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• Context HP in the Netherlands
• Strategies to improve effectiveness in practice
• Instrument Preffi 2.0
• Use the Preffi
Context HP in the Netherlands

• Since 1962 building infrastructure

• 1000 HP-specialist on local level; 70% with a university training
• active professional association

• 4 university-centres HP-oriented

• 6 national institutes on HP-topics
• NIGZ : HP in general
Trends

• responsibility HP primarily on the local level
• more nationally developed evidence based projects
• development of quality systems for HP
• advocacy for increased investment in health
Different roles for improvement of effectiveness in practice

1. Research
   - focus on developing and testing evidence based programs

2. Practice
   - how to use the ‘effectiveness’ knowledge

3. National institutes
   - linking practice, research and policy
   - support practice on a local level
   - advocate for evidence-based practice and practice based science
Research perspective, 1

• focused at rigorously testing the efficacy and effectiveness of preventive interventions.

• aim: large scale dissemination and implementation of only the evidence-based, effective ‘model programs’

This approach has been quite beneficial for advocacy for HP and is widely used
But many ‘evidence-based’ programs:

- have limited effect in terms of objectives, participants and period
- show low or moderate effect size and large variation in efficacy
- are very difficult to implement and investment in implementation is low
- are hardly used in practice
Practitioners perspective, 1

- develop a lot of projects bottom up
- creative and adapt model-programs
- act fast and visible
- ambitions much higher than capacity
Practitioners perspective, 2

- not easy to use knowledge about effectiveness
- there are so many new insights
- completed their basic training 8 years ago
- practitioners hardly read
- principles and guidelines are helpful
Practitioners perspective, 2

- not easy to use knowledge about effectiveness
- there are so many new insights
- ended their education 8 years ago
- practitioners hardly read
- principles and guidelines are helpful

→ Serious gap with new scientific insights
To improve effectiveness of prevention practice ..... 

We need a combination strategy:

Development and dissemination of evidence-based model programs

+ 

Use of knowledge about effectiveness in practice through principles and guidelines for effect management
Task national agencies

- bridging the gap between practice and research
- practice is then leading
- develop different support instruments and infrastructure
NIGZ-Centre for Knowledge and Quality

Reviews → What do we know?

QUI → What projects?

Preffi → Principles

Training → Support and advice
the Preffi 2.0

PRevention EFFect-management Instrument

One of the tools to improve the quality of practice in prevention and health promotion
Aim of the Preffi

To provide to HP-specialists an instrument (checklist) for effect management:

that supports them in improving regularly the effectiveness of their interventions through the use of assessment criteria and guidelines that reflect recent scientific knowledge and practice-based knowledge on effect predictors
Development of Preffi

- 1993: start effectiveness project
- 1993-1994: IUHPE effectiveness studies
- 1994-1995: Preffi 1.0
- 1997-1999: implementation Preffi 1.0
- 2000-2002: development Preffi 2.0
- 2002: research concept Preffi 2.0
- Jan. 2003: launch Preffi 2.0
- 2003: implementation: 400 professionals

all steps in collaboration with practitioners
Format Preffi:
Keep it short and simple

- fit on one sheet
- with a maximum of 10 criteria
- mix of scientific- and practice-based knowledge and contextual aspects
- assessment & scenarios for improving interventions
### Health PRomotion E FFectiveness Fostering Instrument, Preffi 1.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context Analysis</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>concl.</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>prior.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0. Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. nature and scope problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (behavioral) determinants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choices (ttic’s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. targetgroup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. effective elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Management of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. pre-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. execution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preffi 2.0

• new or adapted items
• Preffi less linear
• more focus on context
• norms for each item
• a score form
• actions for improvement
Model Preffi 2.0

Divergent and convergent process

Iterative process
Model Preffi 2.0
As an Instrument the Preffi consists of …..

- **Users manual**
  explaining its use and instructions for scoring

- **The Preffi Questionaire**
  126 assessment questions related to 38 known effect predictors (‘criteria’), including norms

- **Scoring Form**
  to assess programs on conditions for effectiveness

- **Explanatory guide**
  summarizing available knowledge and evidence
**DEVELOPMENT**

