AMERICAN JOURNAL OF
Preventive Medicine

VOLUME 46(1) www.ajpmonline.org JANUARY 2014

Understanding Administrative Evidence-Based Practices

Findings from a Survey of Local Health Department Leaders

Ross C. Brownson, PhD, Rodrigo S. Reis, PhD, MSc, Peg Allen, PhD, MPH, Kathleen Duggan, MPH, MS, Robert Fields, MPH, Katherine A. Stamatakis, PhD, MPH, Paul C. Erwin, MD, DrPH

Background: There are sparse data showing the extent to which evidence-based public health is occurring among local health departments.

Purpose: The purpose of the study was to describe the patterns and predictors of administrative evidence-based practices (structures and activities that are associated with performance measures) in a representative sample of local health departments in the U.S.

Methods: A cross-sectional study of 517 local health department directors was conducted from October through December 2012 (analysis in January–March 2013). The questions on administrative evidence-based practices included 19 items based on a recent literature review (five broad domains: workforce development, leadership, organizational climate and culture, relationships and partnerships, financial processes).

Results: There was a wide range in performance among the 19 individual administrative evidence-based practices, ranging from 35% for providing access to current information on evidence-based practices to 96% for funding via a variety of sources Among the five domains, values were generally lowest for organizational climate and culture (mean for the domain=49.9%) and highest for relationships and partnerships (mean for the domain=77.1%). Variables associated with attaining the highest tertile of administrative evidence-based practices included having a population jurisdiction of 25,000 or larger (adjusted ORs [aORs] ranging from 4.4 to 7.5) and state governance structure (aOR=3.1).

Conclusions: This research on the patterns and predictors of administrative evidence-based practices in health departments provides information on gaps and areas for improvement that can be linked with ongoing quality improvement processes.

(Am J Prev Med 2014;46(1):49–57) © 2014 American Journal of Preventive Medicine

Introduction

There have been substantial improvements in health and longevity over the past century in the U.S. and other developed countries. This has come in part from the implementation of public health programs and policies covering a wide range of issues including workplace safety, immunizations, tobacco control, healthier eating, and reductions in motor vehicle crashes.[1–4] A focus on evidence-based public health (EBPH) has been described as the integration of science-based interventions with community preferences to improve the health of populations.[5] The importance of a stronger focus on EBPH is highlighted in numerous publications, including the Public Health Accreditation Board Standards that seek to "contribute to and apply the evidence base of public health"[6] as well as authoritative reports from the IOM that recommend specific actions to improve public health practice.[7,8] These publications and guidelines highlight the importance of using the best available evidence and the role of health departments in adding to the body of evidence on how to improve

From the Prevention Research Center in St. Louis (Brownson, Allen, Duggan, Fields), Brown School, the Division of Public Health Sciences and Alvin J. Siteman Cancer Center (Brownson), Washington University School of Medicine, Washington University in St. Louis, the College for Public Health and Social Justice (Stamatakis), St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri; the Department of Public Health (Erwin), University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee; the Pontifical Catholic University of Parana (Reis), School of Health and Biosciences and the Federal University of Parana (Reis), Department of Physical Education, Curitiba, Brazil

Address correspondence to: Ross C. Brownson, PhD, Washington University in St. Louis, 621 Skinker Boulevard, St. Louis MO 63130-4838. Email:rbrownson@wustl.edu.

0749-3797/$36.00
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2013.08.013

population health. There also is now a considerable literature on the barriers to EBPH (e.g., lack of time/competing demands, inadequate funding/high cost, absence of organizational support).[9–14]

Overcoming these barriers and, thus, fostering EBPH requires a combination of applying evidence-based interventions from scientific sources (e.g., the Community Guide,[15] the Cochrane Collaboration[16]) along with performance in carrying out effective organizational practices in health departments or other agencies. This process of EBPH can include so-called administrative evidence-based practices (A-EBPs), which are agency (health department)– and work unit–level structures and activities that are positively associated with performance measures (e.g., achieving core public health functions, carrying out evidence-based interventions).[17] These A-EBPs often fit under the umbrella of public health services and systems research[18,19] and cover five major domains of workforce development, leadership, organizational climate and culture, relationships and partnerships, and financial processes. These practices were recently articulated via a literature review[17] and are potentially modifiable within a few years, making them useful targets for quality improvement efforts.[20–23]

Although expert reports, state and local quality improvement efforts, and accreditation processes are drawing increasing attention to A-EBPs,[24–29] there are sparse data showing the extent to which performance in EBPH is occurring among local health departments (LHDs). To fill this gap, the current study had two objectives: (1) describe patterns in A-EBPs from a nationally representative sample of LHDs and (2) describe predictors of A-EBPs according to characteristics of the individual LHD leader and the characteristics of the LHD.

Methods

Sample

A stratified random sample of U.S. LHDs was drawn from the database of the National Association of County and City Health Officials (NACCHO).[30] Health departments were drawn from five groups, according to jurisdiction size (i.e., population service area) of an LHD: <25,000, 25,000–49,999, 50,000–99,999, 100,000–499,999, and ≥500,000 people. A sample of 1067 LHDs was used as the initial sample, out of a total of 2565 LHDs. Human subjects approval was obtained from the Washington University IRB.

