

Standards for Public Health in Washington State: 2008 Performance Review Report *Kitsap County Health District*

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 local health jurisdiction 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 data driven work of the last several years, as reflected in the 2006 Annual Report and the Core Public Health Indicators, as well as other reports such as the HIV/AIDS analysis
- The leadership in the community, which is demonstrated across all areas reviewed, but is especially significant in the Access work
- The website, which serves the public by supporting downloadable EH guidance and applications, access to food service establishment inspection scores, fact sheets on an array of topics, and a listing of staff and their contact information for each program area
- The Region 2 planning and implementation activities, especially demonstrated in EPRP documents and applied to the daily notifiable conditions work
- The communicable disease liaison with local health care providers, with the binder and a tracking system of contacts that is also used to update blast fax and other lists
- The Common Ground project, to develop informatics that support chronic disease work
- The EH work plans (Food Safety), which have clear objectives and performance measures
- The use of data and population priority setting to focus the budget, documented in the budget alignment work sheet

Areas for Improvement

- Develop program work plans with goals, objectives and quantifiable performance measures, using the EH template or other templates from the exemplary practices compendium that will be posted in late 2008
- Build on the foundation of program plans to create the overall strategic plan
- Only after these pieces are in place, use program data to develop an annual, focused QI plan

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 an internal DOH 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 organized into three sections. First there is a summary showing each of the 12 standards and the performance on each measure in each standard. This section is color coded with green to indicate that the measure was demonstrated, yellow to indicate that the measure was partially demonstrated and red to indicate that the measure was not demonstrated. The measure is blank if it was scored as "not applicable". This summary gives the agency immediate information on performance in each of the standards. The second section 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 at the agency level. In this second section, measures that were scored at the program level show the calculated score derived from the program scores and the documentation and comments fields are blank. The third section of this report is the program detail with the list of documents and comments for each of the three programs reviewed for the LHJ. The scores from each of the three programs were aggregated to provide a single score for that measure at the agency level that is reported in section two.

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 to your roll-up for the Standard is a roll-up for peer counties, and then a statewide roll-up. Your peer counties are identified below, based on the DOH analysis of Dominant Rural Urban Commuting Area Codes (for detail on this methodology, please go to the DOH website <http://www.doh.wa.gov/Data/Guidelines/RuralUrban.htm>). There is no intent, in an improvement-focused effort, to compare specific organizations to one another. However, this roll-up data does provide each site reviewed with performance benchmarks.

- *For all Standards:* the final segment of this part of the report provides you with a roll-up of all Standards, with the same benchmark data from the peer group and statewide roll-ups.

Peer Groupings

Small Town/Rural	Mixed Rural	Large Town	Urban
Adams	Clallam	Asotin	Benton/Franklin
Columbia	Grays Harbor	Chelan/Douglas	Clark
Garfield	Island	Grant	Cowlitz
Jefferson	Mason	Kittitas	King
Klickitat	Skagit	Lewis	Kitsap
Lincoln	Skamania	Walla Walla	Pierce
NE Tri-County		Whitman	Snohomish
Okanogan			Spokane
Pacific			Thurston
San Juan			Whatcom
Wahkiakum			Yakima

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 and your Board of Health, 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 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/php/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.

Strategies for building on your current performance:

- Save the documentation you have used in this cycle as a good starting point for continuing to identify documentation for demonstrating performance.
- Establish an electronic document library for collecting documentation and to facilitate the use of an electronic format for the next cycle.
- 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 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 state programs, or from other 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.

Summary Site Report

Demonstrates = 2

Partially Demonstrates = 1

Does Not Demonstrate = 0

Standard 1: Community Health Assessment

Measure	Score	Compliance Demonstration
1.1 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
1.2 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
1.3 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
1.4 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
1.5 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
1.6 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
1.7 L	2	Fully Demonstrated

Standard 2: Communications to the Public and Key Stakeholders

Measure	Score	Compliance Demonstration
2.1 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
2.2 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
2.3 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
2.4 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
2.5 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
2.6 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
2.7 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
2.8 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
2.9 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
2.10 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
2.11 L	1	Partially Demonstrated

Standard 3: Community Involvement

Measure	Score	Compliance Demonstration
3.1 L	1	Partially Demonstrated
3.2 L	1	Partially Demonstrated

Standard 4: Monitoring and Reporting Threats to Public's Health

Measure	Score	Compliance Demonstration
4.1 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
4.2 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
4.3 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
4.4 L	1	Partially Demonstrated
4.5 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
4.6 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
4.7 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
4.8 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
4.9 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
4.10 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
4.11 L	2	Fully Demonstrated

Standard 5: Planning for and Responding to Public Health Emergencies

Measure	Score	Compliance Demonstration
5.1 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
5.2 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
5.3 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
5.4 L	1	Partially Demonstrated
5.5 L	0	Not Demonstrated

Standard 6: Prevention and Education

Measure	Score	Compliance Demonstration
6.1 L	1	Partially Demonstrated
6.2 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
6.3 L	0	Not Demonstrated
6.4 L	1	Partially Demonstrated

Standard 7: Helping Communities Address Gaps in Critical Health Services

Measure	Score	Compliance Demonstration
7.1 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
7.2 L	1	Partially Demonstrated
7.3 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
7.4 L	1	Partially Demonstrated

Standard 8: Program Planning and Evaluation

Measure	Score	Compliance Demonstration
8.1 L	1	Partially Demonstrated
8.2 L	1	Partially Demonstrated
8.3 L	0	Not Demonstrated
8.4 L	0	Not Demonstrated
8.5 L	1	Partially Demonstrated
8.6 L	1	Partially Demonstrated
8.7 L	0	Not Demonstrated
8.8 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
8.9 L	1	Partially Demonstrated

Standard 9: Financial and Management Systems

Measure	Score	Compliance Demonstration
9.1 L	1	Partially Demonstrated
9.2 L	2	Fully Demonstrated

Standard 10: Human Resource Systems

Measure	Score	Compliance Demonstration
10.1 L	1	Partially Demonstrated
10.2 L	1	Partially Demonstrated
10.3 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
10.4 L	1	Partially Demonstrated
10.5 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
10.6 L	2	Fully Demonstrated

Standard 11: Information Systems

Measure	Score	Compliance Demonstration
11.1 L	1	Partially Demonstrated
11.2 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
11.3 L	1	Partially Demonstrated
11.4 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
11.5 L	2	Fully Demonstrated

Standard 12: Leadership and Governance

Measure	Score	Compliance Demonstration
12.1 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
12.2 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
12.3 L	0	Not Demonstrated
12.4 L	0	Not Demonstrated
12.5 L	2	Fully Demonstrated
12.6 L	1	Partially Demonstrated
12.7 L	1	Partially Demonstrated
12.8 L	0	Not Demonstrated
12.9 L	0	Not Demonstrated
12.10 L		

Overall Score Totals

	Specific LHJ Totals	Peer Group Totals	Combined LHJ Totals
% Demonstrates	59%	64%	55%
% Partially Demonstrates	29%	31%	34%
% Does Not Demonstrate	12%	4%	12%

Note: Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Detailed Agency Report

Standard 1: Community Health Assessment

Data about community health, environmental health risks, health disparities and access to critical health services are collected, tracked, analyzed and utilized along with review of evidence-based practices to support health policy and program decisions.

