

Standards for Public Health in Washington State: 2008 Performance Review Report

Department of Health *Public Health Laboratory*

The Standards and the 2008 Performance Review

Thank you for participating in the performance review of the Standards for Public Health in Washington State. The intent of the Standards is to provide an overarching measurement framework for the many services, programs, legislation, and state and local administrative codes that affect public health. The Washington State Standards for Public Health Performance address all 10 Public Health Essential Services and crosswalk directly to the NACCHO Operational Definition.

The Washington standards and measures exemplify the national goals for public health performance measurement and development of standards—quality improvement, accountability, and science. Points to remember when looking at the reports include:

- The Standards articulate a higher level of performance, often described as stretch standards, not a description of the system as it is performing currently.
- The Standards reflect an improvement cycle; results of the performance assessment should be used to target areas for improvement.

This Report

The site reviews again demonstrated the incredible commitment, creativity and hard work of the people in the public health system. This report is specific to your agency or program and is intended to give you feedback about the materials you provided as a demonstration of how you met each measure. However, before describing the details that are in the report, we want to summarize overall observations regarding your organization's strengths and opportunities for improvement as observed during the site review.

Strengths

- The comprehensiveness of the information on the PHL website, including information for educational offerings and reporting and compliance
- The contact information for technical assistance and consultation to facilitate stakeholder ability to obtain consultation and technical assistance
- The systematic process for the review of educational information and materials
- The PHL Goals for January 2008 with clear objectives, performance measures and related timeframes and the related monitoring and reporting activities
- The evaluation activities for training and educational offerings and for program services
- The internal audit process to assure compliance with timeliness and protocols

Areas for Improvement

- Assure that a listing of clinical laboratories is available for outbreak response
- Link data review and conclusions to actions taken, especially link program evaluation results to program improvements, in other words, close the Plan-Do-Study-Act loop
- Keep working on training tracking, including annual review of the EPRP

The Performance Review Approach

The performance review included 34 local health jurisdictions (LHJs) sites, 20 Department of Health (DOH) program sites and the State Board of Health for a total of 55 sites. Each site was asked to use the Guidelines to prepare for an on-site visit by organizing the documentation supporting the review of each measure.

During the site review, an independent consultant from MCPP Healthcare Consulting and/or a local health jurisdiction reviewer evaluated the documents and scored each measure. When the reviewer had questions regarding the documentation, an informal interview was conducted with the appropriate manager or staff person from the agency. In addition, potential exemplary practice documentation was requested from each site. The on-site reviews concluded with a closing conference in which general strengths and opportunities for improvement were discussed, and feedback on the Standards and assessment process was obtained. All of this information will be compiled into an Overall System report, with recommendations regarding the next steps for the performance improvement of public health practice across the State.

Results of the Site Review

The attached report is a detailed summary for each measure with a list of all the documents used to score the measure and related comments for all measures applicable to the agency or program.

Comparability to the 2005 Evaluation results: Due to the major revisions in the Standards and measures, only some of the 2008 results can be compared to the results of the 2005 Evaluation results. Please use the crosswalk of the 2005 Standards to the 2008 Standards to identify the measures that are comparable between the two cycles.

Scoring and Related Information in the 2008 Review Site Reports

- For each measure [scored by the reviewer]:
 - 2 = demonstrates the measure,
 - 1 = partially demonstrates the measure,
 - 0 = does not demonstrate the measure,
- Also, some measures were Not Applicable to a specific program and these measures are noted as NA.
- *Comments* provide clarification regarding the intent of the measure or the score assigned.
- *Documents* lists, in abbreviated form, the documents that were the basis for the score. When multiple documents were provided and some did not demonstrate the measure or there were many more examples than needed, they are not all listed.
- *Exemplary documents* lists documents requested for review as potential examples in the exemplary practices compendium.
- *For each Standard:* at the end of each Standard, there is a roll-up of the scores on all *applicable* measures in the Standard (the percent of measures scored as *demonstrates*, the percent scored as *partially demonstrates*, the percent scored as *does not demonstrate*).

