Orientation of potential applicants to the STD AAPPS Supplemental FOA for Enhanced Evaluation

Marion Carter, Brandy Maddox, Penny Loosier, and Kate Brookmeyer (DSTDP)

&

Bernadette Cunningham (PGO)

July 8, 2014

National Center for HIV/AIDS, Viral Hepatitis, STD & TB Prevention
Division of STD Prevention

Outline

First half

- Overview
- Topic descriptions
- Application content and submission process

Second half

- Q&A

OVERVIEW

The Basics

- **Supplement to STD AAPPS**
  - Funding and reporting will be integrated with AAPPS award
- **Eligibility limited to current awardees of STD AAPPS**
- **Competitive**
  - $500,000 to award right now in year 1
  - Approximately 6 awards (?)
- **Multi-year**
  - Additional funding for evaluation for the remaining years of STD AAPPS, with project period of 4 years

Intent of the FOA

- **Support enhanced evaluation of four high priority topics**
  - Recognizing that baseline resources and requirements for STD AAPPS generally preclude this
- **Help build the evidence base for STD programs**
  - Where attribution of certain outcomes to activities/strategies is plausible ….albeit on a small scale
- **Not focused on evaluation capacity-building**
- **Not intended to change or fund the actual implementation of strategies**
  - STD AAPPS should support what you'd be evaluating

Why those four topics?

- **Identified through various internal discussions and prioritization processes**

- **Rationale:**
  - Areas of expansion or change
  - Areas of major investment
  - Fundamental importance to the logic of STD AAPPS

- **1 assessment and 3 assurance topics**
  - 2 DIS-related topics

Intended outcomes of the FOA

Primary

- **Stronger evidence base for certain STD program strategies**
  - What works (outcomes associated with strategies)
  - How to do it (barriers and facilitators to implementation)

Secondary

- **Increased collaboration and communication among awardees about evaluation and effective interventions**

What the work would involve

- **Prospective process and (short-term) outcome evaluations of the topic, over a few years**

- **Common awardee activities include (p. 8-9 of FOA)**
  - Planning the evaluation and engaging stakeholders
  - Bringing sufficient and appropriate expertise to the evaluation
  - Implementing the planned evaluation and tracking progress
  - Disseminating and using the evaluation findings

- **CDC activities:**
  - Provide TA and support
  - Help coordinate among all awardees and among awardees working on the same topic, as appropriate

How does this FOA related to the Targeted Evaluation Plans?

Targeted evaluation plans

- Assurance area only
- Focus determined by project area
- Shorter-term
- Results primarily for project area's own purposes
- Completed with existing STD AAPPS funds
- All project areas required to submit a plan

Enhanced Evaluation FOA applications

- 4 pre-determined topics, including assessment
- Multi-year
- Results should be of broader interest
- Scope larger, requiring additional funds
- Few project areas will be involved

Enhanced evaluations would supplement, not replace, your targeted evaluation planning and implementation

TOPIC DESCRIPTIONS

Topic #1: Evaluation of the strategic use of assessment data

- **Rationale**
  - The broader purpose of assessment activities is to inform program planning and implementation, to ensure resources can be directed to where they are needed most or can be used most effectively
- **Project type and period**
  - Prospective, 2 or more years
- **Expected project plan and outcome**
  - Examine whether and how project areas are able to use assessment data obtained under STD AAPPS to implement assurance activities more strategically

Topic #1 Strategic use of assessment data: Important considerations

- **Efforts to be focused on:**
  - Use of STD surveillance, screening and treatment data
  - Translation of assessment data into program action or decisions

- **Sample questions focus on:**
  - Successful use of assessment data to align program strategies
  - Facilitators or barriers to re-align resources
  - Key data essential to targeting resources and strategies
  - Changes to program directions and resource allocation
  - Unintended consequences of using assessment data strategically

Topic #1 Strategic use of assessment data: Topic-specific activities

- **In addition to the common recipient activities, evaluations for this topic must meet the following minimum requirements:**
  - Be prospective, covering at least 2 years of effort to utilize assessment data
  - Include a process evaluation component involving a case study of how assessment data were reviewed or utilized over the evaluation project period
  - Include an outcome evaluation component, including evidence of the correlation between a project area's assessment data and the project area's strategies funded by STD AAPPS, and measures of that correlation over time