Questionnaire Development and Testing

The survey instrument was based in part on a logic model adapted from Public Health Services Systems Research (PHSSR) frameworks[31–34] and previous work with state and local health departments, where standardized questions existed.[12,35–39] The questionnaire included six sections (i.e., biographical data, A-EBPs, diffusion attributes, barriers to EBPH, use of resources, competencies in EBPH) and 66 questions. The A-EBPs section of the instrument included 19 questions that were new and based on findings from a recent literature review.[17] Six A-EBPs questions used a dichotomous response (yes or no), and 13 used a 7-point, Likert-scaled response option. The instrument was designed for completion in 15 minutes or less.

The survey was reviewed by the core research team (n=11) and experts at NACCHO (n=2). After three rounds of revision, the instrument underwent cognitive response testing with 12 experts who were representative of the target audience (LHD directors). In these cognitive methods,[40–43] testing determined (1) question comprehension (e.g., *What does the respondent think the question is asking?*); (2) information retrieval (e.g., *What information does the respondent need to recall from memory in order to answer the question?*); and (3) decision processing (e.g., *How do they choose their answer?*). The research team incorporated cognitive response feedback into a further revision of the survey. In the next round of instrument development, a group of 38 LHD practitioners were sampled as part of a test–retest study to improve the instrument. These data are reported elsewhere[44] and showed that the majority of items (41/54=76%) had substantial to nearly perfect reliability, and no items had poor reliability.[44,45] For the A-EBPs questions, Cronbach's alpha values ranged from 0.67 to 0.94.[46]

Data Collection

Data were collected using an online survey (Qualtrics software[47]) that was delivered nationally to email accounts of 1067 LHD directors. One person was invited from each selected LHD. The survey was open for a 2-month time period (from October through December 2012) in which four email reminders and two rounds of phone calls were delivered to bolster response rate. After excluding nonvalid email addresses from the initial sample, the final recruitment sample was 967. There were 517 valid responses to the survey (54% response rate). Health department characteristics were similar between respondents and nonrespondents except for two variables. Respondents were less likely to work in health departments with jurisdictions of less than 25,000 people (26.2% compared with 35.3%) and were less likely to reside in the northeast (16.9% compared with 30.5%). The median survey administration time was 14 minutes.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were calculated for each A-EBP. The sample characteristics were derived from the survey data (individual characteristics in Table 1) and from archival data for each health department using U.S. Census regions, population size of jurisdiction, and LHD governance structure.[48] Sample sizes varied due to missing data. For each of five A-EBP domains and for all A-EBPs combined, the scores were summed, ranked, and placed into tertiles. Using unconditional logistic regression models, ORs and 95% CIs were calculated to compare those who reported the highest third of A-EBP scores with those who reported the lowest third. For the final model, significant variables and covariates that contributed to the fit of the model were retained, allowing us to

Table 1. Characteristics of the sample of local health departments, U.S., 2012

Characteristic	*n* (%)
INDIVIDUAL	
Age (years)	
20–39	52 (10.0)
40–49	110 (21.3)
50–59	228 (44.1)
60 and older	127 (24.6)
Gender	
Female	315 (60.9)
Male	202 (39.1)
Job position	
Top executive, health officer, commissioner	351 (67.9)
Administrator, deputy, or assistant director	117 (22.6)
Manager of a division or program, other	49 (9.4)
Highest degree	
Doctoral	91 (17.7)
Master of Public Health	88 (17.1)
Other master's degree	138 (26.8)
Nursing	97 (18.8)
Bachelor's degree or less	101 (19.6)
HEALTH DEPARTMENT	
Census region	
Northeast	87 (16.9)
Midwest	200 (38.8)
South	149 (28.9)
West	80 (15.5)
Population of jurisdiction	
<25,000	135 (26.2)
25,000–49,999	110 (21.4)
50,000–99,999	95 (18.4)
100,000–499,999	106 (20.6)
≥500,000	69 (13.4)
Governance structure	
State governed	51 (9.9)
Locally governed	416 (80.8)
Shared governance	48 (9.3)

calculate adjusted ORs. In addition, state was included as a covariate because LHDs are nested in states and there may be some clustering effect.

Results

From the 517 LHDs that participated in the survey, two thirds of respondents were the top health official in the health departments, followed by a deputy or assistant director (23%) (Table 1). Most of the respondents were aged >50 years and were female. Respondents had a variety of educational backgrounds. Approximately one fourth of respondents held a (non-MPH) master's degree, 17% held an MPH, 18% held a doctorate (e.g., PhD, DrPH, MD), and 20% held a bachelor's degree or less. The largest proportion of respondents was drawn from the Midwest (39%) and South (29%). As designed in the sampling scheme, health departments represented all jurisdiction size categories. Most health departments were locally governed (81%), with about 10% classified as state governed and 9% with shared state/local governance.

There was a wide range in performance among the 19 individual A-EBPs, ranging from 35% for providing access to current information on EBPH practices to 96% for funding via a variety of sources (Table 2). Among the five broad domains (workforce development, leadership, organizational climate and culture, relationships and partnerships, financial processes), values were generally lowest for organizational climate and culture, with three of four items reported by 42% to 43% of LHDs whereas 71% of LHDs reported presence of the fourth item, promotion of lifelong learning (mean for the domain=49.9%). Only four of 19 items were reported as present among more than 75% of LHDs. Five of 19 items were reported by fewer than 50% of the LHDs. The second lowest scoring domain was leadership (mean for the domain=56.8%).

In unadjusted, bivariate analyses, an array of variables predicted attainment of the highest tertile of A-EBPs (Table 3). Because findings were similar by domain, the summary results are presented. After adjustment for all significant bivariate predictors, a few variables were associated with attaining the highest tertile of A-EBPs, including age of 50–59 years (adjusted OR [aOR]=2.5, 95% CI=1.08, 6.0); population jurisdiction of 25,000 or larger (aORs ranging from 4.4 to 7.5); and state governance structure (aOR=3.1, 95% CI=1.04, 9.1).

Because jurisdiction size was the most robust predictor of A-EBP performance, the performance on 19 individual A-EBPs was compared in LHDs serving fewer than 25,000 people with LHDs serving 25,000 or more people (not shown in table). Across the 19 A-EBPs, smaller LHDs showed lower performance on all but one A-EBP (promotes lifelong learning). The largest differences between smaller and larger LHDs were shown for four specific A-EBPs: access to current information on EBPH practices (relative difference [i.e., the higher value minus the lower

Table 2. Administrative evidence-based practices in local health departments, U.S., 2012

Administrative practice	*n* (%)
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT	
Access to training in	
Quality improvement processes[a]	418 (82.1)
Performance assessment[a]	368 (71.5)
Management practices[a]	361 (70.0)
EBDM[a]	279 (59.0)
Access to current information on EBDM processes[b]	181 (35.0)
Average for domain	63.5
LEADERSHIP	
Foster staff participation in decision making[b]	432 (83.6)
Encourage use of EBDM[b]	311 (60.2)
Ability to lead in EBDM[b]	271 (52.4)
Hire people with experience in public health[b]	269 (52.0)
Hire people with public health degree[b]	184 (35.6)
Average for domain	56.8
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AND CULTURE OF AGENCY	
Promotes lifelong learning[b]	367 (71.0)
Access to EBDM information relevant to community needs[b]	224 (43.3)
Access to current research evidence[b]	222 (42.9)
Culture that supports EBDM[b]	218 (42.2)
Average for domain	49.9
RELATIONSHIPS AND PARTNERSHIPS	
Important to develop partnerships with both health and other sectors[b]	477 (92.3)
Partnerships have missions that align with agency[b]	365 (70.7)
Important to have partners who share resources[b]	353 (68.3)
Average for domain	77.1
FINANCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF AGENCY	
Funded through a variety of sources[a]	159 (95.8)
Allocated resources for quality improvement[a]	282 (54.5)
Average for domain	75.2

[a]Dichotomous (yes/no) response option
[b]7-point Likert-type scale response option; frequency shown is those who "strongly agree" and "agree."
EBDM, evidence-based decision making

value divided by the higher value]=49%); hire people with public health experience (relative difference=49%); hire people with public health degree (relative difference=62%); and access to current research evidence (relative difference=51%). In addition, these smaller LHDs were three times more likely to be led by someone holding a nursing degree (36.6% compared with 12.7%).

Discussion

Although the importance of applying principles of EBPH in public health practice has become more prominent over the past 15 years,[49–54] most inquiry has focused on the uptake of evidence-based interventions often providing sparse information on how these concepts are applied in local public health practice (the *performance* in EBPH). This study provides the first nationwide data on a broad range of A-EBPs among LHDs in the U.S. Although the current study focused on the U.S., the same principles of EBPH are important in other regions of the world.[55–60] Across the five domains of A-EBPs, a wide range of estimates was found from the lowest performance in A-EBPs related to organizational climate/culture and the highest responses for partnership development and agency support via multiple funding streams.

Administration and management capacity is one of 12 LHD accreditation domains established by the Public Health Administration Board.[26] The A-EBPs identified in the previous review,[17] now measured in the current study, can be linked with LHD performance, quality improvement, and accreditation processes.[20,21,24,25,61–64] Similar to the current findings, national data on LHDs show that health departments with large size of jurisdiction and centralized governance are more likely to engage in quality improvement activities, provide training, and have trained managers.[21,48,65]

The current findings highlight the need to focus more strongly on enhancing the climate and culture for EBPH

