

**RETURN RESPONSES TO:  
RETOURNER LES RÉPONSES À :**

See instructions in Section 5

Attention: **Rachel Hull**  
 Email | courriel: [rachel.hull@canada.ca](mailto:rachel.hull@canada.ca)

**Request For Information  
Demande de renseignement**

Comments – Commentaires:

Instructions: See Herein  
 Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Issuing Office – Bureau de distribution

Public Safety Canada  
 Contracting and Procurement Section  
 269 Laurier Avenue West  
 Ottawa ON K1A 0P8

Sécurité publique Canada  
 Section des contrats et approvisionnement  
 269, avenue Laurier ouest  
 Ottawa (ON) K1A 0P8

<b>Title – Sujet</b> Acceptance and Commitment Therapy	
<b>Solicitation No. – No de l’invitation</b> 20180ACT	<b>Date</b> 2017-12-18
<b>Solicitation Closes – L’invitation prend fin</b> At – à     4:00 p.m. On – le    2018-01-19	<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b>  Eastern Standard Time (EST)
<b>Delivery Required – Livraison exigée</b> See Herein	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Rachel Hull	
<b>Telephone No. – No de telephone</b> (613) 949-1048	<b>FAX No. – No de FAX</b> (613) 954-1871
<b>Destination – of Goods, Services and Construction:</b> <b>Destination – des biens, services et construction:</b>  Public Safety Canada 269 Laurier Avenue West, Ottawa ON K1A 0P8	
<b>Security – Sécurité</b>  There is no security requirement associated with this requirement.	

<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l’entrepreneur</b>	
_____	
_____	
_____	
<b>Telephone No. – No de telephone:</b> _____	
<b>Facsimile No. – No de télécopieur :</b> _____	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> <b>(type or print)</b>	
<b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom due fournisseur/</b> <b>de l’entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d’imprimerie)</b>	
_____	_____
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>



## 1. **OBJECTIVE**

Public Safety Canada (PS) is requesting Industry feedback to assist in defining the requirement for a potentially upcoming Request for Proposal (RFP).

The objectives of this RFI are to:

- a. Inform potential suppliers of the requirements of this procurement;
- b. Collect information on the level of interest and capability from suppliers regarding the requirements as published in this RFI;
- c. Seek Industry feedback on Annex A – Statement of Work;
- d. Seek Industry feedback on Annex B – Evaluation Criteria
- e. Seek Industry interest to participate in Industry Engagement activities such as one-on-one meetings or Industry Information Sessions; and
- f. Obtain answers to the questions from Industry as provided in this document.

This RFI is neither a call for tender nor a Bid Solicitation. No agreement or contract will be entered into based on this RFI. The issuance of this RFI is not to be considered in any way a commitment by Public Safety Canada or as authority to potential respondents to undertake any work that could be charged to Canada. This RFI is not to be considered as a commitment to issue a subsequent solicitation or award any contract(s) for the work described herein.

Although the information collected may be provided as commercial-in-confidence (and, if identified as such, will be treated accordingly), Public Safety may use the information to assist in drafting performance specifications (which are subject to change) and for budgetary purposes.

Respondents are encouraged to identify, in the information they share with Canada, any information that they feel is proprietary, third party or personal information. Please note that Canada may be obligated by law (e.g. in response to a request under the Access of Information and Privacy Act) to disclose proprietary or commercially-sensitive information concerning a respondent (for more information: <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/a-1/>).

Participation in this RFI is encouraged, but is not mandatory. There will be no short-listing of potential suppliers for the purposes of undertaking any future work as a result of this RFI. Similarly, participation in this RFI is not a condition or prerequisite for the participation in any potential subsequent solicitation.

Respondents will not be reimbursed for any cost incurred by participating in this RFI.

## 2. **ENQUIRIES**

Any questions from respondents concerning this RFI must be made in writing to the Contracting Authority stated below, via e-mail on or before the closing date.

## 3. **LANGUAGE OF RESPONSE**

Responses may be in English or French, at the preference of the respondent.



#### **4. LEGISLATION, TRADE AGREEMENTS, AND GOVERNMENT POLICIES**

The following is indicative of some of the trade agreements that could impact or be applicable to any follow-on solicitation(s):

- the World Trade Organization Agreement on Government Procurement (WTO-AGP)
- the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)
- the Canada-European Union Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA)
- the Canadian Free Trade Agreement (CFTA)

#### **5. SUBMISSION OF RESPONSES**

The RFI closing date published herein is not the deadline for comments or input. Comments and input will be accepted any time up to the time when/if a follow-on solicitation is published.

Respondents are requested submit their response by email only to:

Rachel Hull  
Senior Acquisition Advisor  
Public Safety Canada  
269 Laurier Avenue West  
Ottawa ON K1A 0P8

Tel: 613-949-1048

Email: [ps.contractunit-unitedecontrats.sp@canada.ca](mailto:ps.contractunit-unitedecontrats.sp@canada.ca)

Respondents should include their name, address and this RFI solicitation number.

Respondents are requested to send their written comments in by 4:00 PM Eastern Standard Time (EST) on December 29, 2017.

#### **6. INDUSTRY ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES**

As part of this RFI process, Public Safety Canada may offer to respondents an opportunity to explain and express their comment(s) on this RFI or any of the attached documents. Should the interest arise from Industry, Public Safety Canada may hold Industry Engagement Activities such as one-on-one meetings or information sessions at one of Public Safety Canada's offices or by teleconference. The specific nature of any activity, including dates and times, will be communicated directly to respondents.

#### **7. QUESTIONS FOR INDUSTRY**

Canada is seeking Industry input to assist in defining the requirement for a potentially upcoming Request for Proposal (RFP) and to gain information the following topics and the level of interest of potential suppliers to undertake this type of work. Respondents are invited to provide a response to the following questions:

- a) To the best of your knowledge and in your opinion, how common is Acceptance and Commitment Therapy in Canada?
- b) As per the Statement of Work in Annex A, do you see any issues with recruiting a sufficiently large sample size for a meaningful evaluation in either Phase 1 or Phase 2 or both? If you do anticipate that there may be issues, what do you propose as an alternative solution?



- c) Do you have any suggestions of how the feasibility of the work could be improved upon? If you do, what would you propose?
- d) Do you have any other comments and/or concerns with any aspect of the Statement of Work that would make this requirement too restrictive and/or unrealistic? If so, what alternative solutions do you propose and that would address your concern(s)?
- e) Do you have any comments with respect to the suitability of ACT as a crime prevention program for youth at risk of criminal activity?
- f) Is it possible to mainly work with individuals with crime related risk factors given that we are working towards determining if ACT is a suitable crime prevention program for youth at risk of criminal activity?
- g) Is the timeline feasible? If not, what are your suggestions on modifying the timeline?
- h) Approximately what level of effort do you anticipate would be required for each phase of the work? How did you arrive at this estimation?
- i) Given that nature of the work, it would be necessary that any evaluator be separate from the program administrators where the ACT is being evaluated. Do you believe this would propose a problem for those already using ACT in their practice/programming?
- j) Do you have any comments or concerns on the proposed evaluation criteria? If yes, what are your concerns and what are your proposed solutions for addressing these?
- k) Do you have any additional comments and/or concerns? If so, what would address your concern(s)?
- l) In your opinion, what is a reasonable amount of time for to respond to a Request for Proposal of this scope?



## Annex A – Proposed Statement of Work

### 1. CONTEXT

The Government of Canada is committed to reducing crime and enhancing the safety of our communities through effective prevention, policing, and corrections. With respect to prevention, Public Safety Canada is responsible for the administration of the National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS). The Strategy aims to reduce offending among at-risk groups of the population by funding evidence-based interventions and knowledge dissemination projects. Its current priorities are to address early risk factors among children, youth, and young adults that are at risk of offending, respond to priority crime issues (youth gangs, drug-related crimes), facilitate exit from prostitution, prevent recidivism among high-risk groups, and foster prevention in Aboriginal communities.

In this context, the Crime Prevention (CP) Research Unit, within Public Safety Canada, aims to provide national leadership on effective and cost-efficient ways to prevent and to reduce crime by addressing risk factors in high-risk populations and places. Focusing on effective ways to prevent and reduce crime, the CP research unit continues to gather and collate both national and international evidence on “what works”, in order to help guide policy and program decisions. This information contributes to the overall body of scientific knowledge in the crime prevention domain. In support of these efforts, the work described below will focus on generating new Canadian knowledge on the effectiveness of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT) for mitigating risk factors and reducing recidivism among high-risk juveniles and/or young adults.

### 2. BACKGROUND

Part of the mandate of the Crime Prevention Research Unit at Public Safety Canada is to fund research that aims to build knowledge regarding the prevention of youth offending and to build evidence around the types of programming that works to reduce criminogenic risk factors and increase resilience. One of the mainstays in programming for high-risk youth and young adults has been cognitive-behavioural therapy (CBT). However, other interventions are also showing evidence of being effective in building resilience and reducing risk factors. For example, Acceptance & Commitment Therapy (ACT) has been compared to CBT (Hayes, n.d.1)

Acceptance & Commitment Therapy (ACT) is a model/psychological intervention based on modern behavioural psychology, relational frame theory, acceptance, mindfulness processes, commitment and behaviour change processes towards the development of greater psychological flexibility (Luoma, Hayes, & Walser, 2007). In ACT, the source of human suffering is psychological inflexibility (e.g., attempts to control unwanted thoughts and feelings instead of living a life based on personal values) (Hayes, 2004). Clinical work in ACT focuses on the development of a meaningful life while accepting inner experiences as they appear (Hayes et al., 2012).

ACT uses six core principles to help clients develop psychological flexibility (Hayes et al., 2006). Each principle has its own specific methodology, exercises, homework and metaphors.

1. Cognitive defusion: Learning to see thoughts, images, emotions, and memories as “nothing more than bits of language, words and pictures” rather than as objective truths or facts.
2. Acceptance: Allowing thoughts, feelings and sensations to come and go without struggling with them, avoiding them, or giving them undue attention.
3. Contact with the present moment: Full awareness of the here and now, experienced with openness, interest, and receptiveness.



4. Observing the self: Realizing that you are not your thoughts, feelings or emotions, and that these things are constantly changing, while the essence of who you are does not.
5. Values: Discovering what is most important to one's true self.
6. Committed action: Setting goals according to values and carrying them out responsibly.

ACT is listed as an evidence-based practice on SAMHSA's National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practice (See: <http://legacy.nreppadmin.net/ViewIntervention.aspx?id=191>).

According to the Association for Contextual Behavioral Science, there have been over 170 randomized control trials on ACT (See: [https://contextualscience.org/ACT\\_Randomized\\_Controlled\\_Trials](https://contextualscience.org/ACT_Randomized_Controlled_Trials))

Major meta-analyses published on ACT outcomes indicate that ACT is effective, with medium to large effect sizes as compared to wait lists or treatment as usual across a wide range of problem areas (Öst, 2008; Powers et al., 2009; A-Tjak et al., 2015) such as anxiety disorders, depression, and addiction.

Amrod & Hayes (2013) have written a chapter on using ACT in forensic settings. These authors argue that the target problems in ACT include those that are common in incarcerated populations, such as attempts to suppress or avoid any kind of emotional pain, lack of awareness in the present moment and lack of values-driven behaviours. Arnold & Hayes (2013) provide an example of an ACT protocol that can be used with incarcerated adults. There has been research with adult incarcerated interpersonal violence offenders indicating that this population perceives ACT as an acceptable and useful treatment approach.

According to several studies, ACT appears to be able to address the following risk factors for delinquency/crime: psychological and physical aggression; emotional dysregulation; social functioning; substance use and/or abuse; and negative life experiences (including trauma).

Although there are fewer ACT studies with children and youth, there are some studies that indicate that this is a potentially useful intervention for this population. Research conducted by Gomez and colleagues (2014) suggests that ACT can be beneficial to adolescents with conduct disorder and impulsivity.

According to Steven Hayes (n.d.2), ACT protocols are instances of a general intervention strategy which is designed to be flexibly applied. ACT protocols can vary from short interventions done in minutes or hours, to those that take many sessions. ACT can be used in groups, individual sessions, classroom settings, couples therapy, bibliotherapy, institutions, and workplace trainings. ACT strategies are tailored to fit the needs and resources of specific contexts and populations. Protocols can vary based on the creativity of the researcher/clinician and the relative emphasis on various ACT processes.

