

Prioritisation and planning

Tool 11

This tool provides a shorthand way of ensuring that proposed policies and/or initiatives are subject to systematic scrutiny. It is intended to provide a checklist of issues which can be used to confirm whether planned action is well understood with shared goals. It is also intended to help determine when projects are in a pilot or roll-out phase. The intention is that the tool be used flexibly and can be adapted to suit local planning circumstances.

1 Planning checklist

Subject/priority/proposal _____			
Questions	Evidence		Outputs/outcomes
	Existing	Needed	
Do something	<i>Does evidence exist that shows the need for action?</i>	<i>What further evidence is needed to confirm need?</i>	
What/who is the target?	<i>Is there clear evidence of the rationale for targeting?</i>	<i>What further evidence is needed to confirm targets?</i>	
How/where to intervene?	<i>Is there a clear understanding of the methodology and cause and effect chain?</i>	<i>What further evidence is needed to define the methodology?</i>	
What specifically could be done?	<i>What is the full range of potential action?</i>	<i>Are there gaps in understanding?</i>	
What specifically should be done?	<i>What is it practical to deliver?</i>	<i>Is there a need for feasibility tests?</i>	

D

Resources

2 Impact screening tool

Subject/priority/proposal _____			
Certainty of efficacy	Potential impact on the population		
	Low	Moderate	High
High There is high degree of certainty of success.	Successful interventions but for relatively small population	Successful interventions but would require roll-out across large population group	Successful interventions that by their nature affect the whole population
Medium There is some evidence of success in right circumstances.	Some evidence of success but only for small population	Some evidence of success but not effective for whole population	Some evidence of success, with the potential to reach the whole population
Low There is limited evidence of success and/or evidence is limited to unique circumstances.	Little evidence of success and for small population	Little evidence of success and not effective for the whole population	Little evidence of success but has focus on whole population

3 Convergence check

Subject/priority/proposal _____		
Agreement on need to implement	Certainty about what works	
	Low	High
High	All signed up but not sure of where to go Planning implication?	All signed up, with clear understanding of action required Planning implication?
Low	Don't agree on need to act and don't know what to do Planning implication?	Clear about what works but little agreement on whether to implement Planning implication?

4 Ranking tool

Subject/priority/proposal _____			
Factor/ determinant	a) Relevance/ impact	b) Changeability	c) Score (a x b)
	1 = Little relevance/impact 2 = Moderate relevance/impact 3 = Major relevance/impact	1 = Little scope for change 2 = Moderate scope for change 3 = Major scope for change	1 = Little basis for action 9 = Greatest case for action
Physical environment			
Economic environment			
Social/cultural environment			
Individual behavioural patterns			

For a more comprehensive approach to project planning in health promotion, readers may wish to review the Preffi system – a planning scheme produced by Molleman *et al* (2003).¹ The Preffi system, which considers the importance of fitting the content of health promotion projects to the contextual conditions, provides a comprehensive approach to planning. Detailed information is available from www.nigz.nl/index_en.cfm?act=esite.tonen&a=6&b=54.

Source: Adapted from G Robertson, Health Scotland.

Reference

- 1 Molleman G, Peters L, Hommels L, Ploeg M (2003) *Health Promotion Effect Management Instrument. Preffi 2.0. Assessment package*. Woerden, The Netherlands: NIGZ Netherlands Institute for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention

D

Resources

