



The Suicide Prevention Hub

Best practice programs and services

Submission Guidelines

1. Overview

The aim of these guidelines is to make the submission process as straightforward and transparent as possible. Each submission will be reviewed by a minimum of two Expert Reviewers. To ensure Expert Reviewers have enough information to complete the review process, significant detail is collected via the submission form about:

- The program/service itself, and
- Research/evaluation undertaken on the program/service (or research/evaluation activity that is planned or underway).

It is expected that the submission form will take approximately 60-120 minutes to complete. Importantly, the submission form can be saved and returned to at a later date (i.e. it does not need to be completed in one sitting).

To ensure the submission process is only completed for eligible programs/services, the submission process begins with questions to confirm eligibility. Eligibility criteria cover whether:

- The program/service is delivered primarily to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations. If so, these applications will be more appropriate for a Clearing House currently in development specifically for programs/services designed for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations. For more information about the Clearing House, please contact Barb Ahmat at barb.ahmat@uwa.edu.au.
- The organisation making the submission is registered with an appropriate body such as the Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC), the Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (ACNC), or a state based regulatory body.
- The program/service is funded for at least another 24 months.
- The program/service has a core focus on typical components of national suicide strategies as outlined by the World Health Organisation (<https://bit.ly/2vK6VX9> page 57).
- A primary goal of the program/service is to deliver suicide-related outcomes.
- Research/evaluation activity has either been conducted, or is in progress or planned, and detailed information can be provided about this activity.
- Protocols/procedures are in place to ensure the ethical and safe operation of the program/service.
- Appropriate permissions have been sought if the organisation making the submission is delivering a program or service that was developed or designed by another organisation.

Programs/services that receive a positive rating will be displayed on The Hub for 24 months. Programs/services that do not receive a positive rating will not be displayed on The Hub. They will receive detailed feedback about why they did not receive a positive rating and provided with

support/guidance to achieve a positive rating in the future. They will also have an opportunity to query/challenge the rating received.

To ensure transparency, further detail about the review process completed by Expert Reviewers is provided below.

2. Two types of review: ‘Full’ and ‘Promising’

If research/evaluation activity has not been completed, that is if the only research/evaluation activity for a program/service is that which is planned for the future or underway, the program/service will not be eligible for a full assessment for The Hub. In such cases, programs/services are simply assessed in terms of whether they should be assigned a ‘Promising’ rating on The Hub.

2.1 The ‘Full’ review process

The full review process is multifaceted. Expert Reviewers are required to: 1) complete two rating scales developed specifically for The Suicide Prevention Hub; 2) select any caution flags they think are appropriate; and 3) provide qualitative comments. Each aspect is described in detail below.

Where organisations conducted, or commissioned, the research/evaluation activity themselves, detailed information about the research/evaluation is collected via specific questions in the submission form. Citations and/or uploads, of research/evaluation reports and peer-reviewed publications are also sought.

Where organisations are providing information about research/evaluation conducted or commissioned by another organisation or research institution (e.g. if the organisation is delivering an ‘off the shelf’ program/service), less detail is collected via specific questions in the submission form. Where possible, citations and/or uploads of reports and peer-reviewed publications are gathered. If these are not available, there is one question in the submission form where information can be provided about the research/evaluation activity conducted.

2.1.1 Review criteria and rating scales

Expert Reviewers complete two rating scales for each program/service:

- Research/evaluation quality, and
- Overall assessment.

The assessment of ‘Research/evaluation quality’ forms part of the ‘Overall assessment’. The review criteria for the ‘Research/evaluation quality’ assessment are based on the Better Evaluation Rainbow Framework (<http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/plan>). They cover an assessment of how well the research/evaluation activity was: planned/scoped; framed; described; and reported/utilised. Please find the ‘Research/evaluation quality’ review criteria and rating scale as Appendix one.

The review criteria for the ‘Overall assessment’ are based on the ‘NHMRC Body of evidence matrix’ (<https://bit.ly/1U6TNL7>). There are four criteria: research/evaluation quality (rating inserted from the above rating scale); impact; generalisability and applicability. Please find the ‘Overall assessment’ review criteria and rating scale as Appendix two.

2.1.2 Caution flags

Expert Reviewers are asked to indicate whether they think caution flags should sit alongside the overall assessment. Please find a full list of these caution flags as Appendix three.