Public Safety Canada (PSC) has a need for an evaluator or team of evaluators to conduct an evaluation of an Acceptance & Commitment Therapy (ACT) protocol with high risk youth and/or young adults.

The purpose of the evaluation is to determine the effectiveness/potential effectiveness of the protocol in reducing risk factors and/or building resilience in a sample of high risk<sup>1</sup> youth or young adults.

### **3. OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION**

The key objective of the evaluation is to measure an ACT protocol's effectiveness in building resilience and/or reducing risk factors amongst high-risk Canadian youth or young adults.

The most rigorous methods feasible must be undertaken and every effort must be made to conduct pre-, post, and follow-up testing, use of a comparison or equivalent design that allows for there to be valid

<sup>1</sup> For a list of criminogenic risk factors, see: <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/spprtng-mplmtn/index-en.aspx>



results related to how the outcomes can be attributed to the intervention. The Contractor must also utilize qualitative methods (e.g., interviews, focus groups, case studies) in order to triangulate results with the quantitative data. If the research design is not experimental, the contractor must also provide a detailed Program Logic Model, Theory of Change, and Contribution Analysis.

In order to enhance objectivity, Public Safety is seeking distinct project implementation and evaluation teams.

The evaluation must be conducted in two distinct phases:

### Phase 1:

The purpose of Phase 1 is to determine whether or not a larger scale rigorous evaluation of an ACT protocol is feasible. All data collection instruments and procedures must be drafted and pilot tested in this phase.

- a) Create a detailed description of an ACT protocol that is aimed at increasing resilience / decreasing criminogenic risk factors of high-risk youth or young adults. This can be an existing ACT protocol or an ACT protocol specifically developed for this project. Provide a detailed Program Logic Model and Theory of Change. Explain the treatment-as-usual<sup>2</sup> (e.g., cognitive-behavioural therapy).
- b) Provide letters of support from at least one youth-serving organization (that has 4 or more therapists) or at least 4 therapists who could use the described ACT protocol with high-risk youth or young adults, and are willing to participate in a rigorous evaluation of the protocol.
- c) Provide a detailed Evaluation Plan, including data collection instruments. The evaluation should include a process evaluation<sup>3</sup> (extent to which the protocol was implemented as intended) and an impact evaluation. The impact evaluation must utilize rigorous quantitative methods including pre-, post, and follow-up testing, use of a comparison or equivalent design that allows for there to be valid results related to how the outcomes can be attributed to the intervention. Outcomes must include, where applicable: positive changes in risk factors, improvements in psychological flexibility and mindfulness, reduced contact with the criminal justice system. Utilize qualitative methods (e.g., interviews, focus groups, case studies) in order to triangulate results with the quantitative data. Describe how a cost-benefit analysis could be conducted. If a cost-benefit analysis is not feasible, then a descriptive cost analysis of the intervention must be planned for and undertaken.
- d) Seek Ethics Approval for the evaluation of the ACT protocol. The Ethics application should specify that the protocol and evaluation methodology will be pilot tested initially, and subsequently used in a larger scale evaluation.
- e) Conduct a pilot test<sup>4</sup> of the ACT protocol on at least 4 units (e.g., 4 individuals or 4 groups).
- f) Prepare a report describing the results of the pilot test. Outline any modifications to the protocol, evaluation methods, or instruments that are suggested for a larger scale evaluation of the ACT protocol (that would take place if the Contractor is approved to move on to Phase 2). Identify lessons learned, exploring what worked well, what did not work as well, and make recommendations to strengthen the intervention for the benefit of others interested in implementing an intervention of this nature in the future.

<sup>2</sup> See: Löfholm, C., Brännström, L., Olsson, M., & Hansson, K. (2013). Treatment-as-usual in effectiveness studies: What is it and does it matter? *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 22, 25-34. 10.1111/j.1468-2397.2012.00870.x.

<sup>3</sup> See the Sample Evaluation Matrix for questions that should be answered in the process evaluation.

<sup>4</sup> The pilot test is a small-scale evaluation of the protocol's impact on at least 4 individuals. The same or a slightly modified methodology will be used in Phase 2, but with a larger sample size. The purpose of the pilot testing is to assess and refine the protocol and the data collection procedures for evaluating the intervention.

## Phase 2:

The purpose of Phase 2 is to conduct a larger-scale rigorous process and impact evaluation of the ACT protocol that was pilot tested in Phase 1. See below for more details.

- a) Provide a detailed description of the ACT protocol (updated from Phase 1, if necessary) and explain the treatment-as-usual<sup>5</sup>. Provide a detailed Program Logic Model and Theory of Change.
- b) Conduct a process evaluation. That is, assess the extent to which the protocol was implemented as intended<sup>6</sup>;
- c) Conduct an impact evaluation of the protocol, specifying the causal attribution strategies used (e.g., counterfactual; contribution analysis; theory of change). Utilize rigorous quantitative methods including pre-, post, and follow-up testing, use of a comparison or equivalent design that allows for there to be valid results related to how the outcomes can be attributed to the intervention. Outcomes must include, where applicable: positive changes in risk factors, improvements in psychological flexibility and mindfulness, reduced contact with the criminal justice system. A minimum sample size of n=30 for the experimental group and n=30 for the control group is expected.
- d) Utilize qualitative methods (e.g., interviews, focus groups, case studies) in order to triangulate results with the quantitative data;
- e) Provide a cost-benefit analysis, if possible. If a cost-benefit analysis is not feasible, then a descriptive cost analysis of the intervention must be provided;
- f) Identify lessons learned, exploring what worked well, what did not work as well, and make recommendations to strengthen the intervention for the benefit of others interested in implementing an intervention of this nature in the future.

## 4. APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS AND WEBSITES

- PSC ethics review application – Appendix 1 to Annex A
- Reporting Guidelines for Project Evaluations – Appendix 2 to Annex A
- Process Evaluation Matrix – Appendix 3 to Annex A

## 5. TASKS

The tasks to be completed by the contractor include, but are not necessarily limited to the following:

### 5.1 Phase 1

- 5.1.1 Within one week of contract award, the Contractor must attend a kick-off meeting with Project Authority and/or Technical Authority (PA/TA) to discuss the overall scope of the work, including the provisional work plan and approach and methodology that were submitted during the Request for Proposal stage; and, to clarify any issues.
- 5.1.2 Based on the discussion at the kick-off meeting, the Contractor must update both the work plan, and methodology and approach. Both updated documents must be submitted within five days of the kick-off meeting for approval by the PA/TA.

<sup>5</sup> See: Löffholm, C., Brännström, L., Olsson, M., & Hansson, K. (2013). Treatment-as-usual in effectiveness studies: What is it and does it matter? *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 22, 25-34. 10.1111/j.1468-2397.2012.00870.x.

<sup>6</sup> See the Sample Evaluation Matrix for questions that should be answered in the process evaluation.





- 5.1.3 Within eight weeks of receiving approval for the revised work plan and approach and methodology, the Contractor must write and submit to the PA/TA the draft version of its detailed ACT protocol.
- 5.1.4 Within eight weeks of receiving approval for the revised work plan and approach and methodology, the Contractor must submit its Evaluation Plan, including research design, and instruments.
- 5.1.5 Within two weeks of receiving approval for the ACT protocol and the Evaluation Plan, the Contractor must seek Ethics Approval for their evaluation plan. Implementation of the evaluation cannot begin until ethics approval has been granted. If the Contractor is with a university or other institution that has an ethics review procedure that meets the standards of the Tri-Council Policy on research with human subjects, written verification of this approval will suffice. Where the Contractor is not associated with an institution that has an ethics review procedure that meets the standards of the Tri-Council Policy on research with human subjects, Public Safety will conduct an internal ethics review via an ethics review committee constituted by Public Safety. For more information on ethics review see Public Safety's Ethics Review Policy (attached).
- 5.1.6 After receiving approval of the ACT protocol and Evaluation Plan, the Contractor must begin seeking Letters of Support and provide these to the PA/TA as they obtain them.
- 5.1.7 Once the Contractor receives Ethics Approval and Letters of Support, it must begin pilot testing the protocol.
- 5.1.8 After completing the data collection during the pilot test, the Contractor must write and submit a detailed report that describes the results of the pilot test. The report must also include a proposal for a larger scale evaluation of the protocol. This proposal should include all of the details required in the original evaluation plan and include any modifications suggested based on the results of the pilot test.
- 5.1.9 The Contractor must provide regular updates to the PA/TA by email, teleconference or in-person meetings as required. This must include any modifications to the intervention/project that could affect the evaluation and any difficulties that would present in implementing the approved evaluation design.

## **5.2 Phase 2**

The Contractor must complete the following tasks only if it is authorized to proceed with Phase 2 of the work. For administrative purposes, authorization to proceed with Phase 2 will be evidenced by a Contract Amendment issued and signed by the Contracting Authority.

- 5.2.1 Within five days of receiving the approval to proceed with Phase 2, the Contractor must attend a meeting with PA/TA to discuss the work, including any required changes or updates to the work plan and/or approach and methodology.
- 5.2.2 Based on the outcome of the meeting, the Contractor must update and submit any documents that were to be updated (e.g., description of ACT protocol; evaluation plan, including research design, and instruments). All updated documents must be submitted within five days of the meeting for approval by the PA/TA.
- 5.2.3 Based upon the approved documents, the Contractor must conduct a process and an impact evaluation. A minimum sample size of  $n=30$  for the experimental group and  $n=30$  for the control group is expected.



- 5.2.4 Within two months of beginning the pilot testing, the Contractor must write and submit to the PA/TA a report that details all of the work undertaken to date, including a detailed description of any challenges faced. The Contractor must also identify any slippages concerning the delivery dates outlined in its approved work plan and must update and submit its work plan to outlines the new delivery dates.
- 5.2.5 Two months after data collection has been completed, the Contractor must submit a draft report. The Contractor must follow the template provided by the PA/TA (see attached “Reporting Guidelines for Project Evaluations” – Appendix 2 to Annex A)

**6. DELIVERABLES AND SCHEDULE**

The following deliverables are required during the course of the contract:

<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
Evaluation plan including research design, and instruments. Ethics application to a Canadian university Research Ethics Board or to Public Safety Canada. Letters of Support. (Phase 1)	Eight weeks after the contract is signed
Report of results of pilot test (Phase 1)	Two months after ethics approval
Progress report (Phase 2)	Two months after the start of the larger scale program implementation.
Draft evaluation report (Phase 2)	One month after data collection has been completed
Final evaluation report (Phase 2)	Six weeks after feedback on draft report is received from the Technical Authority

**7. PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND QUALITY MEASUREMENTS**

- 7.1 The work conducted for this evaluation must be carried out to the specifications of the contractual agreement and to the satisfaction of the representative of PSC who has been designated as the Technical Authority for the project. If the Technical Authority is not satisfied with the nature and quality of the work performed/received, he/she reserves the right to reject and/or request alterations/improvements to the work provided by the contractor.
- 7.2 The Evaluation Plan must receive ethics approval prior to the evaluation being implemented. If the contractor is with a university or other institution that has an ethics review procedure that meets the standards of the Tri-Council Policy on research with human subjects, written verification of this approval will suffice. Where the contractor is not associated with an institution that has an ethics review procedure that meets the standards of the Tri-Council Policy on research with human subjects, PSC will conduct an internal ethics review via an ethics review committee constituted by PSC. For more information on ethics review see PSC’s Ethics Review Policy (attached). If the evaluation is to be implemented within a school, then a school board ethics application must be completed.



## **8.        DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND SUPPORT**

The Department will provide the following to the Contractor:

- a)        Access to the Technical Authority, or this person's designate, who will be responsible for coordinating the overall project, providing as-required direction, guidance, and support to the Contractor, and accepting and approving Contractor deliverables on behalf of the Department.
- b)        Timely feedback on deliverables, in order to enable the Contractor to stay within the timelines specified in the Contract.

## **9.        REPORTING AND COMMUNICATION**

The Contractor should plan for at least the following meetings, either in person or by phone, in addition to any meetings or interviews scheduled as part of the work plan development and data collection stages of the evaluation:

- a)        Start-up meeting with the Technical Authority and project representative(s) to launch the work;
- b)        Meetings to review each of the required deliverables; and
- c)        Other meetings as needed.

