



# ASSESSMENT OF CONTENT FOR HEALTHINSITE

# ASSESSMENT OF CONTENT FOR HEALTHINSITE

## Contents:

- *Definitions / Overview / Site quality assurance process / Assessment process*
- *Assessment Checklist*
- *Summary of the Assessment Checklist*
- *Quality Process assessment*

## Accompanying document:

- *Publishing standards for HealthInsite*

## Definitions

**HealthInsite information partners** are organisations such as peak health organisations, government agencies, consumer groups, community agencies and educational and research institutions, which have entered into a deed of agreement to provide information and links for HealthInsite.

The **HealthInsite Editorial Team**, which supports the Editorial Board, is a unit of the Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing.

A **resource** is a discrete item of content for HealthInsite such as a document, image, video or multimedia item.

***Publishing Standards for HealthInsite*** is a separate document which defines required and recommended standards for quality of information, authentication, technical issues, accessibility and metadata. The selection criteria in this document are closely linked to those standards. The *Publishing Standards* are also available online at <http://www.healthinsite.gov.au/content/internal/page.cfm?ObjID=0009F5AF-096A-1D2D-81CF83032BFA006D>

**URL** is the Uniform Resource Locator used to address web resources.

## Overview

Websites which have been put forward for approval to be accessed through HealthInsite must go through the HealthInsite quality assessment process. This involves assessment by the information partner and the HealthInsite Editorial Team.

Websites are usually assessed as a whole, although sometimes only a section or specified items on a website may be submitted for assessment. Assessment does not include pages outside the site that are linked from the site being assessed.

Once a new information partner site has been approved by the HealthInsite Editorial Board, future resources which have been prepared according to the HealthInsite standards and the information partner's quality process may be added to the HealthInsite database. However the HealthInsite Editorial Team will monitor the approval of those resources.

The assessment process involves the completion of two forms: an *Assessment Checklist* covering compliance with HealthInsite publishing standards and related selection criteria, and a *Quality Process* form for providing details of the quality process used by the organisation responsible for the website being assessed. The forms may be completed and returned to the HealthInsite Editorial Team by email or on paper, or may be submitted using the online

information partner application facility on Health*Insite* at <http://www.healthinsite.gov.au/content/partner/manageassessments.cfm>.

In addition to their use in the Health*Insite* assessment process, the criteria may assist information partners in the internal review and development of their web sites.

## **HealthInsite *Publishing Standards and Assessment Checklist***

The *Assessment Checklist* is used to assess the compliance of the potential information partner's website against the Health*Insite Publishing Standards* and a range of relevant World Wide Web health information quality criteria. Each section of the checklist includes 'desirable' and, in some cases, 'required' criteria. Not all 'desirable' criteria will be relevant to all potential information partners. The 'Steps in the Assessment Process' section of this document provides more details on the level of compliance required for approval of new information partners.

The criteria in the *Checklist* cover:

- Quality of information, including clearance and review processes, qualifications of authors, accuracy, appropriateness for intended audience and documentation of sources
- Authority, authentication and disclosure
- Currency
- Document formats
- Navigation
- Aesthetics/design
- Accessibility
- Innovation

## **Quality process form**

Documentation of the quality process used in developing the information partner's website and the information available on the site must be provided to the Health*Insite* Editorial Team for approval. The 'Steps in the Assessment Process' section of this document provides more details on the process for providing this information. The *Quality Process* form may be completed by the potential information partner, or by the Health*Insite* Editorial Team using information provided by the potential partner. The information may be obtained from other documents that have previously been prepared by the organisation. When completing the *Quality Process* form or forwarding relevant documentation to the Health*Insite* Editorial Team to complete the form, information must be included about the mandatory and desirable attributes of the organisation's quality process. These include:

### **Mandatory attributes**

- Includes a policy that each resource is authored by a person or group with appropriate qualifications/experience (incl. Names or positions/ qualifications/experience)
- Includes a procedure for appropriate attribution of resources
- Includes a review process (with capacity for review prior to initial placement onto the site and at appropriate intervals to ensure currency). Needs to cite positions/qualifications/names of who reviews
- Details the final approval process (including responsibility/qualifications)
- Addresses conflict of interest
- Includes a policy on advertising
- Includes a process for consumer consultation and/or audience testing