Table 3. Predictors of administrative evidence-based practices,[a] U.S., 2012

Characteristic	No. in highest tertile	No. in lowest tertile	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR[b] (95% CI)
INDIVIDUAL				
Age (years)				
20–39	13	24	1.0	1.0
40–49	33	32	1.9 (0.8, 4.4)	1.5 (0.6, 3.9)
50–59	77	61	2.3 (1.1, 5.0)	2.5 (1.08, 6.0)
≥60	37	40	1.7 (0.8, 3,8)	1.5 (0.6, 3.7)
Gender				
Female	96	95	0.98 (0.6, 1.5)	—
Male	64	62	1.0	—
Job position				
Top executive, health officer, commissioner	119	97	1.6 (0.7, 3.5)	—
Administrator, deputy, or assistant director	28	43	0.9 (0.4, 2.0)	—
Manager of a division or program, other	13	17	1.0	—
Highest degree				
Doctoral	39	24	3.1 (1.5, 6.4)	2.1 (0.9, 5.3)
Master of Public Health	28	27	2.0 (0.96, 4.1)	1.9 (0.8, 4.6)
Other master's degree	50	33	2.9 (1.5, 5.7)	1.9 (0.9, 4.1)
Nursing	20	28	1.4 (0.6, 2.9	1.5 (0.6, 3.6)
Bachelor's degree or less	23	44	1.0	1.0
HEALTH DEPARTMENT				
Census region				
Northeast	19	40	1.0	1.0
Midwest	55	61	1.9 (0.98, 3.7)	1.4 (0.6, 3.0)
South	65	30	4.5 (2.3, 9.2)	1.9 (0.8, 4.8)
West	21	26	1.7 (0.8, 3.8)	1.5 (0.6, 3.6)
Population of jurisdiction				
<25,000	14	64	1.0	1.0
25,000–49,999	40	26	7.0 (3.3, 15.0)	7.5 (3.3, 17.3)
50,000–99,999	35	28	5.7 (2.7, 12.2)	4.9 (2.1, 11.2)
100,000–499,999	46	23	9.1 (4.3, 19.6)	7.1 (3.0, 16.9)
≥500,000	25	16	7.1 (3.0, 16.8)	4.4 (1.6, 12.5)
Governance structure				
State governed	24	9	3.3 (1.5, 7.4)	3.1 (1.04, 9.1)
Locally governed	114	141	1.0	1.0
Shared governance	22	7	3.9 (1.6, 9.4)	2.5 (0.8, 7.6)

[a]The administrative evidence-based practices (A-EBP) summary score was calculated by summing the respondents' rankings for the 19 individual questions into a summary score and then placing the summary scores into tertiles.
[b]Those variables that were significant in unadjusted analyses (i.e., age, highest degree, census region, population of jurisdiction, and governance structure) were retained in the final model to calculate adjusted ORs. The ORs represent the odds of being in the highest tertile.

in LHDs. The health-related literature on climate and culture comes largely from studies of healthcare organizations (e.g., hospitals) and mental health service organizations. In these settings, organizational culture is the degree to which employees perceive an honest, fair, and trusting workplace.[66,67] Organizational climate is related to the localized manifestation of the culture, can vary across teams or units, and is often less stable over time compared with culture.[66–68] The few studies of public health practitioners suggest difficulty in changing organizational climate and culture.[10,12] Related to climate and culture, there also are numerous studies showing the linkage between health department leadership and EBPH (e.g., leaders who foster a climate supportive of EBPH).[9,39,69–71] There are now leadership training programs to foster leadership skills and develop a culture for EBPH.[72–74] It is also likely that even in the presence of committed leadership, a critical mass of committed staff and a social network in support of EBPH are needed.[75,76]

Strengthening EBPH competencies needs to take into account the diverse education and training backgrounds of the workforce. The emphasis on principles of EBPH is not uniformly taught across disciplines that comprise the public health workforce, in part because most people working in day-to-day public health practice lack formal training in core public health disciplines.[51,77] Several approaches in the literature show promise for addressing the deficits in EBPH-related skills.[38,78] One promising approach involves the use of knowledge brokers (i.e., a master's-trained individual available for technical assistance). Used more in Canada than in the U.S., a knowledge broker provides a link between research and end users (practitioners) by developing a mutual understanding of goals and cultures, collaborating with end users to identify issues and problems for which solutions are required, and enhancing access and use of research evidence in practice and policy.[78] Although there are few well-conducted evaluations of knowledge broker impact,[79] there is considerable evidence of effectiveness in other fields, particularly from business and agricultural sectors.[80–82] Implementation of training and capacity building to address A-EBPs should take into account principles of adult learning (e.g., respect the experience of learners, conduct active learning).[83,84]

These findings also suggest that a "one size fits all" approach for improving A-EBPs may not be effective. The sharp differences between smaller and larger LHDs in performance in A-EBPs highlight the challenges in delivering effective public health services in rural settings.[85–88] Realistic expectations for smaller LHDs can be linked with the recent recommendation from the IOM calling for a minimum set of services that no health department should be without.[7] These cover both foundational capabilities (e.g., surveillance, policy development capacity, quality improvement) and basic programs (e.g., mainly categorical programs: maternal and child health promotion, communicable disease control, chronic disease prevention). The A-EBPs fit most closely with the foundational capabilities and provide baseline data and a reliable method for measuring administrative and management capacity. Smaller LHDs were also much more likely to be led by a person trained in nursing. Although evidence-based practice has been prominent in nursing training for decades, it has largely focused on a patient orientation similar to evidence-based medicine.[89,90] Broadening training for nurses (both in formal, degree-based education and in continuing education) to focus more on public health sciences and skills may benefit the uptake of A-EBPs in LHDs.[91,92] Although it is not intuitively obvious how smaller LHDs could modify the predictor status of their small jurisdictions, there is increasing evidence that cross-jurisdictional sharing and regionalization of multiple LHDs may provide opportunities to enhance A-EBPs in such settings.[28,93]

