

**ISoft – HIMAA INNOVATION AWARDS**  
**Evaluation Criteria \***

Title of Project \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**NEED** (*Report Outline Section A*):

Was a systematic process used to identify the problem to be solved or the improvement desired? Was the problem clearly described? Were the needs to be addressed identified, measured, or quantified? If an organizational impact assessment was completed prior to implementation, was it described? Did the applicant indicate whether the problem was unique to his or her facility, or common to other organizations or settings?

- 0 points The issues to be addressed were not systematically identified or clearly described
- 1 point The issues to be addressed are assumed, rather than identified and/or are not clearly defined
- 2 points The issues to be addressed are clearly identified and defined, but were not measured or quantified
- 3 points The issues have been identified, measured, and quantified and are clearly presented

**TOTAL POINTS:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Descriptive Summary:**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**OBJECTIVES** (*Report Outline Section B*):

Did the applicant provide specific, measurable goals and objectives to be addressed by implementation of the project? Are the identified goals and objectives pertinent to the identified issue or problem?

- 0 points Goals and objectives not clear or not appropriate to the problem or issue identified
- 1 point Goals and objectives are clearly stated but do not fully address the problem or issue
- 2 points Goals and objectives are clearly stated and appropriate to the problem or issue, but not specific and measurable
- 3 points Goals and objectives are specific, measurable and clearly applicable to the problem or issue defined

**TOTAL POINTS:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Descriptive Summary:****Strengths:****Weaknesses:****PLANNING AND ANALYSIS** (*Report Outline Section B and C*):

Was the planning process described clearly, including personnel involved and any use of external resources? Were the decision-making processes described? Was there a description of alternatives evaluated and the reasons for selection of the final solution? Were appropriate tools used to monitor the process? Was benchmarking and other data collection and information gathering used appropriately to inform the process, and was this clearly described?

(Please check all that apply)

- 0 points Decision-making process unclear or unfocused and appropriate data was not identified or used appropriately
- 1 point Decision-making process is described adequately but supporting analysis is not included
- 2 points Systematic decision process, incorporating appropriate planning tools and collaborative efforts. Supporting analysis included.
- 2 points Evidence-based analysis (*integrated scientific research or research processes*)
- 2 points Fact-based analysis (*incorporated clinical experience, expert opinion, descriptive studies, and so forth*)
- 2 points Comparison analysis (*including benchmarking analysis, comparison to national or other standards*)
- 2 points Literature analysis (*supported by published research or expert opinion*)

**TOTAL POINTS:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Descriptive Summary:****Strengths:****Weaknesses:****PROJECT DESIGN** (*Report Outline Section D and E*):

Did the applicant discuss the specific process used for implementation of the project, including key components and materials of the project, timeline of its key activities, costs and cost justification, and hurdles faced in creating this project? Were the personnel involved, the nature and extent of any consulting services required, and the decision-making processes described?

Did the applicant explain alternatives evaluated and the reasoning for final selection of the project?

- 0 points Implementation process not fully described, or the process described is uncoordinated or inconsistent
- 1 point Implementation process is described but too early in the development stage to be accurately assessed
- 2 points Implementation has been clearly described, including key components and materials and alternatives considered.
- 3 points Implementation process is well documented and clearly described, including a thorough analysis of costs, use of personnel, and decision-making processes, in addition to alternatives considered and rationale for final program selection

**TOTAL POINTS:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Descriptive Summary:****Strengths:****Weaknesses**

Are the specific staff requirements and skills required for implementation of the program clearly identified and described? Are any new roles for HIM personnel identified? Are appropriate education and training resources incorporated into the implementation plan?

- 0 points Personnel and training requirements are not described
- 1 point Vague information about staff skills, roles, and training needs are provided
- 2 points Basic information is provided on professional skills required.
- Some aspects of training and education are addressed
- 3 points A complete description of the professional skills and roles for implementation is included. Training and educational needs are addressed in the plan.

**TOTAL POINTS:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMPLEMENTATION** (*Report Outline Section D*):

Has the program been fully implemented? Has it been communicated across interdisciplinary or interdepartmental areas if appropriate? Is the process described systematic and coordinated? Are outcomes, results, or benefits documented? Are there mechanisms in place for feedback and fine tuning of the process?

