**Community Health Improvement Planning (CHIP) Part I Poster Assignment**

The next step in the Community Health Improvement Planning (CHIP) project is Part I of your community health improvement poster.

In this portion of the CHIP assignment, you will develop a community nursing diagnosis using the population assessment data you gathered for the first part and information you gathered from interacting with your population. You will use this community diagnosis to develop your CHIP program idea *and* to guide you in the policy change you would like to see to impact this diagnosis in your Leadership and Management class, which is a separate but linked assignment.

The poster should be submitted **by one group member** to the Community Health Improvement Poster Part I assignment.

Your group's Part I CHIP poster should include the following content:

1. Students' names
2. Focus population/community
3. A summary of the **pertinent** community assessment data (from assessment findings, community member interviews, and local, state, and federal database research). Please summarize the data you found **that supports your program need.** Do not include *all* your data, just the data that supports the need you assessed. Be sure that your assessment data includes input from members of the population.
4. A brief summary of your population's strengths, challenges, health risks, and needs.
5. The organization you partnered with (or would ideally partner with if you have not been able to connect with an organization yet)
6. Community health diagnosis
7. Three ideas for policies that could impact this diagnosis.
8. Appropriate APA formatted references (based on the 7th Edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association)

You will formulate a community health diagnosis based on your population's identified strengths, challenges, risk factors, and health needs (identified in the population assessment and data collection assignment), and input from members of the population (key informants) and/or a community leader/collaborator from a community organization who services this population. The community health diagnosis you create will be the basis for the program you will develop and present in part II of this assignment at the end of April. If you weren't assigned a specific population-serving organization as a partner, identify and organization that would be ideal for your project and community. The CHIP project (Parts I and II) and your L&M policy change assignments should be focused on addressing this same problem. **Follow the rubric carefully. This is a clinical assignment, and you need to earn at least 75%.**

Save this file as **GroupName\_CHIPPoster.CourseNumber.ClinicalSection.Year**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **CHIP Part 1 Poster Rubric** | | | |  |
| **Criteria** | **Ratings** | | | | **Pts** |
| Population name and assessment data summary | **25 to >18.0 pts Excellent**  Thorough, descriptive summary of pertinent assessment data collected. Includes community member interviews, input from a population-serving organization, and research of local, state, and federal databases, and data gathered during windshield survey.  Population name and names of students are included. | **18 to >12.0 pts Good**  Adequate summary of pertinent community assessment data. Missing one or more of community member interviews, input from an organization, research of local, state, and federal databases, or data gathered during windshield survey. Population name or student names missing. | **12 to >6.0 pts Fair**  Summary of pertinent community assessment data is missing many elements; or community member interviews, organization input, or research of local, state, and federal databases or data gathered during windshield survey are inadequate or gaps in assessment data are evident; or population/student names is not included. | **6 to >0 pts Needs Improvement**  Summary of pertinent community assessment data is poorly described and compiled; or major gaps in data from community member interviews, organization input or research of local, state, and federal databases or data gathered during windshield survey; or population and student names not included | 25 pts |
| Community Health Diagnosis | **25 to >18.0 pts Excellent**  Community Health Diagnosis identified & accurate based on assessment findings and clear supporting evidence. Diagnosis includes problem/risk or strengths and weaknesses of the community that influence the problem or risk (the "related to" statement). The ideal state, or the gap between what was assessed and the goal, is identified. | **18 to >12.0 pts Good**  Community Health Diagnosis identified & accurate but supporting evidence unclear.  Diagnosis is missing problem/risk or strengths and weaknesses of the population that influence the problem or risk. The gap between what is ideal and what was assessed is unclear or not well described.  Ideas for two policies that could impact the diagnosis are given. | **12 to >6.0 pts  Fair**  Diagnosis identified but not accurate or not based on supporting evidence. Diagnosis missing risk, population at risk, or strengths and weaknesses of the population. The gap between what is ideal and what was assessed was not addressed fully. Idea for one policy that could impact the diagnosis is given. | **6 to >0 pts Needs Improvement**  Diagnosis not identified, not accurate, or not based on supporting evidence.  Diagnosis missing more than one of: risk, population at risk, or strengths and weaknesses of community. No gap analysis. No ideas for policies that could impact the diagnosis are given. | 25 pts |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Ratings** | | | | **Pts** |
| Poster Appearance/ Clarity/ Presentation | **25 to >19.0 pts Excellent**  Visually appealing, strongly effective poster presentation. Easy to read, with creative use of fonts, headings, colors, & white space. All names and school affiliations present. No grammar or spelling errors.  Evidence of team practice and all members are involved in poster development.  Resources/references identified with 1 or fewer errors in APA 7th edition. | **19 to >12.0 pts Good**  Poster is adequate. Student names and affiliations are present. Lacks some creativity in use of fonts, headings, colors, etc. Poster is "busy" or lacking some creative interest. All members not participating in poster development. More than 1 grammar/spelling error.  Resources/references identified with 2 errors in APA. | **12 to >7.0 pts Fair**  Poster acceptable but needs work to improve visual appeal. Poor use of colors, fonts, space, and headers. Student names are present but missing affiliation. All members are not involved in poster development. More than 2 grammar/spelling errors.  Resources/references identified with 3 errors in APA. | **7 to >0 pts**  **Needs Improvement**  Not visually effective. Poster lacking visual appeal. Student names and affiliations missing. Poster demonstrates lack of understanding of the data analysis and implementation plan is demonstrated. All members are not involved in development. More than 3 grammar/spelling errors.  Resources/references not identified and 4+ errors in APA. | 25 pts |
| Policy Connection | **25 to >19.0 pts Excellent**  Ideas for at least three realistic policies that could impact the diagnosis are given. | **19 to >12.0 pts Good**  Ideas for at least two realistic policies that could impact the diagnosis are given. | **12 to >7.0 pts  Fair**  Ideas for at least one realistic policy that could impact the diagnosis is given. | **7 to >0 pts Needs Improvement**  No realistic ideas for policies that could impact the diagnosis are given. | 25 pts |
| Total Points: 100 | | | | | |