

Proposed Policy Brief Assessment #2 Rubric: Revision and Response Comments in Rubric #1

*To be online form.

Policy Brief Title:

Policy Brief Number:

Reviewer's Name:

Date:

Reviewer Disclosure Statement

The reviewer should disclose any relationship of a financial, professional, or personal nature that may have an impact on his/her ability to objectively review the proposed policy brief or that may be perceived as a conflict of interest.

Conflicts of interest (competing interests) include facts known to a participant in the policy brief development process that, if revealed later, would make a reasonable reader feel misled or deceived (or an author or reviewer feel defensive). Conflicts of interest may influence the judgment of authors and reviewers; these conflicts often are not immediately apparent to others or to the reviewer. They may be personal, commercial, political, academic, or financial.

Financial interests may include employment, research funding (received or pending), stock or share ownership, patents, payment for lectures or travel, consultancies, nonfinancial support, or any fiduciary interest in the company. The perception or appearance of a conflict of interest, without regard to substance, alone creates conflict, because trust is eroded among all participants.

All such interests (or their absence) must be declared in writing by authors upon submission of the proposed policy brief. If any are declared, they will be included with the policy brief proposal during the review process. If there is doubt about whether a circumstance represents a conflict, it should be disclosed.

Instruction

The Proposed Policy Brief Assessment 2 Rubric is to be completed by a member of the Evidentiary Review Committee. The purpose of this assessment, as part of the second evaluation, is to address the recommended revisions to the proposed policy brief identified in the Proposed Policy Brief Assessment #1. As such, the evaluation focuses on the response to those items. It is critical to note that Member Units are not expected to address every comment with changes but should provide justification for not doing so. The Evidentiary Review Committee reviewer should assess based on the following categories:

- **N/A:** There were no comments provided on this section.
- **Fully:** The Member Unit has addressed all comments in this section.
- **Partially:** The Member Unit has addressed most, but not all, of the comments in this section. Those requiring additional consideration should be identified.
- **Not:** The Member Unit has not addressed the comments in this section or has not provided justification for not doing so. Required and recommended revisions should be provided.

Section	Subcategory	Are Initial Reviewer Comments Adequately Addressed?	Questions Remaining from Reviewer	Required Revisions	Optional Revisions
Problem Statement	Evidence of the Problem and Gaps	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not		Revisions necessary to move the policy brief forward, to bring it into alignment with Policy Brief Guidelines and Evidentiary Review Committee expectations. These are decision-driving.	Revisions that are recommended to improve the overall strength of the policy brief but are not review-driving. These are provided for the Member Unit's consideration.
	Target Population	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not			

	Alternative explanations or opposing arguments	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not			
	Overall Context	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not			
Contextual Considerations for Problem and Justification for Action	Historical or Cultural Elements †	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not			
	Ethical Elements †	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not			
	Economic or Resource Elements †	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not			
	Social considerations †	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not			
	Political considerations †	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully			

		<input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not			
Strategies and Action Steps	Evidence Supporting Strategies to Address Problem	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not			
	Justification for Choosing Strategies	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not			
	Link Between Action Steps and Strategies	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not			
	SMART(Specific, Measurable, Reasonable, and Timely/Relevant) Action Steps	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not			
	Strategies and Action Steps Feasible and appropriate in context.	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not			
Contextual Considerations for Strategies	Political Salability †	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not			

and Action Steps					
	Ethical considerations †	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not			
	Economic Feasibility/ Capacity constraints/ and Cost of Implementation †	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not			
	Level of trust/Degree of Support †	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not			
Required Strategy Elements	Public Education Step	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not			
	State/Local Implementation Step	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not			

Overall Reviewer Comments:

Overall Reviewer Assessment:

- Unqualified approval**- All necessary revisions and comments were appropriately addressed. The Evidentiary Review Committee recommends that the proposed policy statement be forwarded to the Governing Council without required revisions.
- Conditional approval**- The Evidentiary Review Committee recommends that the proposed policy statement be forwarded to the Governing Council, pending required additional minor revisions*. If minor revisions are not completed, the proposed Policy Brief will be recommended for rejection.
- Rejection**- The proposed policy was not adequately revised and does not meet the policy brief review criteria described in the author's guidelines. A rejection assessment at this stage automatically removes the proposed policy brief from consideration in the current cycle. Still, it may be re-submitted during the next annual proposed policy brief submission process

**Minor revisions refer to small, straightforward changes or corrections. These changes do not require substantial reworking of the content and may include adjustments such as:*

- *Correcting typographical errors or grammatical mistakes.*
- *Clarifying specific points or language.*
- *Adding or modifying a small amount of information for clarity or completeness.*
- *Providing additional supporting evidence.*
- *Updating references or formatting to meet guidelines.*

Minor revisions can be made without altering the document's structure or key arguments. Examples of revisions at this stage that are inappropriate include:

- *Drastically altering the evidence-informed strategy or action steps.*
- *Introducing new topics, policies, populations, or contexts that change the purpose of the proposed policy brief.*
- *Addressing multiple comments from the initial review that were not adequately addressed.*

† Definitions:

Historical considerations: How have past events and societal changes, including wars, economic shifts, or mass migrations, for example, impacted the problem? How have scientific knowledge and public values shaped the problem's perception and management over time? Also, explore past mistakes and successes in addressing the problem.

Cultural considerations: What are the shared values, beliefs, and practices that influence the population's understanding of problems, desired solutions, and the acceptability of policies?

Ethical considerations: What are the ethical dimensions to the problem and its potential impact on stakeholders' rights, values, and well-being?

Health systems considerations: What institutions and organizations are present to promote, sustain, or restore health? How do these systems function, and are they accessible?

Economic and resource considerations: How is the problem impacted by resource allocation, income distribution, employment, and overall economic well-being?

Social considerations: How do factors like social support and inclusion, discrimination, and violence influence populations' experience with the problem and the desire for a solution?

Political considerations: How do political ideologies, funding structures, power dynamics, interest groups, and government structures influence the problem's definition and the potential for solutions?

Political salability- Is there political will/commitment obtained through public opinion and pressure from interest groups, lobbying, and advocacy? What is the decision-making process, the political agenda, and the means of knowledge sharing? Political salability is based on the idea that decision makers are not receptive to research unless it serves political gain (predetermined decision/evidence sought to justify the problem).

Ethical considerations- To include autonomy, nonmaleficence (not causing more harm), beneficence, justice, service to society and accountability to those served.

Capacity constraints- Knowledge and skills of individuals and organizations, partnerships, networking, structure (organizational composition), funding, training, will, interest, advocacy, process, leadership, communities of learning (knowledge sharing), support for innovation, and value. What needs to be present in the setting to support evidence uptake/ability to carry out the objectives?

Economic feasibility- Examine a project's costs and financial benefits; an appropriate comparison of benefits and costs associated with the project (money and resources available for implementation, cost effectiveness, and opportunity cost).

Level of trust- Are actors or policymakers trusted enough to influence the proposed actions? Is there trust in the action and strategies themselves from actors, policy makers and the target population? Are the action steps easily understood and is there advantage over alternative action well demonstrated? Are the examples of use with success or promotion by those with similar "values" or "culture"

Degree of support- The value is associated with the proposed actions and those who developed and/or are implementing the knowledge base.

Cost of implementation- Who bears the costs? How costly is it to take this action? What is the opportunity cost. What would be needed in terms of time, training, and research and development, and what effects would the action steps have on productivity?

