

end+disparities ECHO Collaborative Regional Group Assessment Tool

Name of Regional Group: _____

Date of Completion: _____

Purpose of the end+disparities Collaborative Regional Group Assessment Tool

Sustained improvement activities across a specific geographic area require the Regional group’s collective attention to ensure that the regional HIV-specific quality management structures, processes, and functions support measurement and improvement activities by local HIV providers. Development, implementation, and spread of sustainable quality improvement (QI) throughout a geographic region require an organizational commitment to quality management by all HIV providers.

The end+disparities ECHO Collaborative Regional Group Assessment Tool has been developed to assess the regional infrastructure for clinical quality management (CQM) by examining key domains, including: cross-Part infrastructure; communication strategies; cross-Part quality management plan; HIV performance measurement; QI projects; and training and technical assistance. Each domain is scored from 0 (no competency) to 5 (maximum competency) with a score of 3 representing an acceptable level of regional collaboration and alignment. The score 2 and score 4 (with no written descriptions) should be used when the regional performance is between scores 1 and 3, and respectively between scores 3 and 5.

Because the intent is to identify and assess the range and sophistication of existing end+disparities ECHO Collaboration efforts, all participating HIV agencies across the region should be ideally invited to participate in the assessment process, including subcontractors. Those individuals who have access to region-wide information about Collaborative efforts are in an ideal position to share their input. Results of the assessment should be openly communicated to agencies, key stakeholders, and consumers.

Regional Quality Management Infrastructure					
A.1. Is there an HIV-specific quality management infrastructure in place to engage all Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program agencies within your region?					
Score 0	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5
Score 0	No quality structure is in place to oversee planning, assessment and implementation of quality improvement activities across Parts.				
Score 1	Only a loose quality structure is in place; a few agencies of different Parts are involved; knowledge of quality structure among agencies is limited.				
Score 2					
Score 3	Strong representation of agencies in the end+disparities ECHO Collaborative quality program; recipients across all Parts are represented in the HIV quality structure; a Regional Response Team is in place; performance data results are shared; consumer voices are integrated.				

Score 4					
Score 5	Senior leaders of all agencies (recipients and subrecipients) across the region actively support the quality infrastructure and planned activities; key roles and responsibilities are clearly identified and individuals are assigned; adequate resources are available to initiate and sustain quality improvement activities across the region; members of the quality structure are routinely trained on quality improvement tools and methodologies; consumers are actively involved in quality improvement activities and are incorporated into the quality improvement infrastructure; the infrastructure is reviewed and updated periodically.				
Comment:					
A.2. Are cross-Part communication strategies in place to solicit feedback from all Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program agencies and to promote quality improvement activities across the region?					
Score 0	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5
Score 0	No communication strategies are in place to solicit feedback from all RWHAP agencies and to promote quality improvement activities across the region.				
Score 1	Agencies are only informed about end+disparities ECHO Collaborative activities as needed.				
Score 2					
Score 3	Communication strategies are in place to routinely inform agencies about quality improvement activities in the region; regular updates are sent out to agencies; agencies of all Parts are included; agencies are asked to provide feedback about upcoming end+disparities ECHO Collaborative activities.				
Score 4					
Score 5	A written and comprehensive communication approach is in place and updated routinely; quality improvement successes are routinely shared with all agencies (recipients and subrecipients) in the region; all recipients and subrecipients in the region across all Parts are regularly informed about end+disparities ECHO Collaborative activities; an individual or a team is assigned to regularly communicate with agencies; multiple communication channels (such as email, mail, internet, etc.) are identified to communicate with agencies and/or consumers; feedback of agencies is used to strengthen the collaborative efforts; quality improvement successes of agencies are openly shared for peer learning.				
Comment:					
A.3. Is a comprehensive quality management plan written to guide the end+disparities ECHO Collaborative quality management activities?					
Score 0	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5
Score 0	There is no or minimal written quality plan in place to envision and guide the end+disparities ECHO Collaborative activities; if any in existence, written plan does not reflect current day-to-day operations.				

Score 1	There is only a loosely outlined written quality management plan to envision and guide end+disparities ECHO Collaborative activities.
Score 2	
Score 3	A written cross-Part quality management plan is developed describing the quality infrastructure, performance measurement, indication of leadership and goals; the quality plan is shared with agencies across the region; the quality plan is reviewed and revised; some areas of detail and integration are not present.
Score 4	
Score 5	A comprehensive and detailed HIV-specific, region-wide end+disparities ECHO Collaborative management plan is in place, with a clear indication of responsibilities and accountability across all RWHAP agencies within the region, committee infrastructure, outline of performance measurement strategies, and elaboration of processes for ongoing evaluation and assessment; engagement of key stakeholders is described; the quality plan is reviewed and revised at least annually; quality plan fits within the framework of other regional quality improvement activities; agencies and key consumer group(s) within the region are aware of the plan and are involved in reviewing and updating the plan; a work plan is in place to detail the implementation of the written plan.
Comment:	

