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Do local health departments (LHDs) in states with more system-level investments and initiatives for Quality Improvement (QI) have higher QI Maturity and higher Accreditation Readiness (AR)?

States Included in Analysis:
- Colorado: mean of ~$25,000 for QI per LHD
- Kansas: mean of ~$30,000 for QI per LHD
- Nebraska: mean of ~$55,000 for QI per LHD

**CONCEPTUAL MODEL**

**FINDINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Readiness</th>
<th>Quality Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LHD Accreditation Readiness Survey</td>
<td>Survey: QI Inventory Respondents; LHD QI Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHD Directors</td>
<td>Survey: Organizational QI Maturity Survey Respondents; LHD Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Steps Process Leadership</td>
<td>QI Maturity Capacity and Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant differences in initials steps and leadership domains.</td>
<td>Significant differences in capacity and competence domain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPLICATIONS**

Conclusions
- Accreditation Readiness and QI Maturity scores are higher in states with more system-level investments and initiatives for QI (Nebraska > Kansas > Colorado)
- QI projects often focus on agency-wide improvements, rather than one single public health activity

Implications
- System-level investments to improve QI in LHDs can both improve local implementation of QI and promote accreditation readiness
- System-level investments should be encouraged as a mechanism to improve QI implementation and enhance accreditation readiness

Limitations
- Endogeneity: Potential for estimates to be biased due to omitted variables
- Response bias: No significant differences between responders and non-responders in their accreditation intent

**NEXT STEPS**

- Incorporate network analysis results of connections among LHDs and state-level partners
- Determine degree to which system-level investments relate to QI Maturity and Accreditation Readiness
- Determine degree to which QI Maturity and Accreditation Readiness are related to immunization delivery and vaccination coverage
- Estimate cost of implementing QI projects intended to impact immunizations