- Includes a process to ensure maintenance of metadata for resources accessed through HealthInsite

### Desirable attributes

- Provides a basis of decisions to provide information
- Provides background information on organisation
- Provides a statement of aims/objectives of organisation/information
- Includes a process to check compliance with external standards (eg. W3C)

### Steps in the Assessment Process

#### STEP

#### DETAILS

**Step 1: Self-assessment by the potential Information Partner**



**Step 2: Assessment by the Editorial Team**



The potential Information Partner should complete the top section and partner columns of the Assessment Checklist. The form may be completed and returned to the Editorial Team by email or on paper, or may be submitted using the online information partner application facility at <http://www.healthinsite.gov.au/content/partner/managerassessments.cfm>. If the form is submitted by email or on paper, documentation about the quality process used by the organisation in developing its website content should also be sent with the form.

The HealthInsite Editorial Team will complete the 'Editorial Team' columns of the *Assessment Checklist*; a summary of the *Assessment Checklist* and the details for the Quality Process form if they have not already been completed by the potential partner. The summary of the Assessment Checklist and the Quality Process form will then be presented to the next meeting of the HealthInsite Editorial Board.

If there are significant discrepancies between the partner's and the Editorial Team's assessments these will be discussed with the potential information partner before completion of the assessment.

Overall assessment of each section of the *Assessment Checklist* is based on the criteria listed in that section. To be given a rating of 'acceptable' for a section, the website and the information on it must clearly meet any 'required' criteria listed in that section and should meet some or all of the 'desirable' criteria. To be given a rating of 'acceptable with reservations', the website and the information on it must generally meet any 'required' criteria in that section, but with some reservations. For example, there may be inconsistency or ambiguity across the resources on the site. To be given a rating of 'Not acceptable', the resources must clearly fail to meet the 'required' criteria in that section, even if some or all of the 'desirable' criteria are met.

**Step 3: Assessment by the Editorial Board**

The 'comments' section in the *Quality Process* form will be completed following discussion within the Editorial Team.

Reasons for any 'no' decisions will be documented in that section of the form.

To be approved for access through Health*Insite*, the site must achieve a rating of 'acceptable' or 'acceptable with reservations' for each criterion in the summary of the Assessment Checklist AND receive a 'yes' decision for each mandatory item in the *Quality Process* form.

**Step 4: Notification of the Board's decision to the Information Partner**

Following completion of the assessment, the information partner will be notified of the outcome by the Editorial Team. Reasons for rejection or deferral of approval will be discussed with the information partner and advice provided on appropriate upgrading or alteration of some or all of the site for possible approval at a later date.

**Step 5: Signing of the Deed of Agreement and creation of records for Health*Insite***

Following approval and agreement by the information partner to the terms of the draft Deed of Agreement, two final copies of the Deed will be signed by the department's delegate and forwarded to the Information Partner for signing. One copy of the signed Deed will be returned to the Editorial Team for filing.

The Editorial Team will confirm arrangements for the creation and maintenance of metadata with each Information Partner to ensure that the Health*Insite* database is kept up-to-date.

## ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Organisation name: \_\_\_\_\_

Site name: \_\_\_\_\_

Item/path URL: \_\_\_\_\_

Each website should be assessed as a whole. This form and the following Quality Process form may be completed and returned to the *HealthInsite* Editorial Team by email or on paper, or online at <http://www.healthinsite.gov.au/content/partner/manageassessments.cfm>.

### All criteria must be completed as follows:

- ✓ Content meets the criterion
- X Content does not meet the criterion
- ? Not known whether content meets criterion
- N/A Criterion is not relevant to the site or resource

Where criteria refer to the *Publishing Standards for HealthInsite*, assessors should refer to the specified section of the *Standards*.

## QUALITY OF INFORMATION

This section covers items related to section 2: Quality of Information of the *HealthInsite Publishing Standards*.

### Required

Partner	Editorial Team	Criterion
		Details of the quality process for the website have been provided in the attached Quality Process form.

## Desirable

The following criteria relate to international best practice features that enhance the credibility of information provided on websites. Further information on these criteria is available on the How to Assess Health Information Online page of *HealthInsite* at [http://www.healthinsite.gov.au/topics/How\\_to\\_Assess\\_Health\\_Information\\_Online](http://www.healthinsite.gov.au/topics/How_to_Assess_Health_Information_Online).

