



E001367



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20852

March 24, 1971

REGIONAL MEDICAL
PROGRAMS SERVICE

S. Richardson Hill, Jr., M.D.
Coordinator
Alabama Regional Medical Program
University of Alabama
1919 Seventh Avenue, South
Birmingham, Alabama 35233

Dear Dr. Hill:

Enclosed for your information is a copy of the "Program Review Criteria" that, effective with the April-May cycle, will be used in the triennial review of Regional Medical Programs.

These criteria are in large measure a synthesis of several earlier but similar efforts, including those of individual Review Committee members. A previous version, of which this is a revision and refinement, was utilized and tested in the course of the January-February review cycle. That trial proved to be a reasonably successful one.

You will note that the decided emphasis of these criteria is on program. This is in keeping with developments over the past 12-18 months, including the decentralization of project review and funding authority. In the latter connection, we shortly will be getting out to you a document outlining the minimum standards (or requirements) that will govern this decentralization of the review process to Regions.

The national review process is increasingly being focused on overall program proposals. Correspondingly its determinations are becoming broad ones -- not, for example, whether a particular project is a good (or poor) one from a technical standpoint but rather whether a given Regional Medical Program has:

- (1) Demonstrated outstanding program quality and maturity as reflected by its performance and overall progress to date.
- (2) Shown satisfactory program progress.
- (3) Performed poorly and reflects unsatisfactory program progress.

All of us recognize that experience will suggest further revisions and perhaps even substantive changes in these program review criteria. Therefore, I would welcome your specific suggestions as to how these program

Page 2 - S. Richardson Hill, Jr., M.D.

review criteria might be improved as soon as both we, including the Review Committee and National Advisory Council, and you have had some experience with them.

Sincerely yours,

Harold Margulies, M.D.
Acting Director

Enclosure

PROGRAM REVIEW CRITERIA

The program review criteria set forth below are intended as a guide in assessing a Region's overall progress and current status -- in short, its performance to date and present strengths. Program performance and strengths constitute major factors that will be taken into account in the triennial review process, including site visits, in assessing or evaluating individual Regional Medical Programs. (Another factor, of course, will be the merits of their overall proposals.)

The review criteria that will be employed are:

(1) Goals, Objectives and Priorities. Are these -

- . explicitly stated?
- . specific?
- . reasonable and relevant?
- . based on assessment of regional needs, problems and resources?
- . congruent with national priorities?
- . understood and accepted by those associated with RMP in the region?
- . a factor in determining the funding of operational proposals?

(2) Organizational Effectiveness.

- a. Coordinator: Has he been successful in developing and maintaining a -
- . strong sense of program direction and cohesion?
 - . effectively functioning core staff?
- b. Core Staff: Does it reflect a -
- . broad range of professional and discipline competence?
 - . adequate administrative and management capability?
 - . balanced relationship between central, field, and institutional components?
- c. Grantee Organization (or Organizational Base): Does it provide and permit -
- . adequate support, including administrative and housekeeping services?
 - . sufficient degree of freedom, especially in distinguishing between its administrative role and the Regional Advisory Group's policymaking one?

- d. Regional Advisory Group: Does it and the corollary planning and review committee structure have -
 - . participation of key regional groups and interests?
 - . policy control over the program?
 - . creditability within the program and region?
 - . an adequate technical review structure and process?
 - e. Subregionalization: To what an extent has an adequate community organization and planning capability been developed by the Region, separately or in conjunction with CHP and others, at the local (or subregional) level?
- (3) Involvement of Regional Resources. To what extent are the Region's health and related interests, institutions, groups, and agencies actively involved in and committed to RMP; or, conversely, has the RMP in effect been captured or co-opted by a single major interest? Among others -
- . practicing physicians and organized medicine?
 - . community hospitals, including their boards as well as the staff?
 - . nursing and allied health professions?
 - . medical schools and centers?
 - . voluntary and official health agencies?
 - . CHP and other related health and planning programs?
 - . consumers and community groups?
 - . region's political and economic power structure?
- (4) Assessment of Needs, Problems and Resources. To what extent are these -
- . the result of a systematic identification and analysis based on data?
 - . reflected in the Region's objectives and priorities?
 - . reflected by the scope and nature of core and operational activities?
- (5) Program Implementation and Accomplishments.
- a. Core Activities: Have these resulted in -
 - . action-oriented planning?
 - . development of community organization and planning at the local level?
 - . coordinated, cooperative, and conjoint activities with others (e.g., OEO, CHP, Appalachia)?
 - . adequate surveillance of ongoing operational activities?

B. Operational Projects: Have these -

- . related to the Region's present objectives and priorities?
- . strengthened or utilized linkages between and among institutions, groups and agencies?
- . been of high quality and generally productive?
- . been phased out where unsuccessful or now irrelevant; or where successful, been incorporated within the regular health care financing system?

(6) Evaluation. Is (or are) there -

- . a formal evaluation plan or strategy?
- . adequate staff and other resources available?
- . ongoing monitoring and surveillance of projects?
- . assessment of the overall program as well as evaluation of projects?
- . a feedback mechanism relating program and project evaluation to the Regional Advisory Group?

March 15, 1971