

# Priority Setting: Foundational Standard

Christina Bradley, Public Health Nurse

Deborah Moore, Epidemiologist

# Outline

- Introduction
- Methods
  - Data collection (quantitative, qualitative)
  - Ranking order
  - Interpretation
- Successes and Limitations

# Introduction

## Foundational Standard:

- Population Health Assessment
- Surveillance

# Priority Setting Process

- Developed by Dr. Sande Harlos
- Examines both qualitative and quantitative data
- Equalizes variables (data sources)
- Broad vs. focused
- Provides structure to stakeholder deliberations
- Transparent documentation

**need**

## Quantitative Criteria

- death
- potential years life lost
- emergency dept visits
- hospitalization
- length of stay

**capacity**

## Qualitative Criteria

- effective interventions
- program standards
- resource availability
- opportunity gaps exist
- community readiness
- collaboration

**impact**

**partnership**

# Quantitative

# Provincial Health Planning Database (PHPDB)

- Niagara Region, 2006
- Deaths, potential years life lost, emergency department visits, hospitalization, length of stay
- External causes by ICD-10 Codes based on intentional and unintentional injuries
- Age categories
  - 0 – 4
  - 5 – 14
  - 15 – 19
  - 20 – 59
  - 60 +

# Step 1: Quantitative Data

	falls	vehicle	poisoning	burn	intentional
death	25	42	7	*	18
PYLL	525	630	70	70	378
ER visits	8972	1279	212	64	498
hospitalization	2150	36	6	36	36
length of stay	6451	108	18	23	72

\* Count less than 5

*These numbers are based on a fictitious community.*

rank average  
 $(2+3+4)/3=3$

	falls	vehicle	poisoning	burn	intentional
death	25 2	42 1	7 4	* 5	18 3
PYLL	525 2	630 1	70 4.5	70 4.5	378 3
ER visits	8972 1	1279 2	212 4	64 5	498 3
hospitalization	2150 1	<b>36</b> <b>3</b>	6 5	<b>36</b> <b>3</b>	<b>36</b> <b>3</b>
length of stay	6451 1	108 2	18 5	23 4	72 3

# Step 3: Sum Rank Scores

	falls	vehicle	poisoning	burn	intentional
death	25 <b>2</b>	42 <b>1</b>	7 <b>4</b>	* <b>5</b>	18 <b>3</b>
PYLL	525 <b>2</b>	630 <b>1</b>	70 <b>4.5</b>	70 <b>4.5</b>	378 <b>3</b>
ER visits	8972 <b>1</b>	1279 <b>2</b>	212 <b>4</b>	64 <b>5</b>	498 <b>3</b>
hospitalization	2150 <b>1</b>	36 <b>3</b>	6 <b>5</b>	36 <b>3</b>	36 <b>3</b>
length of stay	6451 <b>1</b>	108 <b>2</b>	18 <b>5</b>	23 <b>4</b>	72 <b>3</b>
<b>Sum Rank Scores</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>15</b>

# Step 4: Rank Sums

	falls	vehicle	poisoning	burn	intentional
death	25	42	7	*	18
	2	1	4	5	3
PYLL	525	630	70	70	378
	2	1	4.5	4.5	3
ER visits	8972	1279	212	64	498
	1	2	4	5	3
hospitalization	2150	36	6	36	36
	1	3	5	3	3
length of stay	6451	108	18	23	72
	1	2	5	4	3
<b>Sum Rank Score</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>RANK SUMS</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>

# Considering Additional Factors

- effective interventions
- program standards
- resource availability
- opportunity gaps exist
- community readiness
- collaboration

# Qualitative

# Methodology

- Community Asset Mapping
  - Structured interview of Niagara region agencies/committees re: their injury prevention programs, services, resources and partnerships
- Literature reviews
  - Best and promising practices
  - Injury trends (frequency, gender, etc.)
- Consensus

# Community Asset Survey

- Agency name and contact information
- Type of agency (committee vs. organization)
- Programs and services
- Injury categories and ages
- Accessibility
- Perception of needed community enhancements

# Qualitative Template

- Identical injury categories to qualitative
- 1 – 3 vs 1 – 5 Likert Scale
- Rank qualitative statements
- Internal or stakeholder consensus building

# Qualitative Sample

	falls	vehicle	poisoning	burn	intentional
effective interventions	3	2	2	1	2
program standards	3	3	1	1	1
resource availability	3	2	2	2	1
opportunity gaps exist	2	2	2	1	1
collaboration	3	3	2	2	2
community readiness	2	3	1	1	2
<b>Total Rank Score</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>RANK SUMS</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>

\* Fictitious Community

# Combine Quantitative and Qualitative Results

	falls	vehicle	poisoning	burn	intentional
Quantitative Ranks	1	2	5	4	3
Qualitative Ranks	1	2	3	5	4
<b>Sum</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>

# Overall Ranking

	falls	vehicle	poisoning	burn	intentional
Quantitative Ranks	1	2	5	4	3
Qualitative Ranks	1	2	3	5	4
<b>Sum</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Overall Ranking</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>

# Overall Successes

- Methodology recognized nationally
- Comparable data with provincial, regional, municipal organizations
- Set the priorities for injury strategic planning
- Adaptable for other programs
- Collaborative – multidisciplinary

# Overall Limitations

- Time
- Data quality and availability
- Data Management  
(IT tools – relational databases)

# Questions?

## **Christina Bradley**

Public Health Nurse

905-688-8248 ext. 7401

[christina.bradley@niagararegion.ca](mailto:christina.bradley@niagararegion.ca)

## **Deborah Moore**

Epidemiologist

905-688-8248 ext. 7771

[deborah.moore@niagararegion.ca](mailto:deborah.moore@niagararegion.ca)