

Table 3. Measurement tool				
Indicator and definition	Enactment evaluation categories			
	High (5-4)	Medium (3)	Low/No (2-1)	n/a
<p>PDSA cycles</p> <p><i>Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycle: shorthand for testing a change in the real work setting — by planning it, trying it, observing the results, and acting on what is learned.</i>³⁴</p> <p><i>Plan: (for change or test – who; what; when & where)</i></p> <p><i>Do: test (carry out the change), collect data and begin analysis</i></p> <p><i>Study: Review the results of the test, the data (the numbers)</i></p> <p><i>Act: what will we do before the next test cycle, what is the next step?</i></p> <p><i>(SCOPE Operating Protocol, v3.3 2015)</i></p>	<p>The components of the PDSA cycle were differentiated. All components of the PSDA cycle were attempted more than once, with application to additional change ideas.</p>	<p>A PDSA worksheet was populated.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>One PDSA cycle was completed but it was not apparent that learnings informed any further cycles.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Distinctions between components of the PDSA cycle were unclear (e.g., repeated parts of the cycle while omitting others).</p>	<p>No or limited evidence of the use of PDSA cycles. A PDSA worksheet was completed or partially completed, but there is no evidence that a PDSA cycle, whether full or partial, was completed.</p>	<p>Unable to rate - Not enough information</p>
<p>Aim statements</p> <p><i>Aim statement: a description of what the QI project will accomplish. Should include a numeric target for improvement and a defined time period.</i></p> <p><i>SMART Goals:</i></p> <p><i>S: specific & substantiated</i></p> <p><i>M: measurable</i></p> <p><i>A: attainable</i></p> <p><i>R: realistic</i></p> <p><i>T: time-bound</i></p>	<p>An aim statement was developed, either initially or over time, that reflects 4 of 5 of the SMART Goals components, with S and M essential for inclusion.</p>	<p>An aim statement was developed, either initially or over time, that reflects up to 3 of the SMART Goal components.</p>	<p>The aim statement developed did not reflect any components of SMART Goals at any time.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>No aim statement was developed, at all.</p>	<p>Unable to rate - Not enough information</p>

<i>(Modified from SCOPE Operating Protocol, v3.3 2015)</i>				
<p>Change ideas</p> <p><i>Change ideas: What change can we make that will result in improvement?</i>³⁵</p> <p><i>Feasible: it is attainable and is it something that is actually able to be carried out by an HCA (scope of practice).</i></p>	<p>Feasible change ideas were developed that aligned with the PDSA cycle (i.e., reflects Aim Statement and corresponds to baseline data).</p>	<p>Change ideas were developed, but they were not totally feasible OR they were poorly aligned with the PDSA cycle (i.e., did not reflect the Aim Statement and/or did not correspond to baseline data).</p>	<p>Change ideas were not developed.</p>	<p>Unable to rate - Not enough information</p>
<p>Measurement</p> <p><i>Measurement: How will we know that a change is an improvement?</i>³⁶</p>	<p>i. Measures were selected that align with the aim statement/change ideas.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>ii. Baseline measurement was completed.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>iii. Subsequent measurements were completed to evaluate progress and applied to additional change ideas.</p>	<p>Criterion i. was met.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>ii. OR iii.</p>	<p>None of the criteria were met.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Criterion i. was not met (i.e., no alignment), whether or not there was other activity around measurement.</p>	<p>Unable to rate - Not enough information</p>
<p>HCA empowerment</p> <p><i>Psychological empowerment: intrinsic task motivation reflecting a sense of self-control in relation to one's work and an active involvement with one's work role. Manifests in self-directed actions, as opposed to being told</i></p>	<p>There is extensive or considerable and consistent evidence from multiple sources that the actions of the HCAs (e.g., HCA taking initiative, decision-making) and Sponsors [e.g., actions to facilitate HCA empowerment/initiative (i.e., deferring to HCA as to which clinical area to focus</p>	<p>There are a few sources of evidence or inconsistent evidence that the actions of the HCAs or Sponsors demonstrate HCA empowerment.</p>	<p>There is limited or no evidence that HCA empowerment was demonstrated (i.e., initiative and project momentum seems to be largely on the part of Sponsors).</p>	<p>Unable to rate - Not enough information</p>

