



Active Inclusion Evaluation Grid
Offenders / Ex-offenders

Standard	Criteria	Significance multiplier (x2, x3 or x6)	Not compliant with the standard 0	Partially compliant with the standard 1	Fully compliant with the standard 2	Total
I. General approach	I.1 The approach is evidence based (see the 'glossary' in the Instructions)	x1				
	I.2 There is a clear definition of the problem	x1				
	I.3 There is evidence of inter-agency co-operation	x1				
	I.4 The service is personalised and tailored to individual needs ('people focused').	x1				
	I.5 The intervention pays attention to difference: gender, culture, language, access, disability etc.	x1				
	I.6 The intervention implements the active inclusion principles of adequate income support; inclusive labour markets; and access to quality services)	x1				
II. Structural	II.1 The intervention has clear goals	x1				
	II.2 The intervention has clear outputs	x1				
	II.3 The intervention has clear outcomes	x1				
III. Evaluation	III.1 The intervention has been evaluated (see the 'glossary' in the Instructions for what scores should be given depending on what type of evaluation has been used i.e. impact, process or economic evaluation).	x1				
	III.2 The intervention has been independently evaluated	x2				
	III.3 There is evidence of effectiveness or cost-effectiveness	x3				
	III.4 The program seems to have clear social and environmental benefits.	x1				

Standard	Criteria	Significance multiplier (x2, x3 or x6)	Not compliant with the standard 0	Partially compliant with the standard 1	Fully compliant with the standard 2	Total
IV. Learning	IV.1 There are clear learning points derived from this intervention.	x1				
	IV.2 The learning points are derived from the innovation part of the intervention.	x3				
V. Innovation	V.1 The intervention planned to actively engage with innovation.	x2				
	V.2 There is evidence of innovation in the intervention.	x6				
VI. The user's voice	VI.1. The design of the program was informed by the users.	x1				
	VI.2 Users are involved in the decision making of the program.	x1				
VII. Transferability	VII.1 The intervention does not seem to be very context-dependent.	x3				
	VII.2 The intervention already had been tested in other countries.	x1				
	VII.3 The intervention, or parts of it, could be transferred to other programmes/projects etc.	x2				
	VII.4 The intervention, or parts of it, could be transferred to other regions or countries.	x2				
VIII. Specific standards	VIII.1 The intervention starts while the person is still in prison and continues after their release in a coordinated manner ('through the gate approach')	x2				
	VIII.2. There is evidence of a real connection between the jobs available and the training delivered.	x2				
	VIII.3 The intervention involves employers or their representatives.	x2				
	VIII.4 The intervention also tackles the negative public attitude towards ex-offenders.	x2				
Total points						