Appendix C
Accreditation Quality Improvement Survey Results

Local Public Health Department Responses

December 2003
Legend & Layout

- Depicted are responses that were answered using a 5-point Likert Scale
- SA & IA represent ‘Strongly Agree’ and ‘Inclined to Agree’
- Neither represents ‘Neither Agree nor Disagree’
- SD & ID represent ‘Strongly Disagree’ and ‘Inclined to Disagree’
- Slides follow order of on-line survey
Demog1: What is your accreditation status? - LPHD Responses

N = 147, 14 ‘no responses’

Provisional Accreditation = 13, Accredited with Commendation = 95, Accredited = 24, Not Accredited = 15
Demog2: Has your health department completed Cycle 2?

N = 154, 7 ‘no responses’
Yes = 48, No = 106
Demog3: Primary Area of Job Responsibility - LPHD Responses

N = 147, 14 ‘no responses’

*Other included: Planner, IT, Finance
Mean # of Respondents Per LPHD by Accreditation Status

* As of November 15, 2002
Accredited = 119/34 = 3.5
Not Accredited = 36/10 = 3.6
Mean # Of Respondents Per LPHD by Cycle

Cycle 1 = 155/(44-6). Shiawassee did not respond. 5 LPHDs Accredited as of June 2003 Commission Meeting

Cycle 2 = 22/5. 5 LPHDs Accredited as of June 2003 Commission Meeting
SA1: Self Assessment Useful Tool for Identifying Areas Needing Improvement - LPHD Responses

N = 160, 1 ‘no response’
SA = 59, IA = 81, Neither = 8, ID = 9, SD = 3
SA2: Self Assessment Process
Useful in Preparing for On-site Review-
LPHD Responses

N = 159, 2 ‘no responses’
SA = 72, IA = 63, Neither = 12, ID = 10, SD = 2
SA3: Self Assessment Process is Catalyst for Pre-review Consultation - LPHD Responses

N = 160, 1 ‘no response’
SA = 52, IA = 71, Neither = 23, ID = 10, SD = 4
OSR1: On-site Review Can Be Improved by LPHD Evaluation of State Agency Reviewers - LPHD Responses

- SA & IA: 93 responses, 49 responses
- Neither: 15 responses
- ID: 2 responses
- SD: 0 responses

N= 159, 2 'no response'

SA = 93, IA = 49, Neither = 15, ID = 2, SD = 0
OSR2: On-site Review Process Can Be Improved By Increasing Exit Interviews—LPHD Responses

N = 159, 2 ‘no responses’
SA = 104, IA = 39, Neither = 13, ID = 3, SD = 0
OSR3: On-site Review is Opportunity for Constructive Program Related Dialogue - LPHD Responses

N = 158, 3 'no responses
SA = 60, IA = 52, Neither = 16, ID = 23, SD = 7
OSR4: Program Reviewers Have Good Understanding of Accreditation Standards - LPHD Responses

N = 160, 1 ‘no response’
SA = 20, IA = 61, Neither = 36, ID = 39, SD = 4
OSR5: All Reviewers Apply Accreditation Standards the Same Way - LPHD Responses

N = 160, 1 ‘no response’
SA = 10, IA = 11, Neither = 11, ID = 65, SD = 63
OSR6: Same Program Reviewer Applies Accreditation Standard Same Way at Each LPHD - LPHD Responses

N = 160, 1 ‘no response’
SA = 13, IA = 15, Neither = 60, ID = 41, SD = 31
OSR7: Presence of Program Specific Peer Reviewer Would Improve On-Site Review Process - LPHD Responses

N = 160, 1 ‘no response’
SA = 41, IA = 64, Neither = 43, ID = 10, SD = 2
OSSR1: On-site Review Report Assists the LPHD As a Tool for Performance Improvement - LPHD Responses

N = 160, 1 ‘no response’
SA = 46, IA = 81, Neither = 14, ID = 18, SD = 1
OSSR2: On-site Review Report Would Be Improved By More Use of Special Recognition Section - LPHD Responses

N = 159, 2 'no response'

SA = 38, IA = 58, Neither = 48, ID = 13, SD = 2
OSSR3: On-site Review Report Would Be Improved By More Use of Recommendations for Improvement Section - LPHD Responses

N = 159, 2 ‘no responses’
SA = 36, IA = 78, Neither = 35, ID = 9, SD = 1
CPA1: Correction Plan of Action Serves As Useful Mechanism for Continuous Improvement - LPHD Responses

N = 160, 1 'no response'
SA = 36, IA = 79, Neither = 26, ID = 14, SD = 5
CPA2: CPA Process Can Best Be Improved By a Shorter Time Frame for Implementation- LPHD Responses

N = 159, 2 ‘no responses’
SA = 18, IA = 22, Neither = 40, ID = 70, SD = 9
CPA3: CPA Process Would Benefit From Improved Communication Between Program Reviewers and LPHD Staff

LPHD Responses

N = 160, 1 ‘no response’
SA = 71, IA = 64, Neither = 23, ID = 0, SD = 2
Tool1: Accreditation Tool Should Focus More on Achievable Optimal Performance Standards-
LPHD Responses

N = 160, 1 'no response'
SA =32, IA = 44, Neither = 25, ID = 42, SD = 17
Tool2: “Accreditation with Commendation” is Reflective of Enhanced Program Capacity—LPHD Responses

N = 160, 1 ‘no response’
SA = 42, IA = 65, Neither = 29, ID = 19, SD = 5
Tool3: Formatting of the Accreditation Tool Meets User Needs - LPHD Responses

N = 160, 1 'no response'
SA = 20, IA = 52, Neither = 35, ID = 41, SD = 12
Tool4: Standards in the Tool Are Written Clearly and Concisely - LPHD Responses

N = 160, 1 ‘no response’
SA = 15, IA = 53, Neither = 27, ID = 49, SD = 16
Tool 5: Accreditation Tool is Useful Mechanism for Annual LPHD Program Planning Activities - LPHD Responses

N = 160, 1 'no response'
SA = 23, IA = 50, Neither = 38, ID = 35, SD = 13
TA1: Current Technical Assistance Resource Contributes to Quality Improvement of Programs - LPHD Responses

N = 156, 5 'no responses'
SA = 13, ID = 36, Neither = 72, ID = 27, SD = 8
TA3: Accreditation Program Website is a Valuable Resource - LPHD Responses

N = 157, 4 'no responses'
SA = 14, IA = 44, Neither = 78, ID = 11, SD = 10
AP1: Purpose of Accreditation Process Should Be On-going Quality Improvement—LPHD Responses

N = 160, 1 ‘no response’
SA = 90, IA = 55, Neither = 10, ID = 3, SD = 2
AP2: Purpose of Accreditation Process Should Be Contract Compliance - LPHD Responses

N = 157, 4 ‘no responses’
SA = 23, IA = 47, Neither = 21, ID = 43, SD = 23
AP3: Accreditation Process Reflects a Set of Achievable Standards - LPHD Responses

N = 158, 3 ‘no responses’
SA = 23, IA = 66, Neither = 18, ID = 38, SD = 13
AP4: Accreditation Process Can Be Improved by Increased Focus on Recommendations for Performance Improvement - LPHD Responses

N = 158, 3 ‘no responses’

SA = 41, IA = 68, Neither = 32, ID = 14, SD = 3
AP5: Is Important for Agencies to Seek Funds to Conduct an Outside Objective Evaluation of Accreditation Program - LPHD Responses

N = 158, 3 ‘no responses’
SA = 55, IA = 44, Neither = 30, ID = 21, SD = 8
AP6: Overall, Accreditation Process Has Improved Program Performance of LPHD-LPHD Responses

N = 159, 2 ‘no responses’
SA = 37, IA = 68, Neither = 29, ID = 19, SD = 6
AP7: Accreditation Process is Useful for Internal LPHD Program Evaluation Tool-
LPHD Responses

N = 158, 3 ‘no responses’
SA = 32, IA = 83, Neither = 19, ID = 20, SD = 4
AP8: Accreditation Should Be Based On All State-Funded Services Included in Process-LPHD Responses

N = 159, 2 ‘no responses’
SA = 23, IA = 59, Neither = 40, ID = 28, SD = 9
AP9: Accreditation Should Be Based on Minimum Set of Services That Every LPHD Must Provide - LPHD Responses

N = 158, 3 ‘no responses’
SA = 43, IA = 76, Neither = 19, ID = 14, SD = 6
NtWk1: Establishment of APSN Would Improve Accreditation Process - LPHD Responses

N = 159, 2 'no responses'
SA = 45, IA = 75, Neither = 25, ID = 12, SD = 2
NtWk2: I would seek program guidance from peer network for purpose of achieving accreditation.

LPHD Responses

N = 159, 2 ‘no responses’
SA = 53, IA = 80, Neither = 11, ID = 13, SD = 2
NtWk3: I would serve on and/or share resources with a peer network-
LPHD Responses

N = 159, 2 ‘no responses’
SA = 44, IA = 79, Neither = 23, ID = 11, SD = 2

N = 159, 2 ‘no responses’
SA = 59, IA = 74, Neither = 16, ID = 8, SD = 2
BP2: I would seek program guidance from BP Directory for purpose of achieving accreditation - LPHD Responses

N = 159, 2 ‘no responses’
SA = 66, IA = 77, Neither = 8, ID = 7, SD = 1
BP3: I would share results with the Best Practice Directory - LPHD Responses

N = 159, 2 ‘no responses’
SA = 66, IA = 76, Neither = 13, ID = 4, SD = 0
Train1: Additional Training on the Accreditation Process is Needed for LPHDs - LPHD Responses

N = 159, 2 ‘no responses’
SA = 46, IA = 49, Neither = 35, ID = 24, SD = 5
Train2: Additional Training on Accreditation Process is Needed for Program Reviewers - LPHD Responses

N = 159, 2 'no responses'
SA = 89, IA = 51, Neither = 17, ID = 2, SD = 0
Comm1: I am familiar with the membership and purview of the Accreditation Commission-
LPHD Responses

N = 159, 2 ‘no responses’
SA = 22, IA = 49, Neither = 23, ID = 37, SD = 28
Comm2: There Is Adequate Representation of LDH on the Commission-LPHD Responses

N = 157, 4 ‘no responses’
SA = 10, IA = 19, Neither = 74, ID = 40, SD = 14
Comm3: Current Communication Between the Commission and Accreditation Process Stakeholders is Adequate-
LPHD Responses

N = 157, 4 ‘no responses
SA = 9, IA = 11, Neither = 62, ID = 50, SD = 25
MPHI1: I understand MPHI’s role in the accreditation process-
LPHD Responses

N = 156, 5 ‘no responses’
SD = 18, IA = 55, Neither = 28, ID = 38, SD = 17
MPHI2: Coordination of Accreditation Program is Enhanced by MPHI’s Participation - LPHD Responses

N = 154, 7 ‘no responses’
SA = 13, IA = 23, Neither = 74, ID = 24, SD = 20
MPHI3: Processes for which MPHI is Responsible are Handled in a Satisfactory Manner - LPHD Responses

N = 153, 8 'no responses'
SA = 12, IA = 21, Neither = 81, ID = 23, SD = 16
NPHPS1: I am familiar with the CDC National Public Health Performance Standards - LPHD Responses

N = 152, 9 'no responses'
SA = 21, IA = 54, Neither = 28, ID = 30, SD = 19
NPHPS2: Accreditation for Commendation for LPHDs Should Be Tied to Use of NPHPS-LPHD Responses

N = 152, 9 'no responses'
SA = 12, IA = 44, Neither = 75, ID = 15, SD = 6
NPHPS3: NPHPS for LPHDs Should Be Incorporated into the Accreditation Program in a Subsequent Cycle - LPHD Responses

N = 151, 10 ‘no responses’
SA = 13, IA = 45, Neither = 76, ID = 11, SD = 6
MD1: I am familiar with the indicators that address medical directors-
LPHD Responses

N = 151, 10 ‘no responses’
SA = 40, IA = 45, Neither = 23, ID = 23, SD = 20
MD2: Indicators in the Administration Section of the Accreditation Tool are Sufficient to Address Medical Director Competencies - LPHD Responses

N = 150, 11 ‘no responses’
SA = 16, IA = 38, Neither = 73, ID = 17, SD = 6