

Understanding Mis-implementation in Public Health Practice



Ross C. Brownson, PhD, Peg Allen, PhD, MPH, Rebekah R. Jacob, MPH, MSW, Jenine K. Harris, PhD, Kathleen Duggan, MPH, RD, Pamela R. Hipp, MPH, Paul C. Erwin, MD, DrPH

Introduction: A better understanding of mis-implementation in public health (ending effective programs and policies or continuing ineffective ones) may provide important information for decision makers. The purpose of this study is to describe the frequency and patterns in mis-implementation of programs in state and local health departments in the U.S.

Methods: A cross-sectional study of 944 public health practitioners was conducted. The sample included state ($n=277$) and local health department employees ($n=398$) and key partners from other agencies ($n=269$). Data were collected from October 2013 through June 2014 (analyzed in May through October 2014). Online survey questions focused on ending programs that should continue, continuing programs that should end, and reasons for endings.

Results: Among state health department employees, 36.5% reported that programs often or always end that should have continued, compared with 42.0% of respondents in local health departments and 38.3% of respondents working in other agencies. In contrast to ending programs that should have continued, 24.7% of state respondents reported programs often or always continuing when they should have ended, compared to 29.4% for local health departments and 25% of respondents working in other agencies. Certain reasons for program endings differed at the state versus local level (e.g., policy support, support from agency leadership), suggesting that actions to address mis-implementation are likely to vary.

Conclusions: The current data suggest a need to focus on mis-implementation in public health practice in order to make the best use of scarce resources.

(Am J Prev Med 2015;48(5):543–551) © 2015 American Journal of Preventive Medicine

Introduction

Mis-implementation in public health practice refers to both the de-adoption of effective programs, policies, or other interventions that should continue and to the continuation of ineffective interventions that should end. It is important to understand the mis-implementation of public health programs for several reasons. First and most importantly, public health resources are limited and decreasing in many

settings.^{1–3} Resources are most efficiently used when effective programs are continued and ineffective programs are discontinued. Second, understanding reasons for mis-implementation can help practitioners in designing and implementing more effective programs. For example, if having a program champion or “spark plug” is essential for continuing an effective program,⁴ this knowledge can help shape how a program is staffed and managed. And third, building in part from Diffusion of Innovations Theory,⁵ a significant gap in the field of dissemination and implementation science is guidance on how to “de-implement” or reduce the use of interventions that are not evidence-based, have been widely adopted prematurely, or are detrimental.^{6,7} Building this knowledge in public health may translate to other areas (e.g., healthcare delivery, education, social services) and provide new frameworks for action.⁸

Mis-implementation in public health and closely related settings involves two seemingly opposite

From the Prevention Research Center in St. Louis (Brownson, Allen, Jacob, Harris, Duggan), Brown School; Division of Public Health Sciences and Alvin J. Siteman Cancer Center (Brownson), Washington University School of Medicine, Washington University in St. Louis; Medical Affairs (Hipp), Centene Corporation, St. Louis, Missouri; and Department of Public Health (Erwin), University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee

Address correspondence to: Ross C. Brownson, Washington University in St. Louis, 621 Skinker Boulevard, St. Louis MO 63130-4838. E-mail: rbrownson@wustl.edu.

0749-3797/\$36.00

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2014.11.015>

strategies. In some cases, programs are ended that are effective and should be continued. An example of this is the VERB campaign, which was a national program to promote physical activity using a social marketing approach.⁹ The VERB campaign delivered positive messages to youth aged 10–13 years via multiple channels (e.g., mass media, school and community promotions, the Internet).¹⁰ VERB positively influenced children's physical activity and campaign effects persisted into their adolescent years. Despite the benefits of VERB, national-scale efforts to continue VERB have not been successful and sustained community commitment to VERB-like efforts is challenging.^{11,12} In other cases, programs are continued that are not effective and should be ended. A prominent example is the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) program, which is one of the most widely used school-based drug use prevention programs in the U.S. that has been disseminated to over half of U.S. school districts.^{13–15} Although not typically carried out by public health departments, D.A.R.E. relates to core public health topics (substance abuse) and uses public resources. Systematic reviews of D.A.R.E. program evaluations have shown the program is ineffective in preventing substance use behavior.^{16,17} Although these examples may appear opposite, they have the same consequence: inefficient use of scarce resources.