- 0 points Program has not been implemented
- 1 point Program has been partially implemented or is in the early stages of implementation
- 2 points Program has been fully implemented but the process is not systematic or coordinated, *or* there are gaps in communication, *or* lack of documentation or description of benefits and outcomes, *or* has been in place for less than six months and cannot be evaluated yet
- 3 points The program is strong, systematic and coordinated. It has been operating six to nine months with consistent documented benefits or results. There are no major gaps in the program process.
- 4 points The program is strong, systematic and coordinated. It has been in place for at least 12 months with consistent documented benefits or results. Mechanisms have been put in place to allow for feedback and refinement of the program. The process has been taught or communicated to an entire team and, if appropriate, across departmental boundaries.

**TOTAL POINTS:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Descriptive Summary:**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**IMPACT** (*Report Outline Section F*):

Does the program described demonstrate resource efficiency, such as improvements in productivity or financial savings?

- 0 points Resource efficiencies were not measured or addressed
- 1 point Resource efficiency is not specifically addressed but can be inferred from other program descriptions
- 2 points Improvements in resource efficiency at a moderate level have been identified *or* resource benefits are partially measured but program is still in early stages
- 3 points Improvements in resource efficiency at a significant level have been identified and sustained for at least three months
- 4 points Improvements in resource efficiency at a significant level have been identified and sustained for at least six months

**TOTAL POINTS:** \_\_\_\_\_

Did the program achieve expected results and desired outcomes identified in the original problem statement?

- 0 points Program did not achieve the desired outcomes, *or* it is too early in implementation to determine if desired outcomes will be met
- 1 point The program had a neutral affect on the identified problem
- 2 points The program partially achieved desired outcomes
- 3 points The program fully achieved desired outcomes

**TOTAL POINTS:** \_\_\_\_\_

Does the program demonstrate consistent, sustained performance improvement? Does the program demonstrate benchmark leadership?

- 0 points Performance improvement is not addressed, *or* there were no positive results, *or* results had little impact
- 1 point Results reported were fair or inconsistent *or* there is no comparison to previous performance or external benchmarks
- 2 points Results reported were positive and consistent compared to prior performance
- 3 points Results reported were positive, consistent, and sustained for at least six months. Results compared favorably with past performance and/or established benchmarks
- 4 points Results reported were positive, consistent and sustained for at least 12 months. Results compared favorably with prior performance *and* compare favorably with national, regional or system benchmarks

**TOTAL POINTS:** \_\_\_\_\_

Does the program make a positive contribution to HIM knowledge? Is it likely to stimulate new ideas or innovations?

- 0 points Program does not make a positive contribution to larger HIM field and is not innovative
- 1 point Program makes some contribution to the larger HIM field but is not innovative
- 2 points Program makes an important contribution to the HIM field
- 3 points Program makes a significant contribution to the HIM field and is likely to stimulate new ideas or innovations

**TOTAL POINTS:** \_\_\_\_\_

Could the project described be translated to other healthcare organizations or project settings?

- 0 points Program has no clear application to other organizations or settings
- 1 point Program has minimal applicability or adaptability to other organizations or settings
- 2 points Program is moderately applicable or adaptable to other organizations or settings
- 3 points Program is widely applicable or adaptable to other organizations or settings

**TOTAL POINTS:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Descriptive Summary:**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**EVALUATION** (*Outline Section F*):

Does the program evaluate outcomes or results systematically? Is the process comprehensive, addressing both positive and negative results in addition to expected and unexpected results? Is there a plan for ongoing evaluation?

- 0 points No description of a system for evaluating outcomes
- 1 point Evaluation system is incomplete or flawed
- 2 points Acceptable evaluation system is described, but with some gaps in scope or long-term evaluation system
- 3 points Strong, systematic process for measurable evaluation of outcomes
- 4 points Strong, systematic process for measurable evaluation of outcomes, including a system for integrating feedback and analysis into long term planning

**TOTAL POINTS:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Cumulative Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SUMMARY EVALUATION:**

This submission is acceptable for inclusion as a best project: \_\_\_\_Yes \_\_\_\_No

If no, please explain the missing elements or areas that require further development in order for this submission to be considered for a best project: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

---

---

**\*(adapted from AHIMA 2003)**