**Community Health Improvement Program (CHIP) Poster Part II & Presentation**

Part II of your community health improvement poster and the presentation of your project is the next step in the community Heath Improvement Planning (CHIP) project assignment.

In this final portion of the assignment, you will take the community nursing diagnosis you already developed in the CHIP Part I assignment and formulate the planning portion of the community nursing process, developing a program goal with at least 3 objectives to support it and recommending interventions and outcome and evaluation measures. You will describe all the elements of the CHIP, combining your new program planning work with the previous parts of the assignment on a final poster. You will display your posters in the SON lobby during the celebration of Nurses Day on ***insert date***. The dress is business casual. Awards will be presented to the group with the best CHIP.

You will also create an accompanying presentation using slides or by creating a video that you will present in class on ***insert date***. The dress for presentations will also be business casual. Your group will be assigned a specific time to present. Presentations should be 20 minutes, plus 5 minutes for questions. Your CHIP presentation will finish with your associated policy pitch assignment from your L&M course. This should be included in your 20 minutes of presentation time.

The final poster and your group presentation are both due ***insert date*** and should be turned in **by one group member** at the final Community Health Improvement Poster Part II & Presentation assignment in the course site.

Your group’s final CHIP poster and presentation should include the following content:

# From Part I assignment:

1. Students’ names
2. Focus population
3. A summary of the **pertinent** community assessment data (from assessment findings, community member interviews, and research of local, state, and federal databases). 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.
4. A brief summary of the strengths, challenges, health risks and needs of your population
5. The organization you partnered with
6. Community health diagnosis

# New content:

1. Description of your community health improvement plan, including
2. Your program goal and 3 SMART objectives
3. At least 3 evidence-based interventions to achieve the objectives
4. At least 3 outcome measures (what you are targeting for improvement) and how changes in behavior, environment, and/or policy will be measured
5. At least 3 recommendations for sustainability (recommended steps to your community organization for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of outcome measures)
6. Identified/proposed policy, legislation, rule, or regulation, or ordinance with potential to impact the community health issue/diagnosis (your L&M assignment)
7. Appropriate APA formatting of references (based on the 7th Edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association)

# To refresh yourself on community health program planning and evaluation, please review lecture materials from week 3, Chapters 12 and 15. All the week 3 content will help you in this assignment.

The poster and presentation will be graded by your faculty based on the components listed in the rubrics below. Follow the rubric carefully.

Save your poster file as **Population\_CHIP\_Poster.NURSxxxx.ClinicalSection.Year.**