In addition to the timely submission of deliverables and the meetings referenced above, the Contractor will maintain regular communications with the Technical Authority. Communication may include phone calls, electronic mail, faxes, mailings, and meetings, in order to ensure that the project is progressing well and in accordance with expectations.

## **10.      LANGUAGE OF WORK**

It is expected that the majority of the work will be conducted in English and it is requested that reports be submitted in English. However, the Contractor must be able to offer all services in both official languages.

## **11.      LOCATION OF WORK**

It is anticipated that most of the work will be carried out at the Contractor's facilities. Any local travel that is required for data collection activities, meetings etc. will not be reimbursed. Any travel outside the Contractor's region may be reimbursed according to the Treasury Board of Canada guidelines, which may be consulted at [http://publiservice.tbssct.gc.ca/travel/travel E.html](http://publiservice.tbssct.gc.ca/travel/travel_E.html).



## 12. REFERENCES

- Amrod, J., & Hayes, S. C. (2013). Act for the Incarcerated. In R. C. Tafrate & D. Mitchell (Eds.) *Forensic CBT: A Handbook for Clinical Practice* (pp. 43-65). John Wiley & Sons.
- A-Tjak, J. G., Davis, M. L., Morina, N, Powers, M. B., Smits, J. A., & Emmelkamp, P. M. (2015). A meta-analysis of the efficacy of acceptance and commitment therapy for clinically relevant mental and physical health problems. *Psychotherapy and psychosomatics*. 84 (1), 30–6.
- Gomez, M. J., Luciano, C., Paez-Blarrina, M., Ruiz, F. J., Valdivia-Salas, S., & Gil-Luciano, B. (2014). Brief ACT protocol in adolescents with impulsive and antisocial behaviours. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, 14 (3), 307-332
- Hayes, S. (n.d.1). Are there advantages of ACT as compared to traditional CBT? Retrieved from: [https://contextualscience.org/are\\_there\\_advantages\\_of\\_act\\_as\\_compared\\_to\\_traditional\\_cbt](https://contextualscience.org/are_there_advantages_of_act_as_compared_to_traditional_cbt)
- Hayes, S. (n.d.2). *Treatment Protocols*. Retrieved from: [https://contextualscience.org/treatment\\_protocols](https://contextualscience.org/treatment_protocols)
- Hayes, S. C. (2004). Acceptance and Commitment Therapy, Relational Frame Theory and the Third Wave of Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies. *Behavior Therapy*, 35, 639-665.
- Hayes, S. C., Luoma, J., Bond, F., Masuda, A., & Lillis, J. (2006). Acceptance and Commitment Therapy: Model, processes, and outcomes. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 44(1), 1-25.
- Luoma, J., Hayes, S., & Walser, R. (2007). *Learning ACT: An acceptance and commitment therapy skills-training manual for therapists*. Oakland, CA: New Harbinger.
- Öst, L. G. (2008). Efficacy of the third wave of behavioral therapies: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 46(3), 296-321.
- Powers, M. B., Vörding, M. B. Z. S., & Emmelkamp, P. M. G. (2009). Acceptance and commitment therapy: A meta-analytic review. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 78, 73-80.



## Appendix 1 to Annex A PSC Ethics Review Application

### PUBLIC SAFETY CANADA (PSC) Application<sup>1</sup> for Ethics Review

This form is designed to collect information about the proposed research or evaluation in order to assess the proposed study from the perspective of research ethics. The Application for Ethics Review should be completed with reference to the Ethics Guidelines that are part of this package.

If your Evaluation Plan has been approved, you may refer to pages within the Evaluation Plan as you complete the sections below.

#### 1. Identification

Project title: \_\_\_\_\_

Project file number: \_\_\_\_\_

Project start and end date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of lead evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Names of co-investigators: \_\_\_\_\_

Project location(s): \_\_\_\_\_

#### 2. Summary of Evaluation Project and Procedures

Provide a summary of the evaluation project:

- State the purpose of the evaluation, including the rationale and objectives.
- Identify the key evaluation questions (only those related to collection of data from participants).
- Describe the methods used to answer the evaluation questions. The description should include the sampling method (e.g., random sampling), group assignment (e.g., randomization), type of evaluation design (e.g., pre-post-post quasi experimental design, case study), and the data collection methods or evaluation activities (e.g., youth survey, focus group, photovoice, video recording, etc.).
- Identify who is going to be invited to participate in which evaluation activity, how long each activity will take to complete, the frequency of data collection, and where the data will be collected.
- Indicate in which project site location(s) (e.g., Little Red Reserve, Montreal Lake, MB) the study will be implemented.
- Provide a list of instruments used in the study (e.g., interview guides, observation checklists) and attach these in appendices.

#### Use of secondary data

- Will you be collecting secondary data (e.g., police records, school data)  
 Yes  No
- Do you require that these data be linked to individuals?  
 Yes  No

<sup>1</sup> This form is based, with permission, in large part on the University of Victoria Human Research Ethics Board's *Application for Ethics Approval for Human Participant Research*, 2005, and the University of British Columbia Behavioural Research Ethics Board research guidelines, 2011 available online at: [http://rise.ubc.ca/helpCenter/GN/BREB\\_Guidance\\_Notes.html](http://rise.ubc.ca/helpCenter/GN/BREB_Guidance_Notes.html).



If yes, please familiarize yourself with TCPS2 Article 5.5 and ensure that the appropriate procedures (and described in Sections 6 and 7 below) are taken to ensure the confidentiality, anonymity and security of data.

### **Video, audio recordings**

- Will you be recording participants' interviews using videos or make records?  
 Yes  No
  
- Will you be recording participants' interviews using a digital recorder?  
 Yes  No

If yes, familiarize yourself with TCPS2 Article 10.3 and ensure that the appropriate procedures (and described in Sections 6 and 7 below) are taken to ensure the confidentiality and anonymity of those who have not consented to be part of the study or part of the video/audio interviews.

### **3. Selection and Recruitment of Participants**

- **Target group or program participants**
  - Identify the anticipated number of participants in target group
  
  - Describe the salient characteristics of the target group (e.g., age, gender, race, ethnicity, class, etc.).
  
  - Provide a description of the methods of recruitment of the target group
    - Identify the recruitment or eligibility criteria for participation (screening, inclusion, exclusion criteria). Provide justification for excluding participants on the basis of such attributes as culture, language, religion, race, disability, sexual orientation, ethnicity, gender or age. Please review TCPS2 Chapter 4 to ensure that no one is inappropriately excluded from the study. If exclusions are proposed that are not germane to the evaluation question(s), a justification for excluding participants on the basis of such attributes must be provided.
  
    - Describe the recruitment process. Please include all recruitment steps. Please indicate whether or not the recruitment process protects privacy. When confidentiality is to be protected, does the recruitment process pose potential risks to confidentiality?
  
    - Describe how you will gain access to names, addresses, telephone numbers, or email address of potential participants to the treatment or control groups.
  
    - Identify who will recruit/contact participants (e.g., researcher, assistant, third party) and describe any relationship between the investigator(s) and participant(s) (e.g., project staff-participant, manager-employee).
  
    - Indicate where members of the target group will be recruited (e.g., school, community centre, group home).
  
    - Attach copies of any recruitment materials, such as recruitment scripts, information letters, advertisements, flyers, or Internet/email messages.



- **Control group or Matched comparison group**

- Will your study design include a control group?  
 Yes  No

If yes,

- Identify the anticipated number of participants to the control group.
- Should the characteristics of the control group participants as well as methods of recruitment differ from the program participants, please make note of the differences below, taking care to cover all questions as per above section on Recruitment of Target Groups.

- **Other study participants**

- Identify other categories of participants you will be approaching to gather data for your study. Please do not forget to include an approximate number of participants per category.
- Describe the methods of recruitment you will be using to approach these individuals.

- Are you or any of your co-investigators in any way in a position of authority or power over participants? Examples of a “power-over” situation include teachers-students, counsellors-clients, and supervisors-employees.

Yes  No

If yes, identify/describe:

- Which group(s):
- The nature of the relationship:
- The rationale for conducting research with participants over whom you, the evaluator, have power:
- The safeguards (steps) will you take to minimize inducement, coercion or potential harm:
- How the dual-role relationship and the safeguards will be explained to potential participants.

#### 4. Possible Benefits, Inconveniences, Risks and Harms to Participants

- **Benefits**

Identify any potential or known benefits (to the participants, to society, and/or to the state of knowledge) associated with participation. If there are no benefits, state this specifically. Note that benefits differ from incentives to participate in the study and should not be included in this section.

- **Inconveniences**

Identify and describe any known or potential inconveniences to participants.

*Please consider all inconveniences, including time devoted to the evaluation.* If the study involves questions on sensitive topics, please provide sample questions to participants on the consent / assent form or in a separate verbally presented script where context is provided.



• **Risks**

Could this study involve the following? Please answer each question by putting an **X** in the appropriate box:

- Does the study include participants who whose vulnerability (e.g., capacity (mental, emotional), age, wellness or health status, institutionalization, power relationships, gender and gender identity, setting and recruitment, dependency, socio-economic status, others) could increase their risk by participating in the study?  
Very unlikely Possibly Likely
- Could a participant feel demeaned or embarrassed during their participation in the evaluation study?  
Very unlikely Possibly Likely
- Could a participant feel fatigued or stressed due to the evaluation study?  
Very unlikely Possibly Likely
- Could a participant experience any other emotional or psychological discomfort as a consequence of participation?  
Very unlikely Possibly Likely
- Is there any social risk, possible stigmatization, loss of status, privacy and/or reputation?  
Very unlikely Possibly Likely
- Are there any physical risks?  
Very unlikely Possibly Likely
- Could a participant experience any economic risk? (e.g. job security, job loss)  
Very unlikely Possibly Likely
- Do you see any chance that participants may be harmed in any other way, or that others could be harmed? (e.g., risk to third parties, community)  
Very unlikely Possibly Likely
- Are the risks similar to those encountered by the subjects in everyday life?  
Very unlikely Possibly Likely
- Does the study involve the generation of databases of populations where potential future research is unknown, and where the data could possibly be linked or traced to personally identifiable information?  
Very unlikely Possibly Likely

If you indicated above that any risks are *possible* or *likely*, please explain below:

- What are the risks?
- What will you do to try to minimize or prevent the risks?
- How will you respond if the risk of harm occurs? (e.g., what is your plan?)





- **Partial disclosure or deception**

Will participants be fully informed of everything that will be required of them prior to the start of the evaluation session?

Yes    No

If *No*, please provide an explanation of the extent and nature of deception and why the research could not be conducted without it. This description must be sufficient to justify a waiver of informed consent. Please describe procedures for debriefing participants.

## 5. Compensation / Incentives

- Is there any compensation for participating in the research? (e.g., gifts, money, bonus points)

Yes    No

- If Yes, explain the nature of the compensation and why you consider it necessary.

## 6. Consent / Assent

- **Participant's competence to provide free and informed consent**

- Describe your prospective participants: *(Check all that apply.)*

- Competent adults
- Non-competent adults
- Children (i.e., under the age of legal consent)
- A protected or vulnerable population (e.g., inmates, patients).

- Indicate from whom the consent will be sought, and, if applicable, from whom assent will be requested.

- **Means of obtaining consent:** *(Check all that apply.)*

- Initial verbal explanation and a signed Consent Form
- A Letter of Information and a signed Consent Form
- A Letter of Information, a signed Parental or Guardian Consent Form, and a Participant Assent Form
- A Letter of Information and verbal consent
- Implied consent (e.g., through mail back or web-based questionnaires or surveys)
- Other means (Please describe.)
- Consent will not be obtained (Explain why not.)

- **Consent letters**

Please provide copies of any written materials such as Letters of Information, Consent and/or Assent Forms, scripts, and covering letters or instructions contained in questionnaires where completion of the questionnaire is deemed to imply consent. If applicable, ensure that separate consent is provided for data collected by different means, and provide a separate consent form for each group describing the procedures that will affect the participant directly. There should be provision for the name and signature of a witness on consent / assent forms.



- **Informed consent process**

Describe the steps used in the informed consent process, including a description of how much time given to return the signed consent/assent form(s). If participation in the evaluation is required over multiple occasions or an extended period of time, indicate how you will provide for ongoing consent.

## 7. **Anonymity and Confidentiality**

- Participant contributions will be:

- Public and cited
- Anonymous (i.e., no one, including the principal investigator, is able to associate responses or other data with individual participants)
- Confidential (i.e., a person's identity is protected, and limits are placed on access to, control of and security of his or her data and personal information)

- If you checked "confidential", please indicate the extent to which confidentiality will be maintained:

- Completely
- With limits (*Check relevant boxes below:*)
  - Limits due to the nature of group activities (e.g., focus groups) the researcher can not guarantee confidentiality
  - Limits due to context: The nature or size of the sample from which participants are drawn makes it possible to identify individual participants (e.g., school principals in a small town)
  - Limits due to selection: The procedures for recruiting or selecting participants may compromise the confidentiality of participants (e.g., participants are identified or referred to the study by a person outside the research team)
  - Limits due to legal requirements for reporting
  - Other, please specify

- Please describe the procedures to be used to respect an individual's privacy. Describe provisions regarding both access to raw data and write-up of the results. If there are limits to confidentiality, such that this cannot be guaranteed, explain what the limits are and how you will address them with the participants:

- If confidentiality will not be protected, explain why. If you are asking the participants to waive their right to confidentiality (you plan to identify them with their data), explain what steps will be taken to respect their privacy, if any.

## 8. **Use and Disposal of Data**

- **Storage of Data (Including Use of Online Surveys)**

Describe where the data will be stored and how you will ensure the security of the data. Note that under the *Freedom of Information Act*, data stored on a server located in the United States may be accessed by the US government at any time. Therefore, ensure that data is not stored on a US server and exchanged with other via email storing data on a US server (e.g., hotmail, Gmail). If you are planning to use online surveys, please acquaint yourself with relevant *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* in your jurisdiction (or province)

- **Use(s) of Data**

Because PSC may use your research data / findings in the development of knowledge products (i.e. synthesis reports) and for reporting purposes, your consent form must include a provision to advise participants that their data may be used for additional research purposes. Please reference the consent forms with this provision.

Excluding PSC, will your research data be analyzed, now or in future, by yourself or anyone else, for purposes other than this research project?



- Yes     No     Possibly

If *yes* or *possibly*, describe how you will obtain consent for future data analysis from the participants.

- **Maintenance and disposal of data**

Describe your plans for preserving and protecting data or for destroying data after the evaluation is completed. For all data (e.g., paper records, audio or visual recordings, electronic recordings), indicate the:

- means of storage (e.g., a locked filing cabinet, password protected computer files)
- location of storage
- time duration of storage
- how data will be destroyed or returned to PSC

- **Feedback to participants**

- Yes     No     Possibly

If *yes*, describe when and how you will provide feedback to participants.

## 9. Evaluators

- **Conflict of interest**

Are you or any of the research team members in a perceived, actual or potential conflict of interest in regard to this research or demonstration project (e.g., family, personal, or business relationships with participants, partners in research, project staff or other entities)?

- Yes     No

If *yes*, please detail the conflict and how it will be managed:

- **Evaluator(s) qualifications**

In light of your evaluation methods, the nature of the evaluation and the characteristics of the participants what special training or qualifications do you and/or your research team have or need to acquire?

- **Adherence to ethics guidelines by all members of the evaluation team**

If you involve research assistants, transcribers, interpreters, project staff and/or other personnel to carry out specific evaluation tasks, how will you ensure that they comply with the Ethics Guidelines?

- **Risk to evaluator(s)**

- Does this evaluation study pose any risks to the evaluators, assistants or data collectors?
- If there are any risks, explain the nature of the risks, how they will be minimized, and how they will be responded to if they occur.



### 10. Additional Considerations for Research Involving Aboriginal People or those from a Vulnerable/Marginalized Population

- *If the study specifically involves individuals from an Aboriginal community or other vulnerable/marginalized population, or if a particular Aboriginal community/ communities or vulnerable/marginalized group are a central focus of the research, was/were the community(ies) involved in the research design?*
- *Has the researcher indicated a willingness to afford the community an opportunity to react and respond to the research findings before completion of the final report?*
- *Has the researcher indicated a willingness to acknowledge in the publication of research results the various viewpoints of the community on the topics researched?*
- *Has the researcher indicated a willingness to share the final report findings with the community in way that the community would appreciate?*

### 11. Attachments

As applicable, attach the following documents to this application. Check those that are appended:

- Recruitment materials, e.g., script(s), letter(s)
- Information letter(s) and/or scripts and consent form(s)
- Copies of all research instruments, including standardized instruments, questionnaires or interview guides (if large, attach sample questions)
- Approval from external organizations (or proof of having made a request for permission)
- Permission to gain access to confidential documents or materials
- Other, please describe:

### 12. Agreement and Signatures

I affirm that:

- I have read this application and it is complete and accurate.
- The research will be conducted in accordance with Public Safety Canada's guidelines regarding the ethical conduct of research studies and evaluations
- The researcher(s) will seek further PSC review if the research/evaluation protocol is modified.

Lead Evaluator

Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Print Name



## Consent Form Guidelines

This is a tool to assist you in writing your own consent form, which should be as readable as possible and tailored to your study population. The information provided represent guidelines only – not all the listed elements are required for all research.

However, if you decide not to include all of the standard statements (I, III-VIII, X), you should explain to the PSC Ethics Review Board why these requirements do not apply to your particular evaluation study on a separate cover page preceding the consent form.

Note: Please do not put a statement in your consent form indicating that the study has been reviewed and approved by a UBC Research Ethics Board as this statement may unduly influence prospective participants in making an informed, objective decision regarding their participation in the study.

### Formatting Information:

- Type size should be a minimum 12 point font.
- The use of headings, small paragraphs and spaces between the paragraphs is recommended.
- Use simple language and avoid technical terms and jargon. Try to achieve a readability score at the grade 7 level. In Microsoft Word you can display the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Score by accessing Tools/Options/Spelling & Grammar and by checking  Show readability statistics.
- Write out all acronyms the first time they appear on each page, followed by the acronym in brackets.
- Number the pages, e.g., 1 of 3, 2 of 3, 3 of 3 etc.
- Include a version date in a footnote at the bottom of each page of the consent form.

All information required by the participant to make an informed decision should be included in the informed consent form.

Any changes to the consent form must be approved by the PSC Ethics Review Board before the evaluation study begins or continues.



## Sample Consent / Assent Form

### Identify this document as a “Consent (or Assent) Form”

(insert Title of Study)

If the study involves more than one consent or assent form, in addition to the title indicate to whom it is directed (i.e. Consent Form for Parents, Assent Form for Children, etc.)

#### Study Team

##### Sample headings: *Who is conducting the study?*

Identify the following:

**Lead Evaluator:** Include the Principal Investigator’s Name, name of organization, and contact information, including the telephone number.

**Co-Investigator(s):** Include the name of co-investigators, name of organization, and contact information, including the telephone number.

#### Sponsor

##### Sample headings: *Who is funding this study?*

Name all agencies contributing funds [including grants-in-aid], resources and other products to the study.

#### Sample wording

- *The study is being conducted/funded by the (name of evaluation study group), and funded by Public Safety Canada).*

#### Invitation and Study Purpose

##### Sample headings: *Why should you take part in this study? Why are we doing this study?*

Explain in simple lay terms the purpose of the study. Provide an explanation of why participants have been asked to participate.

#### Sample wording

- *You are being invited to take part in this research study because (describe the characteristics of the sample population being recruited or the inclusion criteria).*
- *We want to learn more about how to help people who have/are [XXX]. This study will help us learn more about [XXX]. We are inviting people like you who have [XXX] to help us.*
- *We are doing this study to learn more about [XXX].*

#### Study Procedures

##### Sample headings: *What happens if you say “Yes, I want to be in the study”? What happens to you in the study? How is the study done?*

Explain in simple lay terms exactly what will happen to people if they participate in the study. Describe the total amount of time required if they participate in the research.

#### Sample wording

*If you say ‘Yes’, here is how we will do the study:*

- *We will ask you about [XXX]*
- *We will give you a form with questions to answer.*
- *If you decide to take part in this evaluation study, here are the types of activities you would be involved in: At the beginning of the study... During the study... At the end of the study:*

If applicable, include the following:

- If the study involves a control group, describe terms such as randomization (how it will be done – i.e. flip of a coin?).
- Describe how many sessions or visits, amount of time required for each visit, amount of time required for interviews/questionnaires, etc.
- If the study takes place in a school and involves the use of class time, include a description of what students whose parents refuse participation will do during the time that the other students are involved with the study.



- If the study involves analysis of tests or activities that are a part of regular class routine, then explain that the results of those who do not participate will not be included in the study.
- If the study involves captive populations (e.g. students, employees, inmates), explain how they opt in and out of the study.
- If audio or video-recording is involved, include a statement to that effect and describe under Confidentiality how you will ensure the confidentiality of the recordings and who will have access to them. The eventual fate of the records must also be disclosed (i.e., where and for how long they will be stored and whether they will be destroyed, any plans for secondary use).
- If video recording is involved, explain that those not participating will not be recorded.
- If the study involves an online survey, describe under Confidentiality the location of the survey company's server and include a description of any associated limits to confidentiality.

### **Study Results**

Describe how the study results will be disseminated.

### **Sample wording**

- *The results of this study will be reported in a graduate thesis and may also be published in journal articles and books.*
- *The main study findings will be published in academic journal articles.*

*If applicable, include the following:*

If the investigators can provide the subject/participant with the results of the study, describe how this will be accomplished; for example, include an option on the consent form to provide a mailing address and/or email address for a summary report on the findings or website details if study results will be made available on line.

### **Potential Risks of the Study**

#### **Sample heading: *Is there any way being in this study could be bad for you?***

Describe all known risks (e.g., psychological, physical, cultural, privacy, confidentiality), and a description of the procedures in place to minimize risks or to provide counselling or referral for those in distress.

### **Sample wording**

- *We do not think there is anything in this study that could harm you or be bad for you. Some of the questions we ask might upset you. Please let one of the study staff know if you have any concerns.*
- *E.g. Risks of sensitive questions - Some of the questions we ask may seem sensitive or personal. You do not have to answer any question if you do not want to”.*

### **Potential Benefits of the Study**

#### **Sample heading: *Will being in this study help you in any way? What are the benefits of participating?***

Describe the possible benefits, if any, to the subject/participant. If there are any anticipated benefits to society or to a specific group describe this in a separate statement.

### **Sample Wording**

- *You may be helped in this study by...*
- *Other than the benefits of participating in the (name) program, we do not think taking part in this evaluation study will help you. However, your participation will help identify what works, what does not, and make the program better for future participants in the program.*

### **Confidentiality**

#### **Sample heading: *How will your identity be protected? How will your privacy be maintained?***

#### **Measures to maintain confidentiality**

If you are planning to disclose the identity of study participants, this should be explained, along with how you will protect those who do not wish to have their identities disclosed. Otherwise, in

### **Sample Wording**

- *Your confidentiality will be respected. Information that discloses your identity will not be released without your consent unless required by law.*



- *All documents will be identified only by code number and kept in a locked filing cabinet. Subjects will not be identified by name in any reports of the completed study. Include an assurance that the subject's/participant's identity will be kept confidential.*

**If applicable, include the following:**

- If the data records are kept on a computer hard disk, describe how the security of the computer record will be maintained. Note: Do not say that the information will be kept confidential, since it will be published.
- If the study involves focus groups, it should be noted that only limited confidentiality can be offered. For example, include a sentence that says something like, *"We encourage participants not to discuss the content of the focus group to people outside the group; however, we can't control what participants do with the information discussed."*
- In circumstances where the study is likely to facilitate the disclosure of behaviours or actions where there are legal limits to confidentiality, a more detailed statement regarding these limits should be provided. For example, you could include a statement that says something like: *"At any point in the study, if you reveal that there has been an incident that involves abuse and/or neglect of a child or an elderly person (or that there is a risk of such occurring) please be advised that the evaluator must, by law, report this information to the appropriate authorities"*.

**Compensation/Incentives**

**Sample heading: *Will you be paid for your time/ taking part in this research study?***

Payment, financial or otherwise, should be clearly outlined on the consent form. Remuneration or compensation should not be dependent on completion of the project, but can be pro-rated for those that withdraw before completion.

