

## Structure

The Q<sup>GPS</sup> procedure is based on four widely-accepted dimensions of quality in health promotion and prevention: concept, structure, process and results. They represent the framework, which has been operationalized by eight quality areas and 32 quality features on the basis of a comprehensive literature review (see also the [Q<sup>HPS</sup> quality model](#) | [Q<sup>HPS</sup> quality chain](#)). Each feature appears as a statement, e.g., “Has the target group been defined against the backdrop of needs?”

The programme’s compliance with the defined quality requirements can be scored on three levels: yes (2 points), partially (1 point), no (0 points). Detailed descriptions of each feature and highly standardized descriptors (i.e. quality indicators) allow for an objective assessment (see the Q<sup>HPS</sup> manual; currently available in German only. An English language version is planned).

The number of accumulated points is considered in relation to the total possible points, and ultimately converted to percentages. Calculations can be done for each quality dimension, as well as across all dimensions.

Tab.: Calculation example of the Q<sup>HPS</sup> procedure

Quality dimension	Accumulated points	Possible points	Score in %
I Concept	16	24	66.7
II Structure	8	14	57.1
III Process	4	10	40.0
IV Results	8	16	50.0
<b>Total number of points / total score in percent</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>53.5</b>

It is likely that programmes will not always be able to fulfill all quality requirements. It strongly depends on how fully they have been developed and implemented. Five quality levels have been defined which allow for a differentiated interpretation of these stages.

Tab.: Interpretation of the assessment results

Range	Level	Description
< 19.9 %	Deficient	Deficits in key areas dominate – substantial elements are missing.
20 - < 40.9 %	Threshold	Deficits in key areas prevail – substantial elements are frequently missing, but are detectable in some areas
41 - < 60.9 %	Average	Although there are deficits, elements of quality exist that outweigh these weaknesses; substantial elements are often present.
61 - < 80.9 %	Proficient	The elements that reflect quality are mostly visible; only a few deficits are apparent – the program is approaching the level of a model program.
> 81 %	Excellent	The quality requirements are met almost completely; the program has reached the state of a role model.

The ascertained total score of 53.5% means that the rated programme is at the 'Average level'.