Topic #1 Strategic use of assessment data: Topic-specific evaluation criteria

- **In addition to the general evaluation criteria to be included in all applications, the following evaluation criteria should be addressed by respondents applying for funding under this topic:**
  - Describe surveillance data that you will try to use strategically, to inform your program's direction and the extent of access to data
  - Identify risks that may limit your ability to access the assessment data you plan to evaluate the use of and to what extent the risks impede your ability to evaluate those strategies, as intended under, and within the timeline of, this FOA

Topic #2: Evaluation of methods for improving screening for chlamydia among young women in primary care settings

- **Rationale**
  - Evaluation of assurance of appropriate screening and treatment of chlamydia in settings where HDs have limited control or history of partnership
- **Project type and period**
  - Prospective, 2 or more years
- **Expected project plan and outcome**
  - Evaluation projects conducted under this topic should work with providers or institutions with low chlamydia screening rates and seek to increase screening significantly over the course of this evaluation project

Topic #2 Screening for chlamydia among young women in primary care settings: Important considerations

- **Efforts to be focused on:**
  - High-volume providers or networks of providers who provide primary care services in primary care settings; (i.e., does not include STD or family planning clinics); and/or,
  - Institutions which exert considerable influence on provider practice across a wide geographical area, such as health plans
- **Sample questions focus on:**
  - Successful intervention(s) and needed workforce capacity
  - Factors influencing intervention adaptation and implementation
  - Reasons for improvement (or not) of screening rates
  - Facilitators or barriers to increasing screening rates
  - Unintended consequences of the intervention(s)
  - Costs and cost-effectiveness of the intervention(s)

Topic #2 Screening for chlamydia among young women in primary care settings: Topic-specific activities

- **The evaluation must:**
  - Implement methods to assure screening for chlamydia among young women in primary care settings. To qualify for this evaluation topic, project areas should:
    - Collaborate with key implementation site(s) in their community (i.e., high-volume provider, provider network, health plan) with poor performance on the NQF measure 0033
    - Performance at or below the state's average performance on latest year's HEDIS reporting data (or equivalent) should be used to identify poorly performing targets for intervention.
  - Include a process evaluation component describing activities conducted to try to influence screening rates in those settings, including but not limited to:
    - Management and administrative aspects; development of necessary partnerships or collaborations; expenditures of staff time or monetary resources; barriers and facilitators to success; and any major course corrections or procedural changes made along the way
  - Include an outcome evaluation component, including reporting on changes in screening rates as assessed at selected site(s) using the NQF measure of chlamydia screening, at least annually.
    - More frequent tracking of screening rates in the intervention settings is preferred, and data used must be as close to real time as possible, to be plausibly attributable to the interventions being conducted. An assessment of cost-effectiveness of activities should also be included.

Topic #2 Screening for chlamydia among young women in primary care settings: Topic-specific evaluation criteria

- **In addition to the general evaluation criteria to be included in all applications, the following evaluation criteria should be addressed by respondents applying for funding under this topic:**
  - Demonstrate that proposed implementation site(s) are high-volume providers of primary care services (as a health center, health care network, health plan, or other relevant institution) with poor performance on the NQF measure of chlamydia screening
  - Identify risks that may limit your ability to implement planned strategies for increasing screening for chlamydia and to what extent the risks impede your ability to evaluate those strategies, as intended under, and within the timeline of, this FOA

Topic #3 Evaluation of models of DIS utilization for HIV-related outcomes

- **Rationale**
  - Most STD programs invest substantial STD AAPPS and other resources to support DIS. Many programs are exploring new ways of using DIS and other staff conducting DIS-related duties, by expanding or modifying their scopes of work towards further integration and collaboration with HIV programs.

- **Project type and period**
  - Prospective, 2 or more years

- **Expected project plan and outcome**
  - Assess the effectiveness of approaches that use DIS, and other staff conducting DIS-related duties, to provide HIV-related services and identify key lessons for further implementation

Topic #3 Models of DIS utilization for HIV-related outcomes: Important considerations

- **Efforts to be focused on:**
  - DIS staff devoting more time towards HIV case identification, linkage to PrEP, linkage to HIV care, and re-engagement in HIV care
  - Programs with a well-functioning and robust cadre of DIS who are integrated into multiple areas of STD prevention and control

- **Sample questions include:**
  - Describing successful approaches and related issues and strategies
  - Factors influencing adaptation and implementation
  - Effects of the approaches on their intended HIV-related outcomes
  - Effects of the approaches on the programs' STD-related outcomes
  - Costs and cost-effectiveness of the approaches

