

FPLS Evaluation Workgroup Proposal

MAY 3, 2018

Proposal:

Focus the workgroup's efforts on MDH and MDH delegated agencies

State agency independence

MDH and MDA have different needs and different requirements in their delegation agreements.

MDH is taking direction from EHCIB. MDA is an active participant, but is not required to follow direction from the Board. MDA will continue to participate in a situational awareness capacity.

Protocol

Evaluation tool

Use the MDH evaluation survey tool from the previous evaluation cycle (Standards 1-8) as the starting point.

- The evaluation tool is formatted according to the MDH Delegation Agreement. The MDH Delegation Agreement is modeled after the VNRFRPS.
- Review the Delegation Agreement to ensure all performance elements are included.
- The evaluation criteria on the assessment form will be rephrased (many are currently yes/no questions).
- The workgroup will develop a scoring rubric for how to meet each of the elements
- Only include the "orange/essential" (from MN Statute) and "yellow/required" (from MDH delegation agreement) elements.

Remove the VNRFRPS elements from the MDH evaluation tool altogether

- Feedback from the pilots is that the effort required to complete the VNRFRPS elements did not add value to the evaluation or result in increased public health protection.
- MDH will continue to support voluntary delegated agency conformance with the VNRFRPS
 - Technical resource
 - Continue to provide standalone verification audit services
 - Promote FDA training opportunities
 - Provide training and mentorship opportunities

FPLS EVALUATION WORKGROUP

Scoring

- Individual elements will be assessed as “meets” or “does not meet”
 - Alternative language for “does not meet” proposed: “more information needed”
- All elements of an individual standard will be met in order to meet the standard

Rollout

- Work group will develop a “high level” road map for how the standards will be rolled out and evaluated up front
 - Develop scoring rubric for how to meet the orange/yellow items
 - Include “pit stops” for improvement opportunities
 - Provide templates, examples, etc.
 - Provide training on a high level
- Evaluation of the Standards will be done one Standard at a time (or in bundles)
 - Provide training and mentoring on the standards prior to evaluation
- Roll out in order of “foundational elements” (i.e. policies, resources) first, and “performance elements” (i.e. frequency, enforcement) last
 - Gives agencies an opportunity to build or improve internal systems while working to meet performance elements.
- All delegated agencies and MDH will be evaluated to the same standards at the same time
- Builds consistency; evaluators will look at the same standards for everyone at the same time vs. over several years
- Develop a transparent dashboard showing status for all agencies
 - Minimize speculation and rumors
 - Provide opportunities for peer mentoring

Communication plan

- MDH will develop messages with EHCIB leadership to be sent to stakeholders
 - The process is changing
 - We need your input
 - A roadmap for the process will be coming
- Will need to consider a communication strategy for the non-delegated areas of the state.

Considerations

- Which elements are “do not pass go” or require critical intervention (vs. continuous improvement cycle)?
- When would termination be deemed necessary?
- This proposal does not align with MDH’s existing delegation agreement language related to evaluation frequency, performance statuses, or improvement plans.