

## GOOD PRACTICE ASSESSMENT FORM

for health promotion and prevention

<sup>1</sup> (release 2010)

### Prerequisite:

This form was designed to evaluate completed *projects* with the following requisites:

- they are correctly inserted in Pro.Sa Database
- they present a documentation as complete as possible (minimum standard: document plan and final report)
- the type of intervention is not only informative

### Form structure and score:

The assessment form is composed of **18 sets of questions** for a total amount of **69 questions**

For each set of questions is provided:

- a “core” question (ie, a fundamental, central question) highlighted in gray,
- a space for **notes/comments** where the reader can spell out any "doubts" about the assessment.

For each question is provided the following score:

- **1 (YES)**
- **0 (NO)**

The “core” question’s score is multiplied by a factor equal to **3**

$$\text{Total Score (T)} = \frac{\text{Core questions score} + \text{non core questions score}}{\text{Highest possible score}}$$

\* Value given by the sum of the highest score of the core questions (18x3 = 54) and non-core questions (51)

The result will be  $\leq 1$  where **1 is the highest possible score**

Sulla base del punteggio totale ottenuto un **progetto** è considerato:

- **Good practice** if score range from **0,8 to 1**
- **Discreet practice** if score range from **0,6 to 0,79**
- **Sufficient practice** if score range from **0,4 to 0,59**
- **Insufficient practice** if score is **< 0,4**

<sup>1</sup> Editorial staff: M.E. Coffano, L. Dettoni, M. Di Pilato, S. Lingua, R. Longo, P. Ragazzoni, S. Scarponi, A. Suglia, C. Tortone – DoRS Regione Piemonte ASL TO3

Group of readers and peer reviewers: M. Brusa – ASL AL; M.G. Tomaciello – ASL CN1; E. Gelormino – Servizio di Epidemiologia ASL TO3; L. Charrier, A. Coppo, F. Di Stefano, C. Piccinelli - Centro Prevenzione Oncologica (CPO) Piemonte; T. Begotti, M. Bina, G. Borca, E. Calandri, F. Graziano - Dipartimento di Psicologia dello Sviluppo Università degli Studi di Torino; A. Zambon - Dipartimento di Sanità Pubblica Università degli Studi di Torino; A. Donna, P. Arata – M.I.U.R. Ufficio Scolastico Regionale per il Piemonte; G. Corni, Ufficio Scolastico Provinciale di Torino; P. Brigoni, P. Capra - DoRS Regione Piemonte ASL TO.

National good practice group: coordinatore Paola Ragazzoni – Dors; P. Beltrami – Regione Emilia Romagna; Chiara Cattaneo – ISS; Ilaria Giovannelli – ISS; Nadia Olimpì – Regione Toscana; Rita Longo- Dors; Valentina Possenti – ISS; Caterina Silvestri – Regione Toscana

**Project Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Project coordinator** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reader:** \_\_\_\_\_

### 1. Working group

	SI	NO
1. The working group is <b>multidisciplinary</b> (different professions/disciplines or different departments of the same organization)	1	0
2. The working group is <b>multi-sectoral</b> (health, school, social, ....)	1	0
3. The working group includes representatives of <b>target groups</b>	3	0
4. The working group is <b>formally recognized</b> with a document that identifies the group participants	1	0
TOTAL SCORE		0
Notes and comments:		

### 2. Equity in health

	SI	NO
1. The project explicit aim is to <b>reduce inequalities</b> for one or more target groups	3	0
2. The project uses <b>strategies and tools</b> in order to reduce inequalities	1	0
TOTAL SCORE		0
Notes and comments:		

### 3. Empowerment

	SI	NO
1. The project aims to increase the responsibility of <b>intermediate target</b> towards his/other people health as well as towards healthy living conditions	1	0
2. The project aims to increase the responsibility of <b>the final target</b> towards his/other people health as well as towards healthy living conditions	1	0
3. The project creates <b>opportunities for intermediate/final target</b> (individuals and groups) to <b>increase their skills/abilities</b> in improving healthy choices	3	0
TOTAL SCORE		0
Notes and comments:		

