

## Advocacy Project Evaluation Tool

Date:	
Campus:	
Team member(s):	
Advocacy topic:	

### **Advocacy Presentation**

1. Able to articulate why topic is relevant to pediatric population

1	2	3	4	5	Comments:
Unable to justify how topic is relevant for pediatric care		Able to show how topic is tangentially related to pediatric care		Demonstrates how topic is timely and highly relevant for pediatrics	

2. Provided supportive background information, inclusive of relevant statistics, accepted guidelines, and policies in place

1	2	3	4	5	Comments:
Completely inadequate or incorrect background information		Includes some pertinent information though could be more robust		Includes relevant history, statistics, guidelines, and policies, including things specific to our city/state/region	

3. Proposed a solution or sound contribution to fixing the problem (something reasonable, realistic)

1	2	3	4	5	Comments:
No solutions discussed		Solutions discussed, but not realistic or reasonable		Solution(s) reasonable, realistic, and “call to action” included	

4. Included 3 take-aways or summary points

1	2	3	4	5	Comments:
Not included		Take-aways included, but “missed the mark” in relevance		3 relevant take-aways included	

5. Materials are visually pleasing and well organized

1	2	3	4	5	Comments:
Poorly organized OR multiple typos OR graphics not legible		Good organization, could have optimized graphics, some text or images may be difficult to read		Excellent organization, no typos, excellent use of graphics and text-to-graphic ratio	

6. Presenters are familiar with materials, able to present without reading slides, and field questions appropriately

1	2	3	4	5	Comments:
Appears unfamiliar with material; reads directly from slides		Familiar with topic and materials, but unable to provide thoughtful response to questions		Well familiarized with topic and materials, can present with only referencing slides, appropriate responses to audience questions	

**One-pager OR op-ed**

7. Create one-pager that contains appropriate, correct information and is visually pleasing

1	2	3	4	5	Comments:
Not visually pleasing, exhaustive text without graphics or incorrect information		Includes text and graphics, fairly readable, includes "call to action"		Optimal use of text and graphics, easily readable, includes specific, reasonable "call to action"	

7. Create op-ed that contains a story, provokes emotion, is suitable for the audience, and includes a call to action.

1	2	3	4	5	Comments:
No story OR written as a research-type paper		Includes a story, has a call to action		Story includes appropriate amount of detail and well-illustrates the issue at hand. Call to action is clear but not too political.	

**Letter to policymaker**

8. Able to identify appropriate policymaker(s) (local, state, federal) for letter

1	2	3	4	5	Comments:
Did not identify policymaker		Identified correct policymaker(s), though letter better suited for different tier of government (local/state/federal)		Identified correct policymaker(s) in most appropriate tier of government (local/state/federal)	

9. Create an effective letter with pertinent information and specific “ask” or call to action

1	2	3	4	5	Comments:
Letter poorly organized, multiple typos, no “ask”		Generally well organized, contains background information and some type of call to action. May contain false information.		Well-organized, has relevant background information, call to action is specific and reasonable, no incorrect or “hallucinated” information	

10. Supplemental AI information submitted for the project.

1	2	3	4	5	Comments:
Supplemental form incomplete.		Supplemental form completed; demonstrates inappropriate integration of AI (incorrect information OR lack of revisions)		Supplemental form is completed in full and demonstrates team appropriately integrated AI into the project.	

**Final Grade**

**Total Score: \_\_\_/50**

Honors: 45+/50 (90%)

High Pass: 40-44/50 (80%)

Pass: 35-39/50 (70%)

Fail <35/50