To date, much of our knowledge related to mis-implementation comes from public policy and medicine. The concept of mis-implementation in policy settings is commonly deemed policy “termination” and is an important part of the policy process. Policy termination has been described for several decades and suggests that a specific policy should be regularly evaluated, and in some cases ended if it is redundant or outmoded.^{18–21} Most of the literature on policy termination consists of case studies,²² with sparse quantitative research. In medicine and health services research, the attention has been on underuse of certain types of medical care (e.g., not prescribing aspirin after myocardial infarction), misuse/incorrect care (e.g., prescribing a drug the patient is allergic to), and overuse of medical services that lack benefits or cause harms (e.g., treating a simple viral infection with antibiotics).^{23–25} It is estimated that overuse may account for up to 30% of U.S. healthcare spending.²³

Given its importance and the sparse empirical literature, this article reports on the frequency and reasons for mis-implementation among state and local public health departments.

Methods

The reported data were derived from two cross-sectional surveys of the state and local public health workforce as part of ongoing research projects (the State Survey and Local Survey described

below).^{26–28} Participants were state and local public health department employees and key partners from other agencies who were identified by leaders in the public health agencies (e.g., coalitions, voluntary health organizations, advocacy organizations, healthcare organizations, universities). Human subjects approval was obtained from Washington University in St. Louis.

State Survey

A sample of 596 public health practitioners was drawn from six randomly selected states (Arizona, Delaware, Minnesota, South Dakota, Washington, and Wisconsin) that are part of a larger ongoing cluster randomized trial examining dissemination and implementation of evidence-based practices in state health departments.²⁶ Potential respondents were selected by state health department chronic disease directors and their leadership teams of program managers. Represented program areas were cancer prevention and screening, obesity prevention, physical activity, healthy eating, tobacco control, heart health, diabetes, school health, and related areas. The state survey asked about evidence-based public health skills and resources and contained 63 items. The 596 State Survey participants included 277 state health department employees, 50 from local health departments, and 269 from other partnering health organizations or agencies. Most participants worked in chronic disease prevention and health promotion.

Local Survey

The local data came from a follow-up 66-item survey on evidence-based public health with local health departments in selected states. The sampling was derived from a merged database of two national surveys previously conducted by the research team.^{27,28} In the original data collection, a random sample of 1,067 U.S. local health departments was drawn from the database of 2,565 local health departments maintained by the National Association of County and City Health Officials. The baseline survey consisted of 849 local health department directors (or their designees) and program managers. The follow-up survey was part of evidence-based public health capacity-building activities in four intervention states (Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio, and Washington) along with a set of controls from the original two national samples.²⁹ In this follow-up survey, a subsample of local health department directors and program managers was invited to participate. For this study, post-intervention data were used from 348 local public health practitioners drawn from 34 states including the four intervention states.

Measures

In addition to the core questions in each survey, a set of new questions on program mis-implementation was developed for both the State and Local Surveys. First, the literature was reviewed to identify reasons for potential mis-implementation from medicine and policy. An initial set of items was reviewed by the research team, revised, and reviewed with a larger team of faculty and practice-oriented partners. The final instrument included three mis-implementation items. A definition of a *program* was provided and included any type of organized public health action, including direct service interventions, community mobilization efforts, policy implementation, environmental changes, outbreak

investigations, health communication campaigns, or health promotion programs. Two items used Likert scale questions to ascertain mis-implementation (de-adoption) of effective programs (*In your opinion, how often do programs end that should not have ended?*) and continuation of ineffective programs (*In your opinion, how often do programs continue that should have ended?*). One question focused on common reasons for mis-implementation (*When you think about public health programs that have ended, what are the most common reasons for programs ending?* [Respondents were asked to rank the top three from a list.]). The reported reasons were categorized relative to three domains proposed by Bauer and Knill³⁰: (1) external factors (e.g., state-level policy support changed); (2) institutional constraints and opportunities (e.g., support from leaders in agency changed); and (3) situational factors (e.g., funding diverted to a higher-priority program).

Data Collection

All data were self-reported and collected online using Qualtrics Survey Research Suite software (Provo UT). In both the State and Local Surveys, a unique link was e-mailed to each participant, and non-respondents received e-mail and phone reminders to bolster response rates. No financial incentive was provided in the State Survey; upon completion, a \$10 Amazon gift card was provided in the Local Survey. The State Survey data were collected from January through June 2014 and the Local Survey Data were collected from October through December 2013. The median completion time was 16 minutes for the State Survey and 20 minutes for the Local Survey. Response rates were 75.1% for the State Survey (596/794) and 75.1% for the Local Survey (348/460).