#### 4. Involvement

	SI	NO
1. The intermediate/final target is involved <sup>2</sup> in the <b>project development phase</b>	1	0
2. The intermediate/final target is involved in the <b>context analysis</b> and the identification of determinants	1	0
3. The intermediate/final target is involved in the <b>implementation of the intervention</b>	1	0
4. The intermediate/final target is involved in the <b>assessment of the project results</b>	1	0
5. It is described how the <b>intermediate/final target is involved in the different project phases</b> and the choice of the procedures is motivated.	3	0
TOTAL SCORE		0
Notes and comments:		

#### 5. Setting

	SI	NO
1. The <b>choice of the setting</b> in which you should take action was motivated	1	0
2. A motivation was given for having choose some of the five levels of intervention (individual, group, organization, community action and political / social)	1	0
3. The project includes <b>activities/interventions</b> , mutually consistent, on several levels	3	0
TOTAL SCORE		0
Notes and comments:		

---

<sup>2</sup> It means an active and practical involvement (discussion, collaboration), not a simple target group information

## 6. Theoretical models and theories of design and behavior change

	SI	NO
1. The <b>project theoretical models</b> were explicit <sup>3</sup>	1	0
2. The formulation of the objectives and of the overall activities/interventions is consistent with the <b>project theoretical models</b>	1	0
3. In the description of the intervention <b>the theoretical models of behavior change</b> used (individual, organizational, community) were explicit	1	0
4. The formulation of the objectives and the overall activities/interventions is consistent with the choice of <b>the theoretical models of behavior change</b> (individual, organizational, community)	3	0
5. The theoretical models are presented in a detailed <b>bibliography</b> that allows you to retrieve the sources previously cited	1	0
TOTAL SCORE		0
Notes and comments:		

## 7. Evidence of effectiveness and good practice examples

	SI	NO
1. The <b>evidence of effectiveness</b> presented in the literature on the subject are outlined, or (if evidence of effectiveness is not found) the <b>strategies used for the literature search</b> are described	1	0
2. The examples of good practice that have inspired the work are described	1	0
3. The applicability to the context of the evidence of efficacy and/or good practice examples chosen on the basis of the project's objectives is described	3	0
4. The evidence of efficacy and/or good practice examples can be found in a <b>detailed bibliography</b> that allows you to retrieve the sources previously cited	1	0
TOTAL SCORE		0
Notes and comments:		

<sup>3</sup> It may be that it is not clearly explained the design model chosen (eg Green) but that the formulation of objectives and the set of activities is consistent with a recognizable pattern. In the latter 'case in point 6.1 must be given a score of 0 (no) while in 6.2 you can give score 1 (yes)

## 8. Context analysis

	SI	NO
1. The project is articulated and described in relation to the <b>context characteristics</b> (socio-demographic, economic, social, environmental and behavioral)	3	0
2. <b>Resources and/or limits</b> <sup>4</sup> of the context are described	1	0
3. <b>Tools and methods</b> used for context analysis are described	1	0
TOTAL SCORE		0
Notes and comments:		

## 9. Determinants analysis

	si	no
1. The individual, environmental, social determinants of health problem/need (eg: Predisposing, Enabling, Reinforcing factors) have been identified	3	0
2. The process by which determinants were identified is argued	1	0
3. The <b>tools</b> used to analyze health determinants are described	1	0
4. The <b>priorities</b> are identified and argued	1	0
TOTAL SCORE		0
Notes and comments:		

## 10. Resources, times and limits

	si	no
1. The resources (professional, instrumental, economic) needed for the different projects phases (planning, implementation and evaluation) are described	3	0
2. The <b>resources available within</b> the community (resource mobilization) are identified and used	1	0
3. <b>The temporary span</b> of the project activity and of the total amount of time spent implementing the project is described	1	0
4. The <b>difficulties</b> encountered (limits, constraints, barriers) and the solutions adopted to address them are clearly described	1	0
TOTAL SCORE		0
Notes and comments:		

<sup>4</sup> Resources and constraints of the environment can be described also in the process, without a particular and specific emphasis on the context. Analysis. Give score 1 (yes) if described

### 11. Partnerships and alliances

	SI	NO
1. Partnerships and alliances have been set up between <b>multiple services</b> of the same organization/institution	1	0
2. Partnerships and alliances have been set up with <b>institutions/organizations in the community</b>	3	0
3. The creation and maintenance of partnerships and alliances have been identified as one of the project <b>objectives</b>	1	0
4. The <b>economic needs and resources</b> necessary to allow partnerships and alliances to work well are identified	1	0
TOTAL SCORE		0
Notes and comments:		

