

Using NPHPSP results in strategic planning: Prioritizing (Example)

Following the NPHPSP assessment, several sites have used the process below to present results and ultimately develop strategic plans for their jurisdictions.

1. Present the results, identifying **strengths** and **weaknesses/challenges** as follows:
 - Strengths = Model Standards within all Model Standard “Met” categories, highlighting those that fell under the “Fully Met” range (see sample chart)
 - Weaknesses/challenges = Model Standards within the “Not Met” category. In addition, any sub-indicators with a numeric score of 0 are also specifically noted in the weaknesses/challenges category.
2. List the weaknesses/challenges from the report on a flip chart, and ask participants to identify the indicators that (in their opinion) are the biggest priorities to improve community health.
3. Narrow the list to 5 to 10 priorities. From this list, use discussion to decide which ones participants are interested in addressing.
4. For each priority, a work group establishes A) goals, B) objectives, C) strategies for addressing objectives, and D) a two-year timeline for activities.
 - The work group consists of individuals who were invited to the public health assessment meeting and other partners in the community who have an invested interest.
 - The two-year timeline is implemented so that each public health entity can plan activities and revisit the assessment instrument every three-to-five years and have baseline data and additional data to compare the progress of their public health systems.

Essential Service / Model Standard	Fully Met	Substantially Met	Partially Met	Not Met
EPHS 1: Monitor Health Status			•	
1.1 Population Based Community Health Profile		•		
1.2 Access to and Utilization of Current Technology				•
1.3 Maintenance of Population Health Registries		•		
EPHS 2: Diagnose and Investigate Health Problems	•			
2.1 Identification and Surveillance of Health Threats	•			
2.2 Plan for Public Health Emergencies	•			
2.3 Investigate and Respond to Public Health Emergencies			•	
2.4 Laboratory Support for Investigation of Health Threats	•			

The CDC table above places each indicator into one of four categories: met, substantially met, partially met, and not met. The table helps sites identify high and low performing areas.

Adapted from Yolanda Savage, Aberdeen Area Indian Health Service. Since 2002, over 20 Tribal and Indian Health Service sites across the United States have completed NPHPSP assessments using the state or local instruments.