



PROGRAM REVIEW CRITERIA

These revised criteria constitute the major factors to be taken into account in the national review process, including site visits, in assessing or evaluating Regional Medical Programs. They are aimed at assessing a Region's overall progress and current status -- in short, its performance to date -- and only secondarily the merits of its overall proposal or the Region's future prospects except insofar as directly reflected by its past performance and present strengths. Moreover, their focus is essentially on program rather than projects.

These criteria are in large measure a synthesis of several earlier but similar efforts, including those of individual Review Committee members. An earlier version of them was utilized and tested in the course of the several site visits made in December.

These criteria are being incorporated as an integral element of the national review process. A critical assessment flowing from that process, in turn, is 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 progress and program status.

The review criteria to be employed are as follows:

- (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 RAG's policy-making one?
- d. Regional Advisory Group, including the corollary planning, review, and other committees. Does this advisory structure have -
- . participation of key regional groups and interests?
 - . policy control over the program?
 - . creditability within the program and region?
 - . adequate technical review structure and process?
- e. Subregionalization. Is an adequate community organization and planning capability being developed by the region, separately or in conjunction with CHP and others, at the local (or sub-regional) 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 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?
 - . related to 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 -

- . reflected Region's present objectives and priorities?
- . strengthened or utilized linkages between and among institutions, groups and agencies?
- . been of high quality and generally productive?
- . resulted in a turnover of funds?
- . been phased out where unsuccessful or now irrelevant?

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

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