLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF 29 FTES NEEDED TO AVOID POTENTIAL ERRORS IN CASE MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS. 1,740 CONSUMERS IMPACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Avoidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Savings</td>
<td>POTENTIAL OF &gt; ~$735,000 ANNUALLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Process Steps**| BEFORE (AS-IS) - SILOED PROCESSES AMONG 3 DIVISIONS  
AFTER (TO-BE) - MONTHLY FTE & WIDGET DATA COLLECTION AMONG 2 DIVISIONS  
DIFFERENCE - MONTHLY, REGULAR, SYSTEMATIC COLLECTION, COORDINATION, & REVIEW OF INFORMATION |
| **Handoffs**     | REAL-TIME BUDGET (SPENDING), STAFFING, AND WIDGET DATA |
| **Decisions**    | ALIGNMENT OF SPENDING DATA ACCORDING TO STAFFING AND WIDGET DATA |
| **Waste Points** | MORE CM’s = < BACKLOGS. |
| **Backlog Reduction** | MORE CM’s = < BACKLOGS. |
PROJECT BENEFITS - INTANGIBLE

- The “voices” are listened to.

- These actions foster a continuous approach to: oversight; compliance; quality; and program performance.

- Monitoring should not be static.
LESSONS LEARNED

- Jumping to conclusions can be a bad exercise.
- Let the Data take you there.
- You cannot boil the ocean.
- Shift Happens