COURSE OVERVIEW

SPPH525 is an introductory, graduate-level course that exposes students to key issues and concepts in population and public health. Students will explore strategies, policies and challenges by examining specific topics. This course focuses on health issues at the local, provincial, and national levels. This is a mixed mode, or blended, course. This means that you will be working with the instructor, teaching assistant and fellow students both online and face-to-face in the classroom. It is necessary for you to participate fully in all parts to successfully complete the course. Background material provided and online material, combined with readings, will outline key issues and concepts in population and public health. Both face-to-face and online discussions and assignments will provide an opportunity for application of these concepts.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

At the end of SPPH 525, students will:
1. Have an understanding of the breadth of the field of public health with an emphasis on Canadian context;
2. Be introduced to the concepts, issues and organizations involved in each of the areas of public health presented;
3. Be able to debate public health issues, considering the challenges of public health, evidence-based decision making and public health interventions;
4. Become familiar with some of the essential skills in public health;
5. Have had an opportunity to investigate a public health program or policy in detail using existing evidence from the literature and from discussion with contacts/experts in the field; and
6. Have formed a sense of community with classmates as an outcome of interaction in the in-class sessions and on-line discussions of the case studies.
COURSE STRUCTURE
SPPH 525 is a mixed mode, or blended, course. This means that you will be working with your instructor and fellow students both online and face-to-face in the classroom. It is necessary for you to participate fully in all parts of this course to successfully complete the course. Case studies, guest lectures and online material, combined with pre-assigned readings, will outline key issues and concepts in public health. Small group sessions, face-to-face and online discussions, and assignments will provide an opportunity for application of these concepts. The course revolves around case studies on a variety of public health topics, each supported by readings, web links, discussion questions, guest lectures and on-line discussion.

THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT
In this course you are directed in your learning through modules/case studies that describe public health issues, accompanied by a series of discussions and assignments. These discussions and assignments are designed so that you can acquire a broad understanding and knowledge of public health concepts, issues, and skills. Part of your final mark for this course will come from a continuous assessment of your contribution to your own learning and to that of your classmates. This will be assessed by your contribution to the discussion or debate, using the ‘Discussions’ tool located in the Course Tools menu in Canvas.

Readings and Resources
These are suggested optional readings from which you may choose to consult at different times during the course. The purpose is to enrich the course material and provide resources that will be helpful for the course and beyond. None are required.


There will also be references cited in the background section of the weekly modules that I encourage students to access; there will also be one or two designated required readings each week. All required readings will be available on the course website under the respective module. Note that there will be optional readings. The goal is to provide an opportunity to expand your comprehension of the material. It is up to you to decide what to read/view to prepare you to complete your assignments.

SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Where to Submit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation at in-class sessions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sun Sept 9, Oct 14, Nov 18</td>
<td>In Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>First post: Fri Sept 21, Response: Mon Sept 24</td>
<td>Post in Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>First post: Fri Oct 5, Response: Mon Oct 8</td>
<td>Post in Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class debate</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sun Oct 14</td>
<td>In Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>First post: Fri Nov 9, Response: Mon Nov 12</td>
<td>Post in Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing Note</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mon Nov 5</td>
<td>Course website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class group presentation</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sun Nov 18</td>
<td>In Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>First post: Fri Nov 23, Response: Mon Nov 26</td>
<td>Post in Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Essay</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Fri Dec 7</td>
<td>Course website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASSIGNMENT DESCRIPTIONS**

**Participation-5% of overall grade**
During each of the in-person sessions students are expected to actively engage in discussions to encourage an open and stimulating learning environment.

**In-class debate-15% of overall grade**
During the second in-person classes, students will debate on different topics related to public health in small groups. There will be ~three debates during each class. You will be assigned to a group and topic in advance of the class to give you time to prepare as a group. You can find your debate group under Discussions on the course website. The performance of each team will be graded by the instructors, but the winning team for each debate will be decided by portion of the class not participating in that debate. The debate format is loosely based on a modified British Parliamentary style. Given the size of the class, there will be ~3 people assigned to Government and ~3 to Opposition. Each person will have up to 10 minutes to present their course of action on the topic and a chance to offer a rebuttal. You are able to use speaking aides (computer documents, cue cards etc) but please do not prepare slides to minimize the disruption in switching between sides.

