

INSTITUTIONAL ADOPTION

Using Equivalence at a university

A concise guide for research offices, libraries, methods units, ethics committees, and academic departments evaluating Equivalence for instrument and scale adaptation.

Question	Short answer
What is it?	A web platform that turns established adaptation frameworks into a traceable, role-based workflow.
Who uses it?	Researchers, graduate students, translators, expert reviewers, interviewers, and project administrators.
What does it produce?	A project record plus publication-ready methods text, tables, a workflow figure, and an audit certificate.
What does it not do?	It does not supply translators, automate translation, replace research ethics review, or perform psychometric validation.

Institutional value

Equivalence reduces dependence on disconnected spreadsheets, documents, and email chains while preserving the human judgement required for cross-cultural adaptation.

A practical institutional use case

- A principal investigator creates a project and selects an established framework or adjusts its stage sequence.
- The project team enters every respondent-facing unit, including instructions and response options, then assigns human translators and reviewers.
- The platform records handovers, rationales, ratings, participant feedback, and the signed-off version.
- At completion, the team exports documentation for a manuscript, supplement, ethics file, funder report, or institutional archive.

GOVERNANCE AND ASSURANCE

What the institution should evaluate

Institutional approval should consider methodological fit, access, data handling, records, and the responsibilities that remain with the research team.

Area	What Equivalence provides	What the institution retains
Method	Framework-based stages with adjustable sequences.	Approval of the selected method and any deviations.
Roles	Scoped interfaces, task assignments, and independence controls.	Selection, qualification, and supervision of personnel.
Data	Authenticated access, project-level permissions, and recorded activity.	Ethics, consent, data-management, and retention decisions.
Reporting	Draft methods text, tables, figures, and an audit certificate.	Verification, interpretation, journal compliance, and authorship.
Validation	Content-validity calculations and documented cognitive debriefing.	Reliability, factor structure, invariance, norms, and other validation analyses.

Recommended institutional review checklist

- Confirm that the intended project is an adaptation and not merely an unauthorised translation.
- Confirm permission to reproduce and adapt each source instrument.
- Review the selected framework and any role-independence requirements.
- Decide what information may be entered and how long project records should be retained.
- Confirm who will act as project leader and who can approve the final adapted version.
- Plan validation analyses outside Equivalence where required.

Important

The audit certificate is a traceable project record. It can support an ethics, funder, or governance submission, but it is not an institutional approval or a claim that the adapted scale is psychometrically validated.

IMPLEMENTATION

A low-friction adoption pathway

Universities can begin with one supervised project, then decide whether broader access or local guidance is needed.

1	Nominate a lead Choose a faculty member or methods specialist responsible for the first project and institutional feedback.
2	Review a completed example Open Example outputs and compare the exported report with local reporting expectations.
3	Run one pilot project Create an account, complete the research profile, and begin from New project .
4	Review governance Use Frameworks and standards and the platform data-governance information to complete local review.
5	Set local expectations Document who may lead projects, what may be entered, and which outputs require institutional review before use.

Access and cost

Equivalence One includes one leader-owned project and a completed-report PDF. Equivalence Pro adds additional leader-owned projects and editable Word exports. Invited collaborators do not consume the project leader's allowance.

Current plans and billing terms are listed at [Pricing](#). Individual project teams can manage their own subscriptions through Stripe; institutional purchasing arrangements should be confirmed directly with Equivalence.

Suggested pilot evidence

Ask the pilot team to provide the completed report, role list, workflow figure, audit certificate, and a short account of where Equivalence reduced or introduced administrative work.

REFERENCE

Key links and decision questions

Use these links when reviewing Equivalence or sharing it with a research team.

Equivalence page	Use it for
Platform overview	Review the product, workflow, and community activity.
Frameworks and standards	Review supported frameworks, TARES alignment, and references.
Example outputs	Inspect representative reports before institutional adoption.
Pricing	Compare Equivalence One and Equivalence Pro.
Developer and user guides	Review platform background and download current guidance.

Before approving or recommending Equivalence

- Does the proposed framework fit the construct, population, language route, and intended use?
- Has the team secured instrument permissions and qualified human translators and reviewers?
- Are role independence, data governance, project duration, and sign-off authority documented?
- Is there a plan for psychometric validation after adaptation?
- Who will review the exported methods section and audit record before dissemination?

Need a closer review?

The [Principal Investigator and Project Leader Guide](#) explains the complete study workflow. The [Adaptation Administrator Guide](#) covers daily coordination and troubleshooting.