

Life Course Screening Criteria

Question number	Criterion	Description for criterion	Scaling/scoring
Life Course 1	<p>Implications for equity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the indicator reflect or have implications for equity? 	<p>This screening criterion will determine how well the indicator reflects and has implications for equity-related measures such as social, psychosocial, and environmental conditions, poverty, disparities, and racism. Examples of social conditions include parental and individual education, occupation, income, and socioeconomic status, and food security. Examples of psychosocial measures include depression, hopelessness, and hostility. Examples of environmental conditions include environmental toxins, public services and stores, investments in recreational spaces, urbanization, and housing conditions.</p>	<p>1= no reflection or implications for equity 2= little reflection or implications for equity 3= inconsistent reflection or implications for equity 4= moderate reflection or implications for equity 5= great reflection or implications for equity</p>
Life Course 2	<p>Public health impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the potential impact of intervening or not intervening on this indicator? 	<p>This screening criterion assesses the public health impact of a positive (increase or decrease depending on the indicator) change in the indicator due to program or policy interventions. For example, if the indicator is the number of people living in poverty, is there is a positive change (decrease in number of people living in poverty) will there be a large public health impact? Or, if the indicator is the percentage of adults who respond that they 'always or usually get the social and emotional support they need', if there is a positive change (increase in the number of adults responding that they 'always or usually get the social and emotional support they need') will there be a large public health impact?</p>	<p>1= no impact 2= little impact 3= inconsistent impact 4= moderate impact 5= large impact</p>
Life Course 3	<p>Leverage or realign resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the indicator have the potential to leverage or realign resources such as funding, policy, programs across multiple sectors? 	<p>Based on the life course approach, health and illness are influenced by multiple interacting factors from many different contexts such as social, psychosocial, and environmental conditions. Therefore, the indicator will assess how well it is reflective of programs, services, and policies that expand beyond the traditional MCH focus. For example, what new, non-traditional partnerships are reflected in the indicator, such as urban planners, justice system stakeholders, representatives of transportation, and housing as well as private business partners?</p>	<p>1= no potential 2= little potential 3= inconsistent potential 4= moderate potential 5= great potential</p>

<p>Life Course 4</p>	<p>Predict an individual's health and wellness and/or that of their offspring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the indicator predict an individual's health and wellness and/or that of their offspring? 	<p>This screening criterion measures how well the indicator reflects the time and trajectory components of the life course theory with an emphasis on indicators that address critical and transitional periods throughout life. It also emphasizes the impact of the mother-child dyad, the father, the family and extends forward in time to the individual's children. To receive the highest score, the indicator should be an adequate predictor of the individual's health and wellness and of their offspring.</p>	<p>1= no potential to predict 2= little potential to predict 3= inconsistent potential to predict 4= moderate potential to predict 5= great potential to predict</p>
<p>Life Course 5</p>	<p>Connection to life course consistent with current science</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what degree is the indicator's connection to life course consistent with current science? 	<p>This screening criterion measures how well the indicator is connected to our current, scientific understanding of life course health.</p>	<p>1= no connection 2= little connection 3= inconsistent connection 4= moderate connection 5= great connection</p>
<p>Data 1</p>	<p>Data availability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what degree is the data for this indicator available in each of the public health agencies in the 50 states and the District of Columbia? 	<p>This criterion assesses the availability of the data to calculate the indicator in each of the public health agencies in 50 states and the District of Columbia. This includes: 1) whether the data set(s) is(are) available, 2) whether the data set requires data linkage for calculation and the ready availability of the linked data, 3) whether MCH program can readily get access to the data, and 4) whether the data required is a mandatory module for inclusion or an optional module in the data set. Extra weight should be given to indicators that are also available in local jurisdictions.</p>	<p>Data are available for: 1= no one 2= less than ½ of agencies 3=around ½ of agencies 4= more than ½ but not all agencies 5= all agencies</p>
<p>Data 2</p>	<p>Data quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what degree is quality data available for measuring the indicator? 	<p>This criterion assesses all dimensions of the data quality in the 51 jurisdictions including the indicator's sensitivity, specificity, predictive value positive, and reliability. This also includes the consistency of the data quality and reporting across these.</p>	<p>Overall data quality is: 1= poor 2= fair 3= moderately good 4= good 5= excellent</p>
<p>Data 3</p>	<p>Simplicity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what degree is the indicator simple to calculate and explain to professionals and the public? 	<p>This criterion refers to the level of complexity in calculating and explaining the indicator. This includes the statistical formula, number of data elements, data weighting, data indexing, and data adjustment. This also includes the ease of ability to explain the meaning and the use of the indicator to professionals and the public. The need for simplicity must be maintained in balance with meaningfulness and usefulness as measure by other criteria.</p>	<p>1= complex to calculate and explain 2= fairly complex to calculate and explain 3= simple to calculate, complex to explain 4= moderately simple to calculate and explain 5= simple to calculate and easy to explain</p>

September 12, 2012

AMCHP Life Course Metrics Project