Next Steps

First, celebrate what you have accomplished. In the two and a half year period between the 2005 Evaluation and this performance cycle, it was clear to the site reviewers that improvements had been developed and implemented. Again, thank you for all of your hard work every day and especially for your work in preparing for the site reviews.

Next, select the areas where you want to improve your performance. All of the information provided in this report is intended to support improvement of your organization's work on behalf of the citizens in your community and Washington State. After you have had a chance to digest this report and share it with staff, you should review the data again to determine which areas of your work might benefit from a focused improvement process. Develop a brief, but specific and doable work plan—don't try to improve everything at once!

In selecting your areas of improvement you will be able to look at your overall strengths and opportunities for improvement (summarized above), or at the scores of specific Standards or measures. You will be assisted in this effort by several initiatives:

- **Exemplary practices:** The Exemplary Practices Compendium provides you with documentation from many of the LHJs and DOH programs in Washington State. Potential exemplary practice documents were gathered from each of the sites and the very best examples for each measure will be organized into a electronic tool kit. This material will be available by year-end 2008 at www.doh.wa.gov/philp/Standards/BestPractices/StandardsExemplaryPractices.htm

- **Statewide initiatives** such as the Multistate Learning Collaborative and other efforts like the 5930 Initiative provide opportunities for formal efforts to improve performance. Based on the recommendations in the system-wide report, the PHIP process will adopt additional statewide initiatives related to the measures.

Finally, begin preparing now for the next performance review. The Standards Performance process itself has been conducted using quality improvement principles and methods, including the Plan-Do-Study-Act cycle. The next cycle is planned for 2009-2011, with site visits probably occurring in the spring of 2011. Your program may save the documentation you have used in this cycle as a good starting point for continuing to identify documentation for demonstrating performance. Other strategies for improving your performance and documentation include:

- Adopt or adapt as many exemplary practices as possible to improve your performance against the measures. There is no reason to “re-invent the wheel”, when another LHJ or DOH program may have an excellent process or documentation method that you can start using with less time and effort.
- Identify methods for getting technical assistance from other state programs or from LHJs that may have targeted the same areas for improvement. Great gains can be made through sharing ideas and resources.

Again, we thank you for all your work in preparing for this 2008 performance review, and especially for the terrific work you do in protecting and promoting the health of the citizens of Washington State that we were privileged to review.

PUBLIC HEALTH LABORATORY

	Measure	Score	Comments	Documents
1.5 S	For programs/activities that collect and use data, description of method for LHJs or other state programs to obtain technical assistance or consultation on how to collect and analyze health data. Note: Consultation is focused on health data collection and analysis methods and expertise, and not on specific requirements such as contract performance/compliance. Documentation of consultation or technical assistance to LHJs or other state programs regarding how to collect and analyze health data (at least two examples).	2	Documentation not provided regarding a description of the method for LHJs or other state programs to obtain technical assistance or consultation on how to collect and analyze health data.	HIVKit_Oct07; NBSCollection IrisInstructions_Apr08; RabiesSpecimen_Oct07; DOH website; PHL website re: tech assistance
1.9 S	For projects or activities that include research-based information, one example of collaboration with outside researchers on community health that demonstrates at least one of the activities listed below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identification of appropriate populations, geographic areas or partners, or • active involvement of the LHJ and/or community, or • provision of data and expertise to support research, or • facilitation of efforts to share research findings with state stakeholders, the community, governing bodies and policy makers. 	2		MicroSDFCollection_Mar07; NBSFabrayDisease_Sep07
2.8 S	Information about public health activities, including at least one example of each of the topics listed below: • educational offerings, AND • reporting and compliance requirements. Note: If the program/activity does not have any reporting and compliance requirements, the program/activity is exempt from demonstrating performance.	2		Chemical Incident Response brochure; TopiPHL_2-8_Elaborations_Feb08; TrainingCalendar_Jan08; Notification Conditions & Washington's Hospitals 12/07
2.9 S	For programs and activities that provide regulations and codes to the public, the information is publicly available for all the topics listed below (one example of each): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • written policies, AND • permit/license application requirements, AND • administrative code, AND • enabling laws. Note: Form of documentation should indicate how it is made available to the public. 	2		CommunicableDiseaseWAC-Jan08; NBSWebHelp; NotifiableConditions_Jan08; website: PHL Directory of Service policies and procedures. PHL does not do permitting or licensing of other labs.
2.10 S	Two examples of educational material in non-English language OR One example of educational material in non-English language and example of how interpretation assistance is available (such as a language line)	2		GreekNBS_Mar08; SpanishSputum_Mar08; InterpreterInstructions_Mar08

