

## HKCA Formal Project Assessment Rubric

### Quality Improvement Projects

	Excellent	Good	Needs improvement
Title and abstract	<p>-Title: indicate an initiative to improve healthcare (e.g. quality, safety, cost, efficiency, patient-centredness)</p> <p>-abstract: concise and clear summary of background, local problem, methods, interventions, results and conclusions</p>	<p>- Title: indicate an initiative to improve healthcare</p> <p>-abstract: covers the background, local problem, methods, interventions, results and conclusions</p>	<p>-Title: does not indicate an initiative to improve healthcare</p> <p>-abstract: does not cover all the key components of an abstract</p>
Introduction	<p>-Concise and relevant background information summarizing what is currently known about the problem, including relevant previous studies</p> <p>-Clear explanation of study rationale and why the intervention(s) was expected to work</p> <p>-Problem identified and intervention(s) suggested is clinically impactful</p> <p>-Describes clearly the specific aims of the project and this report</p>	<p>-Provides some background information, includes some relevant studies</p> <p>-Description of study rationale and intervention(s) given</p> <p>-Description of aim of the project provided</p>	<p>-Relevant background information not provided</p> <p>-Rationale of the study is not clear or cannot be justified</p> <p>-Intervention(s) suggested is not practical or reproducible</p> <p>-No/inadequate description of the aim of the project</p>
Methods	<p>-Context: description of elements important for introducing the intervention(s), e.g. people, resources, social influences, setting, interrelationships</p> <p>-Intervention(s): description of intervention(s) in sufficient detail so others could reproduce it</p> <p>-Study of intervention(s): clear description of method to assess the impact of the intervention(s) and</p>	<p>-Context: description of elements important for introducing the intervention(s), e.g. people, resources, social influences, setting, interrelationships</p> <p>-Intervention(s): description of intervention(s) provided and the intervention(s) could mostly be replicated</p> <p>-Study of intervention(s): description of method to assess the impact of the intervention(s) provided, efforts shown to</p>	<p>-Context: no description of elements important for introducing the intervention(s), e.g. people, resources, social influences, setting, interrelationships</p> <p>-Intervention(s): description of intervention(s) not provided</p> <p>-Study of intervention(s): no description of method to assess the impact of the intervention(s) provided, or it is unclear</p>

	<p>method to establish whether the observed outcomes were due to the intervention(s)</p> <p>-Measures: description of the measures chosen for studying the outcomes of the intervention(s) including the rationale for choosing them, their validity and reliability</p> <p>-Description of methods employed for assessing completeness and accuracy of data</p> <p>-Analysis: appropriate qualitative and quantitative methods used to draw inferences from the data; methods for understanding the variation within data provided (including the effect of time as a variable)</p> <p>-Ethical considerations: local ethics approval obtained, potential conflicts of interest addressed</p>	<p>establish whether the observed outcomes were due to the intervention(s)</p> <p>-Measures: description of the measures chosen for studying the outcomes of the intervention(s) including the rationale for choosing them</p> <p>-Description of methods employed for assessing completeness and accuracy of data</p> <p>-Analysis: appropriate qualitative and quantitative methods used to draw inferences from the data</p> <p>-Ethical considerations: local ethics approval obtained</p>	<p>whether the observed outcomes were due to the intervention(s)</p> <p>-Measures: no description of the measures chosen or the rationale for choosing these measures to study the outcomes of the intervention(s)</p> <p>-No description of methods employed for assessing completeness and accuracy of data</p> <p>-Analysis: did not choose appropriate qualitative and quantitative methods to draw inferences from the data</p> <p>-Lack of ethical considerations, e.g. no local ethics approval</p>
Results	<p>-Clear description of initial steps of the intervention(s) and its evolution over time (preferably shown in time-line diagram, flow chart or table), including modifications made to the intervention(s) during the project</p> <p>-Details of the process measures and outcomes given</p> <p>-Observed associations between outcomes, intervention(s) and relevant contextual elements given</p> <p>-Unintended consequences such as</p>	<p>-Provided description of initial steps of the intervention(s) and its evolution over time, including modifications made to the intervention(s) during the project</p> <p>-Details of the process measures and outcomes given</p> <p>-Observed associations between outcomes, and intervention(s) given</p> <p>-Unintended consequences such as</p>	<p>-Unclear description of steps of the intervention(s) and its evolution over time</p> <p>-No details of the process measures and outcomes given</p> <p>-Observed associations between outcomes, interventions and relevant contextual elements not given</p> <p>-Intended consequences not mentioned</p>

	<p>unexpected benefits, problems, failures or costs associated with the intervention(s) listed</p> <p>-Missing data details given and explained</p>	<p>unexpected benefits, problems, failures or costs associated with the intervention(s) mentioned</p> <p>-Missing data details given</p>	<p>-Missing data details not given</p>
Discussion	<p>-Concise summary of the key findings of the project, including highlights of its particular strengths and specific aims</p> <p>-High quality interpretation of the association between the intervention(s) and outcomes, with a stress on the impact of the project to people and systems</p> <p>-Good comparison of the project results with findings from other relevant or similar publications</p> <p>-High quality reasoning and explanation of differences between observed and anticipated outcomes</p> <p>-Explanation of the limitations of the study, such as limited internal validity (confounding factors, bias, design imprecision, and other methods/measurement inaccuracy)</p> <p>-Show great efforts to minimize and adjust for limitations</p> <p>-Conclusion: Summarizes key findings. Highlights importance and implications of findings. Addresses sustainability of intervention(s) and suggests next steps for further quality improvement.</p>	<p>-Reasonable summary of the project's key findings</p> <p>-Reasonably appropriate interpretation of association between intervention(s) and outcomes, with a mention of its impact</p> <p>-Shows comparison of the project results with findings from other publications</p> <p>-Gives explanation of differences between observed and anticipated outcomes</p> <p>-Adequate explanation of key study limitations</p> <p>-Conclusion: summarizes information, provides appropriate interpretation of findings</p>	<p>-Inaccurate interpretation of study results (including over or under exaggeration)</p> <p>-Inability to compare project results with findings from other publications</p> <p>-Important study limitations have been omitted or not explained</p> <p>-Conclusion: does not convey the important information, inappropriate interpretation of findings</p>

## **Grading**

Title and abstract 1-3

Introduction 1-3

Methods 1-3

Results 1-3

Discussion and conclusion 1-3