**In-class presentation-15% of overall grade**
Group presentations will occur during the final face-to-face class. Groups should consist of two to three students. Choose your own group, if you cannot find a group, please contact the instructor/TA for assistance. Presentation grades will be assigned to the group as a whole and all members of the group are expected to participate equally in the preparation and presentation. Please inform the instructor if the responsibility of
the work is not being shared. Presentations should be 30-35 minutes with 5-10 minutes for questions. You will be expected to ask questions following presentations. Electronic copies of the presentations should also be sent prior to Sun Nov 18 to the TA.

The goal of the presentation is to speak about a Public Health topic comparing and contrasting the different approaches to prevention and intervention (e.g. voluntary vs. mandatory, technical vs. social, education vs. enforcement, economic vs. altruistic, etc). All presentations should include slides for ‘Objectives’ and ‘Conclusions’ and address the follow areas:

1. Epidemiology and/or history of the issue
2. Natural history of the disease if applicable
3. Populations health significance of the issue
4. Economic significance of the issue
5. Medical intervention or treatment if applicable
6. Public Health interventions

Different groups cannot present the same topic. Topics will be assigned on a first come first come basis and should be discussed with the instructor. You may come up with your own topic (subject to approval of the instructor) or choose from the list below:

1. Local and global response to Zika
2. SARS and MERS-CoV: Lessons learned
3. Contaminated foods: an international problem
4. Safe drinking water: lessons from the Walkerton E.coli tragedy
5. Health effects of climate change
6. John Snow and the origins of disease mapping
7. Do chronic diseases actually have infectious causes?
8. What does an ideal Public Health information system look like?
9. Malaria: Can an effective intervention be developed?
10. How can obesity rates be reduced?

Online Discussions-5% each, 20% of overall grade
There are four online discussions. For each discussion, initial posts (limited to 250 words) are due by 11:59pm on Friday. You also need to reply to other’s students posts (word limit: 150). One reply is mandatory and will be marked, additional comments are appreciated to generate a good discussion. You will lose marks if you exceed the word limit. Responses to your peers are due by 11.59pm on the following Monday. After that time, you will not be able to submit any posts. Discussions will open the week prior to the due date. Discussion posts should be clear, succinct and respectful. The instructor and/or teaching assistant will moderate the on-line discussion during the week.

Briefing Note-15% of overall grade
The goal of this exercise is to debrief a policymaker on an issue related to this week’s
material (Social determinants of health) and require the policymaker to agree or disagree with a recommendation to take a position or a course of action. The brief should provide a factual presentation of the evidence and a clear recommendation of future directions. Good briefs are concise, accurate, objective and strategic. Maximum 800 words.

Format (adapted from the Public Health Agency of Canada and the BC Ministry of Health Services). Policy briefs do not require references, but since this is an academic exercise, please include your references at the end (this does not count towards the page limit). The following sections should be included in your decision brief and examples are included in the weeks material.

➢ Title: should be centred and bold
➢ Summary (1/2 page): describe the issue in 3-4 bullets with key considerations that may affect the Minister’s decision including contentious issues, your recommendation and the substantive arguments in its favour.
➢ Background (2-3 paragraphs): use this section to provide relevant facts about the issue including the history of the issue, past decisions, previous action(s) taken, why the issue evolved, why the issue is being brought to the Minister’s attention at this time, and major participants and stakeholders.
➢ Options and Rationale (3-5 paragraphs): identify two or three options that have been considered and the pros and cons of each. Indicate the rationale for the option/course of action that is recommended. Include the scientific evidence supporting the recommendation.
➢ Considerations (3-5 paragraphs): use this section to identify the considerations which the Minister needs taken into account in concurring with the recommended course of action such as the unintended consequences, political and financial feasibility, level of expected social acceptance, and probability of successful implementation. This section does not have to draw a specific conclusion, but rather highlights which aspects of the issue will be most important in developing and implementing the recommended policy.
➢ Summary (1 paragraph): indicate succinctly what your recommendation is and why this option is the preferred approach. This is a critical piece of the brief so ensure that you provide a specific recommendation.

Final Essay (topic of student’s choice)-30% of overall grade
The purpose of the final assignment is to provide a written critical analysis of a public health topic. Please discuss your idea with the teaching assistant to ensure that your topic is appropriate for the final paper. Select a public health issue that you were exposed to in the course and are interested in, one you work in, or have prior knowledge of. Use the skills and knowledge you have obtained throughout the course to develop your final paper. You may do any of the following:

➢ Identify a public health issue that requires attention or intervention
➢ Propose a public health program or intervention in your topic area
➢ Evaluate the effectiveness of a specific intervention in your topic area
The full paper should be a maximum of 10 pages single-spaced including abstract and any tables/figures/graphs (12 pt font with 1” margins). Your final paper should be submitted to the final assignment on the course website.

**LATE SUBMISSION OF ASSIGNMENTS**

Please contact the TA with reason if you cannot turn in an assignment on time. ALL late assignments (online discussions, in-class exercises, and all other assignments) will be deducted 10% for each day late unless the course director or TA decides otherwise.

**EXPECTATIONS FOR STUDENT AND INSTRUCTOR**

You are expected to fulfill the course objectives, assignments, and discussions in a timely manner, and to contact us via course mail whenever you need help. We will return your communication within 48 to 72 hours. Spend enough time on the background resources for each session in order to make the most of the face-to-face sessions. It is very important that you have finished the online components of the course prior to attending the workshop sessions.

You will be expected to use the Discussion Forums on the website to discuss the readings and activities in the weekly session. These discussions will provide you with an opportunity to share your knowledge, to seek feedback from your peers as well as your instructor on your ideas, and to ask for help when you need it.

**INSTRUCTOR INFORMATION**

**Instructor**

Dr. Rachel Murphy is an Assistant Professor in the Centre of Excellence in Cancer Prevention, School of Population and Public Health at UBC. She completed her PhD in Nutrition and Metabolism from the University of Alberta. She received training in population oncology at the Cross Cancer Institute in Alberta before joining the Laboratory of Epidemiology and Population Sciences at the National Institute on Aging, National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, MD, where she studied diet, body weight and healthy aging. She worked as Scientific Leader at DSM Nutritional Products in New Jersey before coming to UBC in 2015. Dr. Murphy is interested in health promotion, particularly healthy eating and disease prevention. Her research studies factors associated with healthy/unhealthy lifestyle behaviours, mechanistic factors linking lifestyle behaviours to disease and programs aimed at encouraging healthy choices. Through her research, Dr. Murphy works with fellow researchers, knowledge users in health care settings, NGO’s and other stakeholders.

**Teaching Assistant**

Matt Shupler is a fourth-year PhD candidate in Population and Public Health at UBC. He received his MPH in Biostatistics from George Washington University in Washington, D.C. Matt’s Masters thesis was focused on a behavioural intervention, assessing the use of an ethanol cookstove among Nigerian women to reduce their exposure to air pollution due to using biomass (e.g. wood, animal dung, crop waste) cooking fuels. His dissertation at UBC is centered on a multinational cohort study, the Prospective Urban
and Rural Epidemiology (PURE)-AIR study. PURE-AIR is examining the cardiovascular health impacts of the air pollution generated from using biomass fuels across 10 countries in Africa, Asia and South America, with different economic and environmental conditions. Matt is interested in social, behavioural (e.g. diet and exercise) and environmental determinants of health and how they can interact to affect our health.

Grading (from the UBC Department of Educational Studies, Graduate Course Grading Policy)

➢ A+ is from 90% to 100%: It is reserved for exceptional work that greatly exceeds course expectations. In addition, achievement must satisfy all the conditions below.

➢ A is from 85% to 89%: A mark of this order suggests a very high level of performance on all criteria used for evaluation. Contributions deserving an A are distinguished in virtually every aspect. They show that the individual significantly shows initiative, creativity, insight, and probing analysis where appropriate. Further, the achievement must show careful attention to course requirements as established by the instructor.

➢ A- is from 80% to 84%: It is awarded for generally high quality of performance, no problems of any significance, and fulfillment of all course requirements.

➢ B Level (68% to 79%). This category of achievement is typified by adequate but unexceptional performance when the criteria of assessment are considered. It is distinguished from A level work by problems such as: One of more significant errors in understanding, superficial representation or analysis of key concepts, absence of any special initiatives, or lack of coherent organization or explanation of ideas. The level of B work is judged in accordance with the severity of the difficulties demonstrated. B+ is from 76% to 79%, B is from 72% to 75%, and B- is from 68% to 71%

➢ C Level (55% to 67%). Although a C+, C, or C- grade may be given in a graduate course, the Faculty of Graduate Studies considers 68% as a minimum passing grade for doctoral graduate students.

PLAGIARISM

Students are expected to know what constitutes plagiarism and that plagiarism is a form of academic misconduct. As such, plagiarism is subject to penalty. Please review the Student Discipline section of the UBC Calendar: http://www.calendar.ubc.ca/Vancouver/index.cfm?tree=3,54,111,959

COURSE SCHEDULE

The weekly course activities including links to readings/viewing materials can be found under modules on the course website. An overview is also provided below.

Date and Topic: Week 1 (Sept 4), Overview of the course, Introduction to key public health concepts
Objectives: Understand public health terminology, understand different types of prevention, use frameworks for public health issues, understand social determinants of health and different ways to improve the health of individuals and communities
Activities: Read the background provided in Module 1. Familiarize yourself with the course website, introduce yourself on the discussion board on the course website (Canvas). Read the core readings (CPHA and Bircher) and expand your learning from the optional textbook readings.

Date and Topic: In Class (Sun Sept 9), Venue: SPPH B104,
Activities: Come prepared for facilitated discussions in small groups

Date and Topic: Week 2 (Sept 10), Evidence-based Public Health
Objectives: Understand the concept of evidence-based Public Health and how it may contrast with ideology based Public Health, understand population approach, methods to measure population health, assess ways interventions can be implemented and barriers to evidence base for public health practice
Activities: Read the background provided in Module 2. Read the core reading: (Brownson and Kiefer) and optional reading to enhance your learning

Date and Topic: Week 3 (Sept 17), Public Health systems, structures and initiatives in Canada
Objectives: Discuss the provisions of Canada’s Health Act, understand the nature of threats to Canada’s healthcare system, understand Canadian health law/legislation and health equity
Activities: Read the background provided in Module 3. Read the core readings (AFMC Ch 12, Lewis et al.), watch the video. Participate in online discussion #1, Initial post due Fri Sept 21, Response due Mon Sept 24

Date and Topic: Week 4 (Sept 24), Public Health systems, structures and initiatives locally and in British Columbia (BC)
Objectives: Understand the threats to the sustainability of the healthcare system in BC, how transforming primary healthcare services can support sustainability of healthcare, the key points for transforming primary healthcare in BC, understand why little progress has been made and what is required to achieve transformative change
Activities: Read the background provided in Module 4. Read the core readings (Millar 2011 and Laverne et al 2014).

Date and Topic: Week 5 (Oct 1), Aboriginal health and social justice
Objectives: Describe the disproportionate rates of ill health among Aboriginal populations vs. non-Aboriginals, analyze the underlying social processes that predispose Aboriginal populations to higher disease burden, understand the mandate and activities of the First Nations Health Authority and other agencies responsible for Aboriginal health in Canada, explore mechanisms by which the health inequities can be lessened
Activities: Read the background provided in Module 5. Read the core reading (Adelson and Richmond) and watch the video. Participate in online discussion #2, Initial post due Fri Oct 5, Response due Mon Oct 8

Date and Topic: Week 6 (Oct 8), Health promotion and health protection
Objectives: Understand the origins of health promotion and the Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion, understand the role of advocacy and health policy for health promotion and health protection, describe examples of building healthy public policy
Activities: Read the background provided in Module 7. Listen to the podcast (e-cigarettes), read the core reading (Srinivasan et al.).

Date and Topic: In Class (Sun Oct 14), Venue: SPPH B104
Activities: Come prepared to debate in small groups and engage in discussion with our guest speakers

Date and Topic: Week 7 (Oct 15), Diet, food policy and public health
Objectives: Appreciate the magnitude of health problems attributable to lack of food security/food sovereignty, begin to understand various pathways to health equity related to the food system, appreciate the complexity of health eating policies/programs
Activities: Read the background provided in Module 7. Watch the powerpoint lecture (Part 1 and 2). Read the core reading (Jones et al.). Start planning the Briefing Note on an issue related to week 8’s material (Social determinants of health), Due Monday Nov 5 11.50pm

Date and Topic: Week 8 (Oct 22), Social determinants of health
Objectives: Understand the impact of social determinants on health, discuss current issues in Canada related to the social determinants of health, describe examples of programs/policies for vulnerable populations
Activities: Read the background provided in Module 8. Watch the video ‘The Social Determinants of Health’. Read the core readings (Bryant and Hwang et al.).

Date and Topic: Week 9 (Oct 29), Immunization and vaccines-preventable diseases
Objectives: Understand the importance of vaccines in public health, understand why there is controversy regarding vaccinations, discuss the concerns about the current BC Influenza Policy of “Mandatory Vaccination or Mask” for healthcare workers, discuss the impact of politics and economics on public health policies
Activities: Read the background provided in Module 9. Read the core reading (Behrman and Offley)

Date and Topic: Week 10 (Nov 5), Environmental health protection
Objectives: Understand the interplay between science, economic interests and politics in public health, explore the “precautionary principle” and its role in environmental and population health, develop familiarity with concepts in risk assessment, management and communication
Activities: Read the background provided in Module 10. Read the core reading (Finley et al.). Participate in online discussion #3, Initial post due Fri Nov 9, Response due Mon Nov 12

Date and Topic: Week 11 (Nov 12), Obesity, lifestyle and chronic disease
Objectives: Understand the burden of chronic diseases and common risk factors in BC, Canada and worldwide, discuss the process of developing an obesity prevention program, identify the roles that academic, non-governmental and governmental institutions play in chronic disease prevention, understand the natural history, epidemiology, risk factors and health burden of obesity
Activities: Read the background provided in Module 11. Read the core reading (Global Burden of Disease).

Date and Topic: In Class (Sun Nov 18), Venue: SPPH B104
Activities: Come prepared for Group presentations

Date and Topic: Week 12 (Nov 19), Responses to outbreaks and Public Health emergencies
Objectives: Understand the processes contributing to the emergence of disease outbreaks, understand the general principles and concepts involved in outbreak investigation and response, understand the general principles and concepts involved in emergency management, discuss the roles and responsibilities of local, provincial and federal governments as well as international agencies in health emergencies and the prevention and response to outbreaks
Activities: Read the background provided in Module 12. Read the core readings (AFMC, Boggild et al. and Learning from SARS). Participate in online discussion #4, Initial post due Fri Nov 23, Response due Mon Nov 26