**Sample Wording**

- *We will not pay you for the time you take to be in this study.*
- *We will not pay you for the time you take to be in this study. However, we will pay the cost of your (bus or taxi fare, childcare, parking).*

**Contact for Information about the Study**

**Sample heading: *Who can you contact if you have questions about the study?***

Include an offer to answer any inquiries concerning the procedures, to ensure that they are fully understood by the participant.

**Sample Wording**

- *If you have any questions or concerns about what we are asking of you, please contact the study leader or one of the study staff. The names and telephone numbers are listed at the top of the first page of this form.*

**Contact for Complaints**

**Sample Heading: *Who can you contact if you have complaints or concerns about the study?***

**Required Wording**

- *If you have any concerns about your rights as a participant to this study and/or your experiences while participating in this study, you may contact (name) the project Evaluation Advisor at Public Safety Canada at (phone number) or e-mail (email address).*

**Participant Consent and Signature Page**

**Standard Wording**

*"Taking part in this study is entirely up to you. You have the right to refuse to participate in this study. If you decide to take part, you may choose to pull out of the study at any time without giving a reason and without any negative impact on your (for example, participation to the program, class standing, access to further services from the community centre, etc.)"*

- *Your signature below indicates that you have received a copy of this consent form for your own records.*
- *Your signature indicates that you consent to participate in this study.*





---

Participant Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
(or Parent or Guardian Signature)

---

Printed Name of the Participant (or Parent or Guardian) signing above

---

Name of Witness \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

If applicable, include the following:

- On parental consent forms, include a statement of choice, for example: 'I consent/I do not consent (check one) to my child's participation in the study'
- Parents must be provided with a copy of the parental consent form. It is acceptable to include a separate section for signatures so that they may return the signature page or section and keep the information contained in the consent form for their own records.



## Appendix 2 to Annex A Reporting Guidelines for Project Evaluations

### Evaluation Report (Annual and Final) Template

#### **Background:**

This evaluation report template is being provided to ensure that the 3<sup>rd</sup> party evaluator hired by the project recipient provides the information Public Safety Canada (PSC) requires in a standard manner and as per the Contribution Agreement. Frequently referring to these guidelines and consulting with a PSC Evaluation Advisor will ensure that you submit a report with the required level of detail and that follows the required format. The hired evaluation team should also consider the evaluation information shared at PSC information sessions, the evaluation framework, and the previously completed Annual Reports (if applicable) when completing the reports.

It is important to remember that each report is expected to stand alone. In other words, the evaluation findings are cumulative and are carried forward. They are built upon as additional data are collected and further analysis is conducted over time. Each annual report should carry over the project/program description and methodology sections from the original Evaluation Plan and clearly note and explain if there were modifications. The Final Evaluation Report should integrate new data with all of the information from previous Annual Reports and should be considered a stand alone report. PSC evaluation staff can provide you with more information to ensure this report is comprehensive.

Project recipients should refer to their Contribution Agreement for the precise due date. The first Annual Report will be submitted within a year of the completed (and approved) Evaluation Plan. The remaining Annual Reports will be submitted on an annual basis. The draft Final Evaluation Report is due 45 days prior to the end of project activities. The final Evaluation Report is due three months after the project activities end and after all of the required Annual Reports are completed.

#### **Report Format and Guidelines:**

The format for the evaluation reports includes section headings 1 through 10 below. Guidance on the expected content is also provided.

The title page should include the following information:

- Name of the deliverable
- Name of project being evaluated
- Number of the project (assigned by Public Safety Canada)
- Submitted by: name of contractor / firm
- Submitted to: Public Safety Canada
- Date submitted
- Period covered by the report
- Version number



## 1. **Executive Summary (Maximum 5 pages)**

Use the following headings for the Executive Summary. These reports will be summarized and posted on our website. Visit our website <http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/res/cp/res/es-gps-eng.aspx> to review other summaries that use this reporting format.

### **Title of Evaluation Summary**

- Introduction
- Project Description
  - Primary Project Components
  - Project Participants (target group)
- Evaluation Methodology
  - Evaluation Design
  - Data Collection Methods
  - Data Analysis Methods
  - Methodological Limitations
- Process Evaluation Questions and Findings
- Outcome Evaluation Questions and Findings
  - Knowledge
  - Attitudes
  - Skills
  - Behaviours ( i.e., changes in police charges, arrests, non-violent offending; drug trafficking; violent offending; clinical behaviours)
- Cost Analysis Findings
- Relevance
- Challenges, Opportunities, Lessons Learned
  - Project
  - Evaluation
- Recommendations
  - Project
  - Evaluation

## 2. **Introduction**

Describe the overall purpose and scope of the evaluation study including the name of the Project, the sponsoring organization (and location) and start date and end date of the project and where the project was implemented.

If the project was implementing a model, promising or innovative crime prevention program, briefly describe the program's origin.

## 3. **Project Description**

### **3.1. Project Logic Model Graphic** (updated, if necessary)

### **3.2. Project Theory of Change** (updated, if necessary)

- Ensure that the logical relationship between the program components, target group and outcomes are clear
- Provide research/references that demonstrate the logical relationship between the components
- Include a brief description about the program components, dosage, outcomes and risk/protective factors to complement the logic model



### 3.3. Target Group (expected number, how they are recruited, how eligibility is determined)

- Provide information about the project's screening and risk assessment tools.
- Identify the name and origin of the risk assessment tools used. Where possible report the reliability and/or validity of the tools.
- Discuss and report on how the evaluation team supported the project with an effective risk assessment tool that would help the program accurately identify the appropriate target group.

## 4. Evaluation Questions

This section should outline the evaluation questions from the original evaluation plan.

## 5. Methodology

### 5.1 Evaluation Design

- Describe the overall evaluation design that was used during this evaluation (e.g. pre-post or repeated measures, including the intervals at which measures were administered, and whether or not there was a comparison group).
- Include information about what approach was used (qualitative, quantitative or mixed design).
- If the design has changed from the planning stage (evaluation framework), describe how and why the evaluation design has changed.
- Demonstrate what strategies were used to ensure the comparison group (if any) was feasible or comparable to the experimental group (i.e. matching techniques etc.) Report on the extent to which both groups are comparable.
- Describe when and how the comparison group was recruited.
- Report on the attrition rate and indicate if the varying attrition rates affected the feasibility of comparing the experimental and comparison group.
- Identify the various threats to validity and how these were mitigated in the evaluation.
- Describe the current evaluation design at the time of preparing this report.
- If using a qualitative design only, such as case studies or ethnographic design or mix of the two, describe:
  - whether you measured outcomes over time, the focus of inquiry (cultural context, program, program activities, event (e.g., T1, T2, T3, etc.) or individuals with key characteristics (e.g., low, moderate, high risks), and
  - whether you conducted a single case (within site or program activities or other unit of analysis chosen), multi-cases (between sites or program activities or other unit of analysis chosen), and/or cross-case analyses (aggregate data).

If using a combination of qualitative and quantitative, or mixed design, ensure that you include a description of both qualitative and quantitative approaches, as indicated above.

- Report on any modifications made to the process evaluation matrix (include process evaluation sub-matrix in Appendix).

## 5.2 Data Collection Methods

- Identify all data sources used in this report (quantitative and qualitative).
- Identify and describe the purpose of each instrument used and/or types of information (documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observations, participant observations,) collected in the study. Clarify how each evaluation question relates to questions in the instruments used for this study.
- Describe how the data were collected, when, and by whom.
- Report on how the evaluation team incorporated data from the monitoring and information system being implemented.
- Clarify if the data used were self-reported or validated by an external source (i.e. school and police records).
- Provide the response rates for various measures.
- Append all questionnaires, survey instruments, interview guides, consent forms, scripts, templates, MOUs signed for access to police and school boards data, etc. in Appendices.

## 5.3 Data Analysis Methods

- For quantitative analyses section:
  - Identify the statistical tests used.
  - Indicate whether the evaluation had enough statistical power to conduct tests of statistical significance. Identify all aspects of the formula used: statistical test, level of power, alpha level, sample size and standard deviation where applicable.
  - Report the results including statistical significance, effect sizes and clinical significance where appropriate.
- Qualitative analyses section:
  - Describe how qualitative data were collated and analyzed
  - If using case studies, describe the analytical and triangulation methods used:
    - Single case:
      - Holistic analysis: analysis of the entire case;
      - Embedded analysis - analysis of a specific aspect of the case;
    - Multiple cases:
      - Thematic analysis of cases (within case analysis);
      - Thematic analysis across cases (cross-case analysis);
  - If using ethnography, describe analytical and triangulation methods used.

## 5.4 Methodological limitations

- Identify the limitations of the evaluation and the implications these might have for the validity of the findings from both a qualitative and quantitative perspective.

## 6. Evaluation Findings and Interpretation

Ensure findings incorporate the evaluation questions and indicators identified in the process and impact evaluation matrix. Evaluation findings should be reported using the following headings:

- Evaluation questions;
- Indicators (for each question);
- Description of data source used (i.e. further explain how the questionnaire was used to conduct the analysis);
- Findings (Include a table with the data where applicable);
- Limitations (include discussion of statistical power, sampling, statistical assumptions, measurement, etc. relevant to the evaluation question and findings);

- Interpretation (discuss whether the outcomes could or could not be attributed to the program being assessed).

The analysis should also include an interpretation of the findings. If the implementation did not occur as expected, or produce the anticipated outputs or outcomes, the evaluation report should identify possible explanations for the findings.

Findings should be used for the following purposes:

- To determine if the project reached the appropriate target group – i.e. youth at risk of committing violent crimes? If not, what are the possible reasons (e.g. recruitment methods, inappropriate risk assessment, etc.)?
- To determine if youth, once recruited into the program, are staying with the program long enough for benefits to accrue? If not, why not?
- To analyze and project whether the program was currently implemented to be able to contribute to change in the outcomes of interest;
- To determine the extent to which participant outcomes may be impacted by external influences.

Ensure all key tables with data are incorporated into the report. Tables that provide additional details can be appended to the report.

### **6.1 Process Evaluation Questions and Findings**

Process evaluation findings should be based on relevant data sources identified in the original evaluation plan. Refer to Appendix A and B of this template that include systematic reporting samples and sample tables to report process evaluation data.

- Provide a summary and incorporate any process evaluation findings in this section of the report. Focus on process related information that is needed to interpret the outcome evaluation findings that are being reported in the current report.
- A profile of participants should be provided that answers the questions, “what risk factors are experienced by the participants” and “what is their overall level of risk”?
- The profile should include the following (for primary participants only):
  - # and % of participants by ethnicity
  - # and % of participants with a criminal history (break down by charges, arrests, criminal offences)
  - % and # of participants with school related suspensions
  - # and % of participants with substance abuse problems (drug, alcohol or both).
- The findings in this section should report on such aspects of the program as recruitment, intake and referral, determination of eligibility. In this context, the report should describe the assessment tools used to select appropriate youth into the program. This section should describe, for example, what is the distribution of scores on the risk assessment tool for the youth accepted into the program? For those not accepted?
- The findings should include the number of participants admitted to the program compared to the number of referrals.
- Utilize the fidelity tool developed/modified to systematically report if the program was implemented as intended (include the fidelity tool in an Appendix).
- Report on any changes or adaptations to the program model.
- Report any modifications to the fidelity tool.
- Where relevant, the process analysis can provide comparisons over time in order to explore patterns, identify areas for improvement or progress being made, etc.
- Qualitative data should be linked to quantitative data on the same topic so that the two together provide richer, more robust findings.
- Report on how the evaluation team used the process evaluation findings to strengthen or interpret the outcome related findings.

- Refer to Appendix B for systematic reporting guidelines.

## 6.2 Outcome Evaluation Questions and Findings

- This section should clearly present the results to date, in a way that they are linked to the outcomes in the logic model and the impact evaluation sub-matrix. For example, rather than reporting individual item scores, scale scores related to particular concepts (e.g. parental monitoring, family functioning, attitude towards marginalized youth etc.) should be used.
- Provide an overall summary table that provides a “quick reference” to results demonstrating “positive change”, “No change” or “unfavorable change”

When using tables to present findings, they must be appropriately numbered, titled, and labeled. SPSS or similar output is not acceptable. Refer to Appendix C and D of this template that includes sample tables to report impact evaluation data.