Access to information also seems to be a particular challenge for smaller LHDs because in the current sample, smaller health departments were half as likely to have access to current research evidence for public health. Internet connectivity alone does not ensure access to research, as many journals do not provide free access; however, a recent decision to promote access to the new online journal *Frontiers in Public Health Systems and Services Research* to all LHDs through NACCHO is just one example of efforts that could enhance performance in A-EBPs (personal communication, B. Pestronk and G. Mays, University of Kentucky, April 2013). A recent systematic review suggests that in order to increase use of and access to scientific evidence in public health, two-way communication is needed between practitioners and researchers.[14] This may be enhanced by practice–academic linkages,[94,95] yet may be particularly challenging for widely dispersed LHDs that are not well linked with universities. Recent experiences of a select number of LHDs serving as demonstration sites for conducting community health assessments, however, indicate that there is a wide range of academic institutions—including community colleges and other institutions that do not have schools or programs in public health—with which LHDs can successfully partner.[96] There is a need for creating new and creative methods for reaching LHDs—this may rely on more-effective use of opinion leaders,[97] social media,[98] organizational partnerships, and new priorities from funding agencies (to better design research for dissemination).[99–102]

A few limitations of this study should be noted. The main limitation is that the data are self-reported.

Although psychometric testing of the instrument showed it is reliable, it is difficult to precisely ascertain the difference between people's report of A-EBPs and how these practices are being carried out in their agency (validity). In addition, the response rate was modest at 54%, suggesting the possibility of response bias due to lower representation from health departments with jurisdictions of less than 25,000 people and those from the northeast. And finally, the A-EBPs presented include a mixture of structures and activities; future work to refine the terminology in this field research will be beneficial.

This report on the patterns and predictors of A-EBPs in health departments provides information on gaps and areas for improvement that can be linked with ongoing quality improvement processes. These activities include practice-based research networks,[103] public health accreditation efforts,[6] and several practice-based training programs.[104,105] This type of practice-oriented research is promising because it marries university-based inquiry with the real-world experience of practitioners.

This study was supported in part by Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's grant no. 69964 (Public Health Services and Systems Research).

This article is a product of a Prevention Research Center and was supported also by Cooperative Agreement Number U48/DP001903 from the CDC. The findings and conclusions in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the CDC.

We also thank members of our research team, Beth Dodson, Jenine Harris, Carolyn Leep, Carson Smith and Drs. Glen Mays and Douglas Scutchfield of the National Coordinating Center for Public Health Services and Systems Research, University of Kentucky College of Public Health.

No financial disclosures were reported by the authors of this paper.

