

Evaluating the MACP

Developing the SEP

The **Strategic Evaluation Plan (SEP)** final draft is due to the CDC in **August 2015**.

A key component of evaluation that distinguishes it from traditional research is stakeholder participation.

Evaluating the MACP

Individual Evaluation Plan (IEP) drafts will be reviewed and discussed in the December MAAG meetings.

To take a more active role in developing the IEPs, or revising the SEP over time, please contact Jessie Fernandes (jfernandes@mt.gov).

Benefits of Participating

1. Taking a more active role in the statewide efforts of the MACP
2. Learning about evaluation methodologies
3. Help ensure evaluation designs are effective and focused, which will make evaluation results more meaningful

Evaluating the MACP

All MACP activities were considered as candidates for evaluation.

All candidates were prioritized according to the following criteria:

- Cost, prior evaluation, recent changes made, stakeholder involvement, impact on target, pilot, information need, utility, and disparities.

Criteria/Activity	Administration	Surveillance and Epidemiology	Evaluation	Partner and Advisory Group Coordination	MAP Home Visiting Program	School Asthma Mini-Grants	School and Childcare Trainings	Media Campaign	AHEAD Protocol	Asthma Health Care QI	Reimbursement Efforts	Health Care Provider Education
Cost				+	+					+		
Prior Evaluation					+	+			+	+	-	-
Change		-		-	+	+	+		+	+		-
Stakeholders		+		+	+		-	-			+	
Impact	-		-			+	+		+	+		
Pilot		-		-	+	+				+	+	-
Information Need									+		+	
Disparities		+				-	-	-	+		+	
Utility				+	+			-		+		
Score	-1	0	-1	+1	+6	+3	0	-3	+5	+6	+3	-3

Prioritizing Candidates

Infrastructure	Services	Health Systems
1. Partner and Advisory Group Coordination	1. MAP (home visiting program)	1. Asthma Health Care Quality Improvement
2. Surveillance and Epidemiology	2. School and childcare trainings	2. Reimbursement efforts
3. Administration	3. School asthma mini-grants	3. AHEAD Protocol (ED discharge protocol)
4. Evaluation	4. Media campaign	4. Health care provider education

Note:

Red– High priority, **Orange**– Mid priority, **Green**- Low priority, **White**– No formal evaluation proposed

Timeline

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Milestones for which Evaluation Findings Are Needed			MT legislative session	Develop the State Chronic Disease Plan	Develop the DPHHS PHSD strategic plan
Evaluations	MAAG	Surveillance/Epidemiology	School and childcare trainings	Asthma QI	Health care provider education
		MAP 1	School asthma mini-grants	AHEAD Protocol	ASME reimbursement
				MAP 2	
Capacity Building Activities	Write evaluation plan	Present final SEP to MAAG	Send staff to evaluation conference	Consider hiring an intern	Present manuscript at professional conference
				Develop manuscript	Submit manuscript for publication

Overall Comments

These ideas for evaluation of MACP activities are in draft form– we welcome your feedback!

We plan to distribute results from all evaluations at MAAG meetings, and develop “fact sheets” that summarize findings to be posted on our website.

Services:

School and Childcare Trainings

Overview: Online and in-person trainings are offered to school staff and childcare professionals to increase their capacity to manage asthma and improve asthma control among children.

Previous Evaluation: A manuscript was written in 2013 and submitted to journals for publication, and was not accepted. The manuscript focused on pre- and post-test results of training participants, and changes were made to the pre- and post-tests in order to make them more robust as a result. This activity has not otherwise been formally evaluated by the MACP.

Purpose of Evaluation: Investigate barriers to participation, how participants utilize skills gained from the training activities, and what changes (if any) are made to the facility environment as a results of the trainings.

Year 3 (2016-2017)

Services:

School and Childcare Trainings

- Possible evaluation questions:
 - How do audiences learn about training opportunities?
 - What are barriers to participating in the training?
 - How do participants utilize new knowledge or skills?
 - Are any changes made in the site environment as a result of the trainings?
 - How is school or childcare facility wellness impacted?
- Is there anything else you want to know?
What else is important?

Services:

School Asthma Mini-grants

Overview: School nurses can apply for a mini-grant to complete one of seven approved activities in their schools to enhance the health of students with asthma. This was recently opened up to certified asthma educators (AE-Cs) as well.

Previous Evaluation: Conducted in 2014, it reviewed implementation and participant perception. Several changes were made, including adding new activities, removing activities that were not ideal, and allowing AE-Cs to apply for grants.

