

# Maximizing Quality in a Portfolio Review of the NCIPC Core State Injury Program

**Rose Ann M. Renteria**—AED Center for Health Communication  
Senior Technical Manager

American Evaluation Association National Meeting  
November 13, 2010



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

# Overview

## ❑ Purpose for the Portfolio Review

- Evaluation of National Center for Injury and Prevention Control (NCIPC) “Core” State Injury Program

## ❑ Background

- Core cohort comprises 30 state health departments funded by CDC for injury prevention and control work in their states
- All states funded at same level for Core activities
- Examined most recent funding cycle (2005-2010)

# Evaluation Initiative

## □ Primary Goals

- Utilization-focused approach
- Inform future program development and refinement
- Inform the CDC of state-level activity: implementation, successes, challenges
- Highlight leveraging and innovation
- Consideration: no attempt to compare or rank states against each other

# Evaluation Framework Development

- ❑ Evaluation questions
- ❑ Developing indicators and measures
- ❑ Operationalizing measures
- ❑ Sources of data
- ❑ Quality control

# Evaluation Framework Development

## □ Evaluation questions

- To what extent were performance objectives fulfilled by the Core State Program?
- What were examples of success?
- What challenges were encountered by Core states?
- How did Core states use CDC funding to leverage resources?
- How can NCIPC best support Core states and foster activity to affect policy and support evaluation?

# Evaluation Framework Development

## ❑ Developing indicators and measures

- Linked to performance objectives stated in 2005 FOA for NCIPC Core State Program

## ❑ Operationalizing measures

- AED proposed indicators and working definitions
- CDC and Safe States Alliance (SSA) refined indicators/definitions
- Data Considerations
  - What Is “Good” Data?
  - Limitations of Data
  - Realistic Scope Given Time and Money Constraints

## **Challenges to Developing Indicators and Measures**

- ❑ Data collection and project monitoring tools (e.g., progress reports) were not designed for portfolio review**
- ❑ 2005 performance objectives did not focus on new topics of interest (advising policy changes, innovation, leveraging)**

## **Sources of Information**

- ❑ State progress reports, submitted annually by each state to CDC**
- ❑ Survey data from the 2007 Safe States Alliance “State of the States” survey**
- ❑ Interviews with representatives of Core states**
- ❑ Interviews and qualitative feedback from representatives of non-Core states**
- ❑ Interviews with analogous CDC programs**

# Content Analysis of Documents

- ❑ **Sources: State progress reports and state plans**
- ❑ **Developed coding tool for analysis using NVivo**
  - Format issues
  - Varied reporting completeness/quality
- ❑ **Inter-coder reliability testing**

## Survey Responses

### □ **Source: Safe States Alliance 2007 State of the States Survey**

- Confidentiality MOU
- SSA review of evaluation framework for transparency
- Input from SSA research director on which items lacked reliability
- Full dataset of 50 states; analysis focused on 30 Core states



# In-Depth Interviews

## □ State Representatives

- Sample selection was informed by emerging findings
  - Used convenience sample
  - State representatives responded to preliminary findings

## □ CDC Project Officers

- How do other State programs work?
  - Lessons learned with their state programs/grantees
  - Evaluation expectations
  - Advising on policy development, implementation, and promotion

# Maximizing Quality—Lessons Learned

## □ Use an External Evaluator

- Ensures confidentiality
- Provides objective assessment of data reliability and validity

## □ Work closely with evaluator to develop work plan

- Ensure the best use of CDC resources and data
- Set realistic turnaround times for reports
- Use technical memos to keep abreast of preliminary findings
  - Helpful to validate preliminary findings
- Facilitate data sharing and interviews

## ❑ **Integration of CDC and Its Partners**

- Provides relevant feedback to CDC at the end of the study
- Keeps evaluation initiative focused
- Key for outreach to broader constituency (e.g., non-Core states) and for transparency

## ❑ **Overall lesson**

- Maximizing quality for the portfolio review requires effective team work from CDC staff, partners, stakeholders, and an external evaluator.

# Thank you!

**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](mailto:cdcinfo@cdc.gov) Web: [www.atsdr.cdc.gov](http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov)



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