<i>what to do (e.g., by Sponsors).</i>	on)] demonstrate HCA empowerment.			
<p>Engagement with best available evidence to inform their QI project (e.g., to develop the aim statement, generate change ideas, and/or identify measures)</p> <p><i>Best available evidence: the Change Package, or equivalent external sources such as research or research-informed evidence that QI team members are using in the interests of applying it to the problem/project.</i></p>	Resources were used that are based on the best available evidence AND align with the aim statement/change ideas.	<p>Resources were used that are based on the best available evidence but did not align with the aim statement/change ideas.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Resources that are based on the best available evidence and align with the aim statement/change ideas were selected <u>but</u> did not use them.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Resources that were not apparently based on the best available evidence were used, and/or the quality of evidence was unclear.</p>	A resource(s) was used but it was not based on the best available evidence.	Unable to rate - Not enough information to determine if resources were used.
<p>Achievements of stated aim</p> <p><i>Aim statement: A description of what the QI project will accomplish.</i></p>	There is extensive or considerable and consistent evidence from multiple sources that progress was made toward achieving the Aim (e.g., binder contents, report from QI team, QI Advisor notes, Sponsor call notes, Wrap-Up focus group data).	There are a few sources of evidence or inconsistent evidence that suggests that progress toward achieving the aim was made.	There is limited or no evidence that progress toward the aim was made.	Unable to rate - Not enough information
<p>Appropriate Sponsor support</p> <p><i>Appropriate support relates to Sponsors' facilitation of the QI team's activities and ensuring that the QI project relies on a team-based approach.</i></p>	There is extensive or considerable and consistent evidence from multiple sources that, <u>overall</u> , the Sponsors provided appropriate support to the QI team (e.g., through provision of resources and time,	There are a few sources of evidence or inconsistent evidence that, <u>overall</u> , the support provided by Sponsors to the QI team was somewhat appropriate.	There is limited or no evidence that, <u>overall</u> , the Sponsors provided appropriate support to the QI team.	Unable to rate - Not enough information

	not just offering encouraging words).				
<p>HCA Leadership (i.e., HCA-led)</p> <p><i>The QI team should be led by a HCA or co-led by two HCAs and should comprise five to six staff.</i></p> <p><i>(SCOPE Operating Protocol, v3.3 2015)</i></p>	There is extensive or considerable and consistent evidence from multiple sources that the entire QI team and Senior Sponsor understood that this was an HCA-led initiative, and the HCAs were given the opportunity to fully lead their project.	There are a few sources of evidence or inconsistent evidence that the QI team and Senior Sponsor understood that this was an HCA-led initiative (e.g., the Sponsors understood that the initiative was to be HCA-led but the QI team did not do it and momentum was dependent upon the Sponsor(s)).	There is limited or no evidence that the QI team and Senior Sponsor understood that this was to be a HCA-led initiative (e.g., the Sponsor(s) assumed a directive leadership role throughout the entire project).	Unable to rate - Not enough information	
<p>Functioning as a team</p> <p><i>Team-based approach: A style of project management in which everyone on the project team is held equally responsible for the quality and success of the project.</i></p>	There is extensive or considerable and consistent evidence from multiple sources that the QI team demonstrated a team-based approach to their QI project and everyone contributed.	There are a few sources of evidence or inconsistent evidence that the QI team demonstrated a team-based approach. OR There were unequal contributions across QI team members.	There is limited or no evidence that the QI team demonstrated a team-based approach (e.g., one person did all the work).	Unable to rate - Not enough information	