ASSESSMENT 5 – CREATE AN EPI DATA BRIEF

DUE <mark>December 8th</mark> (_25 points_)

General Instructions: Your group will create an Epi Data Brief to respond to a research question your group decides upon. The data brief can be no longer than 2 pages. You will submit a data brief that has the following sections:

1. Title
2. Background
3. Definitions
4. Description of the population
5. Results
6. Figures (2 of 3: graphs, tables, maps)
7. Implications

You will be graded on both the content and design of the data brief. Please see the rubric on the next page. Use the rubric to ensure your group has included all components of the data brief. The audience of a data brief (DB) is policy makers, and the purpose of a DB is to share the importance of the outcome of interest.

Review the tenants of plain language from NIH: https://www.nih.gov/institutes-nih/nih-office-director/office-communications-public-liaison/clear-communication/plain-language/plain-language-getting-started-or-brushing

Examples of NYC Data briefs are here: https://www1.nyc.gov/site/doh/data/data-publications/epi-data-briefs-and-data-tables.page

Here is the approximate length of each section:

1. Title
One title at the top of the page
2. Background
8-10 sentences, include footnotes
3. Definitions
As many as deemed necessary
4. Description of the population
4-6 bullets
5. Results
3-4 sub-sections
6. Figures
Must include 2 of 3: graphs, tables, maps
7. Implications
4-6 sentences

Domain	Meets expectation 1	Somewhat meets expectation 0.5	Doesn't meet expectation 0
Background			
1. Title	Reflects main topic of DB concisely	Somewhat reflects topic of DB (either shorter or longer or more specific)	Title does not reflect main topic of DB
2. Relevance (explains why the topic is worth exploring)	Explains scope of issue, draws on outside sources as needed	Partially explains scope of issue	Does not explain scope adequately
3. Key terms defined	Appropriately identify which terms need to be defined and correctly defines them.	Either appropriately identifies terms to be defined or correctly defines them	Neither appropriately identifies terms to be defined nor correctly defines them
4. Implications of the issue defined (the 'so what')	Impact of the issue(s) are appropriately stated	Impact of the issue(s) are partially explained	Implications of issue not clear
5. Ties to TCNY*	Succinctly explains relevance to TCNY	Somewhat explains relevance to TCNY	Does not explain relevance to TCNY
6. RQ is clearly stated	RQ stated in appropriate terms for target audience	RQ stated in terms somewhat appropriate for target audience	RQ not stated in terms appropriate for target audience
7. Notes data source and year data collected	Both data source and year data was collected are included	Either data source or year data was collected are included	Neither data source nor year data was collected are included
8. Ties to relevant programming (if applicable)	Mentions NYC program related to outcome of interest	-	Does not mention NYC program related to outcome of interest
9. Link to health equity is compelling*	Makes compelling link to health equity	Makes somewhat compelling link to health equity	Does not make a compelling link to health equity
10. Clearly presented	Follows conventions of good writing	Somewhat follows conventions of good writing	Does not follow conventions of good writing
Definitions			
11. Chose appropriate words to define	Includes words that require a common definition for understanding DB results	Included or excluded 1-2 words that require a common definition for understanding DB results	Included or excluded > 2 words that require a common definition for understanding DB results
12. Definitions are correctly defined	Fully considers nuances of word/categories and definition reflects how variable is used in analyses	Somewhat considers nuances of word/categories and definition somewhat reflects how variable is used in analyses	Does not consider nuances of word/categories and definition does not reflects how variable is used in analyses
Description of the Population			
13. Descriptives give a clear idea of the scope of the outcome	Clearly (in lay terms) states analytic group and their exposure to outcome	Somewhat clearly states analytic group and their exposure	Does not clearly state analytic group and their exposure
14. Descriptives compare appropriate socio-demographic groups	Relevant socio-demographic groups are compared	Some socio-demographic groups are relevant	Socio-demographic groups are not relevant
15. Clearly presented	Description of population follows conventions of good writing	Description of population somewhat follows conventions of good writing	Description of population does not follow conventions of good writing
Results			
16. Results respond to RQ	Results answer RQ	Results somewhat answer RQ	Results do not answer RQ
17. Sub-headings describe findings	Sub-heading accurately reflects text	Sub-heading somewhat accurately reflects text	Sub-heading does not reflect text
18. Groups compared	Appropriate groups compared	Groups compared are somewhat appropriate	Groups compared are not appropriate
19. Clearly presented	Comparison group and units always	Comparison group and units	Comparison group and units not

	included	sometimes included	included
20. Correct statistical test is used*	Correct statistical test is used	-	Correct statistical test not used
21. Data are correct	Results are consistently correct	Results are sometimes correct	Results are not correct
Figures			
22. Figures chosen best represent the results aiming to convey	Figures best for the results are chosen	1 of 2 figures is well-chosen	Neither figure is well-chosen for the data
23. Figures include all components	All of the following: Title; x and y axis labeled; values all labeled; key is clear; source included; sub-groups labeled	1 of the following missing: Title; x and y axis labeled; values all labeled; key is clear; source included; sub-groups labeled	2 or more missing: Title; x and y axis labeled; values all labeled; key is clear; source included; sub-groups labeled
Implications			
24. Explains outcome in context of social determinants of health	Clearly explains outcome in context of social determinants of health	Somewhat clearly explains outcome in context of social determinants of health	Does not clearly explain outcome in context of social determinants of health
25. Clearly presented	Follows conventions of good writing	Somewhat follows conventions of good writing	Does not follow conventions of good writing

*indicates a domain that is not in the NYC DoHMH data briefs but are relevant for DSHE