

Performance Measures Review

FINAL

Agency: Medical Examiners, Board of
Date: September 13, 2002
Lead Reviewer: Rita Conrad, (503) 986-0031
Approved: Jeff Tryens

Mission: Protect the health, safety, and well being of Oregon citizens by regulating the practice of medicine in a manner that promotes quality care.

Summary

The DAS Performance Measure Review Committee finds that performance measures for this agency meet all basic criteria that are required at this time as specified in the Performance Measure Guidelines. The Board lists nine performance measures in association with six goals, a mission statement and two Oregon Benchmarks: premature death (#45) and self-perceived health status (#46). The goals appear to cover the essential functions of a regulatory agency. This agency is one of the few that included a sheet, per instructions, detailing why it is changing some of its 2001-03 performance measures. Targets, due in January, have not yet been submitted. A good data sources sheet is included.

Comments and recommendations specific to basic criteria

1. Gauge progress towards goals and pertinent benchmarks

The Board lists nine performance measures in association with six goals, a mission statement and two Oregon Benchmarks: premature death (#45) and self-perceived health status (#46). The goals appear to cover the essential functions of a regulatory agency: licensure, enforcement, education and efficient operations. The goals are strategy oriented, as opposed to results-oriented. This is the only comment not addressed by the agency. For example, Goal 1 reads: "Determine requirements for licensure and ensure that all applicants granted licensure meet Oregon requirements." A more results-oriented goal is: "Protect Oregon medical patients from incompetent, and/or unethical medical practices." In the future, the Board may want to consider restating its highest level goals in more results-oriented terms.

2. A few key measures

Measures are relatively few in number, but articulate the agency's story. All previous editing suggestions, designed to clarify the measures, have been adopted by the agency.

3. Conforms to standard concepts and definitions

The measures are a good mixture of intermediate outcome and efficiency measures.

4. Targets

These have not yet been set. Targets are not due till January 2003. Targets should be ambitious but realistic and take into account historical data. If that is not possible, comparisons to other similar agencies or expert opinion should be considered.

5. Accurate and reliable data

The agency has included a good data sources sheet. The agency was unable to provide 2000 data points for new measures. As it approaches the target setting exercise, however, this and other historical data points will be helpful (see comment #4).