References

1. Briss PA, Brownson RC, Fielding JE, Zaza S. Developing and using the Guide to Community Preventive Services: lessons learned about evidence-based public health. Annu Rev Public Health 2004;25:281–302.
2. Fielding JE. Public health in the twentieth century: advances and challenges. Annu Rev Public Health 1999;20:xiii–xxx.
3. CDC. Ten great public health achievements—U.S., 1900–1999. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 1999;48(12):241–3.
4. CDC. Ten great public health achievements—U.S., 2001–2010. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2011;60(19):619–23.
5. Kohatsu ND, Robinson JG, Torner JC. Evidence-based public health: an evolving concept. Am J Prev Med 2004;27(5):417–21.
6. Public Health Accreditation Board. Public Health Accreditation Board standards: an overview. Alexandria VA: Public Health Accreditation Board, 2011.
7. Committee on Public Health Strategies to Improve Health. For the public's health. Investing in a healthier future. Washington DC: IOM of the National Academies, 2012.
8. IOM. Bridging the evidence gap in obesity prevention: a framework to inform decision making. Washington DC: IOM of the National Academies, 2010.
9. Baker EA, Brownson RC, Dreisinger M, McIntosh LD, Karamehic-Muratovic A. Examining the role of training in evidence-based public health: a qualitative study. Health Promot Pract 2009;10(3):342–8.
10. Ciliska D, Hayward S, Dobbins M, Brunton G, Underwood J. Transferring public-health nursing research to health-system planning: assessing the relevance and accessibility of systematic reviews. Can J Nurs Res 1999;31(1):23–36.
11. Dobbins M, Cockerill R, Barnsley J, Ciliska D. Factors of the innovation, organization, environment, and individual that predict the influence five systematic reviews had on public health decisions. Int J Technol Assess Health Care 2001;17(4):467–78.
12. Jacobs JA, Dodson EA, Baker EA, Deshpande AD, Brownson RC. Barriers to evidence-based decision making in public health: a national survey of chronic disease practitioners. Public Health Rep 2010;125(5):736–42.
13. Maylahn C, Bohn C, Hammer M, Waltz EC. Strengthening epidemiologic competencies among local health professionals in New York: teaching evidence-based public health. Public Health Rep 2008;123(S1):35–43.
14. Orton L, Lloyd-Williams F, Taylor-Robinson D, O'Flaherty M, Capewell S. The use of research evidence in public health decision making processes: systematic review. PLoS One 2011;6(7):e21704.
15. Zaza S, Briss PA, Harris KW, eds. The Guide to Community Preventive Services: what works to promote health? New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
16. The Cochrane Public Health Group. The Cochrane Collaboration; 2011. ph.cochrane.org/.
17. Brownson RC, Allen P, Duggan K, Stamatakis KA, Erwin PC. Fostering more-effective public health by identifying administrative evidence-based practices: a review of the literature. Am J Prev Med 2012;43(3):309–19.
18. Mays GP, Scutchfield FD. Advancing the science of delivery: public health services and systems research. J Public Health Manag Pract 2012;18(6):481–4.
19. Scutchfield FD, Marks JS, Perez DJ, Mays GP. Public health services and systems research. Am J Prev Med 2007;33(2):169–71.
20. Baker SL, Beitsch L, Landrum LB, Head R. The role of performance management and quality improvement in a national voluntary public health accreditation system. J Public Health Manag Pract 2007;13(4):427–9.
21. Beitsch LM, Leep C, Shah G, Brooks RG, Pestronk RM. Quality improvement in local health departments: results of the NACCHO 2008 survey. J Public Health Manag Pract 2010;16(1):49–54.
22. Drabczyk A, Epstein P, Marshall M. A quality improvement initiative to enhance public health workforce capabilities. J Public Health Manag Pract 2012;18(1):95–9.
23. Erwin PC. The performance of local health departments: a review of the literature. J Public Health Manag Pract 2008;14(2):E9–E18.
24. Lenaway D, Corso LC, Buchanan S, Thomas C, Astles R. Quality improvement and performance: CDC's strategies to strengthen public health. J Public Health Manag Pract 2010;16(1):11–3.
25. Randolph GD, Stanley C, Rowe B, et al. Lessons learned from building a culture and infrastructure for continuous quality improvement at Cabarrus Health Alliance. J Public Health Manag Pract 2012;18(1):55–62.
26. Riley WJ, Bender K, Lownik E. Public health department accreditation implementation: transforming public health department performance. Am J Public Health 2012;102(2):237–42.