Purpose of Evaluation: Explore why participation in the program is beneficial to schools and participants by reviewing what changes have been made in schools, which projects to keep and what new projects to add, and barriers to participation.

Year 3 (2016-2017)

Services:

School Asthma Mini-grants

- Possible evaluation questions:
 - Is the activity being implemented according to core activity work plans?
 - What changes have been made in the schools as a result of the activity?
 - Which projects should remain and what could be added?
 - What barriers to participation exist?
 - Do areas with more school nurses have more participation in the activity?
- Is there anything else you want to know? What else is important?

Services:

Asthma Home Visiting (MAP)

Overview: A multi-component home visiting program that supports self-management education and environmental trigger reduction for children with asthma.

Previous Evaluation: Two evaluations have occurred: in 2013 the MACP examined implementation, and in 2014 the focus was on attrition. The MAP has rapidly expanded, tripling in size since the first evaluation was conducted.

Purpose of Evaluation: Two additional evaluations are planned: in grant year 2, the MACP will again review implementation to ensure all new sites are operating as planned, and in grant year 4 the MACP will examine return on investment for participation in the program.

Year 2 (2015-2016)

Year 4 (2017-2018)

Services:

Asthma Home Visiting (MAP)

- Possible evaluation questions:
 - Is the activity being implemented according to core activity work plans?
 - Is the activity reaching disparate populations?
 - Does the child experience positive health outcomes?
 - Does the family experience positive health outcomes?
 - What health care linkages are being made for participants?
 - How are participants being referred to the MAP?
 - What is the cost benefit/ROI of the program? (Goal of evaluation #2.)
- Is there anything else you want to know? What else is important?

Health Systems: Asthma Health Care QI

Overview: Previously known as ACMS, this activity is being refocused to promote team- and guidelines-based care in primary care facilities.

Previous Evaluation: Conducted in 2013, it revealed that with the onset of Electronic Health Records (EHRs) maintaining a separate database for patients with asthma was not realistic. The quality improvement portion of the activity is still seen as important work.

Purpose of Evaluation: Determine what components are essential to providing quality improvement support to primary care providers and pharmacists in Montana, and assess sustainability and effectiveness.

Year 4 (2017-2018)

Health Systems: Asthma Health Care QI

- Possible evaluation questions:
 - Is the activity being implemented according to core activity work plans?
 - What is the facility project lead's perception of the activity and experienced barriers or enhancers?
 - What changes are made in the facility as a result of the activity?
 - Are patient asthma outcomes improving?
 - How could the activity better serve provider needs in Montana?
 - Would sites recommend the activity to other possible participants?
- Is there anything else you want to know? What else is important?

Health Systems: AHEAD Protocol

Overview: A program based in hospital emergency departments (EDs) that is designed to facilitate implementation of EPR-3 recommendations for patient education upon discharge from the ED.

Previous Evaluation: Conducted in 2013, this evaluation resulted in several changes being made to implementation. Mainly, a \$5,000 grant is now offered to 2 to 3 EDs per year, and there is more ongoing communication between the MACP and the facility.

Purpose of Evaluation: Determine what components are essential to providing quality improvement support to EDs in Montana, and assess sustainability and effectiveness of the program.

Year 4 (2017-2018)

Health Systems: AHEAD Protocol

- Possible evaluation questions:
 - Is the activity being implemented according to core activity work plans?
 - What is the facility project lead's perception of this activity and experienced barriers or enhancers?
 - How could the activity better serve EDs in Montana?
 - What was the motivation to participate in the activity?
 - Would sites recommend the activity to other facilities?
 - What changes have been made in the facility as a result of the activity?
- Is there anything else you want to know? What else is important?

Health Systems: Health Care Provider Education

Overview: Several components come together to create this activity, including annual review courses through the AAE, a lending library of AE-C exam review materials, the annual Big Sky Pulmonary Conference, and offering at least two webinars per year to provide ongoing educational opportunities.

Previous Evaluation: Conducted in 2014, it determined that the logistics of taking the exam (travel, cost, time off work and away from family) were a barrier to increasing the number of AE-Cs in Montana. However, becoming an AE-C has value to people who participate in asthma education efforts. Also, the MACP needs to continuously promote the resources it has available.

Purpose of Evaluation: Improve the overall quality of the activity and determine continuing education needs of health care providers and asthma educators in Montana.