Insert schedule of presentations.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **CHIP Part II Poster Presentation** | | | |  |
| **Criteria** | **Ratings** | | | | **Pts** |
| Community & summary Community name and summary of assessment data | **16.7 to >14.69 pts Excellent**  Descriptive summary of pertinent community assessment data collected. Includes community member interviews and research of local, state, and federal databases, and data gathered during population survey/assessment.  Population, students, and community partners are identified. | **14.69 to >10.86 pts Good**  Adequate summary of pertinent community assessment data.  Includes a sufficient representation of community member interviews, research of local, state, and federal databases, and data gathered during population survey/assessment.  One of population, students, or community partners not identified. | **10.86 to >4.83 pts Fair**  Summary of pertinent community assessment data is missing many elements; or community member interviews or research of local, state, and federal databases or data gathered during population assessment are inadequate or gaps in assessment data are evident; or population, students, or organization name is not included. | **4.83 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 or research of local, state, and federal databases or data gathered during windshield survey; or population, students, or organization name not included. | 16.7 pts |
| Analysis & Community leader input | **16.7 to >14.69 pts Excellent**  Clear analysis of population strengths, challenges, health risks and needs that support the need for this program. Input from a community collaborator organization is included and taken into consideration in creating diagnosis.  Organizational partner is identified. Analysis provides context and evidence for dx and proposed interventions. | **14.69 to >10.86 pts Good**  Adequate analysis of population strengths, challenges, health risks and needs that support the need for this program. Input from a community collaborator organization is included but not taken into consideration in creating diagnosis.  Analysis provides some context for diagnosis and proposed interventions. | **10.86 to >4.83 pts Fair**  Inadequate analysis of population strengths, challenges, health risks and needs that support the need for this program. Input from a community collaborator organization is not included or input is not taken into consideration in creating diagnosis.  Weak context provided for diagnosis and proposed interventions. | **4.83 to >0 pts Needs Improvement**  Poor analysis of population strengths, challenges, health risks and needs that support the need for this program. Input from a community collaborator organization is not included.  Analysis is insufficient to provide context for diagnosis and proposed interventions. | 16.7 pts |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Community health diagnosis | **16.7 to >14.69 pts Excellent**  Population Health  Diagnosis identified &  accurate based on  assessment findings  and clear supporting  evidence. Diagnosis  includes problem/risk  or strengths and  weaknesses of the  population that  influence the problem  or risk. The ideal state,  or the gap between  what was assessed and the goal, is identified. | **14.69 to >10.86 pts**  **Good**  Population Health  Diagnosis identified &  accurate but supporting  evidence unclear.  Diagnosis includes  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. | **10.86 to >4.83 pts**  **Fair**  Diagnosis identified  but not accurate or not  based on supporting  evidence. Diagnosis  missing one of: risk,  population at risk, or  strengths and  weaknesses of  community. The gap  between what is ideal  and what was  assessed was not  addressed fully. | **4.83 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. | 16.7 pts |
| Goal, objectives, interventions | **16.7 to >14.69 pts Excellent**  Strongly connected goal, with at least three objectives & at least three interventions well connected to diagnosis. Purpose of the program is clearly supported by data and analysis. 3 or more objectives identified, which are SMART (precise, behaviorally stated, measurable series of steps over a quantified time-period). Three or more interventions are realistic to meet the objectives. | **14.69 to >10.86 pts Good**  Adequately presented connection of goal, objectives & interventions to diagnosis.  More information on connection to data & analysis would have helped support the planned interventions. 3 objectives identified.  One or two elements of SMART is missing on one objective. Only two interventions that are realistic to meet the objectives. | **10.86 to >4.83 pts Fair**  Vague connection of goal, objectives & interventions to diagnosis. Missing connection to data & analysis for support of planned interventions. 2 objectives identified. One or more elements of SMART is missing on more than one objective.  Only one intervention  that is realistic. | **4.83 to >0 pts Needs Improvement**  Unable to clearly connect goal, objectives, and interventions to diagnosis. Poor connection between data & analysis to planned interventions.  One objective identified with several missing SMART  elements. Interventions are unrealistic to meet the objectives. | 16.7 pts |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Poster appearance/clarity/presentation | **16.7 to >14.69 pts Excellent** | **14.69 to >10.86 pts Good** | **10.86 to >4.83 pts Fair** | **4.83 to >0 pts Needs Improvement** | 16.7 pts |
|  | 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. All group members display a professional appearance for poster presentation, with enthusiasm for the project and with  proficient understanding of their data analysis and implementation plan.  Evidence of team  practice and all  members are involved in presenting.  Resources/references  identified with 1 or  fewer errors in APA  7th edition. | 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. Most group members display a professional appearance for poster presentation. Mostly show enthusiasm for the project and with proficient  understanding of the data analysis and  implementation plan.  Team seems somewhat  unpracticed, or all members are not involved in presenting. More than 1 grammar/spelling error.  Resources/references  identified with 2 errors in APA. | 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 group members do not display a professional appearance or show enthusiasm for the project or proficient understanding of their data analysis and  implementation plan.  Team appears not to  be ready to present or  all members are not  involved in presenting. More than 2 grammar/spelling errors.  Resources/references  identified with 3 errors  in APA. | Not visually effective. Poster lacking visual appeal. Student names and affiliations missing. No professionalism in presentation, with no enthusiasm for the project. Lack of understanding of the data analysis and implementation plan is demonstrated. No evidence of team practice and all members are not  involved in  presenting. More than 3 grammar/spelling  errors.  Resources/  References not identified and 4+  errors in APA. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation/Sustainability/Policy Connection | **16.5 to >14.69 pts Excellent**  Clear description of methods for evaluation and measurement of the success of the program is included. At least 3 outcome measures are described and how they will be measured is clear. At least 3 recommendations for sustainability of the program are included. Proposed law, policy, legislation, rule or regulation with ability to impact this problem is defined. | **14.69 to >10.86 pts  Good**  Description of the methods for evaluation of program success is not comprehensive.  Only two outcome measures that are not clearly defined, or the method to measure them is unclear. Two recommendations for sustainability are given. Connection to an applicable rule, law, policy, etc. is not convincing. | **10.86 to >4.83 pts Fair**  Description of the methods for evaluation of program success is not included or is not realistic. Only one outcome measure that is not appropriate to measure the change desired or not clearly defined and the method to measure them is unclear. One recommendation for sustainability is given. Connection to an applicable rule, law, policy, etc. is not realistic or applicable. | **4.83 to >0 pts Needs Improvement**  Description of the methods for evaluation of program success is not given. Outcome measures not included. No recommendations for sustainability are given. Connection to an applicable rule, law, policy, etc. is not included. | 16.5 pts |
| Total Points: 100 | | | | | |