Attachment B. NOE Data Collection Instrument Table

National Outcomes Evaluation Data Collection Activities						
Instrume nt	Domains	Data Elements	State/Tribal	Campus	Method	
PSI State/ Tribal Campus	 Program implementatio n Budget 	 Different strategies implemented and products distributed Populations of focus for each strategy Total amount of GLS funds Percent funds allocated by activity type 	October 2006 – continuing • Program evaluation staff • All grantees	October 2006 – continuing • Program evaluation staff • All grantees	Web survey	
TASP State/ Tribal Campus	 Suicide prevention training Trainee and training characteristics 	 Trainee role/setting Aggregate count of number of trainings Number and roles of training participants Evidence-based programs (curriculum type) Training setting (online/in-person), & ZIP Length of training Booster training, Training of Training Behavioral rehearsal/role play Resources/materials provided 	October 2006 – continuing • Program staff/evaluator from all grantees	October 2006 – continuing • Program staff/evaluator from all grantees	Web survey	
TUP-S 3 and 6 Month <i>State/</i> <i>Tribal</i>	 Training application Identification and referral of youths 	 Trainee demographics Self-efficacy to identify/refer at-risk youth Awareness/knowledge of risk factors Perceptions of training Intended and applied use of training Identifications/referrals since training Type/source of referral Primary setting to identify youths Use of phone and or online tools/apps —resources/materials provided at training Behavioral rehearsal/role-play Did not refer, provided services 	October 2010 – continuing Random sample of trainees from all States/Tribes Annually 2,000 trainees at 3 months & 600 trainees at 6 months		Phone survey	

National Outcomes Evaluation Data Collection Activities					
Instrume nt	Domains	Data Elements	State/Tribal	Campus	Method
	-	directly Previous suicide prevention training Participation in booster training Quality of relationships with youths Prior contact with someone suicidal Sharing information 			
TUP-S Campus 3 Month <i>Campus</i>	youths	 Trainee demographics Self-efficacy to identify/refer at-risk youth Awareness/knowledge of risk factors Perceptions of training Intended and applied use of training Identifications/referrals since training Type/source of referral 		January 2014 – OMB Year 1 Random sample of 500 trainees from Cohort 7 and 8 Campus grantees	Phone survey
TUP-S RCT Baseline & 12 Month <i>State/</i> <i>Tribal</i>	 Trainee characteristics Training application Identification and referral of youths Self-efficacy to identify and refer youths 	 risk populations Awareness/knowledge of risk factors Perceptions of training Intended and applied use of training Identifications and referrals of at-risk 	 Proposed new; expected launch FY2016 Q1 Sample of 10 State/Tribal (cohort 9 and 10) grantees Total of 1,332 participants 		Phone survey
EIRF-I	 Suicide risk 	 Individual-level data on youth at risk 	October 2006 –		Web

		National Outcomes Evaluation	Data Collection Activities		
Instrume nt	Domains	Data Elements	State/Tribal	Campus	Method
State/ Tribal	(ideation, attempt) • Service referral • Service receipt	 Demographic of youth Date and setting of identification Confirmation of risk Type of referral 	 continuing All State/Tribal grantees (for youth identified through GKT or screenings) Program staff/evaluator 		survey; existing data abstractio n
EIRF-S State/ Tribal	 Characteristics of screening activities Suicide risk (number identified) 	 Aggregate-level data on number of screenings by grant program Consent information (number distributed, returned, permitted screening) Screening tool used Unduplicated count of youth initially screened positive Number of youth confirmed positive 	October 2006 – continuing All State/Tribal grantees State/Tribal grantee staff Mental health providers for referred youth Existing data source abstraction		Web survey
SBHF Data Abstracti on <i>Campus</i>	 Service utilization Suicide risk 	 Student use of behavioral health services (including counts of specific services) Campus use of standardized screenings (and screening tool) Linkages to community providers Follow-up support Student suicide attempts & completions 		October 2006 – continuing • All grantees; one response from each program annually in Spring	Web survey
RNS State/ Tribal	 Network collaboration and development Continuity of Care 	 Agency/organization type Services provided Training exposure Assessment of network collaboration Linkages to other agencies Barriers and facilitators to collaboration 	October 2006 – OMB Year 1 • Grant year 2 for Cohort 8 grantees • One respondent per agency		Web survey using snowball sampling
BHPS	 Utilization of 	 Agency/organization/respondent type 	Annually upon OMB		Web

National Outcomes Evaluation Data Collection Activities						
Instrume nt	Domains	Data Elements	State/Tribal	Campus	Method	
State/ Tribal	electronic health records (EHRs) • Follow-up practices • Provider training • Goal 8 and 9 implementatio n	 Type of clients served Use of EHRs Suicide prevention and care Gatekeeper training of staff Trainings of evidence-based treatment with providers Assessment of staff self-efficacy and training adherence Screening and assessment practices Follow-up care and referral practices Collaboration with GLS Suicide Prevention Program grantee Annual data on screenings, assessments, care provision, and monitoring of at-risk patients 	 approval All Cohort 9 and 10 State/Tribal grantees Administrators and supervisors from GLS- partnering behavioral health provider agencies One to 10 respondents from each GLS- partnering behavioral health provider agency 		survey	
SMSS Campus	 Exposure to prevention activities Suicide risk 	 Exposure to campus prevention activities Suicidal ideation history Suicide attempt history 		 April 2014 - OMB Year Cohort 7 year 3 of grant; 100 respondents per grantee 	Text message survey	