- Repeated Measures Data:
  - Where no comparison group has been developed or achieved, provide a clear reporting of within group changes, discussing the change between T1 (pre-test), T2 (post program test, T3 (6 months post program) and T4 (1 year post program).
  - Where applicable, report on differences between cohorts.
  - Where there is a comparison group, provide results for between group comparisons (i.e. for the first annual report it is likely that most evaluation teams will be able to report on potential between group differences (experimental vs. comparison) at the T2 interval. If T3 data is available, the between group findings should be reported.
  - Where a comparison group is being used, the report should include a comparison between participants and comparison group on the pre-test measures, and the implications for the analysis. It should describe the techniques used to test differences between the participants and the comparison group and identify mitigation strategies if groups are not as similar as projected.
  - Utilize APA standards and clearly report the type of significance tests being used (i.e. statistical significance, clinical significance, organizational significance etc.)
- Case studies or other qualitative approaches to the measurement of outcomes
  - Open with a vignette
  - Provide a synopsis of the issues, the purpose and method of the study so that the reader learns how the study came to be.
  - Provide an extensive description of the cases and their context.
  - Summarize key themes and present each assertion separately and systematically for each case.
  - Discuss main findings for each case.
  - Discuss findings and interpretations overall or cross-sectionally.
  - Summarize and conclude.
- Where possible, outcomes can be linked to outputs, for example, by comparing outcomes for participants who receive different dosages of the intervention. Attempts to correlate fidelity levels and outcomes should be considered and reported where relevant (i.e. For example, did the low level of fidelity in one group cohort contribute to limited change in anger and substance abuse levels?)
- Not all projects have activities directed towards changing community-level risk factors, but for those that do; these community-level impacts should be reported.
- For projects that cannot conduct inferential testing of the outcome variables, descriptive data should be provided with projections about when inferential testing will be feasible.
- Qualitative data should be linked to quantitative data on the same topic so that the two together provide richer, more robust findings.
- Utilize triangulation techniques when reporting findings. Incorporate qualitative data and external sources of validation (police and school records) to support concluding statements.

## 7. Cost Analysis Findings

At minimum this section should include a complete descriptive cost analysis (including the total cost of the project to date, project start up costs, cost per participant and cost per intervention/activity or component). See Public Safety Canada's Descriptive Cost Analysis Guidelines. This section should present the cost data since project inception (not including the cost of this evaluation).

This section should also report on data that are available to conduct a cost effectiveness analysis and any gaps or challenges that prevent the evaluation team from reporting on cost effectiveness analysis. If the evaluation team identified that a cost effectiveness analysis was feasible in their evaluation the following should be reported in this report:

- Information/data that is available (i.e. the evaluation may have new information about the feasibility of conducting a CEA).
- Barriers or challenges to completing a CEA. Specific details should be provided so the Public Safety Canada evaluation team can assess whether the challenges can be mitigated to make the analysis possible or can make recommendations for future CEA evaluation studies.

## **8. Relevance**

This section focuses on the relevance of the project in relation to the community and Public Safety Canada. Specific questions and findings would include:

- Determine the community youth/needs. Does there continue to be a need for this program?
- Determine the extent to which the project/model corresponds to the needs of the community/youth.
- Determine whether the project's results are consistent with the National Crime Prevention Strategy objectives.

## **9. Challenges, Opportunities and Lessons Learned**

The evaluation should identify challenges, and opportunities that occurred during the evaluation period. Include a discussion of lessons learned (positive and/or negative) to date that might be of interest to the project, Public Safety Canada and the broader evaluation and project development community. Lessons learned should include those related to conducting evaluations of this nature and/or the kind of projects or target populations being addressed. This component should also highlight key lessons learned about the intervention itself.

This section should be sub-divided into: a) Challenges, Opportunities and Lessons Learned for the Project, and b) Challenges, Opportunities and Lessons Learned for the Evaluation.





## **10. Recommendations**

Recommendations should flow logically from the evaluation findings and / or lessons learned and focus on project administration in an attempt to identify future project direction and changes to implementation. Other recommendations should focus on specific courses of action for evaluation and best evaluation practices when working with certain types of projects and/or participants so as to enhance the probability of a successful evaluation study – one that is beneficial to all involved (funded projects, Public Safety Canada and evaluators).

This section should be sub-divided into: a) Recommendations for the Project, and b) Recommendations for the Evaluation.

### **Other Considerations:**

Tables and figures should be presented using APA style, as described in the Publications Manual of the American Psychological Association (Chapter 5), or similar format. That is, SPSS or similar output is not acceptable. Tables need to be appropriately numbered, titled, and labeled.

**All reports should be stand-alone documents which include all the necessary appendices and explanations. The reader should not have to refer back to any previous documents to understand the context.**



## APPENDIX A - Evaluation Results Matrix<sup>1</sup>

<b>Evaluation Question</b>				
<b>Question 1: Target Population</b>				
Did the project reach its intended target population?				
<b>Area of inquiry</b>	<b>Process Indicators (from the original evaluation matrix)</b>	<b>Target Outputs</b>	<b>Actual Result</b>	<b>Data Sources</b>
<b>Program Intake and Completion</b>	- # participants selected per year - Total # of participants selected over the 3 year project	- 82 participants selected per year - 246 participants total over 3 years	- 93 participants selected for program per year - 200 total over 3 years	Project data tracking instruments document selection process Project database
	- X% of the youth have at least 80% of the eligibility requirements met	- To have 90% of the youth have at least 80% of the eligibility requirements met	- 95% of youth that have at least 80% of the eligibility requirements met	Eligibility checklist scores (from database)
	- # participants completing training per year - Total # of participants completing training over the 3 year project	- 65 complete training each year 185 over 3 years	- 72 (X%) participants completed training each year 195 over 3 years	- Attendance data - Program completion statistics (from project database)
<b>Demographics</b>	- 100% of participants should be under the age of 12 - Age breakdown – # participants in 8-10 and over 10 – 12 years groupings - Gender breakdown - Income levels - % below LICO - Cultural/language breakdown	- Subjective – expected representation of groups: 100% under 12 yrs 40% girls 30% Immigrant 50 % Low income – family income below LICO	- 200 participants (100%) were under 12 (provide age breakdown of sample if applicable) 42% girls 41% immigrants 60% low-income	- Baseline intake data - Parental survey (income levels) - Comparison of income data with local LICO statistics
<b>Risk Factors</b>	- Baseline Score > or = to 70 (CBCL) - % reported by school authorities to have anti-social or conduct problems	- 90% will have a T score > or = to 70 (CBCL) - 100% were reported by school authorities to have anti-social or conduct problems	- 90% had T score > or = to 70 (CBCL) - 100% were reported by school authorities to have anti-social or conduct problems	- CBCL, CD rule breaking/Aggressiveness subscales - School-based data collection (from project database) - Referral information/criteria
	- Record of police contact for engaging in general offences, anti-social activities or having conduct problems	15% had police contact	10% had police contact	Police records
<b>Analysis:</b>	Provide analysis of whether the projected results/targets were achieved. Ensure the analysis incorporates all of the areas of enquiry that relate to the overall question posed in this section			
<b>Conclusions</b>	Ensure that you incorporate the analysis from this section in the overall findings section of the process evaluation report. This will ensure that you are able to substantiate any claims related to whether the target group was served			

<sup>1</sup> This type of table should be completed for each evaluation question and included in an appendix of the report

## **Appendix B - Systematic Reporting of Evaluation Findings<sup>2</sup>**

**Evaluation Question:** Were the activities implemented as planned?

**Indicators:**

- % of cognitive behavioural sessions completed
- % of cognitive behavioural sessions completed on a weekly basis over a 6 month period
- # of qualified case managers delivering the cognitive behavioural sessions
- % of training sessions completed with parents within the 6 month period

**Data Source**

- In the pre-test and post-test interviews for questionnaire 2 C, youth were asked to answer a series of fifteen questions about their attitudes towards education and educational goals (for example, if getting good grades is important or if a good education is related to career success and high income). Scores from these fifteen items were summed to produce an overall “educational attitudes” score. (Based on pre-test clients, the Cronbach’s alpha = .76). The score could range from 15 to 75, and some items were recoded so that higher scores indicate a more positive attitude towards education. (Pre- and Post-Test Interviews with Youth)

**Results**

Four key indicators were used to determine whether the program was implemented as planned. The findings below indicate that three of the four related areas were successful. Expectations were that at least 75% of the youth would complete the activities as required. Therefore 75% and above is an indicator that the program was being implemented as planned.

- 79% of cognitive behavioural sessions completed
- 85% of cognitive behavioural sessions completed on a weekly basis over a 6 month period
- Only 50% of the case managers delivering the cognitive behavioural sessions during the program period were qualified
- 95% of the parent training sessions were completed within the 6 month period

**Interpretation**

A narrative is provided to further explain the results. Any key informant or focus group discussions should be triangulated with the quantitative data to further interpret the results.

---

<sup>2</sup> This is how results should be presented in the body of the evaluation report



## Appendix C - Samples of Tables for Findings

Table 1: Types of risk factors experienced by participants

Types of risk factors	Number of participants with these risk factors	Percentage of participants with these risk factors
Substance Abuse	12	21.8%
Negative Peer Association	51	92.7%
Limited employment skills	44	80.0%
No Risk factors present	4	7.1 %
Total no. of participants (2009-2010)	55	N/A

Table 2: Participants' Level of Risk for Marginalized youth Involvement

Level of Risk	Number of participants at risk level	Percentage of participants at risk level
High risk (indicate range here)	12	21.8%
Moderate risk (indicate range here)	35	63.6%
Low Risk (indicate range here)	4	7.3%
No risk (indicate range here)	4	7.3%
Total	55	100%

Table 3: Sample Table for Other Outcomes

Knowledge: Levels of knowledge about the consequences of negative peer associations

Levels of knowledge	Number of participants	Percentage of Participants
Low (indicate range )		
Moderate		
High		
Total		

Note: Based on composite index or questions (XXXX)

Table 4: Logistic Regression Predicting Improvement in Peer Deviance between Pre-Test and Post-Test Interviews (1=Peer deviance improved; 0=Peer deviance remained the same or got worse)

Predictor Variables	B	S.E.	Odds Ratio	P-value
Level of risk	-.074	.067	.929	.267
Program dosage	.003	.002	1.003	.061
Age	-.566	.341	.568	.097
Male	-.755	.488	.470	.122
Constant	7.333	4.314	1529.824	.089
N	84			
-2 Log Likelihood (df = 4)	105.963			
Nagelkerke R <sup>2</sup>	.151			

Table 5: Analysis of Variance: Pro-crime and Pro-gang Attitudes (paired sample)



SCALE	Experimental Group			Comparison			Group F-value	Time F-value	Time X Group F-value
	N	Pre-test	Post-test	N	Pre-test	Post-test			
Pro-Crime Attitudes	65	26.92 (6.79)	25.26 (5.90)	42	31.83 (7.02)	30.83 (6.43)	20.71***	5.29*	0.33

\*\*\* p<0.001; \* p<0.05

Source: Pre-test I11 and I3, Post-test F11 and F3

NOTE: 2 youth did not respond



## Appendix D – Multi-site Analyses (if applicable)

1) The report or specific tables should provide context that will provide clarity about the potential differences between the sites. Ensure the following criteria are included in the report:

- ✓ Sample sizes.
- ✓ Testing points: What T measures are being compared (i.e. Site 1: T1-T3; Site 2: T1-T2).
- ✓ Are comparison groups available for all sites?
- ✓ Were the comparison groups similar enough to isolate program attribution?
- ✓ How were internal threats to validity addressed for sites that did not have a comparison group?
- ✓ Clearly describe the limitations that potentially diminished the ability to compare the sites.

### 2) Sample of Table

**Table X. Scale: Pro-Crime Attitudes**

SITES	Experimental Group			Comparison			Group F-value	Time F-value	Time X Group F-value
	N	Pre-test	Post-test	N	Pre-test	Post-test			
Site 1	65	26.92 (6.79)	25.26 (5.90)	42	31.83 (7.02)	30.83 (6.43)	20.71***	5.29*	0.33
Site 2	20	16.92 (5.79)	15.26 (5.90)	13	21.83 (6.02)	20.83 (5.43)	10.31***	3.29*	0.46
Site 3	45	36.92 (7.79)	35.26 (6.90)	17	41.83 (8.02)	40.83 (6.43)	18.41***	6..29*	0.53

\*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ ; \*  $p < 0.05$

Source: Pre-test I11 and I3, Post-test F11 and F3

Note: All Sites in this sample had T1-T3 comparisons.