Topic #3 Models of DIS utilization for HIV-related outcomes: Topic-specific activities

- **In addition to the common recipient activities, evaluations for this topic must meet the following minimum requirements:**
  - Be prospective, covering at least 2 years of effort towards utilizing the DIS and related workforce to provide HIV-related services and track outcomes
  - Include a process evaluation component, including: 1) A case study of the process of implementation, describing the program approach; and 2) Evaluation of DIS-related activities through time/motion studies, characterization of caseload, etc.
  - Include an outcome evaluation component, including: 1) Analysis of HIV-related and STD-related outcome data for index patients and their contacts contacted by DIS providing HIV-related services; and 2) Economic evaluation of the implementation of these approaches assessing costs and cost-effectiveness

Topic #3 Models of DIS utilization for HIV-related outcomes: Topic-specific evaluation criteria

- **In addition to the general evaluation criteria to be included in all applications, the following evaluation criteria should be addressed by respondents applying for funding under this topic:**
  - Describe existing DIS staffing capacity and how current activities are conducive to enhanced evaluation of DIS workforce utilization for HIV-related services.
  - Identify risks that may limit your ability to implement program models that direct the DIS workforce towards HIV-related outcomes, and to what extent the risks impede your ability to evaluate those strategies, as intended under, and within the timeline of, this FOA.

Topic #4 Evaluation of the public health contributions of DIS to STD prevention and control

- **Rationale**
  - Evaluation to assess and describe the value of DIS and their activities as a public health resource
- **Project type and period**
  - Prospective, 2 or more years
- **Expected project plan and outcome:**
  - Evaluation projects conducted under this topic should quantify the contributions that DIS have on community-level prevention and control of STDs including, at a minimum, traditional partner services activities as well as involvement with the broader community and healthcare infrastructure

Topic #4 Public health contributions of DIS: Important considerations

- **Efforts to be focused on:**
  - Documenting breadth and depth of DIS activities across multiple sectors; assessing impact of DIS activities on public health; and, identifying ways to integrate DIS into larger health systems
  - Examine whether and how some DIS functions may become reimbursable by third party payors
- **Sample questions focus on:**
  - Describing today's DIS workforce, balance of activities, etc.
  - Contribution of DIS to STD prevention and control at community level as well as to public health and larger health care system
  - Realignment of DIS activities in response to health systems changes
  - Possibility for reimbursement for DIS services by third party payors

Topic #4 Public health contributions of DIS: Topic-specific activities

- **The evaluation must:**
  - Track the public health contributions of DIS to STD prevention and control and improve efficiency or effectiveness of DIS for those purposes
  - Include a baseline assessment of DIS activities, including:
    - 1) tracking and quantifying DIS activities (e.g., partner services, risk reduction counseling, working with healthcare providers and community organizations, etc.) through time/motion studies, characterization of caseload, etc.; 2) conducting an economic evaluation of the provision of DIS activities (where applicable, data should include economic information on the provision of services in clinical sites supported by funds provided through the existing AAPPS award
  - Include at least one follow-up assessment to track changes made to the program based on the baseline assessment and to track any improvements in efficiency or effectiveness that result from those changes.
  - Include a case study of efforts to collaborate with the state Medicaid program to explore reimbursement options for preventive services provided by DIS, including an in-depth description of discussions about this issue and related barriers, facilitators, successes, and failures encountered. In states where conditions prevent much discussion or progress on this issue, awardees will be expected to document this over the course of their award.

Topic #4 Public health contributions of DIS: Topic-specific evaluation criteria

- **In addition to the general evaluation criteria to be included in all applications, the following evaluation criteria should be addressed by respondents applying for funding under this topic:**
  - A description of DIS activities in your program area, including:
    - Number of staff performing DIS activities, including average case load
    - Areas of program focus in which DIS are significantly involved
    - Collaborations or integration with key community partners, including scope and focus
    - Collaborations or integration with key sites within the community providing healthcare services, including scope and focus?
  - Description of the status of your relationship to your state Medicaid office, in terms of whether and how they are beginning discussions about reimbursement options for some DIS functions

APPLICATION CONTENT

Application Submission

- **Applicants must submit one application per topic**
  - If an applicant applies for more than one topic, they must submit more than one application
  - Applications will be reviewed and evaluated by topic
- **Project Abstract**
  - Summary of proposed activity: project description, objectives, methods
- **Project Narrative (10 pages maximum)**
  - Five sections

