

Designing a Program or Community Intervention Rubric

	Novice	Beginning	Proficient	Expert
Executive summary	<p>Absent or most items absent</p> <p>Not focused or succinct</p> <p>Wordy</p> <p>Not a summary</p>	<p>Missing items</p> <p>Unnecessarily wordy or more than one page</p> <p>Unimportant items mentioned</p> <p>Not a summary</p>	<p>Somewhat unnecessarily wordy</p> <p>Most or all key points present, lesser points may also be present</p>	<p>Succinct summation on one page (typed double space, 11 or 12 font; 300 words or less)</p> <p>Nature and magnitude of problem clearly stated</p> <p>Convincing rationale for recommendations</p> <p>Goal and objectives stated</p> <p>Limited to key points</p>
Goal and specific objectives	<p>Confusing goal statement or absent</p> <p>No clear objectives, objectives absent or not specified</p> <p>No, irrelevant or unconvincing reason given for addressing problem</p>	<p>Mostly incomplete goal statement</p> <p>Objectives not stated in measurable terms (no measurable outcomes); lack of specificity</p> <p>Reason to address problem is superficial, no particular or minor benefit to population given</p>	<p>Somewhat incomplete goal statement</p> <p>Somewhat incomplete objectives, not fully specified or stated in measurable terms</p> <p>Rationale for addressing problem somewhat deficient, clear benefit to population not fully addressed</p>	<p>Complete goal statement present and specific (to do what for whom)</p> <p>Objectives stated in specific and measurable (quantitative) terms (outcomes are measurable) (to do X for Y to achieve Z)</p> <p>Importance of addressing problem is clear and appropriate; benefit to population clearly identified</p>
Description of the public health problem	<p>Poor description of problem, or absent</p> <p>No or little information on magnitude or distribution</p> <p>Population not or poorly specified</p> <p>Impact of problem on community not described or only in terms of health effects</p> <p>Confusing, unconvincing or absent justification as public health problem</p>	<p>Partial problem statement, but not well described</p> <p>Little information on magnitude or distribution; lack of clarity</p> <p>Only few population characteristics specified</p> <p>Impact of problem on community described in too limited terms, often only health effects</p> <p>Weak, but not erroneous, justification of it being a public health problem</p>	<p>Problem described reasonably well</p> <p>Magnitude and distribution described somewhat but without critical measures</p> <p>Population described but some lack of specificity or missing some important factors</p> <p>Impact of problem on community described somewhat more than just effects on health</p> <p>Justification for it being a public health problem does not fully address the characteristics of public health</p>	<p>Clear identification and definition of problem (include natural history if problem is a particular disease or injury)</p> <p>Succinct yet comprehensive statement of magnitude and distribution with critical estimate(s) provided</p> <p>Population clearly specified (e.g., educational level, cultural characteristics, life styles and living standards, primary occupations, income, services available, etc., as appropriate)</p> <p>Impact of problem on community well described (health, economic, social and other relevant effects)</p> <p>Justification of why it is a public health problem is clear and convincing; fully addresses the characteristics of public health</p>