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were calculated for each of the three core questions, reported as percentages with 95% CIs. The sample characteristics were derived from the survey data and archival data for each health department using population size of jurisdiction and local health department governance structure.³¹ Statistical testing for differences in proportions across the surveys or for the full combined sample was not conducted owing to the lack of independence of observations (e.g., nesting of individuals in a small number of state and local health departments and other organizations).

Results

Of the 944 respondents, 29.3% ($n=277$) worked in a state health department, 42.2% ($n=398$) worked in a local health department, and 28.5% ($n=269$) worked in another agency (e.g., a voluntary health organization, university extension) (Table 1). The largest proportion of respondents held a master's degree (43.4% total, including 16.4% with an MPH) as their highest degree earned. Bachelor's degrees were the highest earned by another 27.6% and 15.6% held a doctorate (e.g., PhD, MD). Respondents had worked in public health for an average of 15 years ($SD=9.7$).

Among state health department employees, 36.5% reported that programs often or always end that should have continued, compared with 42.0% of respondents in local health departments and 38.3% of respondents working in other agencies (Table 2). For state respondents, those working in cancer programs reported less frequent inappropriate program endings compared to those from other program areas. People working in diabetes and cardiovascular disease programs were the most likely to report programs being discontinued when they should have been continued. Local respondents from jurisdictions with population between 25,000 and 99,999 people reported more programs ending inappropriately. Those local agencies with a state governance structure (i.e., local health departments operating within a centralized state administrative unit) may be less likely to end programs inappropriately, although the denominators were small for the state-governed ($n=7$) and shared governance ($n=6$) categories. Among those from the local health department survey, managers and other employees were more likely than administrators to perceive programs ending that should have continued (46.8% vs 30.5%, $p=0.003$) (data not shown).

In contrast to ending programs that should have continued, 24.7% of state respondents reported programs often or always continuing when they should have ended, compared to 29.4% for local health departments and 25% of respondents working in other agencies (Table 2). It appears that among state health department respondents, staff in tobacco and cancer programs may be less likely to report inappropriate continuation of programs compared to staff in other program areas. Among local public health practitioners, there were no clear patterns of continuing programs when they should have ended based on population of jurisdiction or governance structure. Participants conducting work in other agencies in diabetes/cardiovascular disease prevention and management reported a higher rate of continuing programs when they should have ended compared to other agency respondents conducting other types of programs.

The ranking of reasons for ending programs showed a wide range in frequencies (Table 3). The ending of grant funding was the top reason for all three respondent groups, with nearly equal proportions among state and local practitioners (87.4% and 88.0%), and a lower frequency among respondents from other agencies (79.2%). Two variables (a change in support from policymakers, support from leaders in your agency changed) were more common reasons among state respondents than among local respondents and respondents from other agencies. One reason (program was continued by another organization) was more commonly reported by local respondents (30.3%) than by state respondents (16.7%) or other agencies (15.6%). Two

Table 1. Characteristics of the Sample, Program Mis-Implementation, U.S. 2013–2014

Characteristic	State health department ^a n=277	Local health department ^a n=398	Other agencies combined ^a n=269
Age (y)			
20–39	74 (27.0)	100 (26.2)	90 (33.6)
40–49	61 (22.3)	101 (26.4)	62 (23.1)
50–59	88 (31.8)	135 (35.3)	70 (26.1)
≥60	51 (18.6)	46 (12.0)	46 (17.2)
Gender			
Female	224 (81.2)	289 (75.7)	206 (76.9)
Male	52 (18.8)	93 (24.3)	62 (23.1)
Years worked in public health, mean (SD)	15.5 (9.9)	15.5 (9.3)	13.9 (9.9)
Highest degree			
Doctoral	59 (21.6)	21 (5.5)	64 (23.8)
Master of Public Health	65 (23.8)	71 (18.7)	15 (15.6)
Other master's degree	65 (23.8)	111 (29.3)	72 (26.8)
Nursing	17 (6.2)	56 (14.8)	17 (6.3)
Bachelor's degree or less	67 (24.5)	120 (31.7)	101 (37.6)
Program area			
Obesity, physical activity, nutrition	36 (13.0)	N/A	41 (15.2)
Tobacco	26 (13.0)	N/A	34 (12.6)
Cancer	32 (11.6)	N/A	30 (11.2)
Diabetes/cardiovascular disease	19 (6.9)	N/A	15 (5.6)
Other single primary program area ^b	82 (29.6)	N/A	68 (25.3)
Multiple program areas ^c	82 (29.6)	N/A	81 (30.1)
Population of jurisdiction ^d			
<25,000	N/A	34 (11.1)	N/A
25,000 to 49,999	N/A	72 (23.5)	N/A
50,000 to 99,999	N/A	62 (20.2)	N/A
100,000 to 499,999	N/A	111 (36.2)	N/A
500,000 or larger	N/A	28 (9.1)	N/A
Governance structure			
State governed	N/A	7 (1.8)	N/A
Locally governed	N/A	385 (96.7)	N/A
Shared governance	N/A	6 (1.5)	N/A