Date and Topic: Week 13 (Nov 26)
Activities: Work on your Final Essay, Due Friday December 7, 11.59pm
## Debate Rubric (30 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>5 points</th>
<th>4 points</th>
<th>3 points</th>
<th>2 points</th>
<th>1 point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for other team</td>
<td>All statements, body language, and responses were respectful and used appropriate language</td>
<td>Statements and responses were respectful and used appropriate language and body language except for 1-2 times</td>
<td>Most statements and responses were respectful and appropriate in language</td>
<td>Statements, responses and/or body language were borderline appropriate</td>
<td>Statements, responses and/or body language were consistently not respectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>All information presented was clear, accurate and thorough</td>
<td>Most information presented was clear, accurate and thorough</td>
<td>Most information presented was clear and accurate but was generally not thorough</td>
<td>Some information was accurate, but there were some minor inaccuracies</td>
<td>Information had major inaccuracies OR was not clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuttal</td>
<td>All counter-arguments were accurate, relevant and strong</td>
<td>Most counter-arguments were accurate, relevant and strong</td>
<td>Most counter-arguments were accurate and relevant, but several were weak</td>
<td>Some counter arguments were weak and irrelevant</td>
<td>Counter arguments were not accurate and/or irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Facts/Statistics</td>
<td>Every major point was well supported with several relevant facts, statistics and/or examples</td>
<td>Every major point was adequately supported with relevant facts, statistics and/or examples</td>
<td>Every major point was supported with facts, statistics and/or examples, but the relevance of some was weak</td>
<td>Some points were well supported, others were not</td>
<td>All points were not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>All arguments were clearly tied to an idea (premise) and organized in a tight, logical fashion</td>
<td>Most arguments were clearly tied to an idea (premise) and organized in a tight, logical fashion</td>
<td>Most arguments were clearly tied to an idea (premise) and organized in a tight logical fashion</td>
<td>Most arguments were clearly tied to an idea (premise) but not organized in a tight logical fashion</td>
<td>Arguments were not tied to an idea (premise) and not organized in a tight logical fashion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Topic</td>
<td>The team clearly understood the topic in depth and presented the information convincingly</td>
<td>The team clearly understood the topic in depth and presented the information with ease</td>
<td>The team seemed to understand the main points of the topic and presented those with ease</td>
<td>The team seemed to understand the main points of the topic, but didn’t present with ease</td>
<td>The team did not shown an adequate understanding of the topic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Presentation Rubric (45 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9 points</th>
<th>6 points</th>
<th>3 points</th>
<th>0 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Appeal</strong></td>
<td>No errors in spelling, grammar and punctuations. Information is clear and concise. Visually appealing/engaging</td>
<td>Some errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation. Too much information on two or more slides. Significant visual appeal</td>
<td>Many errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation. Too much information on many slides. Minimal visual appeal/distracting information</td>
<td>Many errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation. Slides were difficult to read, too much information. No visual appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehension</strong></td>
<td>Extensive knowledge of topic. Members showed complete understanding of assignment. Accurately answered all questions posed.</td>
<td>Most showed a good understanding of topic. All members able to answer most of audience questions.</td>
<td>Few members showed good understanding of some parts of the topic. Only some members accurately answered questions.</td>
<td>Presenters didn’t understand the topic. Majority of questions answered by one member or majority of information was incorrect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation Skills</strong></td>
<td>Regular/consistent eye contact. Audience was engaged, and presenter’s held the audience’s attention. Appropriate speaking volume and body language</td>
<td>Most members spoke to the majority of the audience; consistent eye contact. Audience was engaged by the presentation. Majority of presenters spoke at a suitable volume. Some distracting body language</td>
<td>Members focused on only part of the audience. Sporadic eye contact by more than one presenter. The audience was distracted. Speakers could be heard by only half the audience. Body language was distracting.</td>
<td>Minimal eye contact by more than one member focusing on small part of the audience. Audience was not engaged. Majority of presenters spoke too quickly or quietly making comprehension difficult. Inappropriate/disinterested body language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>The presentation was a concise summary of the topic with all questions answered. Comprehensive and complete coverage of information</td>
<td>The presentation was a good summary of the topic. Most important information covered; little irrelevant information</td>
<td>The presentation was informative but several elements went unanswered. Much of the information irrelevant, some major points omitted</td>
<td>The presentation was a brief overview of the topic. Many questions left unanswered. Majority of information irrelevant and major points omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation/Participation/Group Dynamics</strong></td>
<td>All presenters knew the information, participated equally and helped each other as needed. Extremely prepared and rehearsed</td>
<td>Slight domination of one presenter. Members helped each other. Very well prepared</td>
<td>Significant domination by some members with one minimally contributing. Some preparation but with dependence on reading slides</td>
<td>Unbalanced presentation or tension from over-helping. Multiple group members not participating. Lack of preparation and dependence on reading slides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Post</td>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>1-2 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thoughtful discussion of the question topic</td>
<td>Discussion has some relevance to the question/topic</td>
<td>Discussion has no relevance to the question/topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content and/or argument</td>
<td>States a clearly defined position and provides evidence to support the argument</td>
<td>Position is somewhat defined and some evidence is provided to support the argument</td>
<td>No substantive discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word count and reference</td>
<td>Adheres to the word count and provides at least 2 credible references to support argument</td>
<td>Does not adhere to the word count or does not provide credible reference to support argument</td>
<td>No substantive response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to Peer</th>