2.1.3 Qualitative comments

Finally, Expert Reviewers provide brief qualitative comments about various aspects of organisations' research/evaluation approach. The purpose of these questions is to provide organisations with information that may be valuable for informing future research/evaluation activity they conduct or commission.

2.2 The 'Promising' review process

The promising review process is more straightforward. Please find the 'Promising' review criteria and rating scale as Appendix four. Expert Reviewers also provide a brief qualitative comment to organisations about their research/evaluation approach. The purpose of this is to provide organisations with information that may be valuable for informing future research/evaluation activity they conduct or commission.

3. The Hub platform

The submission form is completed via [The Hub platform](#). In order to complete a submission, you first need to register on The Hub website. Follow the prompts to register or login through the [Submit button](#) on the website.

4. Important information about Expert Reviewers

The main roles of Expert Reviewers are to: thoroughly review and assess the quality of research/evidence behind programs/services against review criteria designed specifically for The Hub; and provide organisations with feedback and advice about existing and future research/evaluation activity. Expert Reviewers will remain anonymous throughout the review process. They sign a confidentiality agreement with Suicide Prevention Australia indicating they will keep information they obtain about programs/services private and confidential. Additionally, they are required to disclose affiliations in the sector and potential conflicts of interest to ensure The Suicide Prevention Hub team can appropriately assign them to programs/services.

5. Frequently Asked Questions

What if I don't have enough information to complete the submission form? Once submitted, there will be very limited opportunity to provide additional information. It is therefore very important that before finalising a submission, a comprehensive response has been provided for each question in the form. It may be necessary to consult with different people involved in the program/service itself and research/evaluation activity conducted on the program/service. Helper text is provided for most questions. Additionally, The Hub team can be contacted if necessary.

What if our organisation does not think the rating for our program/service receives is fair?

There will be opportunity to formally query/challenge ratings. This can be submitted through the Contact form on the website.

6. Appendices

Appendix one: 'Research/evaluation quality' (review criteria and rating scale)

Review criteria	Rating scale
<p>Plan and Scope: Evidence provided that the research/evaluation was well managed (e.g. evidence of stakeholder engagement; evidence that ethical and quality evaluation standards were defined and followed; evidence that planning documents were developed such as an evaluation framework and/or program logic model; appropriateness of staff that undertook the research/evaluation).</p>	<p>0. Not at all 1. Minimal 2. Moderate 3. Strong</p>
<p>Frame: Evidence provided that clear parameters were set for the research/evaluation in terms of its purpose and key evaluation questions.</p>	<p>0. Not at all 1. Minimal 2. Moderate 3. Strong</p>
<p>Describe: Clear description provided of: the sample/participants; measures; how data were collected; how data were managed; how data were analysed; key findings.</p>	<p>0. Not at all 1. Minimal 2. Moderate 3. Strong</p>
<p>Report and support use: Evidence provided that research/evaluation findings have been presented in ways that are useful for the intended users of the evaluation, and/or evidence the research/evaluation findings have been used.</p>	<p>0. Not at all 1. Minimal 2. Moderate 3. Strong</p>
<p>Score:</p>	<p>[Sum of responses to questions 1 to 4 where: 'Not at all' = 0; Minimal = 1; Moderate = 2; and Strong = 3]</p>
<p>Research/evaluation quality rating:</p> <p>Very strong = 10 or higher Strong = 8 or 9 Sufficient = 7 Weak in methodology/conduct = 6 or lower</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very strong • Strong • Sufficient • Weak in methodology/conduct

Appendix two: Overall assessment of the program/service based on research/evidence provided (review criteria and rating scale)

