

## **Campaigns – Categories 1 through 12**

### **Research (15 Points)**

#### **0 to 5 – Poor**

Little or no attempt at research is made and/or no research is documented in entry.

Examples:

- “Due to the tight timeline and limited budget, we were not able to conduct research prior to starting the project.”

#### **6 to 9 – Fair**

An attempt at research has been made, but the research lacks statistical validity and other characteristics that show it is a true and accurate representation of the population/issue in question.

Examples:

- Generic statements without citation (e.g. “studies have shown that...”)
- Gathering of anecdotal evidence from internal stakeholders.
- Cursory review and/or vague reference to previous news coverage of an issue.

#### **10 to 12 – Good**

Research includes primary or secondary research that is specifically cited, included in the supporting documentation, and on point with the issue at hand, but lacks one or more characteristics of ideal research methodology.

Example:

- Survey done by a national trade association about the industry or general issue being addressed by the campaign, but not directly related to the specific task at hand (e.g. national trade association does a survey that says 60 percent of Americans support an idea, but your task is to address the issue in Kansas City, and the national survey does not provide specific data about attitudes of KC residents).
- Focus groups that lack the diversity to be considered representative.
- Analysis of previous news coverage or public discourse of the issue, but not in the form of a formal content analysis.
- Content analysis provided by automated programs that attempt to discern the tone/intent of social media and/or traditional media through keyword searching.
- Primary survey research that relies on nonprobability sampling methods (e.g. convenience sampling).

#### **13 to 15 – Excellent**

Primary research generated specifically for the organization or secondary research analyzed and evaluated related to the issue, that follows sound research methodologies and will directly inform the development of a strategic plan and serve as a benchmark for measuring outcomes.

Examples:

- Statistically valid surveys (either primary or secondary) using probability sampling methods with a data set that covers all key aspects of the issue that the communications campaign is intended to address.
- Multiple focus groups targeting key demographics with randomly selected participants that are led by professional facilitators.
- Content analysis (coded by humans, not computers) that analyzes the theme, tone, posture, or other similar elements of news reports, social media conversations, open-ended survey feedback, etc.

# 2012 PRISM Awards Scoring Rubric



## Planning (25 Points)

### 0 to 10 points – Poor

Little or no attempt to plan.

### 11 to 16 points – Fair

Some sort of a plan has been made, but it lacks strategic thinking and/or key elements of a sound plan (audiences, goals, objectives, research, strategies, tactics, and metrics).

### 17 to 22 points – Good

The plan includes all of the basic elements of a sound plan (audiences, goals, objectives, research, strategies, tactics, and metrics), but those elements are not presented in their ideal forms.

Examples:

- Overly broad or poorly defined key audiences.
- Objectives that are unclear or difficult to measure.
- A disconnect between strategies and audiences.

### 23 to 25 points – Excellent

The plan includes all of the basic elements of a sound plan (audiences, goals, objectives, research, strategies, tactics, and metrics), and each element is complete and representative of PRSA best practices.

Examples:

- Elements that show a clear connection to the research
- Clearly defined target audiences
- Strategies that demonstrate clear focus and understanding of target audiences.
- Objectives that follow the “how much, of what, from whom, by when” template, and demonstrate a clear connection to outcomes for the organization.

## Implementation (40 Points)

**Note to Judges:** The implementation section gives judges broad discretion to determine what is poor, fair, good, and excellent. Generally, we ask that you keep the context of the assignment and goals/needs of the entrant organization in mind when evaluating the program.

A program that uses time-tested, unglamorous methodologies should not be penalized if it is strategic and effective in achieving the well-stated goals. Conversely, a program that is clever and creative should not be rewarded if it lacks the substance, strategy or results to back it up.

Similarly, keep scale in mind when evaluating programs. For some programs, millions of minds might have to be changed for it to be effective, while in others, changing only one or two minds might be all that is required to have a huge impact.

Judges should look for the following information to be addressed by entrants:

- What key messages did they convey, and why?
- What, if any, challenges did they overcome?
- What were the project’s timetable and budget. Were the budget and timetable met?
- Were there any extraordinary/unexpected circumstances that had to be addressed?

Lastly, judges should consider the degree of completeness of implementation when compared to the communication plan.

### 0 to 20 points – Poor

Implementation is incomplete, is of poor quality, is not documented in the entry, and/or does not correlate back to the strategic communication plan.

# 2012 PRISM Awards Scoring Rubric



## **21 to 30 points – Fair**

Program shows signs of implementation, but there are notable gaps between the plan and what was implemented. Program elements are adequate, but not overly impressive.

## **31 to 35 points – Good**

Program is of generally good quality and most elements have been implemented as prescribed in the plan.

## **36 to 40 points – Excellent**

Program shows a high level of professionalism, quality and coordination in its execution. Execution is complete and consistent with the actions prescribed in the communication plan.

## **Evaluation (20 Points)**

### **0 to 6 points – Poor**

Little or no attempt at evaluation that relates to the well-stated objectives.

### **7 to 11 points – Fair**

Measurement is based on output objectives or includes items of limited quantifiable impact.

Examples:

- Number of flyers distributed
- Number of news releases distributed
- Anecdotes
- “Kudos” emails

### **12 to 17 – Good**

The program is measured by outcomes, but those outcomes do not have a clear correlation to positive changes in organization outcomes. The program has completed most of the elements in described in the communication plan and has generally adhered to its timeline and budget.

Examples:

- Impressions/AVEs
- Email open rates
- Website hits

### **18 to 20 – Excellent**

The program shows exceptional measurement the ties back to well-stated objectives identified in the communications plan and follows the measurement standards set forth in the Barcelona Principles. In addition, the program has completed all elements outlined in the communication plan on time and on budget.

Examples:

- Statistically valid pre/post surveys showing change in awareness.
- Increases in sales that can be clearly and credibly attributed to the campaign.
- Favorable outcome of an election, legislative vote, etc.
- Measurable change in the behavior of a target audience that can be clearly and credibly attributed to the campaign (i.e. fewer calls to customer service, increased enrollment in program, fewer returned items, etc.).

For more information on valid metrics based on the Barcelona Principles, consult this PDF:

<http://www.prsa.org/intelligence/businesscase/documents/amec/20110607validmetricsforpmeasurement.pdf>

## **Tactics – Categories 13 through 30**

### **Research & Planning (15 Points)**

**Note to Judges:** The tactical categories contain a wide range of common communication tools. Unlike the campaign categories, the amount of research and planning required to effectively deploy a particular tactic may vary.

For example, most of us don't conduct a focus group and write a whole communication plan before drafting a routine news release. However, if we were creating a new magazine or conducting a significant overhaul of an existing magazine, thorough research and a detailed implementation plan probably are important parts of the development process.

Given the diversity of communication tools represented in categories 13 through 30, we ask that you use your best professional judgment to determine an appropriate level of research and planning for each entry, and judge it based on how it compares to that standard.

#### **0 to 5 Points – Poor**

Little or no attempt to research or plan is made and/or no research or plan is documented in entry.

#### **6 to 9 Points – Fair**

There is evidence of research and planning, but the effort is cursory, not well documented, and/or insufficient to be of much strategic benefit.

#### **10 to 12 Points – Good**

Research has been conducted/compiled and plan developed, but gaps in the quality or research or thoroughness of the plan preclude it from being considered excellent.

#### **13 to 15 Points – Excellent**

Research is appropriately thorough (relative to the scope of the project) and plan contains all required elements.

### **Implementation (25 Points)**

**Note to Judges:** The implementation section gives judges broad discretion to determine what is poor, fair, good, and excellent. Generally, we ask that you keep the context of the assignment and goals/needs of the entrant organization in mind when evaluating the program.

A program that uses time-tested, unglamorous methodologies should not be penalized if it is strategic and effective in achieving the well-stated goals. Conversely, a program that is clever and creative should not be rewarded if it lacks the substance or results to back it up.

Similarly, keep scale in mind when evaluating tactics or projects. For some projects, millions of minds might have to be changed for it to be effective, while in others, changing only one or two minds might be all that is required to have a huge impact.

Judges should look for the following information to be addressed by entrants:

- What key messages did they convey, and why?
- What, if any, challenges did they overcome?
- What were the project's timetable and budget. Were the budget and timetable met?
- Were there any extraordinary/unexpected circumstances that had to be addressed?

Lastly, judges should consider the degree of completeness of implementation when compared to the communication plan.

# 2012 PRISM Awards Scoring Rubric



## **0 to 10 Points – Poor**

Implementation is incomplete, is of poor quality, is not documented in the entry, and/or does not correlate back to the strategic communication plan.

## **11 to 17 Points – Fair**

Project shows signs of implementation, but there are notable gaps between the plan and what was implemented. Program elements are adequate, but not overly impressive.

## **18 to 21 Points – Good**

Project is of generally good quality and most elements have been implemented as prescribed in the plan.

## **22 to 25 Points – Excellent**

Project shows a high level of professionalism, quality and coordination in its execution. Execution is complete and consistent with the actions prescribed in the plan.

## **Evaluation (10 Points)**

### **0 to 4 Points – Poor**

Little or no attempt at evaluation that relates to the well-stated objectives.

### **5 to 6 Points – Fair**

Measurement is based on output objectives or includes items of limited quantifiable impact.

Examples:

- Number of flyers distributed
- Number of news releases distributed
- Anecdotes
- “Kudos” emails

### **7 to 8 Points – Good**

The program is measured by outcomes, but those outcomes do not have a clear correlation to positive changes in organization outcomes. The project has completed most of the elements in described in the communication plan and has generally adhered to its timeline and budget.

Examples:

- Impressions/AVEs
- Email open rates
- Website hits

### **9 to 10 Points – Excellent**

The program shows exceptional measurement the ties back to well-stated objectives identified in the communications plan and follows the measurement standards set forth in the Barcelona Principles. In addition, the project has completed all elements outlined in the communication plan on time and on budget.

Examples:

- Statistically valid pre/post surveys showing change in awareness.
- Increases in sales that can be clearly and credibly attributed to the campaign.
- Favorable outcome of an election, legislative vote, etc.
- Measurable change in the behavior of a target audience that can be clearly and credibly attributed to the campaign (i.e. fewer calls to customer service, increased enrollment in program, fewer returned items, etc.).

For more information on valid metrics based on the Barcelona Principles, consult this PDF:

<http://www.prsa.org/intelligence/businesscase/documents/amec/20110607validmetricsforprmeasurement.pdf>