Note: Values are n (%) unless otherwise noted.

^aPercentages reported for valid, non-missing cases.

^bOther single primary program areas examples are maternal and child health, communicable diseases, and injury and violence prevention.

^cMultiple program areas represent respondents who selected that they primarily worked across several program areas.

^dPopulation size of health department jurisdiction was assessed only among the local health department participants in the Local Survey.

Table 2. Perceived Frequency^a of Program Mis-Implementation, U.S. 2013–2014

Variable	Respondents reporting programs ending that should have continued			Respondents reporting programs continuing that should have ended		
	State health department n=277	Local health department n=398	Other agencies combined n=269	State health department n=277	Local health department n=398	Other agencies combined n=269
Overall	36.5 (30.8, 42.3)	42.0 (37.1, 46.8)	38.3 (32.3, 44.3)	24.7 (19.6, 29.9)	29.4 (24.9, 33.9)	25.0 (19.7, 30.3)
Program area						
Obesity, physical activity, nutrition	31.4 (15.3, 47.6)	N/A	41.0 (24.9, 57.2)	28.6 (12.8, 44.3)	N/A	23.1 (9.2, 36.9)
Tobacco	36.0 (15.8, 56.2)	N/A	50.0 (32.3, 67.7)	16.0 (0.6, 31.4)	N/A	32.4 (15.8, 48.9)
Cancer	18.8 (4.5, 33.1)	N/A	37.9 (19.2, 56.7)	18.8 (4.5, 33.1)	N/A	17.2 (2.6, 31.9)
Diabetes/ cardiovascular disease	47.4 (22.6, 72.1)	N/A	35.7 (7.0, 64.4)	26.3 (4.5, 48.1)	N/A	50.0 (20.0, 80.0)
Other single primary program area ^b	33.8 (23.2, 44.3)	N/A	28.6 (17.1, 40.0)	22.5 (13.2, 31.9)	N/A	15.9 (6.6, 25.2)
Multiple program areas ^c	46.2 (35.1, 57.4)	N/A	40.3 (29.1, 51.5)	30.0 (19.7, 40.3)	N/A	28.6 (18.3, 38.9)
Population of jurisdiction of local health departments						
< 25,000 (n=34)	N/A	32.4 (15.8, 48.9)	N/A	N/A	17.7 (4.2, 31.2)	N/A
25,000 to 49,999 (n=72)	N/A	49.3 (37.4, 61.2)	N/A	N/A	29.6 (18.7, 40.5)	N/A
50,000 to 99,999 (n=62)	N/A	50.8 (38.1, 63.5)	N/A	N/A	33.3 (21.4, 45.3)	N/A
100,000 to 499,999 (n=111)	N/A	34.2 (25.5, 42.9)	N/A	N/A	33.3 (24.7, 42.0)	N/A
500,000 or larger (n=28)	N/A	24.2 (8.8, 39.7)	N/A	N/A	36.4 (19.0, 53.7)	N/A
Governance structure of local health departments						
State governed (n=7)	N/A	14.3 (0.0, 49.2) ^d	N/A	N/A	28.6 (0.0, 73.7) ^d	N/A
Locally governed (n=385)	N/A	42.3 (37.4, 47.3)	N/A	N/A	29.4 (24.8, 33.9)	N/A
Shared governance (n=6)	N/A	50.0 (0.0, 100.0) ^d	N/A	N/A	33.3 (0.0, 87.5) ^d	N/A

Note: Values are % (95% CI)

^aPercentage reporting “often” or “always” for valid non-missing cases.

^bOther single primary program areas examples are maternal and child health, communicable diseases, and injury and violence prevention.

^cMultiple program areas represents respondents who selected that they primarily worked across several program areas.