Partner	Editorial Team	Criterion
		References are included to make clear what sources were used to compile the resources and sources are appropriately attributed
		Evidence for the information contained in the resources is clearly presented
		References or links to additional resources on the topic covered by the resources or to organisations which provide resources on the topic are included
		Any controversial issues and opposing points of view are acknowledged and other appropriate options presented
		Any biases are clearly visible
		For resources covering information on treatments, the risks and benefits of each option (including no treatment or delayed treatment) are presented
		The audience for the resources is defined
		The information in the resources is presented appropriately for the intended audience
		The information in the resources meets the clearly stated aims or mission of the website
		The site subscribes to the HONcode principles of the Health On the Net Foundation
		The resources are well-written, and free of spelling, grammar and typographical errors

## AUTHORITY, AUTHENTICATION AND DISCLOSURE

This section covers items in section 3: Authentication of the *HealthInsite Publishing Standards*.

### Required

Partner	Editorial Team	Criterion
		The resources include clear publisher identification
		The resources include clear titles
		A contact point for requesting further information is included
		Copyright restrictions on material, including images, used to prepare the resources have been adhered to

## Desirable

Partner	Editorial Team	Criterion
		External links from the resources are annotated or evaluated in accordance with the site's links policy
		The credentials of the author and/or webmaster are clearly stated
		The author's/contributor's affiliation(s) is clearly stated
		The copyright owner is clearly stated in a copyright statement
		Information is provided about peer review of the resources and the quality process used for content on the site
		If the information has also been published elsewhere, details are provided
		Resources offering health advice include a suitable disclaimer notice or a link to a site disclaimer notice
		The site meets privacy legislative requirements
		The resources are published under the logo of the potential Partner Organisation
		The information in the resources has been developed by a State or Territory government, professional organisation, national voluntary or nonprofit organisation serving the public interest, peak body or academic institution with expertise in the relevant field
		The organisation's branding (eg. Trademark, logo, name) is clearly visible on each page, including on framed pages when accessed directly to the page URL
		The resources are free of advertising or differentiate clearly between advertising and information
		The resources do not endorse or imply endorsement of a particular product
		The source of funding of any advertising or sponsorship is clearly stated

## CURRENCY

This section covers items related to dating of information in section 3: Authentication of the *HealthInsite Publishing Standards*.

### Required

Partner	Editorial Team	Criterion
		The date of publication, date of last update or date of review is included for each resource.

### Desirable

Partner	Editorial Team	Criterion
		External links have been checked and updated regularly
		The information provided in the resources is still current (ie. there are no more recent editions of the information available or older items have been assessed as still being relevant)
		Any archival material is clearly labelled as such
		Dates on pages are only updated when major or significant changes are made
		Multiple dates on pages are avoided
		Programming code that automatically changes the date displayed whenever a file is changed in any way is not used
		New resources are regularly added to the site
		Out-of-date resources are regularly removed from the site

## DOCUMENT FORMATS

### Required

Partner	Editorial Team	Criterion
		The website conforms to current HTML or XHTML specifications
		Multi-page documents have top pages with full identification information, a contents list and links back from subsequent pages
		PDFs to be linked from HealthInsite have discreet HTML cover pages

### Desirable

Partner	Editorial Team	Criterion
		PDFs are used appropriately, are no longer than 1Mb and include a link to download the Adobe Acrobat reader
		Proprietary formats are avoided
		Very large text documents are split into smaller HTML documents with own authentication information, or provided as PDFs for downloading
		Individual pages, including images, are not larger than 50Kb
		Users are warned if a link is leading to a large file
		Long documents on single pages have contents blocks at the top linked to sections of the page
		Multimedia resources have HTML cover pages with appropriate metadata and descriptions

## NAVIGATION

### Desirable

<b>Partner</b>	<b>Editorial Team</b>	<b>Criterion</b>
		Resources on the site are easy to find
		The site is user-friendly with an effective interface
		Navigation through different areas of the site is consistent
		Navigational aids are used to make it easy to navigate through the site
		New information on the site is easy to find
		A search facility is available for the site
		The search facility offers searching by a variety of methods such as: free text, thesaurus terms, boolean operators, specific searchable fields, or categories
		The search engine retrieves appropriate resources based on the search entered
		There are adequate help screens where required
		The sections of the site to be accessed through HealthInsite do not require registration or payment
		Link text is underlined and in a different colour from the body text
		Image links are avoided
		Frames are not used