27. Scutchfield FD, Patrick K. Public health systems research: the new kid on the block. Am J Prev Med 2007;32(2):173–4.
28. Livingood W, Marshall N, Peden A, et al. Health districts as quality improvement collaboratives and multijurisdictional entities. J Public Health Manag Pract 2012;18(6):561–70.
29. Cilenti D, Brownson RC, Umble K, Erwin PC, Summers R. Information-seeking behaviors and other factors contributing to successful implementation of evidence-based practices in local health departments. J Public Health Manag Pract 2012;18(6):571–6.
30. National Association of County and City Health Officials. 2010 National Profile of Local Health Departments. Washington DC: National Association of County and City Health Officials, 2011.
31. Hajat A, Cilenti D, Harrison LM, et al. What predicts local public health agency performance improvement? A pilot study in North Carolina. J Public Health Manag Pract 2009;15(2):E22–E33.
32. Handler A, Issel M, Turnock B. A conceptual framework to measure performance of the public health system. Am J Public Health 2001;91 (8):1235–9.
33. Mays GP, Smith SA, Ingram RC, Racster LJ, Lamberth CD, Lovely ES. Public health delivery systems: evidence, uncertainty, and emerging research needs. Am J Prev Med 2009;36(3):256–65.
34. Tilburt JC. Evidence-based medicine beyond the bedside: keeping an eye on context. J Eval Clin Pract 2008;14(5):721–5.
35. Brownson RC, Ballew P, Brown KL, et al. The effect of disseminating evidence-based interventions that promote physical activity to health departments. Am J Public Health 2007;97(10):1900–7.
36. Brownson RC, Ballew P, Dieffenderfer B, et al. Evidence-based interventions to promote physical activity: what contributes to dissemination by state health departments. Am J Prev Med 2007;33 (1S):S66–S73.
37. Brownson RC, Ballew P, Kittur ND, et al. Developing competencies for training practitioners in evidence-based cancer control. J Cancer Educ 2009;24(3):186–93.
38. Dreisinger M, Leet TL, Baker EA, Gillespie KN, Haas B, Brownson RC. Improving the public health workforce: evaluation of a training course to enhance evidence-based decision making. J Public Health Manag Pract 2008;14(2):138–43.
39. Jacobs JA, Clayton PF, Dove C, et al. A survey tool for measuring evidence-based decision making capacity in public health agencies. BMC Health Serv Res 2012;12:57.
40. Forsyth BH, Lessler JT. Cognitive laboratory methods: a taxonomy. In: Biemer PP, Groves RM, Lyberg LE, Mathiowetz NA, Sudman S, eds. Measurement errors in surveys. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1991:395–418.
41. Jobe JB, Mingay DJ. Cognitive research improves questionnaires. Am J Public Health 1989;79(8):1053–5.
42. Jobe JB, Mingay DJ. Cognitive laboratory approach to designing questionnaires for surveys of the elderly. Public Health Rep 1990;105 (5):518–24.
43. Willis G. Cognitive interviewing: a tool for improving questionnaire design. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications, 2005.
44. Reis R, Duggan K, Allen P, Stamatakis K, Erwin P, Brownson R. Developing a tool to assess administrative evidence-based practices in local health departments. Frontiers in PHSSR. In press.
45. Landis JR, Koch GG. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. Biometrics 1977;33:159–74.
46. Cronbach LJ. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika 1951;16(3):297–334.
47. Qualtics. Qualtrics: survey research suite. www.qualtrics.com/.
48. Mays GP, McHugh MC, Shim K, et al. Institutional and economic determinants of public health system performance. Am J Public Health 2006;96(3):523–31.
49. Rychetnik L, Frommer M, Hawe P, Shiell A. Criteria for evaluating evidence on public health interventions. J Epidemiol Community Health 2002;56(2):119–27.
50. Brownson RC, Baker EA, Leet TL, Gillespie KN, True WR. Evidence-based public health. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
51. Brownson RC, Fielding JE, Maylahn CM. Evidence-based public health: a fundamental concept for public health practice. Annu Rev Public Health 2009;30:175–201.
52. Fielding JE, Briss PA. Promoting evidence-based public health policy: can we have better evidence and more action? Health Aff (Millwood) 2006;25(4):969–78.
53. Glasziou P, Longbottom H. Evidence-based public health practice. Aust N Z J Public Health 1999;23(4):436–40.
54. Jenicek M. Epidemiology, evidence-based medicine, and evidence-based public health. J Epidemiol Commun Health 1997;7:187–97.
55. Armstrong R, Doyle J, Lamb C, Waters E. Multi-sectoral health promotion and public health: the role of evidence. J Public Health (Oxf) 2006;28(2):168–72.
56. Brownson RC, Diem G, Grabauskas V, et al. Training practitioners in evidence-based chronic disease prevention for global health. Promot Educ 2007;14(3):159–63.
57. Latham J, Murajda L, Forland F, Jansen A. Capacities, practices and perceptions of evidence-based public health in Europe. Euro Surveill 2013;18(10):20421.
58. Petticrew M, Roberts H. Evidence, hierarchies, and typologies: horses for courses. J Epidemiol Community Health 2003;57(7):527–9.
59. Pettman TL, Hall BJ, Waters E, de Silva-Sanigorski A, Armstrong R, Doyle J. Communicating with decision-makers through evidence reviews. J Public Health (Oxf) 2011;33(4):630–3.
60. Rychetnik L, Hawe P, Waters E, Barratt A, Frommer M. A glossary for evidence based public health. J Epidemiol Community Health 2004;58(7):538–45.
61. Derose SF, Schuster MA, Fielding JE, Asch SM. Public health quality measurement: concepts and challenges. Annu Rev Public Health 2002;23:1–21.
62. Leep C, Beitsch LM, Gorenflo G, Solomon J, Brooks RG. Quality improvement in local health departments: progress, pitfalls, and potential. J Public Health Manag Pract 2009;15(6):494–502.
63. Joly BM, Polyak G, Davis MV, et al. Linking accreditation and public health outcomes: a logic model approach. J Public Health Manag Pract 2007;13(4):349–56.
64. Riley WJ, Lownik EM, Scutchfield FD, Mays GP, Corso LC, Beitsch LM. Public health department accreditation: setting the research agenda. Am J Prev Med 2012;42(3):263–71.
65. Porterfield DS, Reaves J, Konrad TR, et al. Assessing local health department performance in diabetes prevention and control—North Carolina, 2005. Prev Chronic Dis 2009;6(3):A87.
66. Gershon RR, Stone PW, Bakken S, Larson E. Measurement of organizational culture and climate in healthcare. J Nurs Adm 2004;34(1):33–40.
67. Kimber M, Barwick M, Fearing G. Becoming an evidence-based service provider: staff perceptions and experiences of organizational change. J Behav Health Serv Res 2012;39(3):314–32.
68. Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, Kirsh SR, Alexander JA, Lowery JC. Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. Implement Sci 2009;4:50.
69. Dodson EA, Baker EA, Brownson RC. Use of evidence-based interventions in state health departments: a qualitative assessment of barriers and solutions. J Public Health Manag Pract 2010;16(6):E9–E15.
70. Maxwell ML, Adily A, Ward JE. Promoting evidence-based practice in population health at the local level: a case study in workforce capacity development. Aust Health Rev 2007;31(3):422–9.
71. Stetler CB. Role of the organization in translating research into evidence-based practice. Outcomes Manag 2003;7(3):97–105.
72. Rowitz L. Management and leadership. J Public Health Manag Pract 2010;16(2):174–6.
73. Wright K, Rowitz L, Merkle A. A conceptual model for leadership development. J Public Health Manag Pract 2001;7(4):60–6.