^dVery few local health department respondents represented states where local public health governance is shared or state governed, which resulted in wide confidence intervals.

variables (program champion left the agency and ending of insurance coverage) were more frequently reported among respondents from other agencies than among those in state or local public health agencies. Among the

three broad (and overlapping) categories of reasons for ending programs (i.e., external, institutional, and situational), the situational factors ranked highest, although all three domains appeared to be important. Among

Table 3. The Most Common Reasons for Programs Ending, U.S., 2013–2014

Reasons	Category ^a	Ranked as 1st, 2nd, or 3rd most common reason		
		State health department <i>n</i> =277	Local health department <i>n</i> =398	Other agency <i>n</i> =269
Grant funding ended	S	87.4 (83.4, 91.4)	88.0 (84.8, 91.3)	79.2 (74.1, 84.3)
Funding was diverted to a higher priority program	S	60.0 (54.1, 65.9)	61.1 (56.2, 65.9)	62.8 (56.8, 68.8)
Support from policymakers changed	E	45.9 (39.9, 51.9)	33.8 (29.1, 38.5)	38.4 (32.3, 44.5)
Support from leaders in your agency changed	I	35.6 (29.8, 41.3)	23.7 (19.4, 27.9)	20.0 (15.0, 25.0)
Program was adopted or continued by other organizations	E	16.7 (12.2, 21.1)	30.3 (25.7, 34.8)	15.6 (11.1, 20.1)
Program champion left the agency	I	16.3 (11.9, 20.7)	12.5 (9.2, 15.8)	26.8 (21.3, 32.3)
Program was never evaluated	I	12.2 (8.3, 16.2)	14.8 (11.2, 18.3)	12.0 (7.9, 16.1)
Program was evaluated but did not demonstrate impact	I	11.1 (7.3, 14.9)	14.2 (10.8, 17.7)	17.2 (12.5, 21.9)
Support from the general public changed	E	3.3 (1.2, 5.5)	6.9 (4.4, 9.4)	6.8 (3.7, 9.9)
Insurance funding/coverage ended	S	3.0 (0.9, 5.0)	4.3 (2.3, 6.4)	8.0 (4.6, 11.4)

Note: Values are *n* (95% CI)

^aCategories: E = external factors; I = institutional constraints and opportunities; S = situational factors.³⁰

those from the local health department survey, managers and other employees were more likely than administrators to report support from leaders changed in their top three reasons for why programs end (27.9% vs 18.3%, $p=0.045$) (data not shown).

Discussion

To the authors' knowledge, this exploratory study is the first to report data on program mis-implementation among state and local public health departments in the U.S. It begins to fill what appears to be a considerable void in the literature; addressing this gap has the potential to make more efficient use of scarce public health resources. There are several key findings from the current study of perceived mis-implementation:

- In both state and local health departments, a substantial proportion of staff report that programs either end when they should continue or continue when they should be terminated.
- For both state and local health departments, there are higher percentages of programs ending that should be

continued than of those continuing that should be ended.

- The problem of mis-implementation in public health may be slightly larger at the local level than at the state level.
- Many of the reasons for mis-implementation relate to funding (e.g., grant funding ended, funding was diverted to a higher-priority program).
- Certain reasons for ending programs differ at the state versus local level, suggesting that actions to address mis-implementation are likely to vary accordingly.
- Although sample sizes for subgroup analyses were small, there may be important variations in mis-implementation according to program area, local population jurisdiction size, and local governance structure.

In part, the reasons for public health mis-implementation show similarity to literature on mental health interventions. Massatti and colleagues³² studied the de-adoption of innovative mental health practices among 12 mental health providers in Ohio. They found that the top reasons for de-adoption included the lack of

financial resources, lack of community support, difficulty in attracting and retaining staff, and lack of tangible outcomes or benefits. The current findings are consistent with these, and also emphasize the importance of support from policymakers and agency leaders (especially among state public health practitioners). Partnerships are critical to success in public health,^{33–36} which is underscored by the current results showing that local practitioners are much more likely to report that programs were adopted or continued by other organizations. Study findings also highlight the importance of evaluation within public health.^{37–39} A reason for program endings is either lack of evaluation or evaluation showing the need to terminate a program (although frequency of noting *program was not evaluated* is lower than most other reasons).