Project Narrative: Overview and Relevance (1 page)

- **High-level overview of proposed enhanced evaluation**
  - Goals and objectives
  - How can activities affect target outcomes and STD prevention
- **Rationale for wanting to conduct evaluation of topic area**
- **Relevance of topic area to project area's epidemiologic and programmatic profile**

Project Narrative: Program Readiness (2 pages)

- **Program readiness for enhanced evaluation**
  - Readiness to evaluate activities as described
- **Description of specific program strategies planning to evaluate**
  - Intended short- and long-term outcomes of strategies
  - Status and stage of development of those strategies
  - Status and role of partnerships to implement strategies
- **Discuss any potential barriers to implementation**

Project Narrative: Evaluation Approach (3 pages)

- **Detailed proposal on how evaluation will be conducted**
  - Stakeholders and partnerships
  - Key evaluation questions
  - Methods to be utilized
  - Key outcomes clearly defined
  - Dissemination plans
  - Timeline for implementation and evaluation

- **Describe added value of supplemental funding**

Project Narrative: Experience and Capacity (1 page)

- **Demonstrate ability to implement proposed evaluation project**

- **Address evaluation capacity and experience**
  - Planning and conducting program evaluation
  - Collecting quantitative and qualitative data for evaluation
  - Ability to analyze data for evaluation purposes
  - Manage data, including client records
  - Conduct quality assurance
  - Produce reports and engage partners

Project Narrative: Infrastructure, Management & Staffing (1 page)

- **Personnel and resources needed to accomplish evaluation project**
  - Detailed plan to manage daily activities, fulfil goals and meet deadlines
- **Describe staffing plan, staff qualifications and roles**
- **Evidence of institutional commitment**
- **Commitment of key staff to evaluation project**

Additional Attachments

- CVs or resumes for key staff
- Logic model for program strategy
- Evaluation plan matrix
- Letters of support from key partners (optional)

Selecting awardees

- **Applications will be reviewed by an objective review panel that is not familiar with your program**
  - Pay attention to the "review criteria" closely (p 22-25)
- **To fund evaluation on any topic, at least 2 project areas must apply and be ranked highly for that topic**
  - So all topics may not be funded
  - Why? To ensure some basis for comparison and contrast on a topic
- **DSTDP reserves the right to fund out of rank order**
  - For geographic and epidemiologic diversity
  - Why? To increase the chance that the results are of broader interest to all STD AAPPS awardees

APPLICATION SUBMISSION

CDC GRANT APPLICATION PROCESS
-APPLICANT AND GRANTS.GOV-

Orientation Webinar - PGO

July 8, 2014

Presented by: Bernadette Cunningham,
Grants Management Specialist

Steps to take when applying for a grant opportunity:

- Register your organization on www.grants.gov. Lengthy process. Give yourself sufficient time.

- Download the Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) **Application Instructions** (you do **NOT** need to be registered to download the instructions)

- Read the FOA instructions thoroughly and carefully. Although each section of the FOA is critically important, special attention should be given to the Award Information and Eligibility Information Sections.

- Prepare all the required forms, documents, and appendices in response to the FOA.

- Download the **FOA Application Package** to upload the documents into www.grants.gov and download/complete the grants forms. (you **MUST** be registered to download the Application Package)

- **IMPORTANT:** Submit your application **at least 7 days prior** to the FOA submission deadline date as possible. After the application is submitted into www.grants.gov it goes through automated error checks. If errors are encountered, you will be notified by email or the system will not allow you to submit the application. If it is prior to the FOA submission deadline, you will have an opportunity to correct your application and resubmit.

- Upon successful submission of your application, you will receive a confirmation email that **verifies** receipt of your application.

Key Points

- **Applications due September 18, 2014**
- **Funding to begin January 1, 2015**
- **Q &A will be posted on the STD AAPPS resources webpage, ASAP**
  - Sample evaluation matrix template as well
- **Send any additional questions to: stdaappsfoa@cdc.gov**

QUESTIONS/CLARIFICATIONS

Thank you!

For more information please contact Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

1600 Clifton Road NE, Atlanta, GA 30333
Telephone, 1-800-CDC-INFO (232-4636)/TTY: 1-888-232-6348
E-mail: cdcinfo@cdc.gov Web: www.cdc.gov

The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.