

Proposed Policy Statement Evaluation Criteria

Science Board and JPC Review

- I. **Format:** Is the proposal in the correct format, as outlined in the format guidelines? Are all the required sections included and labeled?
- II. **Title:** Does the title accurately reflect the problem statement, recommendations and/or action steps?
- III. **Relationship to existing APHA policy statements:**
 - a. Is there an existing APHA policy statement that covers this issue and if so is the relationship adequately described?
 - b. Does the proposal update the science of an older policy statement?
- IV. **Rationale for consideration:**
 - a. Does the author adequately describes the relevance and necessity of the proposed policy statement
 - b. Does the proposed policy statement address a policy statement gap or requested update?
 - c. If the proposed policy statement updates an existing statement, is the rationale for the update well supported?
- V. **Problem Statement:**
 - a. Does the problem statement adequately describe the extent of the problem?
 - b. Does description of problem include the best available scientific evidence?
 - c. Are there important facts missing?
 - d. Does the proposed problem statement describe any disproportionate impact on underserved populations?
 - e. Does the proposed problem statement describe any relevant ethical, equitable, economic and political issues?
- VI. **Evidence-based Strategies:**
 - a. Does the proposal describe what interventions and strategies are being proposed to address the public health problem?
 - b. Are the proposed strategies evidence-based?
 - c. Does the proposal provide reference(s) or scientific evidence regarding the effectiveness and likely impact of each listed strategy?
 - d. Are the proposed strategies ethical, equitable and reasonable?
 - e. What other strategies should be considered?
- VII. **Opposing Arguments/Evidence:**
 - a. Does the proposal include opposing and/or alternative points of view to the main arguments of the proposal?

- b. Does the proposal adequately refute the opposing view(s)?
- c. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence presented? Is there important evidence missing or opposing viewpoints missing (i.e., Is this the best available literature and references)?

VIII. Alternative Strategies (if included):

Does the proposed policy statement:

- a. Document evidence on what alternative strategies have been tried or proposed to address the public health problem?
- b. Explain who carries out the strategies and what do they do?
- c. Justify the interventions/strategies proposed above in Evidence Based Strategies to Address the Problem in relation to these alternative strategies (e.g. more cost effective, greater reach, better equipped to address inequity, etc.)
- d. Indicate if there are no counter points to the author's knowledge?

IX. Action Steps:

Are the action steps:

- a. Externally-directed (i.e. directs an external entity, NOT APHA, to promote or implement a specific strategy)?
- b. Focused on policy/principle and not on specific legislation/regulation?
- c. Supported by the best available evidence or rationale documented in the proposal?
- d. Evidence-based, feasible, ethical and equitable, and directly tied to the evidence-based strategies listed earlier in the policy?
- e. Culturally responsive to the under-represented and underserved populations being addressed (if appropriate)?

X. References:

Does the proposal:

- a. Include references that are connected to the text?
- b. Include references from peer-reviewed, up-to-date and best available primary sources?
- c. Provide the full citation for each numbered reference cited in proposal and follow the recommended AMA format?