Develop a Framework for Target-Setting

Targets are short-term, rather than long-term objectives

The expectation is that targets can be met given appropriate programmatic effort and resource allocation
Develop a Framework for Target-Setting

**Define the Landscape**

1. What factors mitigate for or against improving performance?
2. Are current programs population-wide or designed for high risk groups?
3. How much control / flexibility does the agency have over resource allocation?
4. Apart from the health agency, what other activities, if any, are addressing particular issues?

---

Develop a Framework for Target-Setting

**Strategic choices:**

- How will targets be linked to effort?
  - Targets will reflect past and current programmatic effort
  - or
  - Targets will influence future programmatic effort
Develop a Framework for Target-Setting

**Strategic Choices**

How will “success” or “good performance” be defined?

- Meeting a target
- Making meaningful progress toward a target

Which types and sources of data will be used?

- Professional input
- Community input
- Population data
- Program data
- Current data
- Trend data
- National objectives
- Cost data
Develop a Framework for Target-Setting

**Example Logic statements**

If data exist from all sources and data from all sources agree, then the target will be set as ...

If data exist from all sources but data do not agree across all sources, then the target will be set as ...

---

Develop a Framework for Target-Setting

**Example Logic statements**

If data exist from only some sources and data from those sources agree, then the target will be set as ...

If data exist from only some sources but data from those sources do not agree, then the target will be set as ...
Build an Analytic Strategy for Target-Setting

**Incorporating Trend Data**

- Use the current level of an indicator
- Use the projected level of an indicator based on the continuation of the trend over time
- Use the projected level of an indicator based on *altering* the trend to meet a standard or goal

---

Build an Analytic Strategy for Target-Setting

**Incorporating Trend Data**

Targets might be set based on continuing the recent past trend, or the slope could be “forced” to accelerate the time at which an objective will be met.
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Incorporating Trend Data

Forcing the slope of the trend line to meet an objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>IM Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Build an Analytic Strategy for Target-Setting

Incorporating Trend Data

Since target-setting in MCH is carried out for many indicators, the analytic approach may vary depending on the pattern of current values, projected values, and distance from a longer term goal.

One indicator may currently be farther from a goal than another indicator, but may be improving more rapidly over time so that it's projected value is closer to its goal than the other indicator in the future.
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Incorporating Trend Data

Two indicators with different patterns over time and different distance from long-term goals

Assume being below the goal is desirable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early PNC %</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBW %</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering current values, early PNC % appears to be farther away from its objective; considering projected values, LBW % is farther away from its objective—early PNC % is improving over time, but LBW % is not.
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**Incorporate Trend Data**

A grid reflecting the intersection of trend data and distance to an objective: articulate a target-setting approach for indicators in each cell.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Standard / Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surpassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example Logic Statements:**

If trend data show improvement and the current value is far from the goal then targets will be set as ...
else if the current value is close to the goal then targets will be set as ...
else if the current value meets the goal then targets will be set as ...

If trend data show no change, then etc.
If trend data show deterioration, then etc.
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Statistical Testing

Could choose targets that reflect a statistically significant change from the current value of the indicator.

*Statistical testing is sensitive to sample size, so this may not be appropriate*

---
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Stratification, Means, Medians, and "Pared" Means

Will group differences be used in target-setting?

- Crude (unstratified)?
- Stratified by medical risk status?
- Stratified by geography?
- Stratified by race/ethnicity?
- Stratified by income?
- Stratified by income and geography?
  - Etc., etc., etc.?
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**Stratification, Means, Medians, and "Pared" Means**

One indicator with different patterns over time and different current values across groups

---

**Stratification, Means, Medians, and "Pared" Means**

- Separate, stratum-specific targets
- Overall target based on stratum-specific targets
- Mean of stratum-specific values
- Median of stratum-specific values
- Pared means—overall mean, mean of the "best" 10%, 50%, 75% of the population
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**Stratification, Means, Medians, and "Pared" Means**

With many strata, the range in the indicator values and the shape of the distribution will influence the choice of targets.

With few strata, it may be reasonable to choose the value of the “best” stratum as the target if that stratum includes a large proportion of the population at risk.
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Example Logic Statements:

If current values vary across groups then targets will be set as...

If trends over time vary across groups then targets will be set as...
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If stratification is used, how will data availability and small numbers be addressed?

- Collapsing strata?
- Indirect standardization?
- Synthetic estimation?
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**Example Logic Statements**

If numbers are small within strata
then multiple years of data will be combined...

or
then national rates will be applied to create SMRs...

If small area data is not available
then synthetic estimates may be used...

or
then a proxy variable will be used...

