

THE UNIVERSITY OF LETHBRIDGE
FACULTY OF HEALTH SCIENCES
PUBH 4000 – ADVANCED PUBLIC HEALTH
Course Outline– Fall, 2016
Sept. 8 – Dec. 6 2016

Professor: Sharon Yanicki PhD RN
Office: M3053
Phone: 403.332.5233
Office Hours: Tues 2:00-3:30 or by appointment
E-Mail: yanism@uleth.ca
Class Time: Tuesdays and Thursdays, 12:15 – 1:30 p.m.
Room: AH118

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

This course will support students in integrating knowledge, and developing skills and core competencies for public health (e.g., building upon PUBH 1000, 2000, 3000 and HLSC 2700/SOCI 2700). This course focuses on appraisal, evaluation, assessment, and knowledge translation and exchange as essential skills. An existing health promotion program or health intervention will be considered for the evaluation assignment. A health impact assessment (HIA) framework will be applied to address a complex environmental public health issue. Course assignments, service learning, and class participation will support the development of selected core competencies.

COURSE OBJECTIVES:

Student will be able to:

1. Apply course concepts and develop core competencies for public health
2. Appraise and summarize evidence on a public health issue
3. Apply frameworks and tools for evaluation and health impact assessment
4. Apply knowledge translation strategies, utilize plain language tools, and synthesize information to communicate effectively about public health issues.

APPROACH TO LEARNING:

Classes are 1 hour and 15 minutes twice per week. Course instruction methods include: lectures, class and group discussion, guest lectures, case reviews, videos and Moodle resources. Students are expected to check Moodle regularly for required readings and resources. Students are responsible for information provided through all formats.

REQUIRED TEXT:

There is no required textbook for this course; however, students are expected to download and read weekly readings and resources from Moodle prior to each class.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

Assignment	Due Date	% of Final Grade
Critical Appraisal	September 29	15%
Evaluation Assignment	October 20	20%
Health Impact Assessment	Report: November 17 Poster Presentation November 24	15% 15%
Participation	Oct. 16 and December 1	20%
Final Exam	December 6	15%

DESCRIPTION OF COURSE REQUIREMENTS:**Critical Appraisal (15%)**

The purpose of this individual assignment is to *critically appraise* a *systematic review* on a public health issue (one article summarizing the quality of the available evidence). You will critically appraise this article using *an appropriate critical appraisal tool*. You will compare your findings to a *pre-appraised summary* of evidence on this topic and prepare a short summary of the strengths and limitations of the article you have critically appraised.

- a) Begin by searching for **one** *systematic review* article on a selected public health topic (see the [EMB Reviews \(Cochrane Collection\)](#) tab on the Public Health Resources page of the library)
- b) Select **an appropriate** *critical appraisal tool* to review See Moodle for the National Collaborating Centre for Methods and Tools' [Compendium of Critical Appraisal Tools for Public Health Practice](#).
- c) Apply the critical appraisal tool to evaluate the quality of evidence and the search strategies used in your selected systematic review article.
- d) Select **one** *pre-appraised summary* of a systematic review (by different authors) on the same topic (see the [Health Evidence](#) tab on the Public Health Resources page of the library. You must register to use this site).
- e) Compare your article and critical appraisal results to the pre-appraised summary on this topic in Health Evidence.
- d) Provide a brief summary summarizing your critical appraisal of your article (maximum 3-4 pages). Identify the strengths and limitations of your critical appraisal of a systematic review article. Compare the quality of your systematic review article to a pre-appraised summary in Health Evidence (See the attached marking guide).

Evaluation Assignment (20%)

The purpose of this small group (2 – 3 students) assignment is to assess an existing health promotion program or population intervention. This assignment will be completed in three parts. The first step of the assignment is to complete a review of available evidence on this program or intervention. The second step is to create a logic model linking the programs' underlying theoretical foundation to the program's objectives and outcome measures. The third step is to develop recommendations regarding this program or intervention. Could this program be evaluated with the available information? All group members must complete a component of this assignment and collaborate to develop a written summary (see the Marking Guide for the Evaluation Assignment).