3) Consider the following points when comparing the “between-site” results:

- ✓ Clearly describe any similarities between the sites. Discuss why the sites may have similar findings.
- ✓ Clearly describe any differences between the sites. Discuss why the sites may have demonstrated different results. Consider the following criteria when reporting differences:
  - Target Group (i.e. ability to reach the appropriate target group; risk levels)
  - Geographical Location
  - Culture
  - Time (i.e. some sites started at different times)
  - Implementation Challenges (refer to the fidelity related information)

4) Ensure that between-site reporting is completed for all variables/scales.

5) Integrate qualitative findings into the discussion/reporting to complement the quantitative findings.

## Appendix 3 to Annex A Process Evaluation Matrix

The following table provide sample matrices that must be filled in and submitted during the project development stage. The final versions will be submitted four months after project start.

The Tables must be completed only for those projects that will have process and impact evaluations. The Tables includes the Process Evaluation and the Impact Evaluation matrices. All of the areas covered in the matrices must be covered by the project and other areas may be added as required after discussion with the Public Safety Canada Evaluation Advisor. Public Safety Canada encourages the use of standardized instruments for process and impact evaluations; examples of data collection tools are provided in the matrices whereas final selection of instruments will depend on the model/ promising program funded. For instance, if the program is targeting bullying behaviour, the impact evaluation will need to include outcomes related to bullying and to use appropriate standardized tools. In cases where the evaluator will develop new tools, he will have to ensure reliability and validity and describe them into the matrix. All impact evaluation tools will be submitted for an ethics review.

1. Process Evaluation					
Process Evaluation Questions	Process Evaluation area	Related indicators	Data collection methods (including instruments)	Sources of information	Data collection timelines / Public Safety Canada Reports
<b>Project participants</b>					
Did the project work with the planned number of youth?  <i># of participants</i>	Participant engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- # of youth referred to the program and # youth recruited</li> <li>- # of new primary participants covering April 01-Sept. 30 or # covering Oct. 01-March 31 reporting periods</li> <li>- # of primary participants carry-forwarded from previous PMA period</li> <li>- Total # of participants since project start</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project database</li> <li>- Case management files</li> <li>- Referral forms</li> </ul>	Project staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Program entry</li> <li>- Ongoing data collection</li> <li>- Annual Evaluation Reports</li> <li>- Final Evaluation Report</li> </ul>



<p>Did the target group correspond to Public Safety Canada priority groups?</p>	<p>Participant risk profile</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- # and % of youth corresponding to priority groups:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Age groups: 0-5, 6-11, 12-17, 18-24</li> <li>* Sex: Male, Female</li> <li>* # of Aboriginal participants</li> <li>*Offending history: participants without any prior arrests, charges or convictions; participants with at least one prior arrest but not charged or convicted; participants with at least one prior charge not convicted; participants convicted and not sentenced to institutions; participants convicted and sentenced to institutions</li> <li>* Substance use: participant with alcohol abuse issues only; participant with drug abuse issues only; participants with both alcohol and drug abuse issues;</li> <li>*Mental disorders: participant with diagnosed mental health illnesses; participants with self-reported mental health illnesses</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Referral forms</li> <li>- Case management files</li> <li>- Project database</li> <li>- Standardized tools i.e.: DEP ADO, Massachusetts Youth Screening Instrument, UPPS Impulsive Behavior Scale self-report questionnaire, NLSCY questionnaires, DSM, LSI-R, YLS/CMI, OJJDP guides, etc.</li> </ul>	<p>Project staff, participants, parents and partners</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pre program (referrals)</li> <li>- Program entry</li> <li>- Ongoing data collection</li> <li>- Annual Evaluation Reports</li> <li>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</li> </ul>
<p>Did youth stay engaged in the project?</p> <p><i>- Dropout rate</i> <i>- Duration of program involvement</i></p>	<p>Participant Engagement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- # and % of youth who have dropped out of the program</li> <li>- # of male and female drop outs</li> <li>- Reasons for dropping out</li> <li>- Average # week in the program and Average # of hours/week in the program (for completers and drop outs)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Case management files</li> <li>- Project database</li> </ul>	<p>Project staff, participants and parents</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ongoing data collection</li> <li>- Annual Evaluation Reports</li> <li>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</li> </ul>



<b>Project management</b>					
Was staff sufficiently trained to implement the intervention?	Participation in adequate and high quality trainings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amount and type of training provided</li> <li>- Comprehensive and systematic training manual used</li> <li>- Level of satisfaction quality/ adequacy of training</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project records</li> <li>- Attendance sheets</li> <li>- Training evaluation questionnaires</li> </ul>	Project managers, staff and volunteers (if applicable)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ongoing data collection</li> <li>- Annual Evaluation Reports</li> <li>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</li> </ul>
Did staff have sufficient resources to implement the project?	Adequate resources to implement the program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adequate financial resources</li> <li>- Adequate human resources</li> <li>- Adequate material resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Advisory Committee meetings records</li> <li>- Semi-structured interviews with project managers, staff and volunteers (if applicable)</li> </ul>	Project partners, managers, staff and volunteers (if applicable)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Annual Evaluation Reports</li> <li>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</li> </ul>
Was the project's governance structure able to support the project efficiently?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Active involvement of partners</li> <li>- Level of satisfaction of partners about the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- # of meetings of governance structure (Project Advisory Committee, etc.)</li> <li>- # partners involved in the governance structure</li> <li>- Level of participation in meetings (partners)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Advisory Committee meetings records</li> <li>- Attendance sheets</li> <li>- Semi-structured interviews with project managers, staff and volunteers (if applicable) based on a questionnaire developed by the evaluators</li> </ul>	Project partners and managers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ongoing data collection</li> <li>- Annual Evaluation Reports</li> <li>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</li> </ul>
Were any knowledge products/ materials produced during the program?		# of products/ materials produced (for external dissemination)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project records</li> <li>- Review of products</li> <li>- Training manual, implementation tools, materials, and products produced</li> </ul>	- Project managers and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ongoing data collection</li> <li>- Annual Evaluation Reports</li> <li>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</li> </ul>
<b>Project implementation</b>					
Did the participants receive the planned intervention activities and services?	Activities or services provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- # of project components implemented within the planned timeline</li> <li>- Relevance of activities in line with the logic model</li> <li>- Appropriateness of activities</li> <li>- # and % of youth participating in activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Logic model and project work plan</li> <li>- Project database</li> <li>- Case management files</li> <li>- Attendance sheets</li> <li>- Review of participants intervention plan</li> </ul>	Partners and project staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ongoing data collection</li> <li>- Annual Evaluation Reports</li> <li>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</li> </ul>

			- Fidelity tools, i.e.: Joly and Thibaudeau (2009), existing program fidelity tool provided by program developer, etc.		
If applicable, did the participants receive the appropriate amount and duration of programming (dosage)?	Intensity of activities and services implemented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- # of hours of programming youth received</li> <li>- # of hours received / # of hours planned</li> <li>- Participants level of satisfaction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project data base</li> <li>- Case management files</li> <li>- Attendance sheets</li> <li>- Review of participants intervention plans</li> <li>- Satisfaction questionnaires i.e. : QOSE-21 satisfaction questionnaire, CSQ Client Satisfaction Questionnaire, etc.</li> </ul>	Project staff and participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ongoing data collection</li> <li>- Annual Evaluation Reports</li> <li>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</li> </ul>
Was the program implemented with fidelity?	Alignment of program components, activities and services implemented with program prescriptions	- Level of fidelity, fidelity score (if applicable)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project database</li> <li>- Case management files</li> <li>- Review of participants intervention plans</li> <li>- Review of logbooks (<i>journaux de bord</i>)</li> <li>- Interviews with project staff, participants, parents and partners based on a questionnaire developed by the evaluators</li> <li>- Fidelity tools, i.e.: Joly and Thibaudeau (2009), existing program fidelity tool provided by program developer, etc.</li> </ul>	Project staff, participants, parents and partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Annual Evaluation Reports</li> <li>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</li> </ul>
<b>Community partnerships</b>					
Were partnerships maintained throughout the project?  <i>Partnerships, protocols in place</i>		# of partners, sector, contribution	-Project records	Project manager and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Annual Evaluation Reports</li> <li>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</li> </ul>

Was project staff able to work effectively with community partners?	nature and quality of partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Individual, group and organizational characteristics of collaboration</li> <li>- Positive feedback about the relationship between community partners, project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Advisory Committee's meetings records</li> <li>- Semi-structured interviews based on a questionnaire developed by the evaluators</li> <li>- Self-report questionnaire PINCOM-Q (PINCOM-Q-I, etc.).</li> </ul>	Partners, project managers and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Annual Evaluation Reports</li> <li>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</li> </ul>
Were partners involved in coordinated service delivery with the project?	# and nature of partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- # of activities involving community partners</li> <li>- # of referrals to/ from partner organizations</li> <li>- # of financial/ in-kind contributions</li> <li>- # partners members of Project Advisory Committee</li> <li>- # and frequency of Project Advisory Committee's meetings</li> <li>- Level of participation in Project Advisory Committee</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Advisory Committee's meetings records</li> <li>- Semi-structured interviews based on a questionnaire developed by the evaluators</li> </ul>	Partners, project managers and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ongoing data collection</li> <li>- Annual Evaluation Reports</li> <li>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</li> </ul>
<b>Volunteer activities (if applicable)</b>					
Was the project able to effectively recruit, train and use volunteers?	Service delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- # of volunteers</li> <li>- # of activities involving volunteers</li> <li>- Positive feedback from staff/ volunteers</li> <li>- Amount and type of training provided</li> <li>- Level of satisfaction quality/ adequacy of training</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project records</li> <li>- Training evaluation questionnaires</li> <li>- Semi-structured interviews based on a questionnaire developed by the evaluators</li> </ul>	Project managers, staff and volunteers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ongoing data collection</li> <li>- Annual Evaluation Reports</li> <li>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</li> </ul>
What were the benefits of having volunteers involved with the project?	Service delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Positive feedback of key stakeholders on the role of volunteers</li> </ul>	Semi-structured interviews based on a questionnaire developed by the evaluators	Partners, participants, project managers and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Annual Evaluation Reports</li> <li>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</li> </ul>

<b>Project satisfaction</b>					
Are key stakeholders / partners satisfied with the project?	Satisfaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- # and % of stakeholders/partners satisfied with the project</li> <li>- Positive feedback about the outcomes of the project</li> <li>- Identification of strengths and weaknesses of the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Advisory Committee meetings records</li> <li>- Semi-structured interviews based on a questionnaire developed by the evaluators</li> <li>- Satisfaction questionnaires i.e. : - QOSE-21 satisfaction questionnaire, CSQ Client Satisfaction Questionnaire, etc.</li> </ul>	Partners, participants, parents, project managers and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Annual Evaluation Reports</li> <li>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</li> </ul>
<b>Challenges and lessons learned</b>					
Were there any challenges regarding project implementation, monitoring and evaluation?	Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- # and identification of implementation challenges</li> <li>- # and identification of performance monitoring and evaluation challenges</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Advisory Committee meetings records</li> <li>- Semi-structured interviews based on a questionnaire developed by the evaluators</li> </ul>	Partners, project managers and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Annual Evaluation Reports</li> <li>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</li> </ul>
<b>2. Impact Evaluation</b>					
<b>Evaluation Question (example)</b>	<b>Risk factors / Domains</b>	<b>Related outcome indicators (examples)</b>	<b>Data collection methods (including examples of instruments)</b>	<b>Source of information</b>	<b>Data collection timelines / Public Safety Canada reports</b>
<b>Short term outcomes (knowledge, attitudes and skills)</b>					
Have youth increased their knowledge/awareness of the consequences of the issues the project is addressing (bullying, violence, anti-social behaviour, substance use)?	Knowledge/Awareness of consequences	# and % of youth reporting an increase in awareness of the consequences of the issues being addressed	<b>Examples of tools:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Youth attitudes on drugs (survey questionnaire used by The Gallup Organization)</li> </ul>	Youth (program and control groups)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up</li> <li>- Annual Evaluation Reports</li> <li>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</li> </ul>