	Novice	Beginning	Proficient	Expert
Key risk factors (or determinants)	Few if any, or erroneous, risk factors described	Only some risk factors described, all or nearly all are proximal risk factors	Risk factors reflect ecological model, but not adequately inclusive of all proximal and distal factors	Risk factors comprehensively identified and described, including distal and proximate factors, reflects ecological model (i.e., includes relevant social, economic, and other community or broader level factors as appropriate)
Prevention/intervention strategies (literature review)	Inadequate coverage of the literature No uniformity in reviews, unsystematic Deficient in peer-reviewed sources No, sparse, or inadequate critique of the literature	Some important literature missing Rudimentary critique of literature Some critique misplaced, off-target, or unsound	Mostly relevant, timely, peer reviewed literature Good critical analysis of the literature and of other programs and interventions Somewhat unsystematic	Thorough literature review of current intervention and prevention strategies and programs, systematically presented Critical analysis of the literature well done and systematic Peer-reviewed sources
Advantages and disadvantages of potential interventions	Cursory overview of advantages and disadvantages Few dimensions addressed and done poorly Unsystematic	Rudimentary listing of advantages and disadvantages Unknowns often not identified as such Often unsystematic Not all dimensions addressed	Advantages and disadvantages not fully described Mostly systematic approach Unknowns not always highlighted Most but not all relevant dimensions addressed	Advantages and disadvantages of intervention and prevention strategies and programs fully and systematically described, including dimensions, for example: benefits, costs, technical, political, ease of implementation, potential obstacles. Where unknown, so identified.
Specific recommendations	Method for comparing alternatives and selecting the best intervention not described Recommendation poorly stated, unclear Rationale absent, sparse, inconsistent, not on-target, or address the risk factors	Method may be named but not or poorly described No or very little discussion of assumptions Basic but incomplete statement of recommendation(s) Rationale deficient, simplistic or suspect; does not adequately address the risk factors Extraneous elements in rationale	Method for comparing alternatives described but not very well; may fail to identify and discuss assumptions Recommendation(s) stated but with some lack of clarity Rationale not clearly supportive, some unnecessary "fluff" or repetition; most if not all relevant risk factors addressed	Method for comparing alternatives and selecting the best intervention clearly described Any assumptions made in assessing alternatives clearly described Specific recommendation(s) stated clearly, succinctly, and comprehensively with convincing supporting rationale including clearly addresses the risk factors
Conceptual framework	Absent, too brief and/or faulty	Some elements present but overall incomplete, unsound parts	Most critical elements present, some lack of consistency with the literature, essentially sound	Conceptual framework or logic model comprehensively presented, sound and consistent with the literature

	Novice	Beginning	Proficient	Expert
Program description	Many key items are not addressed or descriptions are significantly incomplete or faulty	Not all key items are addressed or descriptions are somewhat incomplete	All key items are addressed and descriptions are reasonably complete	All key items are addressed and descriptions are complete <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • program purpose (goals and objectives) • the need being addressed • expected effects • criteria for success • program activities • resources used • logic model • program context
Implementation plan	Missing many important aspects of the who, what, when, where, how, and how much Inconsistent with recommendation(s) No barriers identified or means of addressing them inadequate Timeline missing or not well thought-out or formulated and unrealistic	Missing some important aspects of the who, what, when, where, how, and how much Some lack of consistency with recommendation(s) Some barriers identified, some attention to overcoming barriers; somewhat unrealistic expectations Timeline lacking in detail, has inconsistencies among components, and some unrealistic expectations	Some deficiencies in addressing program components, but all addressed (the who, what, when, where, how, and how much) Mostly consistent with recommendation(s) Barriers identified but limited attention to overcoming barriers Timeline reasonably well-formulated and logical, somewhat lacking in detail, perhaps some unrealistic expectations	Succinct but complete description of the intervention or program in specific terms: who, what, when, where, how, and how much Implementation is consistent with recommendation(s) Potential barriers and realistic means for overcoming them identified Timeline well-formulated and logical, adequately detailed, and realistic
Community support	None, little or unrealistic plans for securing community support or involving and integrating community resources	Some consideration given to securing community support or involving and integrating with existing community resources	Reasonable plans for securing community support Appropriate plan for involvement of and integration with existing community resources	Adequate evidence of community support or reasonable plan for securing such support Appropriate plan for involvement of and integration with existing community resources
Evaluation	No or vague evaluation plan	Evaluation plan brief, rudimentary	Evaluation plan described with adequate detail	Basic elements and design of an evaluation plan succinctly described

	Novice	Beginning	Proficient	Expert
Budget and budget narrative	Budget and narrative largely incomplete, unrealistic, missing or not consistent with implementation plan	Budget and narrative somewhat incomplete or unrealistic Not consistent with implementation plan	Mostly complete budget with budget narrative providing rationale for each expenditure Reasonably realistic, informed estimate of expenditures Mostly consistent with implementation plan	Complete budget with budget narrative providing rationale for each expenditure Realistic, informed estimate of expenditures Consistent with implementation plan
Ethical considerations	Deficient in addressing applicable ethical and human rights considerations		All applicable ethical and human rights considerations appropriately addressed	
Sustainability	No or very unreasonable plans for sustainability	Consideration given to sustainability, but unconvincing	Reasonable plan for self-sufficiency, sustainability beyond funding period	