	Measure	Score	Comments	Documents	Exemplary Documents
1.1 L	<p>Annual report or various separate reports with trended data (collected at least every other year) on a set of core indicators that include measures of:</p> <p>population health status AND, communicable disease AND, environmental health risks and related illnesses, AND health disparities AND, access to critical health services.</p> <p>Note: The focus of this measure is the largest set of public health data that includes more than a specific set of core indicators or the set of 32 local Public Health Indicators. See the Performance Management Glossary for definitions of health data.</p> <p>Written definition or description of quantitative data.</p> <p>Qualitative data such as barrier analysis and focus group or interview results (See Glossary)</p>	2		<p>Kitsap County Core Public Health Indicators, 10/31/07; KCHD website/Health Indicators/Reports; Epidemiology of HIV AIDS in Kitsap County, 12/19/07; KCHD 2006 Annual Report</p>	KCHD website/Health Indicators
1.2 L	<p>Description of data tracking and analysis process, or reports of analyzed data indicating regular (systematic) process. Note: Health data, as defined in the Glossary, includes Local Public Health Indicator Report.</p> <p>Review of evidence-based practices.</p> <p>Use of health data to (at least one of the activities below):</p>	2		<p>Kitsap County Core Public Health Indicators, 10/31/07; KCHD website/Health Indicators/Reports; Epidemiology of HIV AIDS in Kitsap County, 12/19/07; KCHD 2006 Annual Report</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • signal changes in health disparities and priority health issues, or • identify emerging health issues, or • identify implications for changes in communicable disease or environmental health investigation, intervention, or education efforts • gap analysis comparing existing services to projected need for services • recommendations for policy decisions, program changes, or other actions [see measure 1.3 L] 				
1.3 L	Written recommendations for policy decisions, program changes, budget changes or other actions. For health policy decisions not tied to the analysis in 1.2L, the health data that led to the health policy decision that was made. Note: The intent is to assure that health policy decisions are based on data, whether the health policy flows from review of data analysis or from the health decision making process.	2		Kitsap County Core Public Health Indicators, 10/31/07; Kitsap Board of Health Regular Meeting, 6/6/06; Kitsap Board of Health Regular Meeting, 4/8/08	
1.4 L	Report or material showing that local health data are shared with at least one of the three levels of organization listed below: • local organization, OR • state organization, OR • regional organization. Note: The intent is to assure that data or materials are shared are based with all appropriate levels of organizations.	2	BOH Minutes 10/2/07 show that KCHD 2006 Annual Report was shared with BOH.	King County Board of Health Agenda, 6/5/07; KCHD 2006 Annual Report, BOH Minutes 10/2/07	KCHD 2006 Annual Report
1.5 L	Description of method for community members to obtain technical assistance from LHJ on assessment methods, data collection or other issues.	2		KCHD Data Request Procedure, 11/27/07; KCHD Request for Public Records; KCHD website/Health Information Resources	KCHD website/Health Information Resources

1.6 L	List of LHJ staff responsible for assessment activities. Training or assessment meeting agendas and materials from last 24 months (at least two examples). Attendance documentation for staff listed above from last 24 months (at least one for each staff person)	2		KCHD Administrative Services Division Organization Chart, 3/4/08; Statewide Assessment Meeting, 9/26/07; Statewide Assessment Meeting, 9/20/06; KCHD Employee Training History, 5/1/08	
1.7 L	Collaboration with outside researchers on activities that benefit the community. If the program does not use any research-based information, this should be stated.	2		Robert Woods Johnson Common Ground Grant: Transforming Public Health Information Systems; School of Public Health student report to Kitsap County	

Score Totals for Standard 1: Community Health Assessment

	Specific LHJ Totals	Peer Group Totals	Combined LHJ Totals
% Demonstrates	100%	89%	78%
% Partially Demonstrates	0%	8%	14%
% Does Not Demonstrate	0%	3%	8%

Note: Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Standard 2: Communications to the Public and Key Stakeholders

Public information is a planned component of all public health programs and activities. Urgent public health messages are communicated quickly and clearly.

	Measure	Score	Comments	Documents	Exemplary Documents
2.1 L	Description(s) of public health's mission and role in communication documents (at least one example) Note: This might include	2		KCHD website; KCHD 2006 Annual Report	

	implementing elements of the PHIP Communications Plan.				
2.2 L	Publicly available 24 hour contact information for the LHJ current within last 14 months. Phone numbers for weekday and after-hours emergency contacts are available to (evidence of availability to both groups listed below): • law enforcement, AND • appropriate local agencies and organizations, such as tribal governments, schools and hospitals.	2	Website lists emergency numbers but does not explicitly identify 24/7 or after-hours availability. Having this information explicitly identified would strengthen this measure.	KCHD website; Region 2, PH EPRP, Tab A, Regional Duty Officer Protocol, 8/31/07	
2.3 L	At least one example of urgent communication sent within the last 24 months to each of the groups listed below: • media, AND • key stakeholders (these may be locally defined).	2		KCHD News Release regarding Local Public Health Agencies Provide Guidance on MRSA, 11/7/07; Fax to Health Care Providers in Region 2 regarding Carbon Monoxide Hazard Signs, 12/22/2006; Letter to parents of Cedar Heights Junior High regarding meningococcal disease	
2.4 L	Contact lists for media and key stakeholders with effective or review date within last 14 months. Description/demonstration of availability to staff	2		KCHD News Release Email Distribution Groups and News Release Media Distribution List, 12/4/07; Memo to staff regarding News Release Distribution Procedures, 12/4/07	
2.5 L	Written description(s) of roles for working with the news media that identify the timeframes for communications.	2		KCHD Policies/Procedures A-13 on News Media Relations, reviewed	KCHD Policies/Procedures A-13 on News Media Relations, reviewed

	Written expectations for all staff regarding information sharing and response to questions (includes direct services, reception staff, not just lead communicators).			6/6/08	6/6/08
2.6 L	Written instructions on how to create a clear and accurate health alert and a media release. Written description of distribution steps and recipients for both health alerts and media releases.	2		KCHD Policies/Procedures A-13 on News Media Relations, reviewed 6/6/08, Appendices A (DOH Media Relations Training) and B (news release template); KCHD EPRP, (SECURES) 8/31/07	KCHD Policies/Procedures A-13 on News Media Relations, reviewed 6/6/08, Appendices A (DOH Media Relations Training) and B (news release template); KCHD EPRP, (SECURES) 8/31/07
2.7 L	Public information that includes at least one example of each of the topics listed below: • health data, AND • information on environmental health risks, AND • communicable disease and other threats to the public's health, AND • access to the local health system, healthcare providers and prevention resources.	2		KCHD website	
2.8 L	Information about public health activities, including at least one example of each of the topics listed below: • educational offerings, AND • reporting and compliance requirements.	2			
2.9 L	Publicly available information for all the topics listed below (one example of each): • written policies, AND • local ordinances, AND • permit/license application requirements, AND • administrative code, AND • enabling laws. Form of documentation should indicate how it is made available to the public.	2			

2.10 L	Two examples of educational material in non-English language OR 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			
2.11 L	Local resource/referral list(s) of each of the types of providers listed below: • private communicable disease treatment providers, AND • public communicable disease treatment providers, AND • providers of critical health services, AND • providers of preventive services. Note: In some cases providers for critical health services are also providers for preventive services. One example of using list to generate a referral.	1	Although some providers are listed on the KCHD website, no example is provided of using a provider list to generate a referral.	KCHD website	

Score Totals for Standard 2: Communications to the Public and Key Stakeholders

	Specific LHJ Totals	Peer Group Totals	Combined LHJ Totals
% Demonstrates	91%	84%	75%
% Partially Demonstrates	9%	16%	23%
% Does Not Demonstrate	0%	0%	2%

Note: Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Standard 3: Community Involvement

Active involvement of community members and development of collaborative partnerships address community health risks and issues, prevention priorities, health disparities and gaps in healthcare resources / critical health services.

	Measure	Score	Comments	Documents	Exemplary Documents
3.1 L	Documentation of community and stakeholder review of local health data, including Local Public Health Indicators. Note: The intent is for LHJ staff to present local 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			
3.2 L	Gap analysis for local critical health services and for prevention services reported to at least one of the groups listed below: • local stakeholders or community groups, or • regional partners, or • statewide program colleagues. Results of program evaluations reported to at least one of the groups listed below: • local stakeholders or community groups, or • regional partners, or • statewide program colleagues. Use of gap analysis and program evaluations in building partnerships with state, regional, and/or local stakeholders and/or state level colleagues.	1			

Score Totals for Standard 3: Community Involvement

	Specific LHJ Totals	Peer Group Totals	Combined LHJ Totals
% Demonstrates	0%	9%	13%
% Partially Demonstrates	100%	91%	76%
% Does Not Demonstrate	0%	0%	10%

Note: Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Standard 4: Monitoring and Reporting Threats to Public's Health

A monitoring and reporting process is maintained to identify emerging threats to the public's health. Investigation and control procedures are in place and actions documented. Compliance with regulations is sought through education, information, investigation, permit/license conditions and appropriate enforcement actions.

