

EXPERT CONSULTANTS SITE SELECTION GUIDANCE DOCUMENT

A. Potential Impact—The initiative appears to have potential for impact on the social or physical environment pertinent to healthy eating and active living. Note: Assess based on your judgement the intervention’s conceptual logic and other pertinent characteristics such as intensity and duration. Interventions that are critical to building a whole environment that is conducive to physical activity (PA) should also be considered as these may result in average increases in PA.

- | | | |
|--|-------|-------------------|
| 1. How likely is this initiative to be effective in increasing physical activity and preventing obesity? | Value | Possible Answers |
| | 1 | Very unlikely |
| | 2 | Somewhat unlikely |
| | 3 | Somewhat likely |
| | 4 | Very likely |
| | 5 | Unable to assess |
| 2. To what extent has the initiative actually enacted/influenced policy, systems or environmental changes? | Value | Possible Answers |
| | 1 | Not at all |
| | 2 | Minimally |
| | 3 | Somewhat |
| | 4 | To a great extent |
| | 5 | Unable to assess |
| 3. If implemented broadly, what is the potential of the Active Transportation initiative increase physical activity and (or) impact obesity? (i.e. If an AT initiative is implementing local initiatives or policies and those initiatives or policies are taken statewide.) | | |
| | 1 | No impact |
| | 2 | Low impact |
| | 3 | Moderate impact |
| | 4 | High impact |
| | 5 | Unable to assess |

B. Reach to Target Population—What percentage of the target population is “reached” or in some other way positively affected by the initiative? Note: Reach in this case should be defined in terms of the initiative achieving participation by the target population or of the target population being covered under the influence of the policy or environmental change.

- | | | |
|--|---|--------------------|
| 4. What percentage of the target population is likely to be, or actually is reached in some way by the initiative? | | |
| | 1 | Low (<25%) |
| | 2 | Moderate (25-50%) |
| | 3 | High (50-75%) |
| | 4 | Very High (>75%) |
| | 5 | Unable to assess |
| 5. What is the AT initiative’s potential for reaching populations disparately affected by obesity? (i.e. minority populations, low income populations, etc...) | | |
| | 1 | No potential |
| | 2 | Low potential |
| | 3 | Moderate potential |
| | 4 | High potential |
| | 5 | Unable to assess |

C. Acceptability to Stakeholders—The AT initiative appears to be acceptable and even attractive to pertinent collaborators, gatekeepers, and other necessary groups, such as community groups, schools, workplaces, and government agencies?

- | | | |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| 6. To what degree does the AT initiative appear acceptable to immediate stakeholders such as the community groups, schools, workplaces, and government agencies involved in implementing it? | Value | Possible Answers |
| | 1 | Unacceptable |
| | 2 | Somewhat acceptable |
| | 3 | Acceptable |
| | 4 | Highly acceptable |
| | 5 | Unable to assess |
| 7. To what degree does the initiative appear acceptable to target audience stakeholders? | | |
| | 1 | Unacceptable |
| | 2 | Somewhat acceptable |
| | 3 | Acceptable |
| | 4 | Highly acceptable |
| | 5 | Unable to assess |

D. Feasibility of Implementation—The likelihood that the AT initiative as designed can be or has been implemented fully. Note: For this question, consider the full implementation of the actual policy or environmental changes established by the AT planning group.

- | | | |
|--|-------|--|
| 8. To what extent has the initiative reached a level of consistent implementation? | Value | Possible Answers |
| | 1 | Assessing need and planning implementation of initiative |
| | 2 | Piloting implementation of initiative |
| | 3 | Maintaining implementation of initiative |
| | 4 | Maintaining implementation and conducting some evaluation/data collection to inform initiative |
| | 5 | Unable to assess |

E. Feasibility of Adoption—The potential for other similar sites/entities to adopt the initiative—particularly in multiple states/regions.

- | | | |
|---|-------|---------------------|
| 9. How easy would it be for other similar sites/entities and their partners to implement this initiative? Consider the clarity of its goals, objectives and strategies; complexity and leadership requirements; barriers to implementation; financial and other costs; and training and supervision requirements. | Value | Possible Answers |
| | 1 | Extremely difficult |
| | 2 | Somewhat difficult |
| | 3 | Somewhat easy |
| | 4 | Very easy |
| | 5 | Unable to assess |

F. Transportability/Generalizability—The degree to which the initiative has the potential to be adapted for other settings that differ in size, resources, and demographics.

- | | | |
|---|-------|------------------|
| 10. How easy would it be to adapt this initiative for other | Value | Possible Answers |
|---|-------|------------------|

populations? For example, if the strategy was designed for a Hispanic population how easy would it be to adapt it for an African American population, or if for a medium-income area, implementing for a low-income area etc.?

- 1 Very difficult
- 2 Somewhat difficult
- 3 Somewhat easy
- 4 Very easy
- 5 Unable to assess

11. How easy would it be to adapt this initiative for other settings? For example, if the strategy was designed for a small, rural jurisdiction, how easy would it be to adapt it for a large, urban area, etc.?

- | | |
|-------|--------------------|
| Value | Possible Answers |
| 1 | Very difficult |
| 2 | Somewhat difficult |
| 3 | Somewhat easy |
| 4 | Very easy |
| 5 | Unable to assess |

G. Initiative Sustainability—The likelihood that the initiative can continue over time without special resources or extraordinary leadership.

12. What is the likelihood that the initiative can continue without special resources or extraordinary leadership? (Consider the importance of funding or a program champion.)

- | | |
|-------|-------------------|
| Value | Possible Answers |
| 1 | Very unlikely |
| 2 | Somewhat unlikely |
| 3 | Somewhat likely |
| 4 | Very likely |
| 5 | Unable to assess |

H. Sustainability of Health Effect—Will the intended health effect of the initiative endure over time?

13. What is the likelihood that the health effects of this initiative are sustainable (e.g., a seasonal program effect vs. long-term effect)?

- | | |
|-------|-------------------|
| Value | Possible Answers |
| 1 | Very unlikely |
| 2 | Somewhat unlikely |
| 3 | Somewhat likely |
| 4 | Very likely |
| 5 | Unable to assess |

I. Staff/Organizational Capacity—Sponsoring organization and staff have the capacity to participate fully in a brief assessment, learn from it, and further develop the initiative. Note: For this question, consider staff’s reported capacity to organize interviews with relevant stakeholders and host a 2-day site visit, and learn from constructive assessments provided.

14. What is the capacity of the organization and staff to participate in a PRE-EVALUATION ASSESSMENT?

- | | |
|-------|------------------|
| Value | Possible Answers |
| 1 | No capacity |
| 2 | Small capacity |
| 3 | Medium capacity |
| 4 | High capacity |
| 5 | Unable to assess |

J. Overall Recommendation

15. How strongly do you recommend this initiative for a pre-evaluation assessment?

- | | |
|-------|---------------------------|
| Value | Possible Answers |
| 1 | Strongly do not recommend |
| 2 | Do not recommend |
| 3 | Recommend |
| 4 | Strongly recommend |

5 Unable to assess

K. Strengths, Weaknesses and Additional Factors for consideration

16. Include additional comments here regarding the nominee's strengths, weaknesses and any additional factors you believe should be considered when reviewing the nominee later on.