Year 5 (2018-2019)

Health Systems: Health Care Provider Education

- Possible evaluation questions:
 - Is the activity being implemented according to core activity work plans?
 - Is the number of AE-Cs in Montana increasing?
 - Are more patients receiving ASME?
 - What educational needs do health care providers report?
 - Would participants recommend using MACP as a source of information?
- Is there anything else you want to know? What else is important?

Health Systems: ASME Reimbursement

Overview: The MACP is actively pursuing reimbursement from health payers to AE-Cs providing self-management education in an effort to leverage health care reform.

Previous Evaluation: This activity has not been previously evaluated. However, past evaluations of other MACP activities have indicated that achieving reimbursement will help program participants overcome key barriers to implementing team- and guidelines-based care in Montana.

Purpose of Evaluation: Generate knowledge about good practices for obtaining reimbursement for AE-Cs to provide ASME to people living with asthma, and demonstrate the effects achieving reimbursement has on program success.

Year 5 (2018-2019)

Health Systems: ASME Reimbursement

- Possible evaluation questions:
 - How many insurance payers reimburse AE-Cs?
 - What effect does reimbursement have on providing ASME?
 - What is the ROI for providing ASME to patients?
 - How was reimbursement achieved?
 - How many CPT codes can be used to provide ASME?
 - Is the amount reimbursed sufficient motivation for provision of ASME?
- Is there anything else you want to know? What else is important?

Infrastructure: Surveillance and Epidemiology

Overview: Provide data to assess asthma burden in Montana, target interventions to groups most at risk, make program decisions, and secure funding. The MACP produces 3 surveillance reports each year, submits journal abstracts on MACP activities, and responds to data requests.

Previous Evaluation: Conducted in 2012, it examined how MACP surveillance products were used by external partners and the general public.

Purpose of Proposed Evaluation: Examine how data is used internally by the MACP to support other program activities.

Year 2 (2015-2016)

Infrastructure: Surveillance and Epidemiology

- Possible evaluation questions:
 - Is this activity being implemented according to core activity work plans?
 - How clean are the data used to conduct surveillance?
 - What reports previously generated by the MACP could be updated?
 - Have new data sources become available that the MACP could be utilizing?
 - How are data used to guide strategic program action?
- Is there anything else you want to know? What else is important?

Infrastructure: Partner and Advisory Group

Overview: The Montana Asthma Advisory Group (MAAG) is a group of diverse stakeholders that provide the MACP with support and guidance.

Previous Evaluation: Conducted in 2012, it led to several changes, such as the development of a brochure for MAAG members to describe their involvement to others.

Purpose of Evaluation: Generate feedback from MAAG members on good practices for developing strong, strategic, and engaging partnerships by investigating barriers to participation, defining what it means to be an “active” partner, determine participant perceptions of the MAAG, and examine the scope of organizations and professions represented.

Year 1 (2014-2015)

MAAG IEP discussion

- Possible evaluation questions:
 - How many partners are active in the MAAG?
 - What is the scope of the organizations represented?
 - What are participant perceptions of the MAAG and its meetings?
 - What are possible barriers to participation?
 - What are future opportunities for the MAAG members to explore?

MAAG IEP discussion

Brief results from first survey (December 2014, n=17):

- Wide variety of health care professions/settings and community members are represented
- Most respondents attend approximately 2 meetings annually
- Most respondents find the meetings are satisfactory and provide them with new or useful information that enhances their current knowledge
- Respondents disagreed on whether or not MAAG participation is high, and were somewhat unclear as to what is their role in the MAAG
- MAAG meetings are seen as useful and important to respondents because members gain knowledge, network with peers, gain experience, and learn about MACP activities
- Time away from work is the largest barrier to attending meetings
- Respondents all “really care about” the future of the MAAG (n=12)

MAAG IEP discussion

Areas for improvement (preliminary):

- Encourage MAAG members to request or suggest topics for meetings
- Further clarify roles and goals of the MAAG members
- Incorporate more time for networking and a more relaxed atmosphere
- Encourage MAAG members to give advice on program activities
- Distribute more information on recent literature
- Discuss areas of need for program expansion

MAAG IEP discussion

Considering a second short survey for June 2015:

- Clarify roles and goals
- Clarify what is an “active” partner or member of the MAAG

Do we want to know anything else? Is there anything else we should consider?

Wrapping Up

Any additional questions or comments?

Please consider contacting the MACP with any further thoughts on evaluating the program activities. We value your input and experience!

Thank You!