Some of the current findings and future work can benefit from related research in policy and medical settings. Literature on policy termination highlights potential areas of importance for public health practice. For example, deLeon¹⁸ suggests a hierarchy of termination, noting that functions are the most difficult to terminate, organizations are the next most difficult to end, policies are intermediate, and programs are the easiest to terminate. The current study did not attempt to differentiate these macro- to micro-level distinctions. Policy termination may garner the greatest attention during times of budget austerity,⁴⁰ which may explain some of the current findings on program ending due in part to the funding challenges in public health practice. In addition, policy termination can be induced, often via media coverage.²¹ Similarly, in medical practice, mis-implementation can sometimes occur rapidly because of highly publicized negative trial data.⁴¹ The impact of the media on mis-implementation in public health is worthy of future inquiry.

As the inverse to inappropriate program endings, there are also likely to be lessons from the literature on sustainability and scale-up of effective programs in public health. For example, maintenance of a public health program is likely to relate closely to having one or more of the following: a sufficient budget, a favorable political climate, sufficient organizational capacity, careful attention to context, and ongoing evaluation allowing for mid-course corrections.^{42–48} There now is a small set of measurement tools for sustainability,^{45,49–51} which needs to be adapted and developed to address the various mis-implementation scenarios (e.g., continuing programs that should be ended, ending programs that should be continued).

There are several limitations to the current study. The study relies on a limited set of self-reported questions that lacked extensive psychometric testing and relies on individual perception of program effectiveness. Study estimates are based on the concept of *programs*, which is a term that

may be interpreted broadly or narrowly. In future work, it will be important to delineate what may be subtle differences among a program, intervention, or policy. The sample includes only selected states participating in or serving as controls in other studies and is not a representative, national sample of state or local health departments. Study data are cross-sectional, limited to certain program areas, and do not allow for assessing predictors of mis-implementation or how findings might be affected by macro-trends such as reductions in funding to public health. And finally, to fully understand the issue of mis-implementation, a mixed-methods approach (quantitative and qualitative)⁵² is likely to be the most useful.

It is likely that research on public health mis-implementation is in its first generation. This suggests a wide range of future research needs, ranging from broad categories of inquiry such as developing reliable and valid measures of mis-implementation, understanding variables that predict mis-implementation, describing mediators and moderators (e.g., state versus local differences, understanding how healthcare reform efforts may affect mis-implementation of clinical services, variations by program area, the role of media attention), to developing qualitative case studies of successful and unsuccessful mis-implementation.

Developing the evidence base for mis-implementation in public health practice will allow practitioners and policymakers to bolster efforts to continue effective programs and target ineffective programs for discontinuation, diverting these resources to promising programs that are not being fully implemented, evaluated, or scaled up. Such actions are likely to make the most effective use of resources and improve the health of the public.

This study was supported in part by Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (grant No. 69964, Public Health Services and Systems Research), National Cancer Institute (grant No. R01CA160327), and National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (grant No. 1P30DK092950). This article is a product of a Prevention Research Center and was also supported by Cooperative Agreement No. U48/DP001903 from CDC. The findings and conclusions in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of CDC. Human subjects approval was obtained from the Washington University IRB.

No financial disclosures were reported by the authors of this paper.

References

1. Association of State and Territorial Health Officials. Scheduled funding cuts jeopardize our public health. www.astho.org/Advocacy/Sequestration-Fact-Page/#Background. Accessed March 4, 2013.