Regional Performance Measurement					
B.1. Are performance data on viral suppression collected to assess the quality of HIV care and services for all participating community partners across the region?					
Score 0	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5
Score 0	No appropriate performance or outcome measures are selected to collect and analyze performance data for participating community partners; no end+disparities ECHO Collaborative performance data are collected across agencies to assess the quality of HIV care and services.				
Score 1	Only those measures are selected that are minimally required by external parties; no process took place to annually review end+disparities ECHO Collaborative measures and their definitions; methods to collect data are not described; some data are collected but not fully utilized; no process established to share data or existing processes only used for punitive				
Score 2					
Score 3	Measures include appropriate clinical measures, such as viral suppression, to assess performance across all participating community partners; measurement information is shared with agencies across the region; a system to measure key quality aspects among agencies of all parts is established; data are collected, analyzed, and routinely disseminated to providers; data are collected from most agencies within the region; steps are taken to coordinate the data collection efforts across parts.				
Score 4					

Score 5	The quality is measured by clinical and system measures; performance data, including disparity data are included from all RWHAP agencies in the region; measures are annually reviewed, prioritized, and aligned with region-wide quality goals; all measures are operationally defined, and augmented with specific targets or target ranges; stratification of performance data is included in the analyses to detect disparities; results and findings are routinely shared with agencies and/or consumers to inform and foster quality improvement activities; data collection activities are streamlined to avoid duplicative efforts across community participants; a detailed data collection plan across agencies is developed and periodically updated.
Comment:	

Regional Quality Improvement Activities					
C.1. Are region-wide quality improvement goals developed in collaboration with Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program agencies of all Parts?					
Score 0	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5
Score 0	No regional improvement goals are established.				
Score 1	Goals for the regional improvement efforts do not reflect current priorities; agencies are unaware of these goals; goals are selected without participation of agencies within the region; goals are only based on external requirements.				
Score 2					
Score 3	Annual improvement goals are developed and prioritized based on the input of agencies within the region; a regional aim statement is articulated; goals are based on past performance and external requirements; some agencies are aware of quality goals; no process in place to routinely review and update goals.				
Score 4					
Score 5	Relevant improvement goals are selected at least annually with the collaboration of all parts within the region; goals are set for quality projects and performance measures, and actively communicated across all participating community partners in the region; goals are relevant to HIV care and include system's measures; at minimum, annual review and update of goals; goals incorporate consumer feedback.				
Comment:					
C.2. Are joint quality improvement project(s) conducted with the engagement of Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program agencies across parts?					
Score 0	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5

NA	The Regional Group does not have an infrastructure to support the planning and implementation of a QI project; the Response Team rarely checks in and discusses with the RWHAP agencies about the need to request technical assistance.
Score 0	The Regional Group is in the process of discussing the Regional Group quality improvement priorities; the Response Team has checked in and discussed with agencies the need to request technical assistance from the Regional Group, CQII, or HRSA/HAB.
Score 1	The Regional Group has discussed regional improvement goals; the Regional Group has developed a regional Aim Statement; baseline measurements have been envisioned.
Score 2	RWHAP agencies have collected the necessary baseline quality improvement data; agencies identified key causes based on results of a root cause analysis of the problem; quality improvements have begun.
Score 3	At least 75% of regional Community Partners have been engaged in the Regional Group improvement initiative and have selected interventions that are an outgrowth of their identified key causes; a plan for testing interventions has been created with initial steps completed for testing and measuring at least one PDSA Cycle by Community Partners; QI project updates have been shared with the Response Team; the Response Team checks with Community Partners who have not shared their progress.
Score 4	At least 75% of regional Community Partners have implemented multiple PDSA Cycles, documented their improvement interventions, and measured their tests of change; Community Partners have shared their improvement interventions and results at RG meetings; modest improvement has been reported.
Score 5	At least 85% of regional Community Partners have been engaged in the regional improvement initiative and have, partly or fully, achieved their individual Aim Statements - if agencies have yet to achieve their stated Aim Statement, they have continued to repeat the quality improvement process of testing small tests of change; the Regional Group has aggregated data to show a trend of improvement; effective interventions have been spread to other agencies; plans are in place to sustain success at individual agencies.
Comment:	

Regional Capacity Building for Quality Improvement					
D.1. Are quality improvement training and technical assistance on quality improvement offered to HIV providers and consumers across the region and across Parts?					
Score 0	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5
Score 0	No quality improvement training and/or technical assistance on quality improvement are offered to provider agencies nor consumers across the region.				
Score 1	Limited process in place to train providers or consumers on quality improvement across agencies; limited technical assistance is available to build capacity for quality improvement.				
Score 2					
Score 3	Capacity to train agencies is available; opportunities routinely exist to train agencies across parts; quality improvement trainings are offered to consumers; invitations to quality improvement trainings are shared across agencies; peer learning network opportunities exist.				



Score 4	
Score 5	A formal, region-wide approach is in place to train agencies and all participating community partners; a formal, region-wide consumer training program is in place; an annual training schedule is developed based on needs assessment findings including input by agencies and consumers; QI resources are shared regionally (i.e., Glasscubes); process in place to triage technical assistance requests from individual provider agencies; technical assistance on quality improvement is provided by quality improvement experts or peer providers; routine sharing of best practices across agencies.
Comment:	