3.1 S	Documentation of community and stakeholder review of health data, including a set of core indicators. Note: The intent is for DOH Staff to present health data to community groups, such as advisory groups or agency committees with community member participation, to get input and feedback from community members and recommendations for action. Recommendations from community or stakeholder groups for at least one of the following actions: • further investigation. OR • new program efforts, OR • policy direction, OR • prevention priorities.	1	No documentation of community and stakeholder review of health data.	NBSScreeningRecommendations_De c07;
3.2 S	Gap analysis for critical health services and for prevention services reported to at least one of the groups listed below: • LHJs, OR • appropriate state, regional or local stakeholders, OR • state level colleagues. Results of program evaluations reported to at least one of the groups listed below: • LHJs, OR • appropriate state, regional or local stakeholders, OR • state level colleagues. Use of gap analysis and program evaluations in building partnerships with state, regional, and/or local stakeholders and/or state level colleagues.	2		Ra-228 Decision Paper (2007); PHL The Ra-228 Backlog ppt(Oct 2007); Drinking Water Radium-228 line graph, Why do we test for Radium- 228 in Water ppt (undated)
4.1 S	Information on notifiable conditions with required reporting timeframes and specific, current 24-hour DOH contact information, in the form of a designated telephone line or a designated contact person, are provided to: • health care providers, including new licensees, AND • laboratories including new licensees. Distribution of notifiable conditions information (at least annually to assure that contact number is current).		This measure is not applicable as CDEPI does this.	
4.2 S	Written protocols for clinical laboratories that address all three types of activities listed below: • handling of specimens, AND • storage of specimens, AND • transportation of specimens. Distribution of protocols to clinical laboratories.	2		www.doh.wa.gov/EHSPHL/PHL/direc tory_of_service (Collection and Submission of Samples and Specimens, Packaging and Shipping); OrasureCollection_Jan08;
4.3 S	Written procedures describe how expanded lab capacity is made readily available when needed for outbreak response. List of clinical laboratories with capacity to analyze specimens dated within the last 14 months.	1	No documentation provided listing clinical laboratories with capacity to analyze specimens dated within the last 14 months.	MultiState MOU 081504 (out of date); FDAMOU_Jul07
4.4 S	Description of the method(s) for LHJs and other stakeholders to obtain technical assistance from state programs during outbreaks, environmental health events or other public health emergencies on all three activities listed below:	2		NBS Notice of how to obtain help; Directory of Services_Sep07; KingCo_Dec07; WSU_Apr08; Packing & Shipping Competency