Part 1 Review of Scholarly Evidence, Best Practices & Evaluation Reports

- a) Choose one existing Canadian public health program or intervention to evaluate.
- b) Each student must identify one scholarly article related to the selected program or intervention. Articles may reflect underlying theories of change that guide a program or evidence on the effectiveness of a selected intervention.
- c) In the reference list for this assignment, list a student's name behind each article.
- d) Prepare a short summary (approximately 5 pages) on the evidence supporting this program or intervention.

Part 2 Program Logic Model

- a) Identify the components of a selected program or intervention (minimum elements to be included):
 - a public health issue and a target group
 - program objectives or the intended impact of an intervention
 - underlying theories (What theories suggested that this program/intervention will result in a desired outcome? (implied or stated))
 - strategies or interventions (How will the outcome be influenced?)
 - program outputs (What tasks or program activities will be completed?)
 - program outcomes (What outcomes could be measured to evaluate program objectives?)
- b) Link components of the program by creating a graphic linking the program's key components linking theory to outcomes). See the resources in Moodle.
- c) Create a graphic representation of the program logic model (see resources in Moodle).

Part 3 Recommendations for Evaluability

- a) Could this program be evaluated with the available information?
- b) What elements of the program could be clarified or are needed to evaluate program objectives?

Finally: Document your Contribution

- c) Document your contributions to the group assignment at the bottom of your Peer Evaluation Form.
- d) Post the Assignment and Peer Evaluation Form in Moodle prior to the start of class

Health Impact Assessment (HIA) (15% + 15%)

This assignment will be carried out in **groups (3 – 4 students)**. Part 1 involves the completion of a health impact assessment report and Part 2 involves developing a poster presentation as part of a knowledge translation and exchange (KT&E) plan to share your findings with other members of the university community and the public. This is a scholarly report based on APA 6th edition format.

Part 1 HIA Report (15%)

- a) Develop a written report of your Health Impact Assessment (HIA) on an issue of importance for public health in Canada. This issue may address one of the following:
 - the social, economic and cultural environment—e.g., a new airport, sports or cultural center
 - the built environment— e.g., urban design and health outcomes, or housing and health equity
 - the physical environment—e.g., air, water, climate change, or sustainable development and the health of a population group
- b) Cite a broad range of scholarly evidence (See Marking Guide for the Health Impact Assessment).
- c) Utilize the [World Health Organization](#) (2013; 1999) steps for completing a HIA (see Moodle for resources): Screening, Scoping, Appraisal, Reporting and Monitoring
You may use tools from the [National Collaborating Center for Healthy Public Policy](#) to complete your assessment.
- d) Identify a few policy recommendations based on your analysis and identify a target for policy advocacy (e.g., organizational, municipal, provincial or federal government). HIA seeks to influence a policy decision under review.
- e) Post your HIA report, and peer evaluation in Moodle (approx. 10-15 pages) prior to the start of class on **November 17**.

Part 2 HIA Poster Presentation (15%)

- a) Each HIA group will present their key findings in poster format* on **November 24**. The attendance and participation of each group member is required for the poster presentation.
- b) Structure your poster presentation to address the five step HIA processes and to highlight one or two policy recommendations.
- c) Apply knowledge translation strategies to develop a one-page summary for the target audience (a handout written in plain English) with key messages and selected scholarly references.
- d) Utilize graphics and color to create visual appeal. Posters may be printed or electronic.
- e) Use an appropriate font size for readability. **Use** a larger font for the electronic poster than listed in the poster template (see the Marking Guide for the Poster Presentation; see Moodle for the poster template).
- f) Post your one-page summary and peer evaluations in Moodle prior to the start of class. Bring copies of your one-page summary to class for the Poster Presentation.