Review criteria	Rating scale
Research/evaluation quality	<p>A. Very strong B. Strong C. Sufficient D. Weak in methodology/conduct</p>
Impact	<p>A. It can be demonstrated that the program or service is causing a change among those who have used the program or service (where the change aligns with the program or service aims) by showing less impact among those who don't receive the program or service. B. Data have been gathered that show some change among those who have used the program or service (where the change aligns with the program or service aims). C. There is a reason (or reasons) to conclude the program or service has the impact(s) it aims to achieve. D. There is no indication that the program or service has the impact(s) it aims to achieve OR There is indication that the program or service has a negative impact(s) and/or adverse outcomes.</p>
Generalisability	<p>A. The population(s) studied in the body of evidence are the same as the target group of the program or service. B. The population(s) studied in the body of evidence are similar to the target group of the program or service. C. The population(s) studied in the body of evidence differ to the target group of the program or service but it is reasonable to apply the evidence to the target group of the program or service. D. The population(s) studied in the body of evidence differ to the target group of the program or service and it is hard to judge if it is reasonable to apply this evidence to the target group of the program or service.</p>
<p>Applicability</p> <p><i>The suicide outcomes and impacts identified for The Hub (based on those identified by the World Health Organisation in their report 'Preventing suicide: A global imperative') include:</i></p>	<p>A. Directly applicable to outcomes and impacts identified for The Hub. B. Applicable to outcomes and impacts identified for The Hub with a few caveats. C. Probably applicable to outcomes and impacts identified for The Hub with some caveats. D. Not applicable to outcomes and impacts identified for The Hub.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A reduction in the suicide rate,</i> • <i>A reduction in suicide-related behaviour,</i> • <i>An increase in help-seeking for suicide-related behaviour,</i> • <i>A reduction in stigma associated with suicide and suicide related behaviour including help seeking;</i> • <i>An increase in the capacity of organisations (including schools, religious organisations, workplaces etc.) to provide appropriate support and referrals to those needing assistance,</i> • <i>An increase in the capacity of individuals, families and social circles to: support and enhance the resilience of loved ones needing assistance; recognise risk factors for suicide; and intervene effectively,</i> • <i>An improvement in media reporting and/or online conversations relating to suicide and suicide-related issues.</i> 	
<p>Final rating:</p> <p>Excellent = A. for Evaluation quality; A. for Impact; A. or B. for Generalisability; A. for Applicability</p> <p>Good = A. or B. for Evaluation quality; A. or B. for Impact; A. or B. for Generalisability; A. or B. for Applicability</p> <p>Satisfactory = A., B. or C. for Evaluation quality; A., B., or C. for Impact; A., B. or C. for Generalisability; A. or B. for Applicability</p> <p>No rating on SPH = Any other scenario</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent • Good • Satisfactory • No rating on The Suicide Prevention Hub

Appendix three: Caution flags

Caution flags
The following 'caution flags' may be selected by Reviewers to help users interpret the quality of the program or service.
<p>Partial evidence <i>Research/evaluation activity has only focussed on certain components/target groups/settings; and/or the body of evidence indicates inconsistency in terms of whether the program or service achieves its impact(s); and/or rating only based on one or two research/evaluation projects.</i></p>
<p>Process evaluation evidence only <i>Only the implementation of the program or service has been researched/evaluated. Outcomes and impacts of the program or service have not yet been explored.</i></p>
<p>Recency <i>The most recent research/evaluation activity occurred more than two years ago.</i></p>
<p>Program adaptations and adjustments <i>Significant program adjustments have occurred since evaluation activity was conducted; and/or the program/service not been specifically adapted for the Australian context; and/or the program/service has been adapted for the Australian context but the adapted version has not been researched/evaluated.</i></p>
<p>Specificity of the body of evidence <i>While there is evidence behind the program or service, the organisation itself has not been evaluated in terms of its delivery of the program or service.</i></p>
<p>Independence <i>Research/evaluation activity was conducted by staff from the same organisation as that which delivers the program or service.</i></p>
<p>Safety protocols and/or monitoring of adverse events <i>Limited evidence provided that protocols/procedures (and/or governance arrangements) are in place to ensure the ethical and safe operation of the program or service.</i></p>
<p>Experts by experience not involved <i>Experts by experience not involved in the design of the program/service itself, the design of safety and quality aspects, the delivery of the program/service or research/evaluation on the program/service.</i></p>

Appendix four: 'Promising' assessment (review criteria and rating scale)

Review criteria	Rating scale
To what extent do you agree that the design of the service or program has been adequately informed by an appropriate range and source of evidence?	1. Not at all 2. To some extent 3. Very much so
To what extent do you agree that the design is innovative?	1. Not at all 2. To some extent 3. Very much so
To what extent do you agree that the research/evaluation activity that is underway or planned will be well conducted and provide useful insight into the implementation and/or effectiveness of the program or service?	0. N.A. – No research/evaluation planned 1. Not at all 2. To some extent 3. Very much so
Score:	[Sum of responses to questions 27-29 where: 'Not at all' = 1; To some extent = 2; and Very much so = 3]
Final rating: Promising = Score of 6 or more Not suitable for The Suicide Prevention Hub = A score lower than 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promising • Not suitable for The Suicide Prevention Hub