**Implementatie**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementatie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Implementatie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Keuze voor implementatiestrategie gericht op intermediaren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1a Wijze van implementeren: top down en/of bottom up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1b Afstemmen van implementatie-interventies op intermediaren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1c Geschiktheid van de aanbieder voor intermediaren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Monitoren en genereren van feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Inbedden in een bestaande structuur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluatie**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluatie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Evaluatie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Duidelijkheid en overeenstemming over de uitgangspunten van de evaluatie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Procesevaluatie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Effectevaluatie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3a Is (of wordt) er een verandering gemeten?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3b Is aannemelijk dat de verandering is toegewezen door de interventie?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Feedback aan betrokkenen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Randvoorwaarden en haalbaarheid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Randvoorwaarden en haalbaarheid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Randvoorwaarden en haalbaarheid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Draagvlak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Capaciteit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Sturing door de projectleider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3a Expertise en eigenschappen van de projectleider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3b Aandachtspunten voor sturing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Randvoorwaarden en haalbaarheid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Randvoorwaarden en haalbaarheid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Randvoorwaarden en haalbaarheid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Draagvlak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Capaciteit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Sturing door de projectleider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3a Expertise en eigenschappen van de projectleider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3b Aandachtspunten voor sturing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Toelichting:**

Vul bij ieder criterium een score in door een kruisje te zetten in een van de vakjes:

- **sterk**
- **matig**
- **zwak**

De operationalisatie vindt u in het document ‘Operationalisering en normering Preffi 2.0’.

Mocht u criteria, vragen of termen onduidelijk vinden, neem dan contact op met het team van de NIGZ.

---

**Korte toelichting:**

Vul bij ieder criterium een score in door een kruisje te zetten in een van de vakjes:

- **sterk**
- **matig**
- **zwak**

De operationalisatie vindt u in het document ‘Operationalisering en normering Preffi 2.0’.

Mocht u criteria, vragen of termen onduidelijk vinden, neem dan contact op met het team van de NIGZ.
Cluster | Effect predictors (quality criteria) | Questions | Norms & scores
--- | --- | --- | ---
Assessment scores per Cluster | Yes / no
Weak
Moderate
Strong

Hosman & Molleman, 2003
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Effect predictors (quality criteria)</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Norms &amp; scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determinants</td>
<td>Theory to base</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes / no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact determ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changeability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priorities and Selection</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment scores per Cluster . . . . .
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Effect predictors (quality criteria)</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Norms &amp; scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program development</td>
<td>Fit to objectives &amp; target population</td>
<td>Yes / no</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration &amp; intensity</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement of Target group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fit to culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment scores per Cluster...
Evaluating a Program with the Preffi 2.0

**Checklist**
- 8 Clusters
- Covering 38 Criteria
- Through 126 questions

**Evaluation Profile**
Scores averaged by cluster

**Evaluation scores**

**Planned Improvements**
Visualize score:

| 1. Contextual conditions and feasibility |
| 2. Problem analysis          |
| 3. Determinants             |
| 4. Target group            |
| 5. Target                  |
| 6. Intervention development |
| 7. Implementation strategies|
| 8. Evaluation              |

[Grid with dots indicating score distribution]
Aspects to improve and actions: *make choices* !!!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To be improved</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation of the Preffi
Implementation interventions 1997-2000

- Announcing the Preffi
- Stimulating use
- Supporting the use of the Preffi

- publications
- mailings
- lectures
- Preffi-prize
- lectures
- workshops
- handbook
- intake workshops
- training sessions
- inter-vision
- advice
National survey among practitioners in 1999

- aware of its existence 96%
- positive attitude 80%
- use Preffi sometimes 45%
- regular use 25%

Most helpful for use of the Preffi:
- support from colleagues and management
- training program
Test of new version: Preffi 2.0 (2002)

Pilot study among 35 practitioners from different sectors who have used the new version:

- 2.0 version is significant improvement: 89%
- positive attitude: mean evaluation score 7.7
- assessing a program with Preffi 2.0: 1.5 hours
Results from testing

• goal of the Preffi
  – diagnostic tool: quality-improvement
  – selection tool: quality-assessment

• use of the score-form
  – score-form +interview
  – training necessary

• internet version most helpful
Reported benefits of using the Preffi

- attention for effectiveness
- planning more explicit
- more use of scientific models
- clear targets ⇒ evaluation
- more realistic choices
- get in contact with new scientific insights
Avarage score on Preffi-items 4 price-winning projects
Preffi can be used in different ways

1. As an assessment instrument to evaluate the quality of ongoing programs and to identify options for improvement

2. As supportive instrument in developing, or selecting and adapting new programs

3. As an educational instrument in the training and supervision of hp specialists
Conclusions

- In addition to promoting the development and dissemination of evidence-based programs, there is a need for continuous improvement of programs and practice.

- This requires evidence-based and practice-based knowledge on the principles of effective programs and implementation.

- The PREFFI provides an instrument and a dynamic learning system to improve effectiveness, by linking science and practice.
More information

www.preffi.nl

www.nigz.nl