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • monitoring, AND • reporting, AND • disease intervention management. <p>Distribution of procedures to LHJs and other stakeholders within last 14 months.</p> <p>Documentation of consultation or technical assistance to LHJs regarding the monitoring, reporting and disease management during an outbreak, EH event or other emergency (at least two examples) within last 24 months.</p>			Checklist- CAP 2007 (sample of three included)
5.5 S	Documentation for most recent 24 months of all new employees receiving orientation to the agency EPRP. Annual review of agency EPRP with all employees (twice within last 24 months). Note: May be division or program specific documentation for every division or program or agency wide with documentation of attendance from every division or program.	0	Training documents provided did not document planning for responding to public health emergencies.	BTTraining_Nov08, EPRPTraining_Sep07, YagerNEO_Jan07
6.1 S	Written descriptions of key program or activity components relevant to prevention and health education activities provided by DOH, LHJs or through contracts with community partners. Strategies (evidence-based or promising practices) for prevention and health education activities provided by DOH, LHJs or through contracts with community partners for any of the groups listed below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • individuals, or • families, or • community in general. 	2		FoodCollectionKits_Dec07; MicroEPIRoadshow_Sep06; Foodborne Disease and the PHLs: A Foodborne Pathogen Quick-Reference Guide for Food Sanitarians
6.3 S	Documented review (at least every other year) of prevention and health education information of all types (including technical assistance). Two examples of updated, expanded or contracted prevention and health education information reflecting revised regulations, changes in community needs, evidence-based practices and health data. Written description of the process to conduct all the activities listed below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • organize materials, AND • develop materials, AND • distribute or select materials, AND • evaluate materials, AND • update materials 	2		NBSdata/review_Aug06; NBSDataReview_Dec07; WebDOSReview_Jan08
6.4 S	Descriptions of at least two partnerships with the community and/or stakeholders to implement population based prevention and health education activities. Each of the two examples must demonstrate different implementation methods (e.g., train the trainer, technical assistance, social marketing, workshops, peer education).		Not within scope of work, therefore this measure is NA.	
6.5 S	Description of the method(s) for LHJs and other stakeholders to obtain consultation and technical assistance from state programs regarding prevention policies and/or initiatives that	2		DOSTrainingContact_sept07; email re: Psittacosis question/TA 12/28/07; 10/18/07 LRN Reference

	include at least one of the types of activities listed below: • development of prevention services, • delivery of prevention services, • evaluation of prevention programs and activities. Distribution/availability of procedures to LHJs and other stakeholders within last 14 months. Documentation of consultation or technical assistance to LHJs or other stakeholders regarding emergency preparedness (at least two examples) within last 24 months.			Laboratory letter re: CAP_LPS-B survey
6.7 S	Written review of prevention, health promotion, early intervention and outreach services and activities that indicates evaluation for compliance with all the types of information listed below: • evidence based practice, AND • professional standards, AND • state and federal requirements.	2		NBSAuburnPerformanceNov07; SelectAgent_Aug07; CAPPT_Nov07
8.1 S	For each program reviewed, a written description of program or activity goals, objectives and performance measures, including consultation to LHJs or other stakeholders, shows use of a systematic process or model. This does not have to be a single, agency wide document, although individual program plans ideally link to agency wide plans such as strategic and QI plans. For each program reviewed a written description(s) of professional requirements, knowledge, skills, and abilities for staff working in the program.	2		PHL Goals_Jan08; KitsapBTPerformance_Aug07; PDF WGS Position Description_Dec07; WADOH RFA: RFA-FDA-ORA-2006-4 Food Safety and Security Monitoring Project- Radiological Health (8/29/06)
8.2 S	For each program reviewed, reports of program performance measures with analysis against goals and trended data where possible. For each program reviewed, documentation showing use of the analysis for at least one of the activities listed below: • improve program activities and services, OR • revised educational curricula or materials.	2	Suggest that QI measures reflect opportunities for performance improvement.	NBSAuburnPerformance_Nov07; NBSQIMeasures_Jan08
8.3 S	Use of additional of information to improve services and activities, including an example for each program from the information sources listed below: • experiences from service delivery, including public requests, testimony to the State BOH, analysis of health data, and information from outreach, screening, referrals, case management, follow-up, investigations complaint/inspections, prevention and health education activities, OR • funding availability, OR • evidence-based practices.	2		MRSARecommendations_Dec07; NBS-SBOHTestimony_Jan08
8.4 S	For programs/activities that have initiated specific community collaborative projects, description of community collaboration project includes all of the factors listed below: • analysis of data, AND • establishment of goals, objectives and performance measures, AND • evaluation of the initiatives.	1	Evaluation of the initiative not included in the plan	MicroSurge_Mar08; CommunityOutreach_Mar08, SICF_May07

