**Proposed Changes to Program Element and Triennial Review Tool Revision Processes**

**DRAFT – March 13, 2018**

|  | **Current Practice** | **Proposed Process Changes** | **Opportunities/Challenges** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Element Changes** | Changes are made whenever requested. No schedule except that any changes needed for July 1 must be completed by mid-March. | * Revisions made only up to twice per year on set schedule for all PEs
* Revision schedule would be set based on input from section manager to best meet program needs
 | Opportunities* Workload for PHD staff and CLHO can be anticipated
* May reduce number of FAA amendments (something county elected officials want)
* Efficiencies gained by doing similar work at same time

Challenges* Revisions needed due to federal grant changes for grants that are not aligned with revision schedule
* Revisions needed due to unanticipated circumstances (reduced funding, etc.)
 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Triennial Review Tool Changes** | Changes are made whenever requested. No schedule.There is a 3-month phase-in period before a new tool can be used in a triennial review.  | * Revisions made only up to twice per year on set schedule for all TR tools
* Revision schedule would be set based on input from section manager to best meet program needs (likely would follow window for PE revisions)
* Three-month phase-in period before new tool can be required for a triennial review
 | Opportunities* Workload for PHD staff and OHA Publications can be anticipated
* Efficiencies gained by doing similar work at same time, including assuring alignment across tools
* Greater clarity for local partners regarding Triennial Review expectations

Challenges* Revisions potentially needed due to federal grant changes for grants that are not aligned with revision schedule
* Revisions needed due to unanticipated circumstances (audit findings, changes in federal regulations, etc.)
 |