2. Brownson RC, Fielding JE, Maylahn CM. Evidence-based public health: a fundamental concept for public health practice. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2009;30:175–201. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.031308.100134>.
3. National Association of County and City Health Officials. Local Health Department Job Losses and Program Cuts: Findings from January 2012 Survey. www.naccho.org/advocacy/resources/upload/LHD-Budget-Cuts-two-pager.pdf. Accessed December 28, 2014.
4. Economos CD, Brownson RC, DeAngelis MA, et al. What lessons have been learned from other attempts to guide social change? *Nutr Rev*. 2001;59(3 Pt 2):S40–S56; discussion S57–65.
5. Rogers EM. *Diffusion of Innovations*. Fifth ed., New York, NY: Free Press, 2003.
6. Brownson R, Colditz G, Proctor E, eds. *Dissemination and Implementation Research in Health: Translating Science to Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press; 2012.
7. NIH. *Dissemination and Implementation Research in Health (R01)*. Vol PAR-13-055. Bethesda, MD: NIH; 2013:24. <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/PA-files/PA-13-055.html>.
8. Tabak RG, Khoong EC, Chambers DA, Brownson RC. Bridging research and practice: models for dissemination and implementation research. *Am J Prev Med*. 2012;43(3):337–350. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2012.05.024>.
9. Wong FL, Greenwell M, Gates S, Berkowitz JM. It's what you do! Reflections on the VERB campaign. *Am J Prev Med*. 2008;34(6 Suppl):S175–S182. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2008.03.003>.
10. Huhman ME, Potter LD, Nolin MJ, et al. The influence of the VERB campaign on children's physical activity in 2002 to 2006. *Am J Public Health*. 2010;100(4):638–645. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2008.142968>.
11. Bauman A. Commentary on the VERB campaign - perspectives on social marketing to encourage physical activity among youth. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2004;1(3):A02.
12. Huhman M, Berkowitz J. Bringing a national campaign to communities: VERB It's what you do! And VERB Scorecard. In: Pate R, Buchner D, eds. *Implementing Physical Activity Strategies*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 2014:45–54.
13. Ennett ST, Tobler NS, Ringwalt CL, Flewelling RL. How effective is drug abuse resistance education? A meta-analysis of Project DARE outcome evaluations. *Am J Public Health*. 1994;84(9):1394–1401. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.84.9.1394>.
14. Shepard E.M. The economic costs of D.A.R.E. Syracuse, NY: Institute of Industrial Relations; November 2001. Research Paper Number 22.
15. Drug Policy Foundation. *Public Policy: Youth Drug Education/The D.A.R.E. Program*. Washington, DC: Drug Policy Foundation; 2003.
16. West SL, O'Neal KK. Project D.A.R.E. outcome effectiveness revisited. *Am J Public Health*. 2004;94:1027–1029. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.94.6.1027>.
17. Vincus AA, Ringwalt C, Harris MS, Shamblen SR. A short-term, quasi-experimental evaluation of D.A.R.E.'s revised elementary school curriculum. *J Drug Educ*. 2010;40(1):37–49. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2190/DE.40.1.c>.
18. deLeon P. Public policy termination: An end and a beginning. *Policy Anal*. 1978;4:369–392.
19. Bardach E. Policy termination as a political process. *Policy Sci*. 1976; 7(2):123–131. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00143910>.
20. Brewer G. Termination: Hard choices, harder questions. *Public Adm Rev*. 1978;38(4):338–344. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/975816>.
21. Geva-May I. Riding the wave of opportunity: Termination in public policy. *J Public Adm Res Theory*. 2004;14(3): 309–333. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muh020>.
22. Geva-May I. When the motto is "Till death do us part": The conceptualization and the craft of termination in the public policy cycle. *Int J Public Adm*. 2006;24(3):263–288. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1081/PAD-100000448>.
23. Delaune J, Everett W. *Waste and Inefficiency in the U.S. Health Care System—Clinical Care: A Comprehensive Analysis in Support of System-wide Improvements*. Cambridge, MA: New England Healthcare Institute, 2008.
24. Kohn L, Corrigan J, Donaldson M. *To Err Is Human: Building a Safer Health Care System*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 2000.
25. Korenstein D, Falk R, Howell EA, Bishop T, Keyhani S. Overuse of health care services in the United States: an understudied problem. *Arch Intern Med*. 2012;172(2):171–178. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/archinternmed.2011.772>.
26. Allen P, Sequeira S, Jacob RR, et al. Promoting state health department evidence-based cancer and chronic disease prevention: a multi-phase dissemination study with a cluster randomized trial component. *Implement Sci*. 2013;8:141. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-8-141>.
27. Brownson RC, Reis RS, Allen P, et al. Understanding administrative evidence-based practices: findings from a survey of local health department leaders. *Am J Prev Med*. 2013;46(1): 49–57. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2013.08.013>.
28. Erwin PC, Harris JK, Smith C, Leep CJ, Duggan K, Brownson RC. Evidence-based public health practice among program managers in local public health departments. *J Public Health Manag Pract*. 2013;20 (5):472–480. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/PHH.0000000000000027>.
29. Jacobs J, Duggan K, Erwin P, et al. Capacity building for evidence-based decision making in local health departments: scaling up an effective training approach. *Implement Sci*. 2014;9(1):124. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13012-014-0124-x>.
30. Bauer M, Knill C. A conceptual framework for the comparative analysis of policy change: Measurement, explanation and strategies of policy dismantling. *J Comp Policy Analysis: Res Pract*. 2014;16(1): 28–44. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2014.885186>.
31. Mays GP, McHugh MC, Shim K, et al. Institutional and economic determinants of public health system performance. *Am J Public Health*. 2006;96(3):523–531. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2005.064253>.
32. Massatti RR, Sweeney HA, Panzano PC, Roth D. The de-adoption of innovative mental health practices (IMHP): why organizations choose not to sustain an IMHP. *Adm Policy Ment Health*. 2008;35(1-2): 50–65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10488-007-0141-z>.
33. Beatty K, Harris JK, Barnes PA. The role of interorganizational partnerships in health services provision among rural, suburban, and urban local health departments. *J Rural Health*. 2010;26(3): 248–258. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-0361.2010.00285.x>.
34. Boex JR, Keck CW, Piatt E, Nunthirapikorn TN, Blacklow RS. Academic health centers and public health departments: partnership matters. *Am J Prev Med*. 2006;30(1):89–93. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2005.08.044>.
35. Fawcett SB, Francisco VT, Paine-Andrews A, Schultz JA. A model memorandum of collaboration: a proposal. *Public Health Rep*. 2000;115(2-3):174–179. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/phr/115.2.174>.
36. Roussos ST, Fawcett SB. A review of collaborative partnerships as a strategy for improving community health. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2000;21:369–402. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.21.1.369>.
37. Brownson RC, Baker EA, Leet TL, Gillespie KN, True WR. *Evidence-Based Public Health*. 2nd ed., New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2011.
38. Fink A. *Evaluation Fundamentals: Insights into Program Effectiveness, Quality, and Value*. Third ed., Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2014.
39. Greene J, Benjamin L, Goodyear L. The merits of mixing methods in evaluation. *Evaluation*. 2001;7(1):25–44. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/13563890122209504>.
40. Ferry M, Bachtler J. Reassessing the concept of policy termination: the case of regional policy in England. *Policy Stud*. 2013;34(3): 255–273. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2013.768389>.