Have youth improved their attitude toward school/ police/ community?	Attitude toward figures of authority	# and % of youth with an improvement in attitudes toward school/ police/ community?  # and % of youth with an increase in the motivation to change	<b>Examples of tools:</b> - Structured Assessment of Protective Factors (SAPROF) - Trousse d'évaluation pour décrocheurs potentiels (TEDP)	Youth (program and control groups), teachers, parents, project staff	- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up - Annual Evaluation Reports - Final Evaluation Report (End of project)
Have youth decreased their pro-gang attitudes?	Attitude toward gangs	# and % of youth with a decrease in pro-gang attitudes	<b>Examples of tools:</b> - MAC-Gang (Guay and Fredette, 2010)	Youth (program and control groups)	- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up - Annual Evaluation Reports - Final Evaluation Report (End of project)
Have youth increased their pro-social attitudes?	Pro-social attitudes	# and % of youth with a increase in pro-social attitudes	<b>Examples of tools:</b> - Structured Assessment of Protective Factors (SAPROF)	Project staff, youth (program and control groups)	- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up - Annual Evaluation Reports - Final Evaluation Report (End of project)
Have youth increased their emotional/ pro-social skills (anger and stress management, conflict resolution, problem solving and communication skills...)?	Emotional/Pro-social skills	# and % of youth with a increase in emotional/ pro-social skills	<b>Examples of tools:</b> - Inventaire d'habiletés sociales pour les adolescents québécois (IHSAQ)	Youth (program and control groups)	- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up - Annual Evaluation Reports - Final Evaluation Report (End of project)
Have parents improved parenting/ primary caregiver skills?	Parenting skills	# and % of parents/primary caregivers with improved parenting skills	<b>Examples of tools:</b> - Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (APQ)	Parents and youth (program and control groups)	- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up - Annual Evaluation Reports - Final Evaluation Report (End of project)



<b>Intermediate outcomes (behaviors)</b>					
Have youth reduced their substance use as a result of this program?	Substance use	# and % of at risk youth that increased awareness about the negative consequences of drug/ alcohol/ substance use (Note the specific type of drugs that propose the risk)  # and % of at risk youth that reduce substance use	<b>Examples of tools:</b> - DEP ADO (RISQ, 2003) - National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth (NLSCY)	Youth (program and control groups), parents/ primary caregiver	- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up - Annual Evaluation Reports - Final Evaluation Report (End of project)
Have youth improved self-management (anxiety, risk-seeking, impulsivity, relaxation...)	Self-management	# and % of youth improving self-management	<b>Examples of tools:</b> - Hamilton Anxiety Scale (HAM) - Barratt Impulsiveness Scale (BIS)	Youth (program and control groups)	- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up - Annual Evaluation Reports - Final Evaluation Report (End of project)
Have youth improved resilience?	Resilience	# and % of youth improving resilience	<b>Examples of tools:</b> <u>The Child and Youth Resilience Measure</u> (CYRM)	Youth (program and control groups)	- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up - Annual Evaluation Reports - Final Evaluation Report (End of project)
Have youth had an increase in positive relationships with family/ care givers?	Family	# and % of youth who report improved relationships with family members  # and % of youth reporting that they receive support from their families  # and % of youth participating in programming for the family	<b>Examples of tools:</b> - Family Assessment Device (FAD) - Inventory of Peers and Parents Attachment (IPPA) - Conflict Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ) - Kansas Parental Satisfaction Scale (KPS) - Parental Monitoring Scale (PMS). - Clinical Assessment Package (CAP)	Youth (program and control groups), project staff	- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up - Annual Evaluation Reports - Final Evaluation Report (End of project)

Have parents improved their relationship with youth?	Family	<p># and % of youth reporting a improvement in their relationship with Youth</p> <p># and % of parents reporting an improvement in their relationship with youth</p>	<p><b>Examples of tools:</b></p> <p>- Family Environment Scale (FES)</p>	Parents (program and control groups)	<p>- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up</p> <p>- Annual Evaluation Reports</p> <p>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</p>
Have youth increased attendance at school?	School engagement/ Attachment	# and % of youth with an increase in school attendance	<p><b>Examples of tools:</b></p> <p>- School records</p>	Youth (program and control groups), school authorities	<p>- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up</p> <p>- Annual Evaluation Reports</p> <p>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</p>
Have youth increased school performance?	School engagement/ Attachment	<p># and % of youth with increased grades or school completion</p> <p># and % of youth reporting improved relationships with teachers</p>	<p><b>Examples of tools:</b></p> <p>- School records</p>	Youth (program and control groups), school authorities and teachers	<p>- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up</p> <p>- Annual Evaluation Reports</p> <p>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</p>
Have youth decreased school suspensions/ expulsions/drop-out	School engagement/ Attachment	<p># and % of youth with reduced disciplinary actions at school</p> <p># and % of youth with reduced suspensions/expulsions at school</p> <p>Decrease in drop-out rate</p>	<p><b>Examples of tools:</b></p> <p>- School records</p>	Youth (program and control groups), school authorities and teachers	<p>- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up</p> <p>- Annual Evaluation Reports</p> <p>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</p>
Have youth increased involvement in pro-social activities?	Pro-sociality	# and % of youth reporting an increase in pro-social activities (organized sports, recreation, arts, culture, for example)	<p><b>Examples of tools:</b></p> <p>- Structured Assessment of Protective factors (SAPROF)</p>	Youth (program and control groups), project staff	<p>- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up</p> <p>- Annual Evaluation Reports</p> <p>- Final Evaluation Report (End of project)</p>



Have youth increased involvement with positive peers and role models?	Peers	# and % of youth reporting a decrease in anti-social behaviour with peers  # and % of youth involved with positive peers and role models	<b>Examples of tools:</b> - Mesure du capital social et criminel (Hagan & McCarthy, 1997)	Youth (program and control groups), project staff	- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up - Annual Evaluation Reports - Final Evaluation Report (End of project)
Have youth reduced their gang involvement?	Peers/ Gangs	# and % of youth reporting a decrease in gang involvement	<b>Examples of tools:</b> - MAC-Gang - Gang Involvement Scale (GIS)	Youth (program and control groups)	- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up - Annual Evaluation Reports - Final Evaluation Report (End of project)
Have youth reduced antisocial and delinquent behaviour?	Antisociality/ Delinquency	# and % of youth reporting a decrease in delinquent behaviour  # and % percent of youth with a reduction in police or school reported delinquent behaviour	<b>Examples of tools:</b> - Child Behavior Checklist (CBC) - Multidimensional Inventory of Development, Sex, and Aggression (MIDSA) - NLSCY questionnaires - Questionnaire sur la délinquance auto-révélee (QDAR) - Police records	Youth (program and control groups), school authorities and police	- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up - Annual Evaluation Reports - Final Evaluation Report (End of project)
Have intimidation/bullying behaviours decreased?	Antisociality/ Delinquency	# and % of decrease in intimidation/bullying behaviours	<b>Examples of tools:</b> - Peer Relations Assessment Questionnaire (PRAQ) - Bullying Prevalence Questionnaire (BPQ) - Handling Bullying Questionnaire (HBQ)	Youth (program and control groups), teachers and parents	- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up - Annual Evaluation Reports - Final Evaluation Report (End of project)
<b>Long term outcomes</b>					
Have youth decreased the number of chargeable offenses?	Offending	The # and % of youth reporting that they have not had an offense	<b>Examples of tools:</b> - Questionnaire sur la délinquance auto-révélee (QDAR) - Police records	Youth (program and control groups) and police	- Pre/post program, 6/12-month follow-up - Annual Evaluation Reports - Final Evaluation Report (End of



		The number and % of youth with fewer police contacts/charges according to police data  The number and % of youth with fewer arrest/convictions/ court contacts			project)
--	--	--	--	--	----------

Notes:

**Reference Documents**

- Youth Gang Prevention Fund Evaluation Guidelines and CPAF Evaluation Guidelines
  - Performance Monitoring and Assessment Guidelines
  - Public Safety Canada Reporting Templates
- Note that all variables identified in those tables must be entered in a project database to ensure that the project is able to report the data in a timely manner



## Annex B – Proposed Evaluation Criteria

### 1. Mandatory Evaluation Criteria

Item	Evaluation Criteria	Demonstrated Compliance
M1	<p>The Bidder must propose a team of resources to complete the work as described in the Statement of Work. The Bidder must describe the structure of the team and include a description of the role that each resource will undertake. At a minimum, the Bidder must propose a Project Leader.</p>	
M2	<p>For each proposed resource that is a senior member of the team, the Bidder must submit a résumé that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed resource’s full name</li> <li>• A detailed description of each of the resource’s relevant work experiences, including their specific role.</li> <li>• The start and end date for each project</li> <li>• A description of all relevant, completed education</li> <li>• A description of all relevant, completed certifications</li> <li>• A listing of the resource’s publications</li> </ul>	
M3	<p>The Bidder must demonstrate that a senior member of the project team has experience in the design and implementation of quantitative and/or qualitative research models and methodology in the field of health or social sciences.</p> <p>In order to meet this criterion, the Bidder’s proposed resource must have conducted a minimum of three projects or have three years’ experience that collectively includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• quantitative and/or qualitative research, and</li> <li>• analysis</li> </ul> <p>in the study of health or social sciences.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> The experience of multiple resources cannot be combined to satisfy this criterion.</p>	
M4	<p>The Bidder must confirm that a senior member of the project team has access to suitable software (for example, NVivo, SAS, Stata, SPSS, MLwiN, Mplus, or HLM, etc.) for the purposes of performing the analyses outlined in the Statement of Work. The Bidder must provide the name of the software and which senior member(s) of its team has access to it.</p>	
M5	<p>The Bidder must demonstrate that a senior member of the project team has expertise in Acceptance and</p>	



Item	Evaluation Criteria	Demonstrated Compliance
	<p>Commitment Therapy (ACT).</p> <p><b>Evidence of this capacity must be demonstrated by means of a list of trainings/workshops taken or conducted by a senior member of the project team.</b></p> <p><b>Expertise involves a least 2 years working with ACT either in a clinic setting (i.e. psychologist, therapist) or in the research and evaluation of the ACT</b></p>	

## 2. Rated Evaluation Criteria

Item	Evaluation Criteria	Scoring	Demonstrated Compliance
R1	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate that a senior member of the project team has a Scholarly Publication Record of quantitative research in the study of health or social sciences.</p>	<p>Up to <b>25 points</b> will be awarded as follows:</p> <p>20 points – a senior member of the project team has peer-reviewed career publications based on quantitative research in the area of health or social sciences – 5 points per work to a maximum of 20 points.</p> <p>PLUS</p> <p>5 points – a senior member of the project team has published two (2) or more times in the past two years in independent, peer-reviewed journals and/or academic publications, based on quantitative research in the area of health or social sciences. Academic publications can include scientific working papers or technical reports published through a recognized university, governmental, or non-governmental institution.</p>	
R2	<p><b>Work Plan</b> The Bidder should provide a work plan that provides a detailed breakdown of the timelines associated with the work as described in the Statement of Work.</p>	<p>The Bidder will be awarded up to five points for each item below that is addressed in its work plan, up to a maximum of <b>20 points</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tasks are logically organized by phase;</li> <li>• There is a clear indication which activities, deadlines and deliverables will be completed in each work phase;</li> <li>• Details on team composition,</li> </ul>	



Item	Evaluation Criteria	Scoring	Demonstrated Compliance
		<p>including the responsibilities of each team member are clearly provided for each task within each phase;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The associated levels of effort per tasks and per phase are clearly indicated; are well distributed amongst resources; and, are appropriate for the tasks as outlined in the Statement of Work.</li> </ul>	
<b>R3</b>	<p><b>Approach and Methodology</b></p> <p>The Bidder should provide the proposed comprehensive approach and methodology it will use to complete the work.</p>	<p>The Bidder will be awarded up to five points for each item below that is addressed in its approach and methodology, up to a maximum of <b>35 points</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Understanding of the project objectives and the scope of work, including a description of the research methodology that will be used to assess the intervention.</li> <li>b) A description of the intervention to be used and a description of the data collection and analysis strategies.</li> <li>c) A description of the access it has to implement the chosen intervention.</li> <li>d) A description of the access it has to a suitable sample of youth or young adults in order to collect sufficient data for a rigorous comparison group design.</li> <li>e) A description of the advantages the chosen intervention.</li> <li>f) Identify potential risks that may prevent the intervention and/or evaluation from being implemented as planned, and present a risk mitigation strategy.</li> <li>g) A description of how validity will be ensured.</li> </ol>	