*Paper posters are preferred. Students choosing to create a print poster will need to pay for the cost of printing a 3'x4' colour poster. Posters may be printed through Printing Services on campus. Laminating is not required.

*An electronic poster can be produced at no cost, however, formatting the poster for in-class presentation will require larger font sizes.

**Posters will be presented in an open class session: guests from the Faculty of Health Sciences will be invited to attend.

Participation (20%)

The purpose of the participation mark is to encourage student accountability for cooperative and group-based learning, regular attendance in class and engagement in leadership development or volunteer activities in the field of public health. All students are expected to complete required readings prior to class and to participate in class discussions, activities and base-groups. The participation mark will be evaluated through: (a) peer-evaluations, (b) attendance and participation in class and (c) leadership development or service learning /volunteer activities supporting the development of selected core competencies for public health. See the Peer Evaluation form attached and resources posted in Moodle. The instructor will make the final determination on participation marks.

Base-Group & Class Participation (5% + 5%)

Base-groups will be selected or assigned (5 – 6 students) by **Class 2**. Peer evaluations, attendance and participation in class will be used to calculate participation marks (mid-term and final evaluations). The instructor will make the final determination of participation marks.

Leadership or Service Learning Activities (10%)

Complete leadership activities (at the university or in the community) or participate in service learning (volunteer activities) for a total of 15 hours. *Only leadership and service learning activities completed during the fall term with a focus as specified below will be considered for the participation mark.

Leadership activities (at the university or in the community) may include one of the following (as approved by the instructor by **Class 4**).

- a) Lead outside-of-class events (e.g., help to organize a social activity for the public health new student orientation or other events for public health students during the term), or
- b) Engage in a *student leadership role* with a public health association (e.g., PHSA, APHA or CPHA) or
- c) Participate as a student representative on a committee (e.g. university committees, City of Lethbridge committees such as Lethbridge Youth Advisory Committee, Vibrant Lethbridge, or the Canadian Municipalities Against Racism and Discrimination [CMARD]). Be prepared to attend regular meetings or
- d) Lead a team (e.g., attend a training session and lead a team of volunteers for the annual Homeless Count, or participate in Project Connect).

Service Learning (volunteer hours with a community organization) – complete documented service learning focused on one of the following (as approved by the instructor by **Class 4**):

- a) Participate in knowledge translation activities to promote public awareness
- b) Participate in health promotion activities (e.g., lead children's activities at Flulupalooza, with Alberta Health Services),
- c) Participate in health advocacy activities (e.g., policy advocacy with APHA)

A police information check (allow 4 weeks) is required *prior* to service learning/volunteer work with a community agency, so plan for this early in the term. *Pick up a letter from an Academic Advisor to get a discount on the fee.

Reporting Requirements for Leadership Development or Volunteer Activities

For leadership development activities involving in-class or outside of class skill development sessions:

- a) Post a 1-page summary report in Moodle on each student leadership activity (on or before **Class 23**)

For service learning activities, post the following in Moodle (on or before **Class 23**)

- a) a *service learning log* including dates and times of volunteer hours and the type of activities completed with a community organization (See the Service Learning Log in Moodle). Please have this form signed by an agency contact.
- b) a *1-page summary report* (describe how service learning activities supported the development of one core competency for public health)

Final Exam (15%)

The in-class final exam (75 minutes) will cover content presented from Class 9 to the end of term. The exam will consist of multiple-choice questions and one long-answer question.

COURSE EXPECTATIONS:**General**

- All assignments are to be submitted in Moodle on or before the start of class on specified dates.
- Students are responsible for completing all course requirements as scheduled. Late assignments will be deducted 5% of the total mark per day (per Faculty of Health Sciences policy).
- A request for an extension must be made 24 hours prior to the due date for an assignment.
- Notify your instructor within 24 hours of a legitimate absence from class in relation to your participation mark or a scheduled assignment (supporting document may be requested). Rescheduling an assignment is at the discretion of the instructor.
- Scholarly references in this course refer to journal articles, books or scholarly grey literature reports with citations listed (e.g., Statistics Canada reports).
- Utilize the American Psychological Association's (APA) 6th edition format for assignments in this course. See: <http://www.uleth.ca/lib/guides/research/display.asp?PageID=1> Review the APA Tutorial on-line or see the APA Manual available in the library. If you need assistance, please speak to the instructor or consult a librarian.
- Assignment materials will be returned in class or during office hours.

