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RESOURCES AND SERVICES
(Note: Key Activities under “Services” were also divided into (i) level of service delivery indicators; (ii) reach indicators; and (iii) effectiveness indicators)

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

HEALTH DETERMINANTS AND STATUS
Adaptations from Woodward et al. Model were:

Divided into 5 Themes
1. Control and Prevention of Infectious Disease and Health Hazards
2. Reproductive Health and Infant/Early Child Development
3. Chronic Disease and Injury Prevention
4. Nutrition and Physical Activity
5. Inclusivity, Immigration, and Population Growth

Divided into 2 Categories:
1. Health Status Indicators
2. Key Activities (by target population)
   (i) level of service delivery indicators; (ii) reach indicators; and (iii) effectiveness indicators

INTEGRATION AND RESPONSIVENESS
(Note: Two Key Activities under “Integration and Responsiveness” were also divided into (i) level of service delivery indicators; (ii) reach indicators; and (iii) effectiveness indicators)
Developmental Stages

- Proceeded through **8 stages**:
  - Conceptualization
  - Stakeholder engagement
  - Indicator development
  - Data collection
  - Report writing
  - Dissemination
  - Implementation
  - Evaluation
Evaluation Questions

The purpose of this evaluation was to:

(a) evaluate the **efficiency** and **effectiveness** of the **consensus-building process** used to develop the BSC; and (b) evaluate the **usefulness** of the **findings** from the BSC report to inform **decision-making** and identify opportunities to **enhance current practices**.
Evaluation Methods

Phase 1: Process Evaluation
Survey

Phase 2: Implementation
Evaluation Focus Groups

Phase 3: Product Evaluation
Survey
Summary of Phase 1 Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Agreement Categories</th>
<th># of Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80-100% Agreement</td>
<td>17 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79% Agreement</td>
<td>5 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69% Agreement</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59% Agreement</td>
<td>8 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-49% Agreement</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Indicators = 40
Phase 2 Results

- 19 themes were identified through inductive content analysis (291 quotations)
- Majority were constructive to improve and refine the process
  - Not specifically related to implementation and/or utility from decision-making standpoint
- Concerns raised about lack of comparative data and context of data presented
- Common change in practice was increased need and use for databases for tracking and monitoring indicators
Phase 3 Results

- Provided information on PH Activities: 74%
- Provided information on PH Accomplishments: 71%
- Enough Detail Provided: 66%
- Clearly Presented: 86%
- Visual Presentation: 91%
- Content Reflected PH: 70%
- BSC Effective Tool: 75%
- Satisfied with the BSC: 78%

Question Items
Discussion

OVERALL

• Phase 1 and 3 results indicate consensus-building process was efficient and effective.

• Phase 1, 2, and 3 provide initial evidence of the utility of the BSC to inform decision-making.
Efficiency and Effectiveness

- Process proceeded smoothly, some improvements could be made
- More activities to enrich panel members regarding other programs are warranted
- May increase familiarity with programs and relevant indicators
Usefulness of BSC to Inform Decision-Making

• Incongruence between the indicators selected and the utility for decision-making

• Difficulty may have been in the interpretation of the indicators

• Similar to Bowen et al (2008) findings that indicators are one source of data and not the gold standard, BSC indicators are not to be relied upon solely
Opportunities to Enhance Current Practices

- Continue to involve BSC panel members in future iterations
- Development of data collection methods and databases to assist in the development of future reports
Limitations

- Low response rate typical of survey research
- Short-turn around times for completion of survey
- Timing of the evaluation proceeded soon after the BSC was disseminated
Recommendations

1. Communication;

2. Indicator Revision;

3. Benchmarking and Targets;

4. Champion-model;

5. Continued Evaluation; and

6. Resources
Thank You!

Questions? Comments?

For copies of the BSC, visit www.york.ca
For copies of the Process Evaluation Report, email scott.cholewa@york.ca