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| --- | --- | --- |
| Introduction | Process Notes are used to record detailed information about the Activities and Decisions within a process map. | |
| Purpose | In order to capture the information and criteria that is know about each step in the process, this is a loosely structured format which is reader-friendly and provides both summary and detailed process step information. | |
| Procedures for Business Analyst and OwnerReview and Approval | The project Business Analyst drafts Process Notes by recording all information previously collected during the project regarding that activity or decisions. Specific steps for the Business Analyst to develop, review and approve Process Notes are:   1. Draft notes 2. Forward to expert / owner of activity 3. Collect feedback from owner and collaborate to finalize draft 4. Confirm owner approval and signoff 5. Forward current draft to Work Group with 5 business day review period | |
| Procedures for Process Owner and Work GroupReview and Approval | In the following Work Group meeting, the Owner represents their Process Note and any feedback is discussed with the group.   1. Owner collects feedback from group and is responsible to update as agreed. 2. Unresolved negotiations between Owner and Work Group are continued offline as necessary. 3. Revisions are done within 5 business days of meeting date. 4. If negotiations continue between Owner and Work Group past 5 days, the Owner-approved Process Note is considered final draft until outcome is resolved. | |
| Contents | Each entry in the Process Notes describes an Activity or Decision box from this Process Map. Process Notes include all currently known or suggested detail about: | |
|  | * how activity or decision occurs * triggering events * who is involved * systems used * methods of communication used * outputs from possible results | * how often * how long * work aids and tools used (contain decision review criteria including applicable guidelines, procedures, regulations, or policies) |
|  | Draft reflects above factors that may possibly apply. Owners and team members negotiate any changes to all applicable factors during revision period. Activities and decisions are recorded in the notes. | |

| ID | Notes |
| --- | --- |
| **6.1.1** | **Receive County APD**  Triggered by 1.1.5, Project Approvals (PA) receives County APD from County via email. |
| **6.1.2** | **Perform Administrative Review of County APD**  Project Approvals performs pre-analysis of County APD. Administrative review function validates:   * appropriate and complete submission of County APD and all attachments per documented guidelines. * receipt of all required attachments. |
| **6.1.2a** | **Does County APD pass Administrative Review?**  Decision from 6.1.2  Possible outcomes:  If No go to 6.1.4  If Yes go to 6.1.5 |
| **6.1.4** | **Contact County**  Triggered by 6.1.2a, Project Approvals contacts County to notify of Administrative Review results, recommended action or requested clarification. Method of communication is by email.  Possible outcomes of input from County are:  Contact provides clarification to pass Administrative Review  Contact does not provide clarification to pass Administrative Review |
| **6.1.5** | **Send Notification of Receipt of County APD and Administrative Review Status**  Triggered by 6.1.2a, Project Approvals sends:   1. Notice of Receipt of County APD, and 2. Administrative Review Status   to County via email. |
| **6.1.3** | **Determine County APD Reviewers**  See Process Notes for *6.1.3 –* *Determine County APD Reviewers (SAWS and Generic)*  **Dual Review APDs**  When an APD is checked by the County as Dual Review, CWS/CMS owns the responsibility to perform the County APD Processes. In these rare cases, SAWS takes the role of a SME reviewer. SAWS performs its review concurrent with other review functions; SAWS provides a separate disposition letter that is sent to the County on the same email as the disposition letter from CWS/CMS.  When SAWS has prepared its disposition letter as an Approval, but CWS/CMS has findings, the revised and resubmitted APD is re-reviewed by SAWS before full approval is granted by both projects.  CWS/CMS has responsibility for the following activities in the Dual Review Process:   * Dual Review Process Box 7: Initiate and own the APD Review function * Dual Review Process Box 9: Copy APD to SAWS and notify county of dual approval * Dual Review Process Box 11: Compile dual findings and send to County and SAWS * Dual Review Process Box 14: Review repeated submission; when APD is final, send to SAWS * Dual Review Process Box 15: Receive disposition letter from SAWS * Dual Review Process Box 16: Send disposition letter with SAWS letter attached to County, CDSS and SAWS   SAWS has responsibility for the following activities in the Dual Review Process:   * Dual Review Process Box 10: Reviews APD and submits findings to CWS/CMS * Dual Review Process Box 15: After review of final versions of APD, SAWS sends disposition letter to CWS/CMS |
| **6.1.6** | **Update County APD Metrics Log**  Project Approvals updates Metrics Log with content based on published guidelines. |
| **6.1.7** | **Contact SME Reviewers**  Project Approvals enters APD reviewer names into PAU log. |
| **6.1.8** | **Reviewers and Approvers review the County APD**  See Process Notes for *6.1.8 –* *Reviewers Review County APD (SAWS and Generic)* |
| **6.1.9** | **Reviewers and Approvers provide County APD Findings**  See Process Notes for *6.1.8 –* *Reviewers Review County APD (SAWS and Generic)* |
| **6.1.10** | **Compile and analyze findings**  Project Approvals APD Coordinator compiles and analyzes Reviewer findings to determine if County APD is approved.  1. Compile findings:   * Collect any reviewer responses from email * Transfer all finding or recommendation responses onto new *County APD Recommendations and Findings* document.   Steps to create *County APD Recommendations and Findings* document:   1. Open document template and create a new document for this APD in accordance with published naming conventions. 2. Update the Findings identified in *Results of Review 1 s*ection   2. Analyze findings   * Analyze responses to determine recommendations on how to proceed. SME review analysis, final recommendation and review are collected and analyzed to determine next step.   Outcomes are either:   1. Approved County APD 2. *County APD Recommendations and Findings* document |
| **6.1.10a** | **Is County APD approved?**  Decision triggered by activity in 6.1.10.  Possible outcomes:  Yes = Approved  No = *County APD Recommendations and Findings* document has been produced |
| **6.1.11** | **Contact County with County APD Findings Report**  Triggered by 6.1.10a  Project Approvals forwards the *County APD Recommendations and Findings* document to the County via email, leads to 1.2.1. |
| **6.1.10b** | **Does County APD require Federal approval?**  Criteria based on review in 6.1.3:   * CDSS Federal Funding Partner (FFP) approval policies CMS and FMS, * If Federal Funding Partner approval is required (*swim lane 5.0*)   Possible outcomes:  If Yes go to 6.1.12  If No go to 6.1.13 |
| **6.1.13** | **Prepare and send County APD Approval letter to County**  Triggered by 6.1.10b  Project Approvals writes approval letter in accordance with published guidelines. Project Approvals creates and entitles “final” version of the approved APD for record-keeping purposes. Letter and final APD are forwarded to the County via email or hard copy.  leads to 1.1.7.  If this is a dual review APD, CWS/CMS Approval letter and SAWS approval letter are both attached by CWS/CMS to one email along with the final version of the approved APD for record-keeping purposes. |
| **6.1.12** | **Prepare and send County APD package & transmittal letter**  Triggered by 6.1.10a  Project Approvals prepares and sends County APD package and transmittal letter to CMS and FMS. |