

Appendix C

Psychometric properties of research assessment tools selected for the study

| Instrument | Reporter | Validity | Reliability |
|---|-----------------|---|---|
| PRIME Early Psychosis Screener (1) | Youth | $r = 0.56$ with SIPS | $\alpha = 0.88$ |
| PTSD Checklist Civilian Version - PCL-C (2, 3) | Youth | $r = 0.61$ with Trauma Symptoms Checklist | $\alpha = .94$ Test-retest $r = 0.66$ |
| Columbia Impairment Scale – CIS (4) | Youth | Canonical correlation with ten indicators of psychological dysfunction: $r = .51$ | Internal consistency: $\alpha = 0.70$ Test-retest: ICC = 0.63 |
| | Parent | Canonical correlation with ten indicators of psychological dysfunction: $r = .81$ | Internal Consistency: $\alpha = 0.85$ Test-Retest: ICC = 0.89 |
| Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire – SDQ (5, 6) | Youth | Higher rate of independent DSM-IV diagnosis associated with higher SDQ scores for all subscales | Total difficulties: $\alpha = .80$, test-retest $r = .62$ Emotional symptoms: $\alpha = .66$, test-retest $r = .57$ Conduct problems: $\alpha = 0.60$, test-retest $r = .51$ Hyperactivity: $\alpha = 0.67$, test-retest $r = .60$ Peer problems: $\alpha = 0.41$, test-retest $r = .54$ Prosocial behavior: $\alpha = 0.66$, test-retest $r = .51$ Impact: $\alpha = 0.81$, test-retest $r = .21$ |
| | Parent | Higher rate of independent DSM-IV diagnosis associated with higher SDQ scores for all subscales | Total difficulties: $\alpha = 0.82$, test-retest $r = .72$ Emotional symptoms: $\alpha = 0.67$, test-retest $r = .57$ Conduct problems: $\alpha = 0.63$, test-retest $r = .64$ Hyperactivity: $\alpha = 0.77$, test-retest $r = .72$ Peer problems: $\alpha = 0.57$, test-retest $r = .61$ Prosocial behavior: $\alpha = 0.65$, test-retest $r = .61$ Impact: $\alpha = 0.85$, test-retest $r = .57$ |
| Global Appraisal of Individual Needs - Short Screener – GAIN SS (7) | Youth | Total disorder screener: $r = .94$ with GAIN-I Severity Internalizing: $r = .89$ with GAIN-I Internal Externalizing: $r = .88$ with GAIN-I Behavior Substance use: $r = .92$ with GAIN-I Substance | Total disorder screener: $\alpha = 0.87$ Internalizing: $\alpha = .74$ Externalizing: $\alpha = .76$ Substance use: $\alpha = .76$ |

| | | | |
|--|---------------|--|--|
| | | Crime/violence: $r = .86$ with GAIN-I Crime/Violence | Crime/violence: $\alpha = .72$ |
| Burden Assessment Scale - BAS (8) | Family member | Higher scores in an actively service-seeking sample | $\alpha = 0.91$ and 0.89 in two different studies |
| Assessment of Quality of Life-6D – AQOL-6D (9, 10) | Youth | In an older adult sample: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physical factor: $r = 0.73$ (physical function SF-36) Psychological factor: $r = -0.74$ (mental health SF-36) In a youth sample: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower utility scores among obese youth compared to youth with a healthy weight | In an older adult sample: Physical ability: $\alpha = 0.86$ Relationships: $\alpha = 0.63$ Mental health: $\alpha = 0.79$ Coping: $\alpha = 0.73$ Pain: $\alpha = 0.84$ Senses: $\alpha = 0.50$ |
| Continuity of Care in Children’s Mental Health - C3MH (11, 12) [42] | Youth | Total continuity: $r = .82$ with CSQ Management: $r = 0.71$ with CSQ Informational: $r = 0.58$ with CSQ Relational: $r = 0.84$ with CSQ | Management, collaboration: $\alpha = 0.77$ Informational, provider knowledge: $\alpha = 0.90$ Relational, interpersonal: $\alpha = 0.93$ |
| | Family member | Management, collaboration: $r = 0.76$ with CSQ Management, transitions: 0.74 with CSQ Informational, provider knowledge: $r = 0.63$ with CSQ Relational, interpersonal: $r = 0.62$ with CSQ Relational, consistency: $r = 0.73$ with CSQ | Management, collaboration: $\alpha = .83$ Management, transitions: $\alpha = .80$ Informational, provider knowledge: $\alpha = .89$ Relational, interpersonal: $\alpha = .93$ Relational, consistency: $\alpha = .86$ |
| Ontario Perception of Care Tool for Mental Health and Addictions – OPOC (13) | Service users | Access: $r = 0.49$ with the CSQ Services provided: $r = 0.56$ with the CSQ Participation/rights: $r = 0.51$ with the CSQ Therapists/support workers/staff: $r = 0.54$ with the CSQ Environment: $r = 0.50$ with the CSQ Recovery/outcome: $r = 0.54$ with the CSQ Service quality: $r = 0.62$ with the CSQ Discharge: $r = 0.49$ with the CSQ | Access: $\alpha = 0.87$ Services provided: $\alpha = 0.89$ Participation/rights: $\alpha = 0.87$ Therapists/support workers/staff: $\alpha = 0.92$ Environment: $\alpha = 0.89$ Discharge: $\alpha = 0.91$ Overall experience: $\alpha = 0.91$ |
| Youth Efficacy/Empowerment Scale - YEES (14) | Youth | Higher scores among youth more satisfied with their treatment plans compared to less satisfied | Self: $\alpha = 0.852$ Services: $\alpha = 0.833$ System: $\alpha = 0.882$ |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|--|---|
| Family Empowerment Scale – FES (15) | Family member | Family: $\kappa = 0.83$ Service System: $\kappa = 0.70$ Community: $\kappa = 0.77$ Overall: $\kappa = 0.77$ with independent clinician ratings | Family: $\alpha = 0.88$, test-retest $r = 0.83$ Service System: $\alpha = 0.87$, test-retest $r = 0.77$ Community: $\alpha = 0.88$, test-retest $r = 0.85$ |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|--|---|