41. Hauptman PJ, Schnitzler MA, Swindle J, Burroughs TE. Use of nesiritide before and after publications suggesting drug-related risks in patients with acute decompensated heart failure. *JAMA*. 2006; 296(15):1877–1884. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jama.296.15.1877>.
42. Shediach-Rizkallah MC, Bone LR. Planning for the sustainability of community-based health programs: conceptual frameworks and future directions for research, practice and policy. *Health Educ Res*. 1998; 13(1):87–108. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/her/13.1.87>.
43. Hacker K, Tendulkar SA, Rideout C, et al. Community capacity building and sustainability: outcomes of community-based participatory research. *Prog Community Health Partnersh*. 2012;6(3): 349–360. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/cpr.2012.0048>.
44. O'Loughlin J, Renaud L, Richard L, Gomez LS, Paradis G. Correlates of the sustainability of community-based heart health promotion interventions. *Prev Med*. 1998;27(5 Pt 1):702–712. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/pmed.1998.0348>.
45. Luke DA, Calhoun A, Robichaux CB, Elliott MB, Moreland-Russell S. The Program Sustainability Assessment Tool: a new instrument for public health programs. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2014;11:130184. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5888/pcd11.130184>.
46. Scheirer MA, Dearing JW. An agenda for research on the sustainability of public health programs. *Am J Public Health*. 2011;101(11): 2059–2067. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2011.300193>.
47. Schell SF, Luke DA, Schooley MW, et al. Public health program capacity for sustainability: a new framework. *Implement Sci*. 2013;8: 15. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-8-15>.
48. Norton W, Mittman B. *Scaling Up Health Promotion/Disease Prevention Programs in Community Settings: Barriers, Facilitators, and Initial Recommendations*. Hartford, CT: Patrick and Catherine Weldon Donaghue Medical Research Foundation; 2010.
49. Blackford J, Street A. Tracking the route to sustainability: a service evaluation tool for an advance care planning model developed for community palliative care services. *J Clin Nurs*. 2012;21(15-16): 2136–2148. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2012.04179.x>.
50. Kelly C, Scharff D, Larose J, Dougherty NL, Hessel AS, Brownson RC. A tool for rating chronic disease prevention and public health interventions. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2013;10:E206. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5888/pcd10.130173>.
51. Sarriot E, Ricca J, Ryan L, Basnet J, Arscott-Mills S. Measuring sustainability as a programming tool for health sector investments: report from a pilot sustainability assessment in five Nepalese health districts. *Int J Health Plann Manage*. 2009;24(4):326–350. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hpm.1012>.
52. Creswell J, Klassen A, Plano Clark V, Clegg Smith K. *Best Practices for Mixed Methods Research in the Health Sciences*. Bethesda, MD: Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research, NIH, 2011.