<th>Relevance and content</th>
<th>3 points</th>
<th>1-2 points</th>
<th>0 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thoughtful follow-up of classmate’s post. Provides additional perspective</td>
<td>Response is not thoughtful. Restatement of original post with minimal unique thoughts</td>
<td>No substantive response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word count and reference</td>
<td>Adheres to the word count and provides at least 1 credible reference to support argument</td>
<td>Does not adhere to the word count or does not provide credible reference to support argument</td>
<td>Does not adhere to the word count nor provide credible reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing Note Rubric (45 points)</td>
<td>9 points</td>
<td>6 points</td>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background information</strong></td>
<td>Relevant facts about the issue are identified including the history of the issue, past decisions, previous action(s) taken, why the issue evolved, why the issue is being brought to the Minister’s attention</td>
<td>Some relevant facts about the issue are provided</td>
<td>Relevant facts about the issue are provided but they are not adequate. Justification for bringing the issue is clearly made</td>
<td>Does not provide adequate information or facts to communicate the relevance of the information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thesis/organization</strong></td>
<td>Well organized and structured briefing note. All elements are present</td>
<td>Missing one element of the note</td>
<td>More than one element is missing</td>
<td>The briefing note lacks a defined structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Considerations</strong></td>
<td>Identifies considerations the Minister needs to take into account to concur with the recommended course of action. E.g. unintended consequences, political and financial feasibility, level of expected social acceptance, probability of successful implementation</td>
<td>Considerations are somewhat identified</td>
<td>Considerations identified are not adequate</td>
<td>No considerations are identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary and Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>Brief states succinctly the student’s recommendation and explains why this option is the preferred approach</td>
<td>Brief states the student’s recommendation but does not provide strong justification for the recommendations</td>
<td>Little or no explanation is given for stated recommendation</td>
<td>Brief does not state any recommendation nor provide any explanation why this is preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Style</strong></td>
<td>Style free of typographical errors, avoids jargons and technical terms. Letter format is followed. Follows assignment instructions. Within page limit</td>
<td>General style relatively free of typographical errors, grammar errors, technical jargons.</td>
<td>Somewhat organized. Incompletely follows assignment instructions.</td>
<td>Letter has many typographical errors, poor grammar, technical jargon or abbreviations. Does not follow assignment instructions. Exceeds page limit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Final Essay Rubric (30 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>9 points</th>
<th>6 points</th>
<th>3 points</th>
<th>0 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>Provides a clear background of the public/population health issue that underlies the program/policy and supports this background by citing the appropriate literature</td>
<td>Background is provided and somewhat supported by appropriate literature</td>
<td>Background is not well supported with appropriate literature</td>
<td>No background is provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content/Argument</strong></td>
<td>Addresses with an exhaustive analysis all the issues referred in the thesis. The provided information is necessary and sufficient to discuss these issues, and a strong and convincing argument is made</td>
<td>Addresses with an in depth analysis all the issues referred in the thesis. The provided information is necessary and sufficient to discuss these issues, and a strong argument is made</td>
<td>For the most part addresses with an in depth analysis most of the issues referred in the thesis. The provided information is, for the most part, necessary and sufficient to discuss these issues</td>
<td>Poorly addresses the issues referred in the proposed topic. The provided information is not necessary or not sufficient to discuss these issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Writing</strong></td>
<td>The essay is extremely well written from start to finish, without spelling, grammar or use of English errors. The essay is well organized, clear and presents ideas in a coherent and compelling way</td>
<td>The essay is well written from start to finish, without spelling, grammar or use of English errors. The essay is well organized, clear and presents ideas in a coherent way</td>
<td>The essay is well written for the most part, without spelling, grammar or use of English errors. The essay is for the most part well organized, clear and presents ideas in a coherent way</td>
<td>The essay is not well written, and contains many spelling errors, and/or grammar errors and/or use of English errors. The essay is badly organized, lacks clarity and/or does not present ideas in a coherent way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Format</strong></td>
<td>Exactly follows all the requirements related to format and layout</td>
<td>Closely follows all the requirements related to format and layout</td>
<td>Follows, for the most part, all the requirements related to format and layout. Some requirements are not followed</td>
<td>Follows poorly the requirements related to format and layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References</strong></td>
<td>All the references used are important, and are of good/scholarly quality. All</td>
<td>All the references used are important, and are of good/scholarly quality.</td>
<td>Most of the references used are important, and are of good/scholarly</td>
<td>Most of the references used are not important, and/or are not of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Scholarly Resources Used</td>
<td>References Used, Cited, Listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good/scholarly quality</td>
<td>Scholarly resources are for the most part used effectively in the essay. Most of the references are effectively used, correctly cited and correctly listed in the reference list</td>
<td>most references effectively used, correctly cited and listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly quality</td>
<td>Scholarly resources are used effectively in the essay.</td>
<td>effectively used, correctly cited and listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Scholarly resources are not used effectively in the essay. References are not effectively used, and/or correctly cited and/or correctly listed in the reference list</td>
<td>references not effectively used, cited, listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>The references are not effectively used, correctly cited and correctly listed</td>
<td>references not effectively used, cited, listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the essay, there is a minimum of 8 scholarly resources that are used effectively in the essay. All the references are effectively used, correctly cited and correctly listed in the reference list according to APA style.