

Conceptualizing and Conducting Quality Peer Reviewed Portfolio Evaluations:

Approaches and Lessons Learned from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)

Multi-Paper Session 807

**Evaluation 2010
San Antonio, TX**

November 13, 2010



U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Introduction

**Sue Lin Yee, M.A., M.P.H.
Senior Evaluation Scientist
Office of the Director**

**National Center for Injury Prevention and Control (NCIPC)
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)**

Email: sby9@cdc.gov

The findings of this presentation are the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

CDC Policy on Research and Scientific Programs

- CDC policy (2002) mandates peer review of research
- Revised policy (2008) expands scope to include scientific programs (research and non-research)
- Policy includes requirements for both extramural and intramural research

Diversity of *Evaluands*

- Definition of research portfolio or scientific program left to discretion of unit
 - Major research topics
 - Organizational units
 - Single topic studies
 - Core service activities (e.g., laboratories, statistical support)
 - Public health practice activities (e.g., surveillance, state/local programs)

Mechanism of Peer Review

- Mechanism left to discretion of unit
 - Board of Scientific Counselors (BSC) administered (e.g., BSC workgroup or BSC subcommittee)
 - Non-BSC-administered (e.g., *ad hoc* review, national academy panel, special emphasis panel)
 - Conducted on-site, by mail, or by telephone

Evaluation Goals and Use of Portfolio Reviews

- Assess research or scientific program's
 - Strengths
 - Weaknesses
 - Redundancies or gaps
 - Future directions
- Evaluation findings guide decision-making
 - Scientific direction
 - Prioritization
 - Financial stewardship
- Identify areas for research and program improvement



Factors Affecting Evaluation Quality

- Participation of key stakeholders
- Political sensitivities – Internal & External
- Feasible evaluation scope and focus
- Forum for dialogue & vetting
- Availability of data
- Limited time and \$\$\$ for conducting evaluation
- Commitment to actionable recommendations



Presenters

“Maximizing Quality in a Portfolio Review of the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control’s (NCIPC) Core State Injury Program”

Elyse Levine, AED, Washington, DC

“Getting the Most from Expert Reviews of Public Health Programs: Barriers and Facilitators of Quality, Relevance, and Utility”

Esther Sumartojo and Tom Bartenfeld, National Center on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities, CDC

“External Program Reviews in the Office of Public Health Preparedness and Response at CDC”

Barbara Ellis, Office of Public Health Preparedness and Response, CDC

Discussion Questions

- **What are some overall lessons learned for conducting and utilizing portfolio reviews in a government setting?**
- **How does transparency affect the portfolio review process and evaluation quality in a government setting?**

For more information please contact Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

1600 Clifton Road NE, Atlanta, GA 30333
Telephone, 1-800-CDC-INFO (232-4636)/TTY: 1-888-232-6348
E-mail: cdcinfo@cdc.gov Web: www.atsdr.cdc.gov



U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention