

CRITERIA

Participants were asked which of the four Goal Areas they most wanted to discuss. They then moved to a table corresponding to the Goal Area they selected. Each table began with a general discussion of CDC's criteria.

What criteria would you use in your community when prioritizing CDC health Objectives?

- *Health Impact:* Participants thought that the number of people the Objective addresses should be considered.
- *Vulnerable or Forgotten Populations:* Participants stressed the need to consider vulnerable or commonly overlooked populations when selecting the Objectives such as minorities, those with disabilities, people who live in rural areas, and populations without a voice such as fetuses, infants, and at times the elderly.
- *Intervention:* The intervention should be feasible, meaning it should be both reasonable and politically feasible, and it should also be locally implemented.
- *Resources:* The Objectives should be cost effective and consider the available resources.
- *Long Term Effect:* Participants wondered what the Objectives' long term implications for health are and thought that this impact should be considered in addition to the sustainability of the intervention.
- *Prevention:* The Healthy World table thought that prevention should be considered more than detection or intervention.
- *Infrastructure:* Numerous participants stressed the importance of infrastructure in prioritizing the Objectives. Some participants felt that the existing public health infrastructure should drive the prioritization of the Objectives while others thought that the Objectives should encourage infrastructure development. Participants noted Arkansas' problems with literacy and thought that if these Objectives were to be implemented, they would require a more educated population to support them. Other participants considered the large Marshall Islanders population in Little Rock and thought that the infrastructure needed to bear this population in mind.
- *Collaborations:* The Objectives should leverage partnerships and collaboration with both traditional and non-traditional partners.

Are there any major criteria missing?

- *Measurability:* The Objectives should have measurable outcomes.
- *Cost Effectiveness:* The highest priority Objectives should use money and other resources efficiently.
- *Timing:* The timing of the interventions should be considered when selecting the Objectives.
- *Climate:* The political and economic climates should be considered when selecting the Objectives.
- *Existing Interventions:* Participants thought that the criteria should consider whether or not interventions were available and if that intervention was evidence-based.

- *Existing Infrastructure*: The necessary infrastructure should exist to support the comprehensive interventions suggested by the highest priority Objectives.
- *Community Values*: The Objectives should consider the community's values by allowing locally driven flexibility in the development of the Goal Action Plans.
- *Greater Emphasis*: Participants noted the presences of prevention and health disparities but thought that both should be given greater emphasis in the Criteria.
- *Criterion D*: There was a great deal of discussion around Criterion D, "Is the objective consistent with CDC's mission, core values, and interests?" Participants thought that this criterion should be rephrased to ask if CDC is the "best agency" to address the Objective, if the Objective is within CDC's area of strength and competence, or if it is appropriate for CDC to address the Objective.

Overall assessment of the group of Criteria as a whole – balanced, reasonable?

Generally, participants agreed that CDC's Criteria as a whole are balanced and reasonable but felt the order in which the criteria are applied is important. One of the Healthy Places' tables reminded CDC to be realistic because money is finite and the Healthy World table added that the application of the Criteria may be difficult for the Healthy World Objectives.

Are CDC's criteria clear?

Again, most of the participants answered in the affirmative though some groups mentioned that the word "important" needs clarification and thought that some of the criteria were a bit vague. One group thought that the criteria were unclear because they are overly simplified.

Are there any that don't belong?

Overall, the participants felt that all four of the Criteria belonged on the list.