8.6 S	One example for each program being reviewed of workshops, other in-person trainings (including technical assistance) or other health education activities with analysis of effectiveness conducted within last 24 months. One example of educational curricula or material revised to address evaluation results dated within last 24 months.	2		EvaluationImprovement_Jun07; TrainingData_Oct07; TrainingEvaluation_Feb07
8.7 S	For programs/activities that have contracts with LHJs or with other contractors, template(s) to support performance measurement by LHJs and other contractors include both types of information listed below: • methods to document performance measures, AND • methods for monitoring (data collection) performance measures. Distribution of templates for performance measurement to LHJs and other contractors within last 24 months.	1	Documentation not provided of distribution of templates for performance measurement to LHJs and other contractors within last 24 months.	ConConStats_Dec07
8.8 S	Description of the method(s) for LHJs or state programs to obtain consultation and technical assistance regarding program evaluation methods and tools. Distribution/availability of procedures to LHJs and state programs within last 14 months. Documentation of consultation or technical assistance to LHJs or state programs regarding program evaluation methods and tools (at least two examples) within last 24 months.	2		Directory of Service_Sep07; DOSContactList_Sep07; IPPConference_Nov07; TBConference_Nov07; KingCo_Dec07; PNL_Mar07; WSU_Apr08
8.9 S	Aggregated annual internal audit* results for last two years of on a sample of program or activity records for repetitive activities, such as the development or use of prevention and health education materials [see 6.3 S] or health alerts [see 2.3 S], including data on timeliness and compliance with program protocols; or for following established procedures.	2		ELSPerformanceMeasures_Nov07; MicroQI_Dec07; PFGEPPerfMeasures_Jan08; BTPerfMeasures_Dec07
9.2 S	For programs/activities that have contracts with vendors or contractors, contract review for legal requirements is documented for two contracts executed in last 24 months. Regular (at least quarterly) monitoring of two contracts with comparison of actual performance to deliverables and conclusions on needed actions.	2	The focus of this measure is on PHL's contracts with external vendors, not for contracts where PHL is the contractee. Therefore the EM Audit does not seem to fall within the scope of this measure. Only one example of monitoring a contract was presented for the Con Con for Regional Labs.	Con Con for Regional Labs --1/07 with quarterly report of activity, WADDL Contract--12/06, Outreach Contract with Norton Sarnold Assoc. with monthly monitoring
10.4 S	Report of staff attending training and/or educational sessions within the last three years for at least three of the following topics, as appropriate: • Assessment and data analysis • Program evaluation to assess program effectiveness •	1	The training logs indicated more than three training sessions for each of the three staff, but no other PHL's staff	EPRP training log for Microbiology, Training log for three staff

	Confidentiality and HIPAA requirements • Communications, including risk, media relations • State laws/regulations/policies, including investigation/compliance procedures • Specific EPRP duties • Community involvement and capacity building methods • Prevention and health promotion methods and tools • Quality Improvement methods and tools • Customer service • Cultural competency • Information technology tools • Leadership • Supervision and coaching • Job specific technical skills Documentation of the content of the training sessions listed in the staff training report(s), such as agendas, PowerPoint presentations, websites screen prints, other training materials and/or brochures.		member's training information was presented	
11.5 S	Documentation of agency requirements for the use and transmission of personal health and other types of protected data to all three groups listed below: • within agency, AND • with other agencies or LHJs, AND • partner organizations. Agency requirements define which data requires confidential and secure transmission (e.g., any identifiable information) and methods to assure confidential and secure transmission. For programs/activities that collect and use identifiable information, two examples of sharing or transfer of data indicate compliance with the security and protection requirements.	2		Confidentiality Agreement with UW--6/07, DOH policy 17.005 confidentiality, Instructions for Completing the Data Sharing Agreement--3/08, Examples of requests for data for Newborn Screening Specimen

Score Totals for: Public Health Laboratory

% Demonstrates	77%
% Partially Demonstrates	19%
% Does Not Demonstrate	4%

Note: Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding