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Applying the Rubric

The Public Impact Fundamentals - Legitimacy, Policy and Action - are underpinned by a rubric that allows users to quickly assess their performance against each of the nine elements. The purpose of the rubric is to provide practitioners with a way of understanding what each element entails and identify areas where they are performing well or could improve. We have used this rubric to assess all of our case studies on our Public Impact Observatory and have found that stronger performance on each of the elements contributes to a higher chance of achieving the initiative’s objectives.

Each element of the Fundamentals can be rated from weak to strong. When attempting to evaluate a policy against the rubric, it is helpful to first identify a precise initiative or programme as this will help answer ensuing questions.

It is worth noting that the concepts below are subjective and creating a scale that will ensure universal agreement on appropriate scores is a difficult task. We did not set out to create an objective criteria that provides an inflexible way to conclusively measure performance on each element. Instead, what the rubric provides is a vocabulary that allows for a structured basis to discuss an initiative, providing some guidance on how to evaluate its performance.

What follows is a description of each of the grades for each element. Use the example sources listed underneath the rubric to help you identify where your initiative falls.
**Policy**

**Clear objectives**

- **Weak**: No objectives stated
- **Fair**: Objectives stated at outset but weakened over time
- **Good**: Objectives stated at outset and clarified over time
- **Strong**: Objectives defined at the outset and maintained throughout

The type of sources one would typically require to evaluate this element are:

- Organisation publications
- Initiative blueprint
- Initiative implementation plan
- Articles/Case studies/Reports on initiative

**Strength of evidence**

- **Weak**: No evidence or clear evidence to the contrary
- **Fair**: Mixed evidence for approach
- **Good**: Broadly positive evidence in favour of approach
- **Strong**: Strong evidence in favour of approach (e.g. multiple studies, pilots)

The type of sources used to evaluate this element are:

- Organisation publications
- Initiative blueprint
- Initiative implementation plan
- Articles/Case studies/Reports on initiative

**Feasibility**

- **Weak**: Significant doubts over feasibility of initiative/major implementation challenges likely
- **Fair**: Some doubts over feasibility of initiative/some implementation challenges likely
- **Good**: Initiative considered to be feasible with a few manageable implementation challenges
- **Strong**: Initiative considered to be highly feasible with no real implementation challenges

The type of sources required to evaluate this element are:

- Organisation publications
- Initiative blueprint
- Initiative implementation plan
- Articles/Case studies/Reports on initiative
**Legitimacy**

### Political commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important political actors are actively opposed</td>
<td>Tentative support from some political actors</td>
<td>Solid support from majority of political actors</td>
<td>Strong support across the political spectrum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The type of sources used to evaluate this element are:

- Speeches from politicians
- Party manifestos
- Newspaper opinion pieces from political actors

### Stakeholder engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority of stakeholders are opposed</td>
<td>Tentative support from some stakeholders</td>
<td>Solid support from majority of stakeholders</td>
<td>Very strong support for almost all stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The type of sources one would typically require to evaluate this element are:

- Organisation publications (Such as an NGO agenda)
- Agency manifestos
- Initiative funding sources
- Opinion polls
- Surveys

### Public confidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant public distrust in the institutions involved</td>
<td>Public neither strongly trust nor distrust institutions involved</td>
<td>Public broadly trust the institutions involved</td>
<td>Strong public trust in the institutions involved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The type of sources required to evaluate this element are:

- Elections
- Opinion polls
- Surveys
Action

Measurement

The type of sources required to evaluate this element are:

- **Weak**: No metrics identified
- **Fair**: Metrics identified at outset but not tracked over time and/or incomplete
- **Good**: Comprehensive metrics identified at outset and tracked over time but not used to significantly influence approach
- **Strong**: Comprehensive metrics identified at outset and tracked over time with results used to assess progress and refine approach

Alignment

The type of sources required to evaluate this element are:

- **Weak**: No alignment of interests between the actors required to make change happen
- **Fair**: Partial alignment of interests between the actors required to make change happen
- **Good**: Good alignment of interests between the actors required to make change happen
- **Strong**: Strong alignment of interests between the actors required to make change happen

Management

The type of sources one would typically require to evaluate this element are:

- **Weak**: No mechanisms in place to ensure progress is made
- **Fair**: Some mechanisms in place to ensure progress is made but with significant weaknesses
- **Good**: Good mechanisms in place to ensure progress is made with only minor weaknesses
- **Strong**: Strong mechanisms in place to ensure progress is made
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