CLASSROOM ETIQUETTE:

Students are expected to attend all classes, be prepared for discussions and to stay for the duration of class. If you are unable to attend, need to come late or leave early, please notify the instructor in advance. Please show respect for the ideas of others and avoid dominating classroom or base-group discussions. A cell phone or laptop may be used in class to support course-based activities, however, texting and accessing non-course related websites are not allowed during class.

GRADING BREAKDOWN:

The grading system for this course is consistent with that established in the Faculty of Health Sciences, effective May, 2002.

Letter	GPA	Percent	Letter	GPA	Percent
A+	4.0	95 - 100%	C+	2.3	71 - 74.9%
A	4.0	91 - 94.9%	C	2.0	67 - 70.9%
A-	3.7	87 - 90.9%	C-	1.7	63 - 66.9%
B+	3.3	83 - 86.9%	D+	1.3	59 - 62.9%
B	3.0	79 - 82.9%	D	1.0	55 - 58.9%
B-	2.7	75 - 78.9%	F	0	0 - 54.9%

PLAGIARISM STATEMENT:

The University of Lethbridge subscribes to Turnitin.com, a plagiarism detection service. Please be advised that student work submitted for credit in this course may be submitted to this system to verify its originality. Students must be able to submit both electronic and hard copy versions of their work upon request.

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR STUDENTS WITH A DISABILITY:

Reasonable accommodations are available for students who have a documented disability. If you have been diagnosed with a disability, there is no need to face the challenge of University without support. Please contact the Accommodated Learning Centre at 403.329.2766 to set up an appointment <http://www.uleth.ca/ross/counselling/index.html>. After registering with the Accommodated Learning Centre, your instructor will be notified by a formal letter of any accommodations you require. In addition, students are responsible for requesting accommodations from the instructor at least ***two weeks*** in advance of the evaluation date. The instructor and student are jointly responsible for arranging the resources needed for the evaluation process.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

All University of Lethbridge students, faculty and staff must comply with Canadian law and institutional license agreements pertaining to copyright. At the same time, keeping abreast of our copyright obligations and options is a complex task as copyright matters locally and globally are in flux and are likely to remain so for at least the near future.

The University's Copyright website (www.uleth.ca/copyright) is a source of current copyright information that includes:

- answers to common copyright questions (see the [FAQs](#)),
- guidance on whether you need permission or a license to copy a particular work (see the [Copyright Permissions Flow Chart](#)),
- guidance on assessing whether fair dealing may apply to specific instances of copying you wish to undertake (see the [Guidelines for Copying under Fair Dealing](#)), and
- a [permissions look-up tool](#) to help you determine the kinds of copying and other uses permitted by the Library's license agreements covering specific online journals and other online resources.

You are encouraged to contact the University Copyright Advisor (copyright@uleth.ca) for assistance with any copyright questions or issues.

Class Schedule (Tentative)

Date	Topic	Readings (posted in Moodle), Activities/Guest Speaker
Class 1 Sept. 8	Introduction to the course Core competencies for public health	See Moodle: PHAC Core Competencies for Public Health
Class 2 Sept. 13	Evidence-informed or evidence-based public health? Are RCTs enough to develop policy?	Reading: Brownson et al (2014) Pollick et al (2011) p. 1-6 See Moodle: NCCMT Evidence-Informed PH
Class 3 Sept. 15	Using evidence synthesis Best practices and practice guidelines	Reading: Jetha et al (2008) See Moodle: Best Practices Portal (PHAC) Example: Black et al (2010) Food Subsidy Programs
Class 4 Sept. 20	What is critical appraisal? Using Critical appraisal tools	See Moodle See Moodle: O'Mathuna 2010 NCCMT Critical Appraisal Tools for PH Practice Leadership/Service Learning Plan Due
Class 5 Sept. 22	Evaluation as a participatory process	Reading: Lavinghouze & Snyder (2013) Identify Service learning activities
Class 6 Sept. 27	Evaluation and quality improvement	Reading: Spiegelman (2016) See Moodle NCCMT: Applicability & Transferability Tool
Class 7 Sept. 29	Program logic models and theories-in-use	See Moodle Reading: Yanicki & Phillips (2012) p 425-431 See: NCCMT Program Planning Toolkit Critical Appraisal Assignment: Due
Class 8 Oct. 4	What is Health Impact Assessment (HIA)? Guiding principles Four types of HIA used in Canada	Reading: Kemmer (2003) See: NCCCHPP What is HIA? See: IAIA (2006) HIA International Best Practice Principles
Class 9 Oct. 6	Health risk versus hazard Communicating with the public	Guest Speaker: Dr. Vivien Suttorp, MOH See Moodle
Class 10 Oct. 11	The HIA Process In-class Activity	Reading: WHO (1999)
Class 11 Oct. 13	Health risk assessment & the MOH role	Guest Speaker: Dr. Vivien Suttorp, MOH See Moodle: HC (2000) Decision-making Framework (see underlying principles)
Class 12 Oct. 18	Evaluating HIA –How effective is HIA in influencing decision-making?	Reading: Wismar et al (2007) Participation Peer Evaluations Due
Class 13 Oct. 20	Exploring public health roles Applying evaluation in practice	Guest Speaker – TBA Evaluation Assignment: Due & See Moodle
Class 14 Oct. 25	Citizen participation in HIA How does HIA differ from program evaluation?	Reading: Wright et al (2005) See Moodle: IAIA Public Participation: International Best Practice Principles

Date	Topic	Readings (posted in Moodle), Activities/Guest Speaker
Class 15 Oct. 27	Exploring Public Health Roles & Competencies	Guest Speakers: TBA
Class 16 Nov 1	What are the benefits and limitations of HIA? HIA – Group Time	Reading: Ahmad et al (2008) Optional: Krieger et al (2003)
Class 17 Nov 3	HIA & Policy Advocacy In-class activities	See Moodle Molnar et al (2016)
Nov. 8 & 10	Fall Reading Week	No Classes
Class 18 Nov 15	Policy advocacy – Why is this controversial? How do we influence Healthy Public Policy?	See Moodle: Case example Radon Kelsal (2015) Guest Speaker: TBA
Class 19 Nov 17	Knowledge Translation & Exchange (KT&E)	See Moodle NCCMT - Knowledge Translation Planning Primer from PHAC HIA Report: Due
Class 20 Nov 22	Health Literacy Adapting communications for health literacy	See Moodle
Class 21 Nov. 24	HIA Poster Presentations	HIA Poster Presentations: Due In Class – Open session
Class 22 Nov. 29	Climate Change & Public Health Mitigation and Adaptation	Reading: Krueger et al (2014) Optional: Cardwell & Elliott (2013) Hess et al (2014)
Class 23 Dec 1	Review for the final Debriefing on participation experiences.	See Moodle Participation Peer Evaluations & Leadership/Service Learning Report Due
Class 24 Dec. 6	In Class Final	Final Exam – In Class (75 min.)

Marking Guide – Critical Appraisal

Student ID # _____ Date _____

Systematic Review Selected for Appraisal (authors/year) _____

Synopsis of a Systematic Review from HealthEvidence.org (authors/year) _____

Critical Appraisal Tool Used: _____

Marks Available	Criteria	Marks Received
Content (50%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How comparable are <i>the systematic review article</i> selected for appraisal and the <i>synopsis of a systematic review</i> selected from HealthEvidence.org (e.g., the types of evidence reviewed, the scope of the databases searched, the quality ratings on evidence, and the interventions assessed on a public health issue)? • What are the strengths and limitations of your selected systematic review article (based on your critical appraisal)? Consider the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Are the results valid (what is the quality of the available evidence)? (b) What are the results (key point summary – 1-2 paragraphs)? (c) Can the results be applied locally (generalizability, similarities or differences from the local context and populations)? 	
Structure (20%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is a brief critical appraisal tool named in the summary? • Does the critical appraisal tool selected match the type of evidence/study design & methods of the article selected for appraisal? • Is the selected article critically appraised (e.g., the criteria from the critical appraisal tool are listed and used to critique the quality of evidence presented in your selected systematic review article)? 	
Expression of Ideas (20%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are key points presented and summarized clearly? • Does the writing reflect depth of thought and critical reflection? 	
Format, Grammar & Spelling (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assignment meets requirements for APA 6th edition format (e.g., title page, headings, citations) • Is the assignment free from spelling and editorial errors? • Is the assignment within the 2-3 pages (body of text) limit? • Are the references correctly listed in APA format? 	

Total: /100 (15% of final mark)

Marking Guide - Evaluation Assignment

Name of Individual _____ or Group Members: _____
 Topic: _____ Date _____

	Poor/Failing			Outstanding/Excellent
Review of Evidence & Best Practices /30%	<input type="checkbox"/> A public health program or intervention is named but strengths and weaknesses are not identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Minimal scholarly references (does not meet specified requirements). Evaluation reports or best practices are missing. <input type="checkbox"/> References for theories in use missing. <input type="checkbox"/> Program outcomes or measures are missing or unclear.	<input type="checkbox"/> A public health program or intervention is identified. Limited evidence of assessment of strengths and weaknesses. <input type="checkbox"/> Incorporates a limited range of scholarly references, evaluations or best practices. <input type="checkbox"/> Minimal identification of theory in use in the program or intervention <input type="checkbox"/> A few outcomes and measurements are named, but not clearly linked to the program goals.	<input type="checkbox"/> A public health program or intervention is identified and some strengths and limitations are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Incorporates an adequate range of scholarly references, evaluations or best practices. <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive evidence presented for theories in use in program/intervention. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and measurement are appropriately named. May at times not be clearly linked to program goals/ strategies/ interventions.	<input type="checkbox"/> A public health program or intervention is critically reviewed and strengths and limitations are summarized. <input type="checkbox"/> Incorporates a broad range of scholarly references, evaluations or best practices (exceeds requirements). <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive evidence integrated with original expression of ideas to describe theories in use. Theories are linked to program strategies or interventions <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and measurement are consistent with the program's goals/ strategies/interventions
Program Logic Model /30%	<input type="checkbox"/> Logical connections between public health issue and components of the program not evident, vague or unclear. <input type="checkbox"/> Logic model components are not clearly identified. <input type="checkbox"/> The schematic is missing or lacks clarity	<input type="checkbox"/> Logical connections between public health issue and components of the program often unclear. <input type="checkbox"/> Logic model components are described, but some elements are missing. <input type="checkbox"/> A schematic is presented by elements are missing or linkages are unclear at times.	<input type="checkbox"/> Logical connection between public health issue and components of the program sometimes unclear. <input type="checkbox"/> Logic model components are described by links to theory, strategies, interventions or outcomes are not always clear. <input type="checkbox"/> A schematic is presented and adequately represents linkages.	<input type="checkbox"/> Logical connections between public health issue and components of the program clearly identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Logic model components are clearly identified linking theory to strategies, interventions, indicators and outcome measures. <input type="checkbox"/> A schematic is presented which improves clarity of the linkages.
Recommendations /20%	<input type="checkbox"/> Summary of the literature predominates and outcome measures may be missing or vague. <input type="checkbox"/> A short summary of the scholarly evidence and/or best practices is missing or unclear.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes of interest are identified but measures may lack clarity <input type="checkbox"/> Explanation of key points and conclusions occasionally lacking. <input type="checkbox"/> A short summary of recommendations based on scholarly evidence or best practices is present, but may be unclear at times.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes of interest and measured are appropriately identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate explanation of key points and conclusions <input type="checkbox"/> A short summary of recommendations based on scholarly evidence and/or best practices is appropriately described.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes of interest and measures are identified from multiple perspectives. <input type="checkbox"/> Elaboration of key points, arguments, and conclusions. <input type="checkbox"/> A short summary of recommendations based on scholarly evidence and/or best practices is insightfully described.
Expression of Ideas /15%	<input type="checkbox"/> Expression of ideas frequently unclear and confusing.	<input type="checkbox"/> Inconsistent clarity, wordiness or duplication. Flow of logic is unclear at times.	<input type="checkbox"/> Generally clear, succinct and logical expression of ideas.	<input type="checkbox"/> Logical, succinct development of ideas.
Format, Grammar & Spelling 5%	<input type="checkbox"/> Grammatical and spelling errors interfere with expression of ideas. <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple and repeated errors in APA format.	<input type="checkbox"/> Significant grammatical errors including incomplete sentence structure, poor usage of terms, colloquial expressions and spelling errors. <input type="checkbox"/> Significant APA format errors.	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor grammatical errors, colloquial expressions and occasional spelling errors. <input type="checkbox"/> Minor APA format errors.	<input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical or spelling errors. <input type="checkbox"/> No APA format errors.

