SASI™ Scoring Options

1 Using the SASI tool and scoring the assessment requires some kind of decision-making group—called the Assessment Group.

2 For every option, the group must first define the network that is the point of focus—what services and facilities, departments and programs does this encompass and for what population? All individuals participating in the rating decisions must understand these definitions. The group will then evaluate whether the network (as defined) is meeting the stated objectives for the target population.

3 For a more thorough assessment, the group should complete the Workbook section of SASI first, before scoring the network on each objective.

4 Once a scoring system is chosen, the same system should be used each time for comparability across time periods. The group should be as clear as possible as to what achieving "the maximum" means. It is likely that over time, group members, as well as ideas about what is ideal for the network will change, therefore clarity is important if scores over multiple time periods will be compared.

Option A 0----------1----------2----------3----------4
Set up a Likert scale with ratings from 0 to 4 (makes a 5-point scale). For each objective, Assessment Group members select the rating that they feel the *network* has achieved. The votes are tallied for each objective and divided by the number of people so that an average is obtained. This average score is then displayed to the group to be sure that consensus is achieved. This score becomes the baseline.

Option B (The SASI Tool contains an exercise that uses this option) 0%–25%–50%–75%–100%
Instead of using a Likert scale, use percentage points—from 0% achieved to 100% achieved (the advantage is that percentages are widely understood, whereas a number score is not). As in Option A, have all Assessment Group members select the percentage score closest to where they believe the network has demonstrated achievement. The votes are tallied, an average or median score is computed, and the result displayed to the group to ensure consensus. The scores can be displayed to show the range of opinion.

Option C
In this option, the Assessment Group would evaluate two aspects of the network's progress on the objectives, (1) the approach or process of moving ahead on that objective and (2) the results achieved related to that objective. This would be similar to the scoring system of the Malcolm Baldridge review process. Using the Malcolm Baldridge guidelines, there are five categories for approach/deployment and for results as follows:

	Approach	**Results**
0%	No approach is evident.	No results or poor results are seen.
10-30%	There is the beginning of a systematic, approach, but major gaps still exist.	Trends are in the early stages of development, and there is some improvement in some areas.
40-60%	A sound, systematic approach and a fact-based improvement process is in place in key areas.	Some trends show areas of strength; improvement trends are reported for many key areas.
70-90%	The fact-based improvement process is a key management tool.	Current performance is good to excellent in most areas.
100%	A systematic approach is fully responsive to all requirements of the Objective.	Current performance is excellent in all areas.