References

1. Kline E, Wilson C, Ereshefsky S, Denenny D, Thompson E, Pitts SC, et al. Psychosis risk screening in youth: a validation study of three self-report measures of attenuated psychosis symptoms. *Schizophr Res*. 2012;141(1):72-7.
2. Weathers F, Litz B, Huska J, Keane T. PTSD Checklist-Civilian version (PCL-C). Boston, MA: National Center for PTSD, 1994.
3. Conybeare D, Behar E, Solomon A, Newman MG, Borkovec TD. The PTSD Checklist-Civilian Version: reliability, validity, and factor structure in a nonclinical sample. *J Clin Psychol*. 2012;68(6):699-713.
4. Bird HR, Shaffer D, Fisher P, Gould MS, et al. The Columbia Impairment Scale (CIS): Pilot findings on a measure of global impairment for children and adolescents. *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res*. 1993;3(3):167-76.
5. Goodman R. The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: A research note. *Child Psychology & Psychiatry & Allied Disciplines*. 1997;38(5):581-6.
6. Goodman R. Psychometric properties of the strengths and difficulties questionnaire. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2001;40(11):1337-45.
7. Dennis ML, Chan YF, Funk RR. Development and validation of the GAIN Short Screener (GSS) for internalizing, externalizing and substance use disorders and crime/violence problems among adolescents and adults. *Am J Addict*. 2006;15 Suppl 1:80-91.
8. Reinhard SC, Gubman GD, Horwitz AV, Minsky S. Burden Assessment Scale for families of the seriously mentally ill. *Eval Program Plann*. 1994;17(3):261-69.
9. Allen J, Inder KJ, Lewin TJ, Attia JR, Kelly BJ. Construct validity of the Assessment of Quality of Life - 6D (AQoL-6D) in community samples. *Health & Quality of Life Outcomes*. 2013;11:61.
10. Keating CL, Moodie ML, Richardson J, Swinburn BA. Utility-based quality of life of overweight and obese adolescents. *Value Health*. 2011;14(5):752-8.
11. Tobon JI, Reid GJ, Goffin RD. Continuity of Care in Children's Mental Health: development of a measure. *Adm Policy Ment Health*. 2014;41(5):668-86.
12. Tobon JI, Reid GJ, Goffin RD. Continuity of Care in Children's Mental Health: development of a measure. *Adm Policy Ment Health*. 2014;41(5):668-86.
13. Rush B, Hansson E, Cvetanova Y, Rotondi N, Furlong A, Behrooz R. Development of a client perception of care tool for mental health and addictions: Qualitative, quantitative, and psychometric analysis. Final Report for the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. Toronto, Ontario: Health Systems and Health Equity Research, Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, 2013.
14. Walker JS, Powers LE. Introduction to the Youth Self-Efficacy Scale/Mental Health and the Youth Participation in Planning Scale. Portland, OR: Research and Training Center on Family Support and Children's Mental Health, Portland State University, 2007.
15. Koren PE, DeChillo N, Friesen BJ. Measuring empowerment in families whose children have emotional disabilities: A brief questionnaire. *Rehabil Psychol*. 1992;37(4):305-21.