### 12. Objectives<sup>5</sup>

	SI	NO
1. The change is described in the form of <b>clear and specific</b> objectives	1	0
2. The change is described in the form of <b>measurable</b> objectives	1	0
3. The change is described in the form of objectives <b>consistent with the selected health determinants</b>	3	0
4. The change is described in the form of <b>realistic</b> objectives	1	0
5. The change is described in the form of <b>timed</b> objectives	1	0
TOTAL SCORE		0
Notes and comments:		

### 13. Process evaluation

	SI	NO
1. <b>Process evaluation</b> is planned and <b>tools and methods</b> are described	1	0
2. <b>Actions</b> and their sequence are clearly described (who, what, how, where and for how long)	1	0
3. <b>Critical aspects and opportunities</b> emerged during the process evaluation are outlined	3	0
TOTAL SCORE		0

<sup>5</sup> In order to give score 1 (yes) to each definition, all the goals have to be met. For example to give the score 1 to the definition, all the project goals must be clear and specific.

Notes and comments:

#### 14. Interventions/activities description

	SI	NO
1. The activities/interventions realized with the target(intermediate/final) are described	1	0
2. Tools, work kit and methods used are described	3	0
TOTAL SCORE		0
Notes and comments:		

#### 15. Output and outcome evaluation

	SI	NO
1. The choice of the indicators is consistent with the objectives and follows recognized standards. Where there are no standards, indicators have been agreed by the project team	1	0
2. For each stated objective the achievement degree has been shown and argued t	1	0
3. Expected results were achieved and described	3	0
4. Unexpected results are described and analyzed	1	0
5. Mechanisms that enabled or hindered the objectives achievement are described	1	0
6. Suggestions for transferability, redesign and additional theoretical contributions were derived from	1	0
TOTAL SCORE		0
Notes and comments:		

#### 16. Sustainability

	SI	NO
1. The project is part of a widest plan/program/strategy, or there is a reason why it is not	1	0
2. The project is explicitly included in the strategy of the organization implementing it, in the community history and it enhances the community skills	1	0
3. The possibilities to continue/full implement/extend the project are discussed, taking into account the limits given from stakeholders fundings, skills, infrastructure and participation.	3	0
TOTAL SCORE		
Notes and comments:		

## 17. Communication

	SI	NO
1. The project was promoted <sup>6</sup> by the community and the stakeholders	1	0
2. Project results were presented <sup>7</sup> and discussed with the community and the stakeholders	1	0
3. The choice of communication channels used for results promotion and presentation is described and justified	3	0
TOTAL SCORE		0
Notes and comments:		

## 18. Documentation

	SI	NO
1. The documents (draft and final report) are clear and complete and allow you to rebuild what has been done	3	0
2. Institutional documents <sup>8</sup> attesting alliances and collaborations and/or group project formalization are available	1	0
3. The tools used for context analysis and/or health determinants are available	1	0
4. Operational tools used in the activities/interventions are described and made available (eg teaching kit)	1	0
5. The tools used for the assessment phase (process and impact) are available	1	0
6. The tools used for communication are available	1	0
TOTAL SCORE		0
Notes and comments:		

---

<sup>6</sup> Through local mass media, web, corporate newsletters, meeting, ...

<sup>7</sup> See note 8

<sup>8</sup> Resolutions, determinations, contracts, protocols

Scores summary	Tot.
1. Working group	
2. Equity in health	
3. Empowerment	
4. Involvement	
5. Setting	
6. Theoretical models and theories of design and behavior change	
7. Evidence of effectiveness and good practice examples	
8. Context analysis	
9. Determinants analysis	
10. Resources, times and limits	
11. Partnerships and alliances	
12. Objectives	
13. Process evaluation	
14. Interventions/activities description	
15. Output and outcome evaluation	
16. Sustainability	
17. Communication	
18. Documentation	
<b>score</b>	<b>/105</b>

**Total score:** Score/Highest possible score (105)

\_\_\_\_\_ /105= \_\_\_\_\_

The result will be a number between 0 and 1

---

**HIGHEST POSSIBLE SCORE = 1**

---

**0,8-1 = Good practice**

**0,6-0,79 = Discreet practice**

**0,4-0,59 = Sufficient practice**

**<0,39 = Insufficient practice**

---