---

**Example Approaches for Target-Setting**

**National Performance Measure 8**
Birth rate (per 1,000) for teens aged 15-17 years.

Possible Targets
Crude, Unstratified Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th># Females 15-17</th>
<th># Births</th>
<th>Teen Birth Rate per 1,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>16,556</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example Approaches for Target-Setting

National Performance Measure 8

Possible Targets

1. No Change = 37.6

2. % Decrease according to past trend
   Assume an average annual decrease of 2%
   
   \[
   \text{Target} = (\% \text{ chge} \times \text{Curr Val}) + \text{Curr Val} \\
   \text{Target} = (-0.02 \times 37.6) + 37.6 \\
   \text{Target} = 36.8
   \]

3. % Decrease to meet a long-term goal
   Assume the goal is 30 per 1,000 in 5 years
   
   \[
   \frac{30.0 - 37.6}{37.6} = -0.04 \\
   \frac{37.6}{5} = -0.04 \\
   \text{Target} = (-0.04 \times 37.6) + 37.6 \\
   \text{Target} = 36.1
   \]
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National Performance Measure 8
Possible Targets

4. Statistically significant decrease:
Set a z-test to 1.96

\[
\frac{\text{Target} - \text{Current Value} \geq 1.96}{\text{Target} + \text{Current Value} \times \text{Multiplier}} \geq \frac{\text{Population at Risk}}{\text{Current Value}}
\]

\[
\frac{\text{Target} - 37.6 \geq 1.96}{\text{Target} + 37.6 \times 1,000} \geq \frac{16,556}{1,000}
\]

Target = 33.5
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National Performance Measure 8
Possible Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>#Females 15-17</th>
<th>#Births 15-17</th>
<th>Teen Birth Rate per 1,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2,785</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1,338</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2,664</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>3,908</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>16,556</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example Approaches for Target-Setting

**National Performance Measure 8**
Possible Targets: Stratified by Area

**Not Considering Sample Size (unweighted)**
5. Mean of the rates 33.8
6. Median of the rates 31.0

**Considering Sample Size (weighted)**
7. Overall rate for Areas A-F 50% of female teens 26.0
8. Overall rate for Areas A-I 75% of female teens 29.9

---

Example Approaches for Target-Setting

**National Performance Measure 8**
Possible Targets: Stratified by Area

8. Overall Rate for Areas A-I
Rate for 75% of Female Teens in State X

\[
\begin{array}{c}
9 + 66 + 22 + 64 + 40 + 32 + 24 + 106 + 15 \\
793 + 2,785 + 859 + 2,205 + 1,338 + \\
994 + 708 + 2,664 + 302 \\
= \frac{378}{12,648} \approx 29.9 \text{ per 1,000}
\end{array}
\]
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**National Performance Measure 8**
Possible Targets: Stratified by Poverty Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Status</th>
<th>#Females 15-17</th>
<th>#Births</th>
<th>Teen Birth Rate per 1,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,533</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14,023</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>16,556</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of teens 15-17 below the poverty level:

\[
\frac{2,533 \times 100}{16,556} \approx 15
\]

9. The value for the "best" stratum—female teens at or above the poverty level—85% of all female teens aged 15-17 33.8
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National Performance Measure 8
Possible Targets: Stratified by Poverty Status

10. Stratum-Specific and Weighted Overall Targets

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Target}_{\text{Poverty}} &= -0.10 \times 58.4 + 58.4 = 52.6 \\
\text{Target}_{\text{No Poverty}} &= -0.02 \times 33.8 + 33.8 = 33.1 \\
\text{Then the overall target is the weighted average of the stratum specific targets:} \\
\text{Target}_{\text{Overall}} &= 0.15 \times 52.6 + 0.85 \times 33.1 = 36.0
\end{align*}
\]

Example Approaches for Target-Setting

National Performance Measure 8
Which should be the annual target?

Unstratified:  
1. No Change 37.6  
2. 2% decrease 36.8  
3. 4% decrease 36.1  
4. Statistical significance 33.5

Stratified by Area:  
5. Mean of the rates 33.8  
6. Median of the rates 31.0  
7. Overall rate for “best” 50% 26.0  
8. Overall rate for “best” 75% 29.9

Stratified by Poverty:  
9. Rate for “best” stratum 33.8  
10. Weighted Rate (10% & 2% change) 36.0
Final Comments on Target Setting

• Many different stratification schemes could be used. Each will give rise to another set of possible targets.

• Other numerical approaches, such as regression modeling, can be used as well. (regression is an extension of a stratified approach)

• The conceptual framework which was developed first must be brought to bear in making final choices for targets.

Final Comments on Target Setting

Each performance measure and outcome indicator may require a different approach.

Each may exhibit different patterns of change and disparity, both in magnitude and kind.
Final Comments on Target Setting

When setting targets for more than one indicator, the relative performance across indicators may influence the target setting process.

For example, you may want to set more challenging targets for indicators farther from a long term goal as an added incentive to make that issue a programmatic priority.

Final Comments on Target Setting

The target-setting process can inform priority-setting. For example, if you use trend data to identify when indicators will meet longer term standards, you can then compare across indicators.

Example:

Indicator #1 -- 2019
Indicator #2 -- 2012
Indicator #3 -- 2013

For this example, priority might be given to improving indicator #1 (assuming other factors have been taken into account).
Final Comments on Target Setting

Returning to the grid for developing target-setting strategies—a scoring scheme or index could be imposed on the cells of the grid to help inform priority-setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Standard / Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surpassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For short-term targets, we want to identify values that are attainable, but still challenge us to critically evaluate programmatic and budgetary decisions.