	Measure	Score	Comments	Documents	Exemplary Documents
4.1 L	Information on notifiable conditions with required reporting timeframes and specific, current 24-hour LHJ 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 current 24 hour contact information)	2			
4.2 L	Information (not the notifiable conditions poster) about managing reportable conditions, such as treatment options or isolation requirements. Evidence of distribution to health care providers	2			
4.3 L	Written description of process for identifying new providers in the community and engaging them in	2			

	the reporting process, OR Reports showing regular identification of new providers in the community and actions to engage them in the reporting process.				
4.4 L	Written protocols for receiving and managing information on notifiable conditions and other public health concerns that include all the information listed below: • role-specific steps to take when receiving information AND • guidance on providing information to the public AND • description of the roles and relationship between communicable disease, environmental health and other programmatic activities.	1			
4.5 L	Tracking system for notifiable conditions that includes documentation of all the information listed below: • the initial report, AND • investigation, AND • findings, AND • subsequent reporting to state and federal agencies. Note: the system may also track the broader category of mandated reporting.	2			
4.6 L	Protocols for specific conditions contain all of the information listed below for each specific condition: • case investigation steps (including timeframes for initiating the investigation), AND • reporting requirements, AND • contact information, AND • clinical management, including referral to care. Protocols document which evidence based practices (EBP) relating to the most effective population-based methods of disease prevention and control have been incorporated in specific conditions and the source of	2			

	the EBP.				
4.7 L	Description of the method for tracking public health concerns, if not already captured by the systems described in either 4.5 or 4.8. Two examples of reports of concern received from the public indicating referral to appropriate agency for response.	2		KCHD website/hard copy complaint submittal form, database, two examples	
4.8 L	Tracking system for environmental health investigations and compliance activities that includes documentation of all the information listed below: • the initial report, AND • investigation, AND • findings, AND • compliance action, AND • subsequent reporting to state and federal agencies.	2			
4.9 L	Written procedures for investigation and compliance actions, based on local policies, ordinances and state laws contain all of the information listed below for each action: • case investigation steps (including timeframes for initiating the investigation), AND • type of documentation needed to take enforcement action.	2			
4.10 L	Protocols for the use of emergency biologics (for example, the "yellow book").	2			
4.11 L	Protocols for exercising legal authority for disease control (including quarantine and non-voluntary isolation)	2		Region 2 EPRP Tab C: Isolation and Quarantine	

Score Totals for Standard 4: Monitoring and Reporting Threats to Public's Health

	Specific LHJ Totals	Peer Group Totals	Combined LHJ Totals
% Demonstrates	91%	88%	82%
% Partially Demonstrates	9%	12%	14%
% Does Not Demonstrate	0%	1%	4%

Note: Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Standard 5: Planning for and Responding to Public Health Emergencies

Emergency preparedness and response plans and efforts delineate roles and responsibilities in regard to preparation, response, and restoration activities as well as services available in the event of communicable disease outbreaks, environmental health risks, natural disasters and other events that threaten the health of people.

	Measure	Score	Comments	Documents	Exemplary Documents
5.1 L	Examples of communications in which the primary contact person(s) is clearly identified for health risk reporting purposes (evidence of distribution to both groups listed below): • health providers, AND • public safety officials.	2	The Region 2 Public Health Regional Officer Protocol, 4/24/06, is included in a community liaison binder that is delivered to health care providers throughout the community during visits with providers held twice throughout the year, providing evidence of distribution to health providers.	KCHD EPRP, Tab B: Notifications, 8/31/07; Region 2 Public Health Regional Officer Protocol, 4/24/06; Fax to Health Care Providers in Region 2 regarding Carbon Monoxide Hazard Signs	
5.2 L	Local public health emergency preparedness and response plans (EPRP) address all types of emergencies listed below: • environmental health risks, AND • communicable disease outbreaks, AND other public health emergencies. The LHJ EPRP describes the specific roles and responsibilities for LHJ programs/staff regarding local response and management of all	2		KCHD EPRP, 8/31/07	

	<p>types of responses listed below: disease outbreaks, AND environmental health risks, AND natural disasters or other threats to the public's health.</p> <p>The LHJ EPRP includes a section that describes processes for exercising the plan, including after-action review and revisions of the plan.</p> <p>Report of drills and/or after-action reviews (at least one example)</p>				
5.3 L	<p>Reports (at least one example) indicate LHJ leadership in community level public health emergency activities including all the activities listed below: • planning, AND • exercises AND • response/restoration activities.</p> <p>Reports (at least one example) indicate full LHJ participation in other community emergencies with public health implications including all the activities listed below: • planning, AND • exercises AND • response activities.</p>	2		<p>Region 2 Public Health Communications and Epidemiological Exercise After Action Report, 6/12/07; Pre-Exercise Report, Region 2/Kitsap County, undated</p>	
5.4 L	<p>Written description or list of public health services that are essential for the public to access in different types of emergencies. Note: The intent of this measure is that the LHJ has identified the essential services it provides during a public health emergency and has told the public how to access those services. An example is a list of the issues on the emergency response webpage for which the public should contact the agency.</p> <p>At least two examples of information distributed/available to the public on how to access the essential services during an emergency.</p>	1	<p>There is no evidence of a list of public health services that are essential for the public to access in different types of emergencies.</p>	<p>Region 2, Public Health Emergency Response Plan, Tab C: Isolation and Quarantine, 8/31/07; KCHD website</p>	

5.5 L	Documentation for most recent 24 months of all new employees receiving orientation to the LHJ EPRP. Annual review of LHJ EPRP with all employees (twice within last 24 months). Note: Review may be specific documentation for every program or division or agency wide with documentation of attendance from every division or program.	0			
-------	---	---	--	--	--

Score Totals for Standard 5: Planning for and Responding to Public Health Emergencies

	Specific LHJ Totals	Peer Group Totals	Combined LHJ Totals
% Demonstrates	60%	65%	59%
% Partially Demonstrates	20%	29%	29%
% Does Not Demonstrate	20%	5%	12%

Note: Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Standard 6: Prevention and Education

Prevention and education is a planned component of all public health programs and activities. Examples include wellness/healthy behaviors promotion, healthy child and family development, as well as primary, secondary and tertiary prevention of chronic disease/disability, communicable disease (food/water/air/waste/vector borne) and injuries. Prevention, health promotion, health education, early intervention and outreach services are provided.

	Measure	Score	Comments	Documents	Exemplary Documents
6.1 L	Written descriptions of key program or activity components relevant to prevention and health education activities provided by LHJs or through contracts with community partners. Strategies (evidence-based or promising practices) for prevention and health education activities	1			

	provided by the LHJ or by contractors for any of the groups listed below: • individuals, OR • families, OR • community in general.				
6.2 L	<p>Descriptions of prevention priorities for prevention, health promotion, early intervention and outreach services for general population or targeted, at-risk populations. (See measure 12.7 L).</p> <p>Analyses (at least two examples) of community health data and program evaluation data used to develop prevention priorities described above. These analyses may also include data on local issues, funding availability, experience in service delivery, or information on evidence based practices.</p>	2		<p>KCHD Core Public Health Indicators 10/31/07, KCHD Annual Report 06/Health Priorities, Epidemiology of HIV/AIDS in Kitsap County, Teen Screen data analysis 4/18/08</p>	
6.3 L	<p>Documented review (at least every other year) of prevention and health education information of all types (including technical assistance).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Written description of the process to conduct all the activities listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • organize materials, AND • develop materials, AND • distribute or select materials, AND • evaluate materials, AND • update materials. 	0			
6.4 L	<p>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</p>	1			

	(e.g., train the trainer, technical assistance, social marketing, workshops, or peer education).				
--	--	--	--	--	--

Score Totals for Standard 6: Prevention and Education

	Specific LHJ Totals	Peer Group Totals	Combined LHJ Totals
% Demonstrates	25%	50%	39%
% Partially Demonstrates	50%	48%	54%
% Does Not Demonstrate	25%	2%	7%

Note: Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Standard 7: Helping Communities Address Gaps in Critical Health Services

Public health organizations convene, facilitate and provide support for state and local partnerships intended to reduce health disparities and specific gaps in access to critical health services. Analysis of state and local health data is a central role for public health in this partnership process.

