General Judging Rubric

	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Exceptional
Use of systems thinking in conceptualization **(25%)**	Does not use systems thinking or recognize interactions between health system "building blocks". Conceptual framework / methodological approach is absent or unclear. **(1)**	Uses some systems thinking and tools; does not directly recognize interactions between health system "building blocks". Conceptual framework / methodological approach is absent may have major logical fallacies. **(2)**	Uses systems thinking and tools; recognizes one or two obvious interactions between health system "building blocks". Conceptual framework / methodological approach is present but may be incomplete or have minor logical fallacies. **(3)**	Clearly uses systems thinking and tools and recognizes interactions between health system "building blocks". Conceptual framework / methodological approach is present and logical, but may not be thorough **(4)**	Thoroughly uses systems thinking and tools to recognize and explain several distinct interactions between health system "building blocks"; conceptual framework / methodological approach is clear, thorough, and logical **(5)**
Intentional and systematic in implementation **(15%)**	No conceptual framework is present, or activity does not adhere to the conceptual framework / methodological approach described. **(1)**	Little evidence of program implemented according to the conceptual framework / methodological approach described. Methods may be applied incorrectly. **(2)**	The activity clearly links to the conceptual framework / methodological approach described, but in an incomplete or ad hoc way. **(3)**	The activity clearly links to the conceptual framework / methodological approach described, attempting to address all aspects of the framework / approach. Some aspects of the approach may be unsuccessfully or incompletely applied. **(4)**	The activity clearly links to the conceptual framework / methodological approach, completely and successfully implementing all aspects. **(5)**

Clearly demonstrates the achievement of health system outcomes linked to the activity **(25%)**	Health system outcomes (depending on question – sustainability and scale; effective monitoring and evaluation; or whole-of-society participation and leadership in developing locally-led solutions) are not achieved **(1)**	Health system outcomes (depending on question – sustainability and scale; effective monitoring and evaluation; or whole-of-society participation and leadership in developing locally-led solutions) are achieved but no clear link is made to the activity. May over-reach on major conclusions. **(2)**	Health system outcomes (depending on question – sustainability and scale; effective monitoring and evaluation; or whole-of-society participation and leadership in developing locally-led solutions) are achieved and linked to the activity, but connection is weak **(3)**	Health system outcomes (depending on question – sustainability and scale; effective monitoring and evaluation; or whole-of-society participation and leadership in developing locally-led solutions) are achieved and clearly linked to the activity **(4)**	Clearly and with supporting evidence demonstrates that health system outcomes (sustainability and scale; effective monitoring and evaluation; or whole-of-society participation and leadership in developing locally led solutions) are achieved and connection to the activity is thoroughly explained **(5)**
Location of leadership **(15%)**	Project is led entirely from another country **(1)**	Project leadership has some local help, but is mostly led from outside of the country **(2)**	Project leadership is equally split between local and international levels **(3)**	Project leadership is mostly local, but has some international level involvement **(4)**	Project is entirely led from a local level **(5)**
Adaptability **(10%)**	Lessons from activity are only applicable to a very specific context and no effort is made to discuss these limitations. **(1)**	Lessons from this activity may be applicable to broader context, but no effort has been made to explore the contexts and learning/analysis of this experience to inform other activities **(2)**	Lessons from this activity are applicable to some other contexts and some efforts have been made to explore the impact of context and learning/analysis of this experience to inform other activities **(3)**	Lessons from this activity are clearly applicable to many contexts, efforts have been made to explore the impact of context and document learnings from this experience to inform others, but there has been little or no uptake by others so far. **(4)**	Lessons from this activity are clearly applicable to many other contexts, the impact of context s thoroughly explored, and efforts have been made to document learnings from this experience to inform others, and there are already clear examples

					of it being taken up by others **(5)**
Expression of themes and ideas **(10%)**	Case study does not exhibit any clear lessons, themes, or insights **(1)**	Case study mentions a few key lessons, themes, or insights, but does not explore them in any depth or they may be illogical **(2)**	Case study adequately explores a few key lessons, themes or insights, but may not express them very clearly or may be missing some key analyses. **(3)**	Case study thoroughly explores several key lessons, themes or insights that are logical, but may be missing some points. The case study may use some data visualizations, tables, or graphics to aid comprehension **(4)**	Lessons, themes or insights are thoroughly addressed and explained. The reader can follow the case study's logic, even if it is not expressed in strong prose (allow some room for non-native English/French speakers or practitioners who are not strong writers); Presentation is strong and effective, using data visualizations, tables, or graphics to aid comprehension. **(5)**
Comments:					Total: