

ATTACHMENT 5
CONTINUING PILOT PROPOSAL TEMPLATE

Warrior Resilience & Fitness Innovation Incubator Continuing Pilot Proposal Template, Criteria, and Metrics (FY21): Continuing Pilots Funded in FYs 19/20

The Warrior Resilience & Fitness (WRF) Division is calling for proposals for FY21 WRF Innovation Incubator (WRFII). Please refer to the Warrior Resilience & Fitness Innovation Incubator FY21 Call for Proposals Memorandum for detail about the timeline, requirements, and submission process.

To submit proposal, email completed proposal template and all supporting documents to:

ng.ncr.ngb-arng.mbx.ngb-j1-wrf@mail.mil

Please include Name of your pilot program and State in the subject line.

If you are unable to send to the email address above, e-mail your Proposal Template to WRFII@ida.org

The attached Continuing Pilot Proposal Template, Criteria, and Metrics provides materials for continuing submissions of pilot programs (programs funded by WRFII in FYs 19/20):

- [Section 1: Proposal Template](#)
- [Section 2: Evaluation Criteria](#) (for reference only, do not fill out)
- [Section 3: Sample Metrics](#) (for reference only, do not fill out)

Section 1: Proposal Template

In preparing this proposal, feel free to draw from any information already provided to you over the course of the WRFH process and/or any documentation your pilot already submitted.

Part 1: Background information

1) Contact information (list additional POCs on [Continuation Page](#))

Name E-mail address

Phone number State/territory

2) With which branch of service are you affiliated?

3) In which branch of service will you implement your proposed program?

4) What is the name of your program or practice?

5) What are the core areas your program addresses?

(Select at maximum TWO - one primary area and one secondary area, if applicable)

Resiliency/life skills promotion

Suicide prevention and/or postvention

Sexual assault prevention and response

Behavioral health

Substance use disorder treatment/prevention

Financial/employment services

Enhancing relationships/connectedness

Physical health (physical fitness, medical/dental, nutritional)

Other (please specify)

Part 2: Program team

List the key personnel needed to administer and evaluate the proposed program and specify each of their roles. Please refer to Attachment 1 for a description of tasks required of all funding recipients.

Part 3: Program information and implementation [[Evaluation criteria 1 and 2 – see Section 2](#)]

Please provide a detailed description of the execution of your program thus far.

[If additional space is required, use the continuation page \(page 7\).](#)

Make every effort to provide concise answers that fit within the space provided.

- *Overview: Provide a brief "elevator pitch" for your program. Concisely describe (less than 50 words) your program and what makes it unique and important.*

- *Program Specifics: Describe i) the target population, ii) the specific resources, assistance, training, or other intervention provided, and iii) where the program is applied (e.g., once a year during drill, at armories during business hours).*

- *Objective: Describe the purpose and specific objectives of your program or practice – what is the problem that you are trying to address and/or the gaps you are trying to fill?*

- *Priority area(s): If applicable, describe any WRF priority area(s) your program addresses. Please refer to Attachment 4 for a description of WRF priority areas and topics.*

- *Novel: Explain why this program is innovative – what the unique/novel features of the program are and how it is distinct from existing DoD programs.*

- *COVID 19: Describe how your program may be impacted by the ongoing pandemic; if applicable, describe any contingency plans developed.*

Part 4: Program funding and assistance [Evaluation criteria 3 – see Section 2]

- a. Have you coordinated this spend plan with your State Contracting Office/USPFO/Budget Analyst?
- b. Please list the name, position (i.e. Contracting, Budget Analyst) and email for the your Budget Point of Contact:
 Name: _____ Position: _____ Email: _____

c. *Spend plan: Provide the amount of funding requested from the WRFII by completing the Spend Plan Template.*

| AR VSVP 2060 AF MILPER 3850 | FUNDING REQUESTED (IDEAL) | FUNDING REQUESTED (MINIMUM) | PURPOSE (specify AF\$ amount and AR\$ amount): |
|--|--|--|---|
| Military P&A | | | |
| Military Travel | | | |
| Other: | | | |
| FY20 2060/3850 TOTAL: | \$ IDEAL | \$ MINIMUM | NOTES: |
| AR VSVP 2065 AF O&M 3840 | FUNDING REQUESTED (IDEAL) | FUNDING REQUESTED (MINIMUM) | PURPOSE (specify AF\$ amount and AR\$ amount): |
| Contracting Personnel and Services | | | |
| Contracting Items | | | |
| Marketing Items | | | |
| Civilian Travel Expenses | | | |
| Civilian P&A | | | |
| Other: | | | |
| FY20 2065/3840 TOTAL: | \$ IDEAL | \$ MINIMUM | NOTES: |

b. *Other funding sources: If applicable, describe any other funding sources you have requested and/or received to assist with meeting program needs (e.g., Yellow Ribbon, Family Programs).*

c. *Non-financial support: Describe any non-financial areas for which you seek support (e.g., assistance securing research partnerships or contracting, program evaluation and analysis support, etc.).*

d. *Critical need for funding: If funding for the pilot is not renewed, explain how that will impact the future of the program and the program evaluation effort in progress.*

Part 5: Evaluation plan and preliminary results [[Evaluation criteria 4, 5, 6, and 7 – see Section 2](#)]

Please provide a description of how you plan to evaluate the program, or how you are currently evaluating the program, and any preliminary results. For guidance on program evaluation, refer to the RAND Suicide Prevention Program Evaluation Toolkit¹, the Army’s Ready and Resilient Initiative Evaluation Process Guide² or any materials you’ve already received/produced through the WRFII process.

a. Quality of Implementation: Describe i) your progress in planning and/or implementing your program – how are you ensuring that the program is implemented well and as intended? and ii) your process metrics (e.g., number of program participants, participant satisfaction with program, program implemented as intended) and any preliminary results.

b. Effectiveness: Describe your outcome metrics (e.g., reduced suicidal behavior among participants, improved attitudes about help-seeking, increased retention) and any preliminary results.

c. Appropriate for broad dissemination [Programs applying for Year 3 funding only]: Describe why you think it would be feasible to adopt the program across the vast majority of NG states/territories (e.g., meets the needs of diverse populations, requirements for resources can be reasonably met)

d. *Robust evaluation plan: Describe your evaluation design*

i. *From whom will you collect data (e.g., program participants, program administrators, unit leadership, etc.)?*

ii. *What sources of data will you use (e.g., administrative data, create new surveys, existing survey)?*

iii. *At what time points will you collect data (e.g., before and after your program (pre/post survey), after your program only (post survey only))?*

iv. *Do you plan to collect data from a control group (i.e., participants randomly assigned not to receive your program) or a comparison group (i.e., individuals who did not participate but are similar to the participating group)?*

Note that a pre/post design that utilizes control groups is the most robust evaluation method.

¹ Acosta, J. D., Ramchand, R., Becker, A., Felton, A., & Kofner, A. (2013). RAND Suicide Prevention Program Evaluation Toolkit. Rand Corporation. <https://www.rand.org/pubs/tools/TL1111.html>

² U.S. Army Health Promotion and Wellness Directorate. (2019). U.S. Army's Ready and Resilient Initiative Evaluation Process Guide. Caution-https://readyandresilient.army.mil/policydocs/IEP_Guide_Final_Jun_2019.pdf

Continuation Page: Clearly annotate the question for which additional information is being provided.

Section 2: Evaluation Criteria Form

Instructions: *For Selection Board Use Only. Included as a reference to assist with submission completion.*

Assess each program using the criteria below. Programs should have “Yes” or “Partial” responses for all the criteria to be considered for selection. Priority should be offered to programs with a higher number of “Yes”, relative to “Partial”, responses, while giving consideration to their fit with current WR&F priorities.

Selection Board Initials:

1. **Addresses WRF priority area:** Does the program fit into one or more of the WRF priority topics for 2020 (i.e., addresses multiple destructive behaviors in an integrative manner; community partnerships to access care and support resources; promoting connectedness; lethal means management) AND one or more of the methodological priorities (i.e., multi-state pilots, joint pilots, and pre/post-test control or comparison group designs)?

Yes

The program directly addresses one or more of the WRF priority topics AND one or more of the priority methods

Partial

The program directly addresses one or more of the WRF priority *topics* but does not address a priority method, OR

The program directly addresses one or more of the WRF priority *methods* but does not address a priority *topic*, OR

The program indirectly or partially addresses one or more of the WRF priority areas and/or methodological approaches

No

The program does not address any of the WRF priority topics or methods

Need more information

2. **Novel:** Is the program unique/novel (i.e., not redundant with existing Department of Defense (DOD) programs)?

Yes

There are no other known DOD programs with the same goals, functions, and intended outcomes.

Partial

There are similar DOD programs, but the current program offers meaningful improvements (e.g., better tailored to the Guard, more efficient, fewer resources needed).

No

There are similar DOD programs that function well and the current program offers no meaningful improvement.

Need more information

3. **Critical need for additional funding:** If funding for the pilot is *not* renewed, will the program be discontinued?

Yes

This program has no alternative source of funding and will not continue without additional funding

Partial

This program has an alternative source of funding and can continue without additional funding, however, the ability to evaluate effectiveness will be greatly impaired

No

This program has an alternative source of funding and can continue without additional funding; the ability to evaluate effectiveness will be only moderately impaired or not impaired at all

Need more information

4. **Quality of implementation:** Is the program being implemented well (e.g., implemented with fidelity to protocol, participants satisfied, utilization is high/as intended)?

Yes

There are convincing data indicating that the program is being implemented well (e.g., fidelity to protocol, participants satisfied, utilization high/as intended), OR

Data are not yet available on implementation, however, plans for implementation are robust and implementation is likely to be effective

Partial

Data are not yet available on implementation, however, plans for implementation appear to be adequate, OR

There are some data to suggest that the program is being implemented well, but the findings are mixed

No

Data are not yet available on implementation, however, plans for implementation are not robust or well specified, OR

There are data to suggest that the program is NOT being implemented well

Need more information

5. **Effective.** Is there evidence of the proposed program's effectiveness (e.g., demonstrated positive change in relevant attitudes and/or behavior as measured before and after implementation)?

Yes

There is convincing data indicating that the program is effective

Partial

Data are not yet available, however, previous research on this program or similar programs indicates a high-likelihood of effectiveness

No

Data are not yet available, OR There are data to suggest the program is NOT effective

6. **Appropriate for broad dissemination** [Programs applying for Year 3 funding only]: Would it be feasible to adopt the program across the vast majority of NG states/territories (e.g., meets the needs of diverse populations, requirements for resources can be reasonably met)?

Yes

The program is applicable to a broad variety of contexts and the requirements for resources could be reasonably met by most NG states/territories

Partial

The program could be applied in some contexts but not others, and requirements for resources may not be feasible in some locations

No

The program cannot be applied beyond a few specific states/territories

7. **Robust evaluation plan:** Is the program being evaluated with the appropriate rigor (e.g., includes both process and outcome metrics; uses a pre-post or similarly robust evaluation design; objectives are clearly defined and measurable; evaluation is feasible, timely, and well-described)?

Yes

The evaluation plan includes all necessary elements and a robust design.

Partial

The evaluation plan is lacking in some areas

No

The evaluation plan is lacking significant elements

Need more information

6. **Global assessment:** At this point, what is your overall assessment of this program?

Excellent: Outstanding program that should have the highest priority for continued support.

Good: High quality program that should be supported but may not be considered a priority.

Fair: Program has significant weaknesses that should be addressed before further consideration.

Poor: Program has critical flaws; to the extent possible, support should be limited or withdrawn.

Need more information

7. **Recommended action:** What is your recommendation for this program?

Full continued support: Fund this proposal at current levels

Reduced continued support: Fund this proposal at a reduced level

Technical support only: Provide technical assistance but no funding

No action

Section 3: Sample Metrics

This document compiles examples of process and outcome metrics from which submission teams can select to develop their evaluation plans. This is not an exhaustive list of measures and pilot teams can select measures not provided here.

PROCESS METRICS

| Metric | Description |
|---------------|---|
| Acceptability | Satisfaction with training/program/resources |
| Utilization | Participants trained, individuals referred for services, use of resources provided |
| Quality | Training implemented as intended (fidelity to protocol; meeting required items on implementation checklist) |

INTERMEDIATE OUTCOME METRICS

| Metric | Description |
|--|---|
| Knowledge of training content | Information learned during training or awareness-raising efforts |
| Preparedness to help individuals at risk | Perceived preparedness to assist someone who is at risk |
| Likelihood to help individuals at risk | Intention to assist someone who is at risk, given an encounter with such an individual |
| Self-efficacy to help individuals at risk | Perceived capacity to assist someone who is at risk |
| Attitudes toward individuals with suicidal behavior | Unfavorable attitudes towards individuals who attempt, complete, or think about suicide |
| Attitudes toward suicide prevention (for clinicians) | Clinician's attitudes about the likelihood of preventing suicide |
| Awareness of NGB resources and services | Familiarity with various NGB resources and services |
| Perceived norms - help seeking | Belief about the social acceptability and perceived prevalence of help-seeking |
| Perceived stigma related to seeking mental health services | Belief that seeking mental health services is a mark of shame or discredit |
| Perceived barriers to mental health treatment | Perceptions that various factors impede access to mental health treatment |
| Help-seeking intentions | Plans or expected plans to seek support services |
| Help-seeking behavior | Support services sought |
| Bystander intervention | Actions taken to intervene in situations where sexual harassment and/or sexual assault may be occurring |
| Gender-related workplace culture and training | Perception of workplace environment that is protective against sexual harassment and assault |

LONG-TERM OUTCOME METRICS

| Metric | Description |
|----------------|--|
| Connectedness | Sense of belonging or positive association with other people |
| Unit belonging | Sense of belonging to or affinity with the unit |
| Unit conflict | Sense of incompatibility with the unit |

| | |
|--|---|
| Perceived social support | Belief that an individual is cared for and has support from other people |
| Trust in leadership | Comfort sharing personal problems with leadership and confidence in leadership's response |
| Health-related quality of life | Quality of physical, mental, emotional, and social functioning |
| Perceived stress | Feeling of being under stress in a defined time period |
| Life satisfaction | Feeling that things overall are going well in life |
| Military satisfaction | Positive or negative evaluations of various aspects of the military experience |
| Financial well-being | Feeling a sense of financial security |
| Social determinants of health | Economic and social conditions that influence an individual's health outcomes |
| Resilience | Individual ability to overcome or recover from difficulties |
| Hopelessness | A lack of hope, optimism, or expectation of future improvement or success |
| Intention to stay in the National Guard | Plans to remain in the National Guard |
| Hazardous alcohol use | Frequency and quantity of an individual's alcohol consumption |
| Sexual harassment risk within organization | An individual's experience of behaviors that constitute sexual harassment |
| Self-harm and suicidal behavior | Engagement in self-injurious behavior or attempted suicide in a defined time frame |
| Retention | Retention of National Guard members |
| Employment | Full and part-time employment of National Guard members |
| Disciplinary actions | Disciplinary actions taken against National Guard members |
| Deployability | National Guard members medically ready to deploy |