74. Dilley JA, Bekemeier B, Harris JR. Quality improvement interventions in public health systems: a systematic review. Am J Prev Med 2012;42(5S1):S58–S71.
75. Aarons GA, Hurlburt M, Horwitz SM. Advancing a conceptual model of evidence-based practice implementation in public service sectors. Adm Policy Ment Health 2011;38(1):4–23.
76. Klein K, Sorra J. The challenge of innovation implementation. Acad Manag Rev 1996;21(4):1055–80.
77. Turnock BJ. Public health: what it is and how it works. 4th ed.. Sudbury MA: Jones and Bartlett Publishers, 2009.
78. Dobbins M, Robeson P, Ciliska D, et al. A description of a knowledge broker role implemented as part of a randomized controlled trial evaluating three knowledge translation strategies. Implement Sci 2009;4:23.
79. Canadian Health Services Research Foundation. The theory and practice of knowledge brokering in Canada's health system. Ottawa: Canadian Health Services Research Foundation, 2003.
80. Hargadon A. Technology brokering and innovation: linking strategy, practice, and people. Strategy Leadership 2005;33:32–6.
81. Verona G, Prandelli E, Sawhney M. Innovation and virtual environments: towards virtual knowledge brokers. Organization Stud 2006;27:765–88.
82. Zook M. The knowledge brokers: venture capitalists, tacit knowledge and regional development. Int J Urban Region Res 2004;28:621–41.
83. Bryan RL, Kreuter MW, Brownson RC. Integrating adult learning principles into training for public health practice. Health Promot Pract 2009;10(4):557–63.
84. Koo D, Miner K. Outcome-based workforce development and education in public health. Annu Rev Public Health 2010;31:253–69.
85. Leeper JD, Meit M, Scutchfield FD, Sumaya CV, Wheat JR. The case for rural public health programs. J Rural Health 2003;19(2):97–100.
86. Meit M. Development of a rural public health research agenda. Public Health Rep 2004;119(5):515–7.
87. Meit M. Public health in rural America. J Public Health Manag Pract 2007;13(3):235–6.
88. Meit M, Knudson A. Why is rural public health important? A look to the future. J Public Health Manag Pract 2009;15(3):185–90.
89. Melnyk BM, Fineout-Overholt E, Stone P, Ackerman M. Evidence-based practice: the past, the present, and recommendations for the millennium. Pediatr Nurs 2000;26(1):77–80.
90. Satterfield JM, Spring B, Brownson RC, et al. Toward a transdisciplinary model of evidence-based practice. Milbank Q 2009;87(2):368–90.
91. Gunzenhauser JD, Eggena ZP, Fielding JE, Smith KN, Jacobson DM, Bazini-Barakat N. The quality improvement experience in a high-performing local health department: Los Angeles County. J Public Health Manag Pract 2010;16(1):39–48.
92. Ogolla C, Cioffi JP. Concerns in workforce development: linking certification and credentialing to outcomes. Public Health Nurs 2007;24(5):429–38.
93. Vest JR, Menachemi N, Ford EW. Governance's role in local health departments' information system and technology usage. J Public Health Manag Pract 2012;18(2):160–8.
94. Boex JR, Keck CW, Piatt E, Nunthirapikorn TN, Blacklow RS. Academic health centers and public health departments: partnership matters. Am J Prev Med 2006;30(1):89–93.
95. Keck CW. Lessons learned from an academic health department. J Public Health Manag Pract 2000;6(1):47–52.
96. National Association of County and City Health Officials. Community health assessments and community health improvement plans for accreditation preparation demonstration sites. www.naccho.org/topics/infrastructure/chachip/accreditation-demo-sites.cfm.
97. Dearing J. Evolution of diffusion and dissemination theory. J Public Health Manag Pract 2008;14:99–108.
98. Harris JK. The network of Web 2.0 connections among state health departments: new pathways for dissemination. J Public Health Manag Pract 2013;19(3):E20–E24.
99. Mays GP, Scutchfield FD. Improving public health system performance through multiorganizational partnerships. Prev Chronic Dis 2010;7(6):A116.
100. Provan KG, Fish A, Sydow J. Interorganizational networks at the network level: a review of the empirical literature on whole networks. J Manag 2007;33(3):479–516.
101. Varda D, Shoup JA, Miller S. A systematic review of collaboration and network research in the public affairs literature: implications for public health practice and research. Am J Public Health 2012;102(3):564–71.
102. Brownson RC, Jacobs JA, Tabak RG, Hoehner CM, Stamatakis KA. Are public health researchers designing for dissemination? Findings from a national survey in the U.S. Am J Public Health 2013;103:1693–9.
103. Mays GP, Hogg RA. Expanding delivery system research in public health settings: lessons from practice-based research networks. J Public Health Manag Pract 2012;18(6):485–98.
104. Davis MV, Vincus A, Eggers M, et al. Effectiveness of public health quality improvement training approaches: application, application, application. J Public Health Manag Pract 2011;18(1):E1–E7.
105. Franks AL, Brownson RC, Bryant C, et al. Prevention research centers: contributions to updating the public health workforce through training. Prev Chronic Dis 2005;2(2):A26.