	Measure	Score	Comments	Documents	Exemplary Documents
7.1 L	LHJ leadership or participation in community process that includes health care providers and is based on information about local resources and trends to address all the issues and activities listed below: • health disparities and/or access to critical health services (including prevention services), AND • set goals, AND • take action.	2		Work with Harrison Medical Center related to deliveries; Kitsap County Behavioral Health Strategic Plan, 3/3/06	Work with Harrison Medical Center related to deliveries; Kitsap County Behavioral Health Strategic Plan, 3/3/06
7.2 L	Local resource/referral list of private and public communicable disease treatment providers, providers of critical health services and providers of preventive services. List must contain all four types of providers. [See measure 2.11 L]. Assessment information on access to	1	No evidence of a current local resource/referral list of private and public communicable disease treatment providers, providers of critical health services and providers of preventive services.	Access to Primary Care Providers in Kitsap County, 4/7/04	

	the four types of providers listed above. One example of using the assessment of access to services to determine where detailed documentation and gap analysis of local capacity is needed.				
7.3 L	Surveys (at least one example within last 24 months) to assess the availability of critical health services and barriers to access. One gap analysis for access to critical health services based on the results of the surveys for availability and other assessment information.	2		Access to Primary Care Providers in Kitsap County, 4/7/04	
7.4 L	Program and activity planning processes, contracts or access initiatives reflect both types of activities listed below (at least one example of each): • coordination of health service delivery among health care providers AND • linkage of individuals to medical home.	1	No demonstration provided of linkage of individuals to medical home.	Spectrum School Based Health Clinic; Welcome Home Baby, 12/26/07	

Score Totals for Standard 7: Helping Communities Address Gaps in Critical Health Services

	Specific LHJ Totals	Peer Group Totals	Combined LHJ Totals
% Demonstrates	50%	68%	57%
% Partially Demonstrates	50%	25%	30%
% Does Not Demonstrate	0%	7%	13%

Note: Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Standard 8: Program Planning and Evaluation

Public health programs and activities identify specific goals, objectives and performance measures and establish mechanisms for regular tracking, reporting, and use of results.

	Measure	Score	Comments	Documents	Exemplary Documents
8.1 L	<p>For each program reviewed, a written description of program or activity goals, objectives and performance measures 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.</p> <p>For each program reviewed, written description(s) of professional requirements, knowledge, skills, and abilities for staff working in the program.</p>	1			
8.2 L	<p>For each program reviewed, reports of program performance measures with analysis against goals and trended data where possible.</p> <p>For each program reviewed, evidence 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.</p>	1			
8.3 L	<p>Use of additional sources of information to improve services and activities, including an example from each program being reviewed from the information sources listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • experiences from service delivery, including public requests, testimony to the BOH, analysis of health data, and information from outreach, screening, referrals, case 	0			

	management, follow-up, investigations complaint/inspections, prevention and health education activities, OR • funding availability, OR • evidence-based practices.				
8.4 L	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.	0			
8.5 L	Customer service standards with related program performance measures for all employees with job functions that require them to interact with the general public, stakeholders and partners. Evaluation results of performance on customer service standards.	1	Not clear that EH customer service survey is in use throughout the organization. No evaluation results provided on performance.	EH customer service survey template, KCHD website/customer service commitment	
8.6 L	One example for each program being reviewed of evaluations 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 for each program being reviewed of educational curricula or material revised to address evaluation results dated within last 24 months.	1			
8.7 L	Aggregated annual internal audit* results for last two years of on a sample of communicable disease investigations records including data on timeliness and compliance with disease-specific protocols. OR *Note: An internal audit is a review of a sample of case files or other types of	0			

	<p>documented work, such as investigation reports, for requirements like timeliness, accuracy, and compliance with protocols or regulations. A sample of 30 files is considered sufficient to identify trends in compliance.</p> <p>Aggregated annual internal audit* results for last two years of on a sample of environmental health investigation/compliance action records including data on timeliness and compliance with investigation/compliance procedures.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Aggregated annual internal audit* results for last two years of on a sample of program or activity case write-ups, such as for client visit; including data on timeliness and compliance with program protocols or on repetitive activities such as the development or use of prevention and health education materials [see 6.3 L] or health alerts [see 2.6 L]</p>				
8.8 L	<p>List of significant outbreaks, environmental events, natural disasters, table top exercises or public health emergencies that have occurred during the last 24 months. After-action/table top evaluation for each event listed above with evidence that each evaluation included all the activities listed below: • participation from stakeholders; such as hospitals, providers and involved community organizations, as appropriate, AND • participation by LHJ staff from communicable disease, environmental health and other public health programs, AND •</p>	2		Communication and Epi Exercise AAR 6/12/07	

	review of the accessibility of essential public health services (See 5.4 L), AND • assessment of how the event was handled, AND • documentation of what worked well, AND • identification of issues, AND • recommend changes in response procedures and other process improvements				
8.9 L	Two examples that demonstrate the use of after action/table top recommendations to improve two or more of the LHJ processes listed below: • monitoring and tracking processes • disease-specific protocols • investigation/compliance procedures • laws and regulations • staff roles • communication efforts • access to essential public health services (See 5.4), • emergency preparedness and response plans • other LHJ plans, such as facility/operations plan. Organizational goals and objectives reflect recommended changes from after action /table top evaluations.	1	No documentation that actions listed were completed.	Communication and Epi Exercise AAR 6/12/07 Improvement Plan	

Score Totals for Standard 8: Program Planning and Evaluation

	Specific LHJ Totals	Peer Group Totals	Combined LHJ Totals
% Demonstrates	11%	31%	24%
% Partially Demonstrates	56%	60%	58%
% Does Not Demonstrate	33%	9%	18%

Note: Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Standard 9: Financial and Management Systems

Effective financial and management systems are in place in all public health organizations.

	Measure	Score	Comments	Documents	Exemplary Documents
9.1 L	<p>Review of the LHJ annual budget shows: • alignment with the organization's strategic plan AND • linkage to the organization's goals. Regular (at least quarterly) budget monitoring with comparison of actual to budget and conclusions on needed actions.</p> <p>Description of process for assuring that all revenues are considered and collected.</p>	1	Although no organization-wide strategic plan is identified, the Budget Matrix identifies priorities for funding.	<p>KCHD 2008 Budget Matrix and Priorities, undated; KCHD Board of Health Finance Committee Agenda, 7/31/07 with item on 2007 Second Quarter Budget Status Report; KCHD 1st Quarter Revenue and Expenditure Summaries, January - March 2008; KCHD Accounting Policies and Procedures, Accounts Receivable for Environmental Health, 1/1/0; Accounts Receivable for Community Health, 5/1/08; Accounts Receivable Write-offs, 7/1/97</p>	<p>KCHD 2008 Budget Matrix and Priorities, undated; KCHD 1st Quarter Revenue and Expenditure Summaries, January - March 2008; KCHD Accounting Policies and Procedures, Accounts Receivable for Environmental Health, 1/1/0; Accounts Receivable for Community Health, 5/1/08; Accounts Receivable Write-offs, 7/1/97</p>
9.2 L	<p>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.</p>	2		<p>Email regarding DRC Facilitation Contract, dated 12/14/07; Email regarding Lewis County Public Health Assessment Program Services Contract, dated 2/20/08; Interlocal Agreement for Professional Services between the KCHD, Jefferson County</p>	

				Health and Clallam County Health Department, for period 1/1/08 - - 6/30/08; Contract for Professional Services with Parametrix, 1/12/06	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Score Totals for Standard 9: Financial and Management Systems

	Specific LHJ Totals	Peer Group Totals	Combined LHJ Totals
% Demonstrates	50%	55%	35%
% Partially Demonstrates	50%	41%	54%
% Does Not Demonstrate	0%	5%	11%

Note: Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Standard 10: Human Resource Systems

Human resource systems and services support the public health workforce.

