

# Evaluation Report - Xinjiekou Sub District

## Appraisal

Overall the report was easy to read, concise and provided key information in a well laid out manner. The community should be commended on the attention given to the necessary details. The balance of programming appears to be comprehensive, insightful and has reached a large portion of the community. The report demonstrates a continued striving to improve the safety for all members of the community. However, there are a few areas in the report which do require further clarification.

What is still missing from the report is what the community considers to be their “state of the art” program within the safe community? What would you like to have showcased to the rest of the world as being your best practice? Also there is a need to highlight some areas in which the community feels that more could be done to strengthen practice at the local level. What in the community’s view is something that could be improved? What have the community members themselves say about what they feel could be improved within the ongoing activities?

One of the items which did stand out as being an area for improvement concerned the use of the word “accident” in several areas of the document. In safety promotion work, we try to avoid the use of the word accident. The word implies that an event was unavoidable. We now know that the vast majority of events that result in injury have predictable precursors which can be studied, mitigated and made for the benefit of those who may happen to find themselves within similar circumstances. Instead we aim to use the phrase “injury prevention” as opposed to “accident prevention”. Kindly consider to modify this in a revised version of the report.

## Indicator 1

This section of the report is well done. Who are the persons responsible for the overall project? Please mention them by name. Has it been the same person(s) since the beginning of your safe community program? Is this position a rotating one (by election)? If so how often are the elections? The main reason for this question concerns the procedural continuity and sustainability of the administrative office.

The community has created a active coalition consisting of a balanced cross-sectoral group. Several issues of concern for the community have been identified by way of ongoing surveillance activities. The political vision and ambition for the community has been well-described.

In section 2.5 the community mentions that there are some limitations concerning the scope of the work due to the leading agency. What then might be some strategies that the community has employed (or has a desire to employ) in order to deal with the interruptions?

### **Indicator 2**

Well described. There are several initiatives on the subject of violence prevention violence prevention, however there is no data in the report concerning the rates of violence within the community. Does the community have any data about suicide rates in the community? Is there any data on domestic violence? Do you have any data about family abuse in your community (i.e. gender based violence/domestic violence/family violence, senior violence, child abuse)?

### **Indicator 3**

Well described.

### **Indicator 4 and 5**

There are a number of surveillance activities taking place. There are three types of evidence you need in order to inform effective safe community interventions. These are programs informed by local surveillance data (which you have). However, this is so important it has its own indicator (Indicator 5). For indicator 4 there are two other types of evidence you need to address these are: evidence-based practice - evidence provided from the scientific literature or obtained from academic colleagues and practice based evidence - what you have learned from other communities.

There are a number of local universities involved in your program. Can you give me an instance where they have helped you design or evaluate an intervention?

### **Indicator 6**

This section could use additional clarification. How are you using the results for continuous improvements? What would you change? What is not working well? Do community members have a way of reporting problems that they see in the community?

### **Indicator 7**

Well described.

This community evaluation is being done by **Michael L. Wilson** as Certifier in collaboration with **Shrikant Bangdiwalla** as Certifier. It is based on the report provided by **Xinjiekou SubDistrict**. There are no conflicts of interest to declare.