COMMENTS

Total /100 (Group mark) Individual marks include peer evaluations of each person's contributions to the assignment. This assignment = 20% of the final mark.

Marking Guide - Health Impact Assessment Report

Project Title _____ Group Members _____

	Criteria	Description
Health Impact Assessment Report	<i>Chosen policy, program or project</i> /15%	Does the report present a logical relationship between the policy/program/project and the potential health impacts? Does the issue involve multiple sectors (e.g., health, environment, human services, government, and the private sector)?
	<i>Content</i> /40%	Does the content presented in the report meet the criteria for a Health Impact Assessment? Does the report present an overview of the rationale for a policy, program or project? Is the WHO HIA framework applied (e.g., screening, scoping, appraisal, reporting, and monitoring)? Is the plan for this review feasible? Is the report appropriately targeted to impact change? Does the report address both the positive and negative potential health impacts of the chosen policy, program or project? Is the content of the report compelling?
	<i>Support</i> /15%	Is a sufficient body of evidence (e.g. academic literature, government reports) reviewed to identify the relationships among policy, program or project and health impacts?
	<i>Style</i> /10%	Words are chosen for their precise meaning and used with an appropriate level of specificity. Sentence style fits paper's audience and purpose. Sentences are varied, yet clearly structured and carefully focused. Is the report presented systematically?
	<i>Mechanics</i> /5%	Spelling, punctuation, APA 6 th edition format use of headings and subheadings, grammar.
	<i>Creativity</i> /15%	Does the report make creative linkages between the chosen policy, program or project and the potential health impacts? Is the chosen policy, program or project novel in its relationship to health?

Total: /100 (15% of the final mark, Group Mark, Individual mark based on peer evaluation and contribution to the assignment)

Health Impact Assessment – Poster Presentation Marking Guide

Project Title _____ Group Members _____

Health Impact Assessment Presentation	<i>Clarity</i> /20marks	Does the presentation clearly identify the focus of assessment and the context surrounding this assessment? Are the elements of the WHO procedure for HIA used as headings and clearly described?
	<i>Organization</i> /20marks	Is the logic and procedure of the assessment evident in headers and the organization of the poster? Does the presentation respect the allotted time (8 min. for presenting information to community members)?
	<i>Content</i> /40 marks	Does the audience gain insights into the process of the HIA and the implications for health? Is an environmental public health issue critically reviewed? Are stakeholders identified and involved in the process of the HIA? Is a rationale described for the decision-makers identified for this public health issue and HIA? Are the recommendations presented consistent with the evidence presented? Is a one-page summary developed?
	<i>Creativity</i> /20 marks	Is the presentation intriguing and thoughtful? Is the layout of the poster, graphics and font size appropriate (e.g., readability, clarity of message, and a pleasing format)? Does the group employ a number of strategies to communicate with the audience during the poster presentation?

Total: /100 (Group Mark) Individual marks will include peer evaluation and contributions to the assignment
This assignment = 15% of the final mark

Marking Criteria for Peer Evaluation - Participation

This is your opportunity to evaluate the contributions of your teammates. Please rate your team members (all but yourself) using the following five team performance characteristics (with a score from 1 to 10) to reflect how you really feel about the extent to which the other members of your team contributed to your team's learning and performance. This is your main opportunity to reward the members of your team who worked hard and helped make your team a positive and productive one. ***Please note that if you give everyone pretty much the same score/rating, you may be penalizing those who worked the hardest, and rewarding those who did not work as hard.***

Preparation – P (Had they prepared & done readings prior to class?)

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
 Completely inadequate preparation Just adequate preparation Extremely well prepared

Contribution – C (Did they contribute productively to group discussion and work?)

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
 Little or no contributions Contributes, but just enough to get by Exceptional contributions

Respect – R (Did they show respect for other people, and encourage others' ideas?)

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
 Little or no respect Generally respectful of others Extremely respectful

Flexibility – F (Were they flexible and open-minded during disagreements?)

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
 Little or no flexibility Sufficiently flexible Exceedingly flexible and open

Dedication – D (Punctuality, class attendance, communication with group during absences?)

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
 Little or no dedication to team Acceptable dedication to team Excellent dedication to team

Peer Evaluation Form

Your Student ID #: _____ **Date:** _____

Provide a copy of this peer evaluation form for each assignment (Check one):

- Mid-term – Base-Group/In-Class Discussions
- Evaluation Assignment HIA Paper HIA Poster
- Final – Base-Group/In-Class Discussions

Group members _____

Group member ratings:

- 1) Team Member's Name: _____ total score _____ (/50)
 - a) Preparation: _____ (/10)
 - b) Contribution: _____ (/10)
 - c) Respect: _____ (/10)
 - d) Flexibility: _____ (/10)
 - e) Dedication: _____ (/10)

- 2) Team Member's Name: _____ total score _____ (/50)
 - a) Preparation: _____ (/10)
 - b) Contribution: _____ (/10)
 - c) Respect: _____ (/10)
 - d) Flexibility: _____ (/10)
 - e) Dedication: _____ (/10)

- 3) Team Member's Name: _____ total score _____ (/50)
 - a) Preparation: _____ (/10)
 - b) Contribution: _____ (/10)
 - c) Respect: _____ (/10)
 - d) Flexibility: _____ (/10)
 - e) Dedication: _____ (/10)

- 4) Team Member's Name: _____ total score _____ (/50)
 - a) Preparation: _____ (/10)
 - b) Contribution: _____ (/10)
 - c) Respect: _____ (/10)
 - d) Flexibility: _____ (/10)
 - e) Dedication: _____ (/10)

- 5) Team Member's Name: _____ total score _____ (/50)
 - a) Preparation: _____ (/10)
 - b) Contribution: _____ (/10)
 - c) Respect: _____ (/10)
 - d) Flexibility: _____ (/10)
 - e) Dedication: _____ (/10)

Describe your contributions to a group assignment:

For Base-Group Participation, each individual group member will receive a percentage of the participation mark based on their participation rating score at mid-term and final ratings (e.g., a participation rating score of 50/50 at mid-term and at final evaluation = 5/5 + 5/5 = 10/10)

For the **Group Assignment** each individual group member will receive a percentage of the group mark based on their participation rating score (e.g., a participation rating score of 50/50 = 100% of the group mark, and a score of 25/50 = 50% of the group mark).