	Measure	Score	Comments	Documents	Exemplary Documents
10.1 L	Human resources policies on all topics listed below: • promotion of diversity and cultural competence, AND • methods for compensation decisions, AND • personnel rules, AND • recruitment and retention of qualified and diverse staff. Description or evidence of how these policies are made available to staff.	1	Documents provided as demonstration are note dated.	KCHD Personnel Rules, current revised date unknown; KCHD Recruitment and Selection Procedures and Checklist, undated	
10.2 L	Documentation of how job descriptions for program positions or job classifications with a description of how they are made available to staff. Note: Job descriptions or job classifications are not required to be presented as documentation for this	1	Documents provided as demonstration are not dated.	KCHD Supervisor's Guide to Performance Evaluation, undated; Spreadsheet entitled Evaluations Due, undated; KCHD	

	<p>measure.</p> <p>Tracking report with listing of staff evaluation completion dates for all eligible (employed more than 12 months). Note: This measure includes public health staff, but not staff from human services if the departments are combined. This does include Environmental Health staff even if they are organized under another department. To fully demonstrate performance in this element the tracking report must indicate that more than 80% of employees have completed performance evaluations in 2007. Validation that an annual training plan is included in evaluation for each employee.</p>			Position Description, undated	
10.3 L	<p>Description of process to assure that employees have the appropriate licenses, credentials and experience to meet job qualifications and perform job requirements.</p>	2		DOH Provider Credential Service	
10.4 L	<p>Report of staff attending training and/or educational sessions within the last three years for at least three of the following topics, as appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment and data analysis • Program evaluation to assess program effectiveness • 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 	1			

	<p>technology tools • Leadership • Supervision and coaching • Job specific technical skills</p> <p>Note: Fully demonstrates requires that 50% or more staff in each program being reviewed have attended at least three training sessions within the last three years. Programs with < 50% of staff having attended three training sessions in the last three years will be scored partially demonstrates and programs with 0% of staff having attended three training sessions in the last three years will be scored Does Not Demonstrate. Training documentation may be from automatically generated Learning Plan from the Smart PH system or a site specific excel or other type of tracking report for staff attendance at training and educational sessions throughout the year. 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.</p>				
10.5 L	<p>Confidentiality and HIPAA policy. List of staff required per policy to sign confidentiality agreement with signature and date of signature, OR 10% sample of signed staff confidentiality statements.</p>	2		<p>KCHD Policies/Procedures, Legal Policy L-2, Protecting Confidentiality of Health Information; KCHD Statement of Confidentiality - signed and dated for 10% sample;</p>	
10.6 L	<p>Evaluation reports of facility and relevant work processes for compliance with ADA requirements within last 24 months.</p>	2		<p>Letter from LMN Architects regarding Norm Dicks Government Center -</p>	

				Building Accessibility, dated 3/28/05; Letter from Rice Fergus Miller Architecture & Planning, LLP regarding Accessibility in the Kitsap County Health District tenant improvements, dated 3/30/05	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Score Totals for Standard 10: Human Resource Systems

	Specific LHJ Totals	Peer Group Totals	Combined LHJ Totals
% Demonstrates	50%	58%	50%
% Partially Demonstrates	50%	41%	36%
% Does Not Demonstrate	0%	2%	14%

Note: Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Standard 11: Information Systems

Information systems support the public health mission and staff by providing infrastructure for data collection, analysis, and rapid communication.

	Measure	Score	Comments	Documents	Exemplary Documents
11.1 L	Description of IT safety and security processes that contains all of the activities listed below: • assuring protection of data (passwords, firewalls, backup systems) and data systems, AND • addressing security, AND • addressing redundancy, AND • appropriate use. Documentation of monitoring these processes for compliance with the policies and procedures described above at least once in last 14 months.	1	Documentation of monitoring processes for compliance with policies and procedures is limited.	KCHD Policies/Procedures, Administrative Policy A-1, Information Technology Security and Use, 1/4/08; Email regarding Backup Exec Alert: Job Success, dated 5/2/08	

11.2 L	Documentation indicates that LHJ staff have computer technology as described above and access to trained staff for assistance in using the technology.	2	Visual observation provided evidence that trained staff available for assistance in using technology.	KCHD 2008 Desktop/Laptop Lifecycle Management Upgrades, based on 3-year lifecycle desktop/4-year lifecycle laptops, 5/6/08	
11.3 L	Agency or county IS plan includes strategies for the use of future technologies by the LHJ.	1		Common Ground: Transforming the Public Health Information Systems, A National Program supported by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, KCHD: Improving Chronic Disease Information Systems and Applying Methodologies, Project Charter and Scope Statement	Common Ground: Transforming the Public Health Information Systems, A National Program supported by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, KCHD: Improving Chronic Disease Information Systems and Applying Methodologies, Project Charter and Scope Statement
11.4 L	Website contains at least the areas of information and content listed below: • 24 hr. contact number for reporting health emergencies, AND • notifiable conditions line and/or contact, AND • health data and core indicator information, AND • how to obtain technical assistance and consultation from the LHJ, AND • links to legislation, regulations, codes, and ordinances, AND • information and materials on communicable disease, environmental health and prevention activities or links to other sites where this information is available.	2		KCHD web site	
11.5 L	Documentation of agency requirements for the use and transmission of personal health and	2		KCHD Consent & Authorization for Release and Sharing	

	<p>other types of protected data to all three groups listed below: • within the agency, AND • other LHJs and/or agencies, AND • partner organizations.</p> <p>Agency requirements define which program data requires confidential and secure transmission (e.g., any identifiable information) and methods to assure confidential and secure transmission.</p> <p>For programs that collect and share identifiable information, two examples of sharing or transfer of data indicate compliance with the security and protection requirements.</p>			<p>of Information, 6/23/03; Ahlers & Associates web page on HIPAA Compliance and Security</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Score Totals for Standard 11: Information Systems

	Specific LHJ Totals	Peer Group Totals	Combined LHJ Totals
% Demonstrates	60%	69%	50%
% Partially Demonstrates	40%	27%	36%
% Does Not Demonstrate	0%	4%	13%

Note: Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Standard 12: Leadership and Governance

Leadership and governance bodies set organizational policies and direction and assure accountability.

	Measure	Score	Comments	Documents	Exemplary Documents
12.1 L	<p>Board of Health documents, including two examples of BOH minutes, indicate that the BOH performs all the activities listed below: • orients new members, AND • sets operating rules including guidelines for communications with senior managers, AND • votes on and documents actions it takes.</p>	2		<p>KCHD Member Orientation Materials, 3/08; Kitsap County Board of Health Regular Meeting, 3/14/06; Kitsap County Board of Health Regular Meeting, 3/6/07;</p>	<p>KCHD Member Orientation Materials, 3/08 - Table of Contents</p>

				Kitsap County Board of Health Regular Meeting, 9/11/07	
12.2 L	BOH review of an annual report or various separate reports with trended data on a set of core indicators that include measures of: • Local Public Health Indicators AND • community health status, AND • communicable disease AND • environmental health risks and related illness, AND • access to critical health services. Documented BOH recommendations for actions on health policy decisions.	2		KCHD Board of Health 2008 Notebook; KCHD Board of Health 2007 Notebook; Kitsap County Board of Health Agenda, 6/5/07, including item on Annual Health Indicators Review	
12.3 L	BOH review of an annual report or various separate reports with specific statements of progress toward agency and program goals.	0	No documentation provided demonstrating progress toward program goals is reported annually to the BOH.		
12.4 L	BOH review of written recommendations based on evaluation of each significant outbreak, environmental event, natural disaster, table top exercise or other public health emergency.	0	No documentation provided demonstrating BOH review of recommendations based on evaluation of each significant outbreak, environmental event, natural disaster, table top exercise or public health emergency.		
12.5 L	Written guidelines for effective assessment and management of clinical and financial risk. Certificate or evidence of insurance coverage for the LHJ's assessed risk.	2		KCHD Policies/Procedures, A-7, Draft Risk Management Policy, 6/1/09; Washington Governmental Entity Pool 2008 Memorandum of Coverage, coverage period 9/1/07-8/31/08 and associated Entity Liability Exposure Questionnaire, Policy Year 2009 (September 1, 2008 - August 31, 2009); Financial Note to	

