

## Attachment D. NPHII Assessment Strategy

**NPHII Assessment Strategy; Data Sources; Timing of Measurement and Notes**  
**FINAL**  
**11/16/2012**

### Outcome 1: Accreditation Readiness

Overarching Assessment Questions	Sub-questions	Specifics	Data Sources
To what extent has NPHII supported increased <b>readiness</b> of its grantees for accreditation by the Public Health Accreditation Board (PHAB)?	In what ways have NPHII grantees addressed the PHAB prerequisites?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of prerequisites                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ % that have current prerequisite as defined by completion within the previous 5 years (each/all)</li> <li>○ % that completed prerequisite(s) in past year</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Annual Assessment  APR/IPR Years 2 and beyond  Workplan Years 3 and beyond
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of prerequisites                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In what ways (if any) are each of the pre-requisites being used by the grantee organizations?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	APR/IPR Years 2 and beyond Qualitative?
	To what extent have NPHII grantees completed self-assessments against the PHAB standards?  For which domains and standards have NPHII grantees identified gaps?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self-assessment against PHAB standards                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ % of grantees that have completed self-assessments</li> <li>○ What is the extent of gaps identified:                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Overall</li> <li>▪ By domain/standard</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Annual Assessment  Work plan Year 3  APR/IPR Years 2 and beyond
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Closing gaps against standards                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ % of grantees conducting efforts to close gaps against standards</li> <li>○ Prioritized domains to address</li> <li>○ Outcomes of efforts- standards met</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
	In what ways has NPHII supported grantee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of grantees engaging in specific accreditation preparation processes such as:</li> </ul>	Annual Assessment

	<p>processes necessary to prepare for accreditation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Developing a timeline for agency’s application to PHAB’s accreditation program</li> <li>○ Developing a “roadmap” to agency’s application to PHAB’s accreditation program</li> <li>○ Organizing agency workforce and documentation for accreditation</li> <li>○ Conducting communications with staff / leadership about accreditation</li> <li>○ That have submitted a statement of intent to pursue accreditation through PHAB</li> </ul>	<p>APR/IPR</p>
	<p>In what ways has NPHII advanced accreditation readiness with other organizations in the grantee’s jurisdiction?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from grantees to other health agencies in grantee jurisdiction (e.g., LHDs, tribes) – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ % of grantees providing support</li> <li>○ Mechanisms/types of support provided (e.g., training and TA, funding such as mini-grants) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ # of jurisdictions receiving each type of support from grantees</li> <li>▪ Funding: Amount of support to jurisdictions—potentially in total \$ or Avg/jurisdiction</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Results achieved</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Annual Assessment IPR/APR PIM-Network evaluation? Qualitative?</p>
	<p>In what ways have the various components of NPHII contributed to grantee readiness for accreditation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How has each component of NPHII contributed to grantee accreditation readiness?</li> <li>• What is the perceived value of each of the components?</li> <li>• Components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ PIM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Knowledge of /ability to advance accreditation readiness</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ PIM Network</li> <li>○ TA/CBA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Grantee use and perceived effectiveness of TA to advance</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Qualitative PIM Network Evaluation TA/CBA Evaluation APR/IPR</p>

		<p>accreditation readiness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Training (including grantee meeting)</li> <li>o Guidance</li> </ul>	
	Which organizational factors facilitate grantees' accreditation readiness?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aspects of organizational QI maturity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Leadership support</li> <li>o Other elements/domains from the QI maturity tool</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Performance Management Capacity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o PIM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Educational background</li> <li>▪ Tenure/turnover</li> </ul> </li> <li>o Existence of a performance management office <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Placement of the performance management office within the organization</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Training of other agency staff in accreditation-readiness related topics or skills</li> </ul>	Qualitative Annual assessment (maturity tool) APR/IPR
	What challenges and successes have grantees experienced when implementing activities to improve accreditation readiness?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenges, successes, and lessons learned that could inform NPHII program improvement and PIM activities</li> </ul>	Qualitative

**Outcome 2: Increased Efficiency / Effectiveness through Quality Improvement**

Overarching Evaluation Questions	Sub-questions	Specifics	Data Sources
----------------------------------	---------------	-----------	--------------

<p>To what extent has NPHII supported improved efficiency and effectiveness of grantees' program-specific and/or agency-wide operations?</p>	<p>How are grantees addressing efficiencies through QI initiatives?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What factors influence the selection of specific initiatives?</li> <li>• How are initiatives implemented (tools/methods used)?</li> <li>• % of grantees addressing efficiencies through QI initiatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overall</li> <li>○ By efficiency outcome (e.g., time saved, money saved)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>APR/IPR: Could add as data elements captured with measures in APR/IPR for Years 3 and beyond</p> <p>Annual Assessment Year 2 Qualitative?</p>
	<p>How are grantees addressing effectiveness through QI initiatives?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What factors influence the selection of specific initiatives?</li> <li>• How are initiatives implemented (tools/methods used)?</li> <li>• % of grantees addressing effectiveness through QI initiatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overall</li> <li>○ By effectiveness category (e.g., increased reach)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>APR/IPR: Could be data elements captured with measures in APR/IPR for Years 3 and beyond</p> <p>Annual Assessment Year 2 Qualitative?</p>
	<p>What outcomes were achieved related to increased efficiencies / effectiveness?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcomes for QI initiatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ % of grantees demonstrating success in achieving outcomes of efficiency or effectiveness</li> <li>○ Efficiency: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ % of grantees demonstrating successful achievement of efficiencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Overall</li> <li>▪ For each outcome (e.g., time saved, money saved)</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Actual results of initiatives (data on time saved, money saved, etc.)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Annual Assessment Year 2</p> <p>APR/IPR: May be some data in Year 2 APR performance measures; Performance Measures Year 3 and beyond</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Effectiveness: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ % of grantees demonstrating successful achievement of effectiveness outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Overall</li> <li>▪ For each outcome (e.g., increased reach, satisfaction)</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Actual results of initiatives (data on increased reach, etc.)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
	In what ways has NPHII advanced quality improvement activities and outcomes within other organizations in the grantee's jurisdiction?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from grantees to other health agencies in grantee jurisdiction (e.g., LHDs, tribes) - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o % of grantees providing support</li> <li>o Mechanisms/types of support provided (e.g., training and TA, funding such as mini-grants) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ # of jurisdictions receiving each type of support from grantees</li> <li>▪ Funding: Amount of support to jurisdictions—potentially in total \$ or Avg/jurisdiction</li> </ul> </li> <li>o Results achieved</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Annual Assessment APR/IPR PIM-Network evaluation? Qualitative?
	In what ways have the various components of NPHII contributed to quality improvement activities and outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How has each component of NPHII contributed to quality improvement activities and outcomes?</li> <li>• What is the perceived value of each of the components?</li> <li>• Components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o PIM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proficiency in QI-related competencies</li> </ul> </li> <li>o PIM Network</li> <li>o TA/CBA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Grantee use and perceived effectiveness of TA to advance quality improvement outcomes</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Qualitative PIM Network Evaluation TA/CBA Evaluation APR/IPR Annual Assessment

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Training (including grantee meeting)</li> <li>o Guidance</li> </ul>	
	Which organizational factors facilitate grantees' positive QI outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aspects of organizational QI maturity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Leadership support</li> <li>o Other elements/domains from the QI maturity tool</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Performance Management Capacity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o PIM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Educational background</li> <li>▪ Tenure/turnover</li> </ul> </li> <li>o Existence of a performance management office</li> <li>o Placement of the performance management office within the organization</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Training of other agency staff in QI methods/tools</li> </ul>	Qualitative Annual Assessment (QI maturity tool) APR/IPR
	What challenges and successes have grantees experienced when implementing activities to improve efficiency and effectiveness?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenges, successes, and lessons learned that could inform NPHII program improvement and PIM activities</li> </ul>	Qualitative

### Outcome 3: Increased Performance Management Capacity

Overarching Evaluation Questions	Sub-questions	Specifics	Data Sources
To what extent has NPHII supported the	How have grantees implemented performance management systems?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of grantees that have established each component</li> <li>• % of grantees that have established / are maintaining a complete systems</li> </ul>	Annual Assessment

implementation of performance management in grantee organizations?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of grantees using data / reports from performance management systems for select purposes</li> <li>• In what other ways are grantees using performance management systems?</li> </ul>	Annual Assessment Qualitative?
	In what ways have grantees strengthened their performance management capacity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has PIMs' proficiency in select performance management-related competencies improved?</li> <li>• % of grantees that have increased performance improvement capacity as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ % of grantees with QI councils/committees</li> <li>○ % of grantees with an agency QI plan</li> </ul> </li> <li>• % of grantees that have spread PM through their organization as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ % of grantee staff with training in PM</li> <li>○ Number of staff dedicated to performance management?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• % of grantees with a dedicated PM office <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Location of office within the agency's organizational structure</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Annual Assessment APR/IPR
	In what ways has NPHII advanced performance management capacity and activities with other organizations in the grantee's jurisdiction?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from grantees to other health agencies in grantee jurisdiction (e.g., LHDs, tribes) - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ % of grantees providing support</li> <li>○ Mechanisms/types of support provided (e.g., training and TA, funding such as mini-grants) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ # of jurisdictions receiving each type of support from grantees</li> <li>▪ Funding: Amount of support to jurisdictions—potentially in total \$ or Avg/jurisdiction</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Results achieved</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Annual Assessment APR/IPR PIM-Network evaluation? Qualitative?

	<p>In what ways have the various components of NPHII contributed to the implementation of performance management?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How has each component of NPHII contributed to the implementation of performance management?</li> <li>• What is the perceived value of each of the components?</li> <li>• Components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ PIM</li> <li>○ Proficiency in performance management-related competencies</li> <li>○ PIM Network</li> <li>○ TA/CBA</li> <li>○ Grantee use and perceived effectiveness of TA to advance performance management capacity</li> <li>○ Training (including grantee meeting)</li> <li>○ Guidance</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Qualitative PIM Network Evaluation TA/CBA Evaluation Annual Assessment APR/IPR</p>
	<p>Which organizational factors facilitate grantees' implementation of performance management?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aspects of organizational QI maturity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Leadership support</li> <li>○ Other elements/domains from the QI maturity tool</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Performance Management Capacity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ PIM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Educational background</li> <li>▪ Tenure/turnover</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Existence of a performance management office</li> <li>○ Placement of the performance management office within the organization</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Training of other agency staff in performance management topics/skills</li> </ul>	<p>Qualitative Annual Assessment (QI maturity tool) APR/IPR</p>



	What challenges and successes have grantees experienced with the implementation of performance management?	Challenges, successes, lessons learned that could inform NPHII program improvement and PIM activities	Qualitative

**Beyond specific NPHII requirements**

<b>Overarching Evaluation Questions</b>	<b>Sub-questions</b>	<b>Specifics</b>	<b>Data Sources</b>
In what ways has NPHII resulted in, or influenced, activities and outcomes beyond specific NPHII cooperative agreement requirements?	What are the unintended outcomes of NPHII?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the unintended positive outcomes of NPHII at grantee organizations?</li> <li>• What are the unintended negative outcomes of NPHII at grantee organizations?</li> </ul>	Qualitative
	What activities <u>beyond cooperative agreement requirements</u> have been conducted?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What additional activities have grantees implemented using NPHII funds (e.g., QI projects beyond minimum requirement, accreditation- or performance-management related activities)?</li> <li>• What additional activities have occurred that were inspired or influenced by NPHII (e.g., locally-funded hiring of additional PM/QI staff, additional adoption of PM/QI)?</li> </ul>	APR/IPR Qualitative
	What is the value-added of the PIM to the grantee organization as a whole?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the breadth of the roles/responsibilities filled by PIMs?</li> <li>• To what extent have PIMs been integrated into the operations of their organizations?</li> <li>• To what extent are PIM-related functions understood within the grantee organization?</li> </ul>	Qualitative

**Additional question to be pursued towards the end of the cooperative agreement / evaluation:**

1. Which of the NPHII components are essential to sustaining the achievement of NPHII outcomes?
  - a. PIM

- b. PIM Network
- c. TA/CBA
- d. Training (including grantee meeting)
- e. Guidance

**Cross-cutting issues to be explored for relevant evaluation questions**

- Context/stratification
  - o Grantee type (STLT)
  - o Funding level (has to be anchored in baseline/starting point)
  - o Starting point along continuum of PM and QI maturity
  - o Governance structure
  - o Free-standing versus super-agency
  - o Executive and legislative influences