## AESTHETICS/DESIGN

### Desirable

Partner	Editorial Team	Criterion
		The site is well organised and logically presented
		There is a consistent style used across the whole website
		Text is readable
		Images used are attractive, assist ease of navigation, and minimise loading time
		Where any additional software is required an appropriate link is available to access the software
		Graphics are used appropriately, with alternate text where necessary, and meet copyright requirements
		Headers, font sizes and white space are used appropriately
		Animated images meet file size criteria, are used sparingly, and loop only once or twice before stopping

## ACCESSIBILITY

### Required

The following issues must be considered in assessing the accessibility aspects of the site as a whole:

Partner	Editorial Team	Criterion
		Resources meet the accessibility requirements of the World Wide Web Consortium's Web Content Accessibility Guidelines ( <a href="http://www.w3.org/tr/wai-webcontent">http://www.w3.org/tr/wai-webcontent</a> ) and the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC) Disability Discrimination Act Advisory Notes ( <a href="http://www.humanrights.gov.au/disability_rights/standards/www_3/www_3.html">http://www.humanrights.gov.au/disability_rights/standards/www_3/www_3.html</a> )
		Informative text alternatives are provided for all contextual images
		Long descriptions are provided for complex images
		Text equivalents are provided for image maps

## Desirable

Partner	Editorial Team	Criterion
		Special needs users have been considered in the design, eg. visually or hearing impaired
		Resources are accessible by users with lower level access (eg. text browsers, slower access lines)
		There is a text only option for resources on the site
		Translations of resources are provided in other languages
		The combination of text and background colours is readable

## INNOVATION

### Desirable

The following issues may be considered in assessing the ability of the site to use innovative ways of providing information and interacting with users:

Partner	Editorial Team	Criterion
		The resources provide a new way to meet the needs of the targeted audience
		The presentation of resources is distinctive from that in other similar projects, applications or services
		The method of presenting resources provides unique motivation for people to use the information infrastructure
		The site makes effective use of new technologies, such as RealAudio, VRML, multimedia video, audio and original graphics etc.
		The site makes innovative use of older technology, such as online forms, forums, etc.
		The site provides alternatives for users who cannot use the technology in use for the main site
		Where they are used, the site includes instructions for any interactive features
		The site uses Java applets appropriately
		Use of javascript is minimised and alternatives are available

**SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST (for completion by HealthInsite Editorial Team):**

**Partner name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Site name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Resource/path URL:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Rating against criteria:**

	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Acceptable with reservations</b>	<b>Not acceptable</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Quality of information</b>				
<b>Authority, Authentication and Disclosure</b>				
<b>Currency</b>				
<b>Document Formats</b>				
<b>Navigation</b>				
<b>Aesthetics and Design</b>				
<b>Accessibility</b>				
<b>Innovation</b>				

**QUALITY PROCESS (Details to be provided by potential information partner)**

Partner name: \_\_\_\_\_

Site name: \_\_\_\_\_

Resource/path URL: \_\_\_\_\_

	Details of policy/process
Includes policy that each resource is authored by a person or group with appropriate qualifications/experience (incl. Names or positions/ qualifications/experience) (MANDATORY)	
Includes procedure for appropriate attribution of resources (MANDATORY)	
Includes a review process (includes capacity for review prior to initial placement onto the site and at appropriate intervals to ensure currency) Need to cite qualifications/names of who reviews (MANDATORY)	
Details the final approval process (including responsibility/qualifications) (MANDATORY)	
Addresses conflict of interest (MANDATORY)	
Includes policy on advertising (MANDATORY)	
Includes a process for consumer consultation and/or audience testing (MANDATORY)	
Includes a process to ensure maintenance of metadata for resources accessed through HealthInsite (MANDATORY)	
Provides basis of decisions to provide information (DESIRABLE)	
Provides background information on organisation (DESIRABLE)	
Provides statement of aims/objectives of organisation/information (DESIRABLE)	

<b>Includes a process to check compliance with other standards (eg. internal, W3C) (DESIRABLE)</b>	
--	--

**Comments:**

--