				Members Annual Report 2007, Note to Washington Governmental Entity Pool Member Financial Statements;	
12.6 L	Organization-wide strategic/operations plan includes both topics listed below: • vision and mission statements, AND • goals, objectives and performance measures for priorities or initiatives	1	Vision, mission and priorities are included in the KCHD 2006 Annual Report.	KCHD 2006 Annual Report	
12.7 L	Organization-wide strategic/operations plan includes all the topics listed below: • assessment activities, and the resources needed, such as staff or outside assistance, to perform the work, AND • use of Local Public Health Indicators and other health data to support health policy and program decisions, AND • addressing communicable disease, environmental health events or other public health emergencies, including response and communication issues identified in the course of after-action evaluations, AND • prevention priorities intended to reach the entire population or at-risk populations in the population.	1	An organization-wide strategic/operations plan does not exist although some strategic objectives are identified for some of the topics listed for this measure.	KCHD 2006 Annual Report; Health Information Resources Program: Community and Environmental Health Assessment, 12/07	
12.8 L	BOH minutes indicate review and adoption of the agency strategic plan within the last 24 months	0	No documents provided demonstrating BOH adoption of the agency strategic plan.		
12.9 L	Organization-wide quality improvement plan contains specific objectives that include all the topics listed below: • address opportunities for improvement identified through use of health data including from data sources such as: the core indicators, including Local Public Health Indicators, OR program evaluation results, OR	0	No documents provided demonstrating the existence of an organization-wide quality improvement plan.		

	<p>outbreak response or after-action evaluation results, OR the strategic planning process, AND • may be program specific and tied to the program evaluation process, or they may reach across programs and activities for operational improvements that impact much of the organization, AND • identify timeframes for completion of objectives and responsible staff, AND • identify performance measures.</p>				
12.10 L	<p>Written review of the quality improvement objectives from the previous year include: • performance measures are tracked, reported and used to assess the impact of improvement actions, AND • meaningful improvement is demonstrated in at least one objective Note: Meaningful improvement can be shown by comparing re-measurement(s) of an outcome to the baseline measurement with a description of the action or intervention taken to improve performance. Re-measurement must show an improved result in the outcome measure. Revised QI plan with new, revised and deleted objectives is made based upon the review</p>		<p>Because an organization-wide quality improvement plan has not been identified, this measure does not apply.</p>		

Score Totals for Standard 12: Leadership and Governance

	Specific LHJ Totals	Peer Group Totals	Combined LHJ Totals
% Demonstrates	33%	46%	34%
% Partially Demonstrates	22%	41%	38%
% Does Not Demonstrate	44%	14%	29%

Note: Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Program Report

COMMUNICABLE DISEASE

	Measure	Score	Comments	Documents	Exemplary Documents
2.8 L	Information about public health activities, including at least one example of each of the topics listed below: • educational offerings, AND • reporting and compliance requirements.	2		KCHD website/communicable disease, 2008 Spring Provider Update,	
2.9 L	Publicly available information for all the topics listed below (one example of each): • written policies, AND • local ordinances, AND • permit/license application requirements, AND • administrative code, AND • enabling laws. Form of documentation should indicate how it is made available to the public.	2		KCHD website/communicable disease w/ DOH links	
2.10 L	Two examples of educational material in non-English language OR 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		Telelanguage service, TB flyer in Spanish	
3.1 L	Documentation of community and stakeholder review of local health data, including Local Public Health Indicators. Note: The intent is for LHJ staff to present local 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.	1	No documentation of recommendations from the Advisory Committee	Epidemiology of HIV/AIDS in Kitsap County, HIV/AIDS Advisory Committee	

	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.				
3.2 L	<p>Gap analysis for local critical health services and for prevention services reported to at least one of the groups listed below: • local stakeholders or community groups, or • regional partners, or • statewide program colleagues.</p> <p>Results of program evaluations reported to at least one of the groups listed below: • local stakeholders or community groups, or • regional partners, or • statewide program colleagues.</p> <p>Use of gap analysis and program evaluations in building partnerships with state, regional, and/or local stakeholders and/or state level colleagues.</p>	2		Common Ground: Improving Chronic Disease Information Systems and Applying Methodologies 10/22/07	
4.1 L	<p>Information on notifiable conditions with required reporting timeframes and specific, current 24-hour LHJ 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.</p> <p>Distribution of notifiable conditions information (at least annually to assure current 24 hour contact information)</p>	2		KCHD website/communicable disease, Community Liaison binder and log sheet	
4.2 L	<p>Information (not the notifiable conditions poster) about managing reportable conditions, such as treatment options or isolation requirements.</p> <p>Evidence of distribution to health care</p>	2		5/1//07 PH Update: Severe Adenovirus Respiratory Infections, 2/8/07 Norovirus to Long Term Care/Assisted	

	providers			Living, Region 2 Newsletter 3/08, contacts data base	
4.3 L	Written description of process for identifying new providers in the community and engaging them in the reporting process, OR Reports showing regular identification of new providers in the community and actions to engage them in the reporting process.	2		Description of process, Community Liaison binder and log, example of change	
4.4 L	Written protocols for receiving and managing information on notifiable conditions and other public health concerns that include all the information listed below: • role-specific steps to take when receiving information AND • guidance on providing information to the public AND • description of the roles and relationship between communicable disease, environmental health and other programmatic activities.	2		DOH Guidelines for Notifiable Conditions, Region 2 EPRP Appendix I and VI 8/31/07, Foodborne Outbreak Procedure (undated)	
4.5 L	Tracking system for notifiable conditions that includes documentation of all the information listed below: • the initial report, AND • investigation, AND • findings, AND • subsequent reporting to state and federal agencies. Note: the system may also track the broader category of mandated reporting.	2		PHIMS example and log history, HIV and TB reporting forms	
4.6 L	Protocols for specific conditions contain all of the information listed below for each specific condition: • case investigation steps (including timeframes for initiating the investigation), AND • reporting requirements, AND • contact information, AND • clinical management, including referral to care. Protocols document which evidence	2		DOH Guidelines	

	based practices (EBP) relating to the most effective population-based methods of disease prevention and control have been incorporated in specific conditions and the source of the EBP.				
4.10 L	Protocols for the use of emergency biologics (for example, the “yellow book”).	2		Yellow Book	
5.5 L	Documentation for most recent 24 months of all new employees receiving orientation to the LHJ EPRP. Annual review of LHJ EPRP with all employees (twice within last 24 months). Note: Review may be specific documentation for every program or division or agency wide with documentation of attendance from every division or program.	0	No documentation provided on annual review of EPRP with all employees (earthquake drill does not meet the intent of this measure) or use of a checklist with new employees	New Employee Orientation Checklist 5/1/08	New Employee Orientation Checklist 5/1/08
6.1 L	Written descriptions of key program or activity components relevant to prevention and health education activities provided by LHJs or through contracts with community partners. Strategies (evidence-based or promising practices) for prevention and health education activities provided by the LHJ or by contractors for any of the groups listed below: • individuals, OR • families, OR • community in general.	1	Documentation provided described strategies, but no overall identification of key CD program components relevant to prevention and health education.	MRSA presentation 07, Disease Transmission/Infection Control/Bloodborne Pathogens presentation, 2008 Spring Provider Update	
6.3 L	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:	0	No documentation of a regular process to review and update health education information.		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • organize materials, AND • develop materials, AND • distribute or select materials, AND • evaluate materials, AND • update materials. 				
6.4 L	<p>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, or peer education).</p>	2		Harrison Hospital Infection Control Committee minutes Feb- April 08, OESD MRSA presentation, Hospice presentation on Infectious Disease	
8.1 L	<p>For each program reviewed, a written description of program or activity goals, objectives and performance measures 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.</p> <p>For each program reviewed, written description(s) of professional requirements, knowledge, skills, and abilities for staff working in the program.</p>	1	<p>The intent of this measure is the development of goals, objectives and performance measures for the CD program as a whole, which would be subsequently reflected in individual work plans and establishing the skills necessary to do the work identified in individual work plans. The documentation provided minimally relates to the intent.</p>	Nurse Epidemiologist position description (undated)	
8.2 L	<p>For each program reviewed, reports of program performance measures with analysis against goals and trended data where possible.</p> <p>For each program reviewed, evidence 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.</p>	0	No documentation provided		
8.3 L	<p>Use of additional sources of information to improve services and activities, including an example from each program being reviewed from</p>	0	No documentation provided of how the use of the examples have resulted in improved services and activities	KCHD Core PH Indicators, Facility EP Assessment template	

	<p>the information sources listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • experiences from service delivery, including public requests, testimony to the 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. 				
8.4 L	<p>For programs/activities that have initiated specific community collaborative projects, description of community collaboration project includes all of the factors listed below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • analysis of data, AND • establishment of goals, objectives and performance measures, AND • evaluation of the initiatives. 	0	No documentation provided		
8.6 L	<p>One example for each program being reviewed of evaluations of workshops, other in-person trainings (including technical assistance) or other health education activities with analysis of effectiveness conducted within last 24 months.</p> <p>One example for each program being reviewed of educational curricula or material revised to address evaluation results dated within last 24 months.</p>	1	No documentation provided of use of evaluations to revise materials.	Spring Provider Update 4/16/08 and evaluation forms	
8.7 L	<p>Aggregated annual internal audit* results for last two years of on a sample of communicable disease investigations records including data on timeliness and compliance with disease-specific protocols. OR *Note: An internal audit is a review of a sample of case files or other types of documented work, such as investigation reports, for requirements like timeliness, accuracy, and compliance with</p>	0	No documentation available		

	<p>protocols or regulations. A sample of 30 files is considered sufficient to identify trends in compliance.</p> <p>Aggregated annual internal audit* results for last two years of on a sample of environmental health investigation/compliance action records including data on timeliness and compliance with investigation/compliance procedures.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Aggregated annual internal audit* results for last two years of on a sample of program or activity case write-ups, such as for client visit; including data on timeliness and compliance with program protocols or on repetitive activities such as the development or use of prevention and health education materials [see 6.3 L] or health alerts [see 2.6 L]</p>				
10.4 L	<p>Report of staff attending training and/or educational sessions within the last three years for at least three of the following topics, as appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment and data analysis • Program evaluation to assess program effectiveness • 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 <p>Note: Fully demonstrates requires</p>	1	Specific content for trainings listed in log not available	Staff training logs	

	<p>that 50% or more staff in each program being reviewed have attended at least three training sessions within the last three years. Programs with < 50% of staff having attended three training sessions in the last three years will be scored partially demonstrates and programs with 0% of staff having attended three training sessions in the last three years will be scored Does Not Demonstrate. Training documentation may be from automatically generated Learning Plan from the Smart PH system or a site specific excel or other type of tracking report for staff attendance at training and educational sessions throughout the year. 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.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--

Score Totals for: Communicable Disease

% Demonstrates	52%
% Partially Demonstrates	22%
% Does Not Demonstrate	26%

Note: Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

FOOD SAFETY

	Measure	Score	Comments	Documents	Exemplary Documents
2.8 L	Information about public health activities, including at least one example of each of the topics listed below: • educational offerings, AND • reporting and compliance requirements.	2		KCHD website/Food Safety and Living Environment	
2.9 L	Publicly available information for all the topics listed below (one example of each): • written policies, AND • local ordinances, AND • permit/license application requirements, AND • administrative code, AND • enabling laws. Form of documentation should indicate how it is made available to the public.	2		KCHD website/Food Business Information/Regulations w/links to DOH	
2.10 L	Two examples of educational material in non-English language OR 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		Food Worker's Manual in spanish and vietnamese	
3.1 L	Documentation of community and stakeholder review of local health data, including Local Public Health Indicators. Note: The intent is for LHJ staff to present local 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	0	The focus of this measure is on presenting local food safety data to community stakeholders and engaging them in further action. No documentation that this occurred.	KCHD Core PH Indicators	

	of the following actions: • further investigation. OR • new program efforts, OR • policy direction, OR • prevention priorities.				
3.2 L	<p>Gap analysis for local critical health services and for prevention services reported to at least one of the groups listed below: • local stakeholders or community groups, or • regional partners, or • statewide program colleagues.</p> <p>Results of program evaluations reported to at least one of the groups listed below: • local stakeholders or community groups, or • regional partners, or • statewide program colleagues.</p> <p>Use of gap analysis and program evaluations in building partnerships with state, regional, and/or local stakeholders and/or state level colleagues.</p>	0	No documentation provided		
4.4 L	Written protocols for receiving and managing information on notifiable conditions and other public health concerns that include all the information listed below: • role-specific steps to take when receiving information AND • guidance on providing information to the public AND • description of the roles and relationship between communicable disease, environmental health and other programmatic activities.	1	Procedure not dated to reflect current practice	Foodborne Outbreak Procedure (undated)	
4.8 L	Tracking system for environmental health investigations and compliance activities that includes documentation of all the information listed below: • the initial report, AND • investigation, AND • findings, AND • compliance action, AND • subsequent reporting to state and federal agencies.	2		DOH and CDC forms for investigating foodborne outbreaks	

4.9 L	Written procedures for investigation and compliance actions, based on local policies, ordinances and state laws contain all of the information listed below for each action: • case investigation steps (including timeframes for initiating the investigation), AND • type of documentation needed to take enforcement action.	2		P&P Enforcement of EH Requirements for Food Service Establishments 1/07, Enforcement of Red High Risk Items	
5.5 L	Documentation for most recent 24 months of all new employees receiving orientation to the LHJ EPRP. Annual review of LHJ EPRP with all employees (twice within last 24 months). Note: Review may be specific documentation for every program or division or agency wide with documentation of attendance from every division or program.	0	No documentation provided on annual review of EPRP with all employees (earthquake drill does not meet the intent of this measure) or use of a checklist with new employees	New Employee Orientation Checklist 5/1/08	
6.1 L	Written descriptions of key program or activity components relevant to prevention and health education activities provided by LHJs or through contracts with community partners. Strategies (evidence-based or promising practices) for prevention and health education activities provided by the LHJ or by contractors for any of the groups listed below: • individuals, OR • families, OR • community in general.	1	Documentation provided described strategies, but no overall identification of key food safety program components relevant to prevention and health education.	Food Safety Class schedule	
6.3 L	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.	0	No documentation of a regular process to review and update health education information, or the process that led to the creation/revision of the examples provided.		

	Written description of the process to conduct all the activities listed below: • organize materials, AND • develop materials, AND • distribute or select materials, AND • evaluate materials, AND • update materials.				
6.4 L	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, or peer education).	1	One example only provided of food safety health education in partnership with another organization	Olympia College Safe Serve program/information available on website/Food Manager Training	
8.1 L	For each program reviewed, a written description of program or activity goals, objectives and performance measures 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, written description(s) of professional requirements, knowledge, skills, and abilities for staff working in the program.	2		2008 Food Safety Work Plan, Job description	2008 Food Safety Work Plan
8.2 L	For each program reviewed, reports of program performance measures with analysis against goals and trended data where possible. For each program reviewed, evidence 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.	1	The monthly report provided does not track all of the performance measures outlined in the work plan; no examples of using the data for program improvement.	Monthly Report 5/07	
8.3 L	Use of additional sources of information to improve services and	0	The focus of this measure is on program improvement, using		

	<p>activities, including an example from each program being reviewed from the information sources listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • experiences from service delivery, including public requests, testimony to the 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. 		<p>information from a variety of sources. No documentation provided of program improvement.</p>		
8.4 L	<p>For programs/activities that have initiated specific community collaborative projects, description of community collaboration project includes all of the factors listed below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • analysis of data, AND • establishment of goals, objectives and performance measures, AND • evaluation of the initiatives. 		No community collaborative projects		
8.6 L	<p>One example for each program being reviewed of evaluations of workshops, other in-person trainings (including technical assistance) or other health education activities with analysis of effectiveness conducted within last 24 months.</p> <p>One example for each program being reviewed of educational curricula or material revised to address evaluation results dated within last 24 months.</p>	0	<p>This measure starts with gathering evaluations from training or similar activities and then analyzing the evaluations and making changes based on the evaluation analysis. The documentation provided did not reflect any of this information.</p>		
8.7 L	<p>Aggregated annual internal audit* results for last two years of on a sample of communicable disease investigations records including data on timeliness and compliance with disease-specific protocols. OR *Note: An internal audit is a review of a sample of case files or other types of documented work, such as investigation reports, for</p>	0	<p>This measure describes a process of reviewing a sample of completed food inspections/reinspections to assure that they were conducted according to the protocols of the program. The result would be aggregate data about program performance, which could also be used for individual performance evaluations, but the evaluation alone does not meet the</p>	Sample staff evaluation	

	<p>requirements like timeliness, accuracy, and compliance with protocols or regulations. A sample of 30 files is considered sufficient to identify trends in compliance.</p> <p>Aggregated annual internal audit* results for last two years of on a sample of environmental health investigation/compliance action records including data on timeliness and compliance with investigation/compliance procedures.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Aggregated annual internal audit* results for last two years of on a sample of program or activity case write-ups, such as for client visit; including data on timeliness and compliance with program protocols or on repetitive activities such as the development or use of prevention and health education materials [see 6.3 L] or health alerts [see 2.6 L]</p>		intent of this measure.		
10.4 L	<p>Report of staff attending training and/or educational sessions within the last three years for at least three of the following topics, as appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment and data analysis • Program evaluation to assess program effectiveness • 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 	1	Specific content for trainings listed in log not available	Staff Training log	

	<p>coaching • Job specific technical skills Note: Fully demonstrates requires that 50% or more staff in each program being reviewed have attended at least three training sessions within the last three years. Programs with < 50% of staff having attended three training sessions in the last three years will be scored partially demonstrates and programs with 0% of staff having attended three training sessions in the last three years will be scored Does Not Demonstrate. Training documentation may be from automatically generated Learning Plan from the Smart PH system or a site specific excel or other type of tracking report for staff attendance at training and educational sessions throughout the year. 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.</p>				
--	---	--	--	--	--

Score Totals for: Food Safety

% Demonstrates	33%
% Partially Demonstrates	28%
% Does Not Demonstrate	39%

Note: Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

IMMUNIZATIONS

	Measure	Score	Comments	Documents	Exemplary Documents
2.8 L	Information about public health activities, including at least one example of each of the topics listed below: • educational offerings, AND • reporting and compliance requirements.	2		KCHD website/communicable disease, 2008 Spring Provider Update,	
2.9 L	Publicly available information for all the topics listed below (one example of each): • written policies, AND • local ordinances, AND • permit/license application requirements, AND • administrative code, AND • enabling laws. Form of documentation should indicate how it is made available to the public.	2		KCHD website/communicable disease w/ DOH links	
2.10 L	Two examples of educational material in non-English language OR 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		Telelanguage service, Immunization Resources Binder/ Spanish	
3.1 L	Documentation of community and stakeholder review of local health data, including Local Public Health Indicators. Note: The intent is for LHJ staff to present local 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	0	The focus of this measure is on presenting local IMM data to community stakeholders and engaging them in further action. No documentation provided of the use of the Core Health Indicators in the meeting information submitted.	KCHD Core PH Indicators	

	investigation. OR • new program efforts, OR • policy direction, OR • prevention priorities.				
3.2 L	<p>Gap analysis for local critical health services and for prevention services reported to at least one of the groups listed below: • local stakeholders or community groups, or • regional partners, or • statewide program colleagues.</p> <p>Results of program evaluations reported to at least one of the groups listed below: • local stakeholders or community groups, or • regional partners, or • statewide program colleagues.</p> <p>Use of gap analysis and program evaluations in building partnerships with state, regional, and/or local stakeholders and/or state level colleagues.</p>	1	The data provided has not been developed into an gap analysis that might lead to improved rates of immunization and no partnership was documented for doing this work.	Child Profile data 4/30/08, Childcare and School Immunization Assessment Surveys, Estimated Vaccination Coverage	
5.5 L	Documentation for most recent 24 months of all new employees receiving orientation to the LHJ EPRP. Annual review of LHJ EPRP with all employees (twice within last 24 months). Note: Review may be specific documentation for every program or division or agency wide with documentation of attendance from every division or program.	0	No documentation provided on annual review of EPRP with all employees (earthquake drill does not meet the intent of this measure) or use of a checklist with new employees	New Employee Orientation Checklist 5/1/08	
6.1 L	Written descriptions of key program or activity components relevant to prevention and health education activities provided by LHJs or through contracts with community partners. Strategies (evidence-based or promising practices) for prevention and health education activities provided by the LHJ or by contractors for any of the groups listed below: • individuals, OR • families, OR • community in general.	1	Documentation provided described strategies, but no overall identification of key IMM program components relevant to prevention and health education.	2008 Spring Provider Update, patient education materials	

6.3 L	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • organize materials, AND • develop materials, AND • distribute or select materials, AND • evaluate materials, AND • update materials. 	0	No documentation of a regular process to review and update health education information, or examples of revised patient education materials		
6.4 L	<p>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, or peer education).</p>	2		<p>Central Kitsap School District IMM clinic 5/08, Bremerton SD 6th grader clinic 11/27/07</p>	
8.1 L	<p>For each program reviewed, a written description of program or activity goals, objectives and performance measures 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.</p> <p>For each program reviewed, written description(s) of professional requirements, knowledge, skills, and abilities for staff working in the program.</p>	1	<p>The intent of this measure is the development of goals, objectives and performance measures for the IMM program as a whole, which would be subsequently reflected in individual work plans and establishing the skills necessary to do the work identified in individual work plans. The documentation provided minimally relates to the intent.</p>	PHN Epidemiologist Position Description	

8.2 L	For each program reviewed, reports of program performance measures with analysis against goals and trended data where possible. For each program reviewed, evidence 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.	0	No documentation provided		
8.3 L	Use of additional sources of information to improve services and activities, including an example from each program being reviewed from the information sources listed below: • experiences from service delivery, including public requests, testimony to the 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.	0	No documentation provided of how the use of the indicators have resulted in improved services and activities	KCHD Core PH Indicators	
8.4 L	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.	0	No documentation provided		
8.6 L	One example for each program being reviewed of evaluations 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 for each program being	1	Spring Provider Update 4/16/08 and evaluation forms, no evidence of how improved	Spring Provider Update 4/16/08 and evaluation forms	

	reviewed of educational curricula or material revised to address evaluation results dated within last 24 months.				
8.7 L	<p>Aggregated annual internal audit* results for last two years of on a sample of communicable disease investigations records including data on timeliness and compliance with disease-specific protocols. OR *Note: An internal audit is a review of a sample of case files or other types of documented work, such as investigation reports, for requirements like timeliness, accuracy, and compliance with protocols or regulations. A sample of 30 files is considered sufficient to identify trends in compliance.</p> <p>Aggregated annual internal audit* results for last two years of on a sample of environmental health investigation/compliance action records including data on timeliness and compliance with investigation/compliance procedures.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Aggregated annual internal audit* results for last two years of on a sample of program or activity case write-ups, such as for client visit; including data on timeliness and compliance with program protocols or on repetitive activities such as the development or use of prevention and health education materials [see 6.3 L] or health alerts [see 2.6 L]</p>	0	No documentation provided		
10.4 L	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	Specific content for trainings listed in log not available	Staff training log	

	<p>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</p> <p>Note: Fully demonstrates requires that 50% or more staff in each program being reviewed have attended at least three training sessions within the last three years. Programs with < 50% of staff having attended three training sessions in the last three years will be scored partially demonstrates and programs with 0% of staff having attended three training sessions in the last three years will be scored Does Not Demonstrate. Training documentation may be from automatically generated Learning Plan from the Smart PH system or a site specific excel or other type of tracking report for staff attendance at training and educational sessions throughout the year.</p> <p>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.</p>				
--	---	--	--	--	--

Score Totals for: Immunizations

% Demonstrates	25%
% Partially Demonstrates	31%
% Does Not Demonstrate	44%

Note: Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding