Comparison of Organizations that Offer Program Reviews

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR MILITARY FAMILY READINESS

SOUND SCIENCE ★ STRONGER SERVICE

Name	Focus	Program Designations	Duration of Effects	Replication	Study Design	Methodological Considerations	Methods for Review	Peer Review	Summary of Key Features
Clearinghouse for Military Family Readiness Continuum	Broad range of prevention, treatment, and education programs that can support military personnel and their families.	• Effective • Promising • Unclear • Ineffective	**Effective**: Effect(s) lasting ≥ two years from the beginning of the program, or ≥ one year from program completion. **Promising**: Effect(s) lasting ≥ one year from the beginning of the program, or ≥ six months from program completion. **Unclear**: Sustainability not assessed or established. **Ineffective**: Program effects not sustained.	External replication required for **Effective** designation only.	**Effective:** RCT or well-matched quasi-experimental. **Promising:** Quasi-experimental.	Must meet all four of the following for **Effective** designation, and at least two for **Promising**: • Representative sample • Modest attrition • Practical significance • Adequate measurement	Full literature review.	Review limited to peer-reviewed publications.	• Rigorous review process • Full lit review • Replications and duration of effects emphasized • Concise fact sheets • Broad range of youth, adult, family programs • Re-reviews programs every three years
Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development	Prevention programs that target problem behavior, education, emotional well-being, physical health, and positive relationships.	• Model Plus • Model • Promising	**Model Plus** or **Model**: Effects lasting 12 months beyond program completion. **Promising**: No long-term effects necessary.	External replication required for **Model Plus** designation only.	**Model Plus** or **Model:** Two RCTs or one RCT and one high quality quasi-experimental. **Promising:** One RCT or two quasi-experimental.	• Proper group assignment • Adequate measures • Intent to treat analysis • Appropriate statistics • Equivalent groups • Program fidelity • Modest attrition • Independent data reports • Ready for dissemination	Full literature review.	No requirement.	• Rigorous review process • Full lit review • Replications and duration of effects emphasized • Comprehensive summaries • Specific focus on youth programs • Re-review of programs not discussed

Name	Focus	Program Designations	Duration of Effects	Replication	Study Design	Methodological Considerations	Methods for Review	Peer Review	Summary of Key Features
National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP)	Mental health and substance abuse prevention and treatment.	• Effective • Promising • Ineffective • Inconclusive *These ratings are for individual outcomes and not for overall program designation	Not considered for placements.	Not required.	RCTs and quasi-experimental designs are preferred, although other designs are considered.	• Study design • Intent to treat • Statistical Precision • Pretest Precision • Pretest Equivalence • Pretest Adjustment • Analysis Method • Threats to Internal Validity • Measurement Reliability • Measurement Validity • Attrition • Effect Sizes • Program Fidelity	Program developers submit materials that are reviewed; in addition literature searches are conducted.	Peer-reviewed publications, books, or technical reports.	• Broad range of youth, adult, family programs • New system in place to review programs • Re-reviewing old programs with new system over next 3 years • Systematic re-review not discussed
California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse	Variety of topics related to child welfare. An advisory committee selects topics.	• Well-supported by research • Supported by research • Promising research evidence • Evidence fails to demonstrate effect • Concerning Practice • Not able to be rated *Also rated on relevance to child welfare system.	For well-supported programs, effects must last at least one year beyond program termination. For supported programs, effects must last at least 6 months beyond program termination.	Required for well-supported programs.	**Well-supported** or **Evidence fails to demonstrate:** RCT. **Promising:** Quasi-experimental.	• No iatrogenic effects • Manualized • Number of replications • Duration of effects • Research design • Quality of measures • Effects across multiple studies	Selected topic experts help identify programs. Comprehensive literature reviews are conducted. Program developers also are contacted for information.	Evaluations published in peer-reviewed outlets only.	• Rigorous review process • Full lit review • Replications and duration of effects emphasized • Specific focus on select child welfare topics • Re-reviews programs when new research is available

Name	Focus	Program Designations	Duration of Effects	Replication	Study Design	Methodological Considerations	Methods for Review	Peer Review	Summary of Key Features
Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL)	Pre-K-12 social and emotional learning programs with potential for broad dissemination in schools.	No program designations: all programs listed are considered to be SELect programs.	SELect programs must be multi-year programs that have been evaluated.	Not required.	RCT or Quasi	• Significance of p<.05 for social or academic behaviors • Grade range covered • Study design • Characteristics of study sample • Evaluation outcomes • Must have a control group	Nominations submitted to CASEL. Materials submitted by program developers.	Peer-reviewed publications and technical reports.	• Specific focus on SEL programs • Submitted materials only • Re-reviews conducted when necessary
Crime-solutions. gov	Interventions that seek to prevent or reduce crime, delinquency, and related problems.	• Effective • Promising • No effects *uses crimesolutions.gov which outlines a scoring system that summarizes considerations and guides program designations.	Duration of effects is one of seven criteria assessed when rating programs. Programs that demonstrate effects lasting at least one year after program completion receive higher scores than those with shorter duration of effects.	Not required.	All designs are considered, although experimental designs receive the most weight, followed by well-matched quasi-experimental designs.	• Conceptual framework • Type of research design • Sample size • Statistical adjustment • Instrumentation • Internal validity • Follow-up period • Displacement/ diffusion • Outcome evidence • Program fidelity	Full literature review.	Peer-reviewed publication or evaluation reports published 1980 or later. Up to three best studies are reviewed.	• Full lit review • Duration of effects emphasized • Specific focus on crime and delinquency • Re-reviewing programs considered when new studies are identified
OJJDP Model Programs Guide	Prevention, treatment, and sanctions designed to address juvenile justice, mental health, and substance abuse among adolescents.	• Effective • Promising • No effects *uses crimesolutions.gov which outlines a scoring system that summarizes considerations and guides program designations.	Duration of effects is one of seven criteria assessed when rating programs. Programs that demonstrate effects lasting at least one year after program completion receive higher scores than those with shorter duration of effects.	Not required.	All designs are considered, although experimental designs receive the most weight, followed by well-matched quasi-experimental designs.	• Conceptual framework • Type of research design • Sample size • Statistical adjustment • Instrumentation • Internal validity • Follow-up period • Displacement/ diffusion • Outcome evidence • Program fidelity	Full literature review.	Peer-reviewed publication or evaluation reports published 1980 or later. Up to three best studies are reviewed.	• Full lit review • Duration of effects emphasized • Specific focus on crime and delinquency • Re-reviewing programs considered when new studies are identified

Name	Focus	Program Designations	Duration of Effects	Replication	Study Design	Methodological Considerations	Methods for Review	Peer Review	Summary of Key Features
Youth.gov Substance Abuse, Violence, and Other Risk Behavior Program Directory	Academic problems, aggression, violence, gang involvement, ATOD, delinquency, family functioning, sexual activity/ exploitation, trauma.	• Effective • Promising • No effects *uses crimesolutions.gov which outlines a scoring system that summarizes considerations and guides program designations.	Duration of effects is one of seven criteria assessed when rating programs. Programs that demonstrate effects lasting at least one year after program completion receive higher scores than those with shorter duration of effects.	Not required.	All designs are considered, although experimental designs receive the most weight, followed by well-matched quasi-experimental designs.	• Conceptual framework • Type of research design • Sample size • Statistical adjustment • Instrumentation • Internal validity • Follow-up period • Displacement/ diffusion • Outcome evidence • Program fidelity	Full literature review.	Peer-reviewed publication or evaluation reports published 1980 or later. Up to three best studies are reviewed.	• Full lit review • Duration of effects emphasized • Specific focus on substance abuse, delinquency, and violence in youth • Re-reviewing programs considered when new studies are identified
Suicide Prevention Resource Center Best Practices Registry (SPRC)/American Foundation for Suicide Prevention (AFSP)	Suicide-related interventions.	• Effective • Promising • Insufficient current support	Not required.	Not required.	True, quasi-experimental, and three group design are mentioned but not specified on how it dictated program classification.	Reviewers rated the quality of program evaluations on a scale from 1 to 5 using the following criteria: • Theory • Intervention fidelity • Design • Attrition • Psychometric properties of measures • Analysis • Threats to validity • Safety • Integrity • Utility However, designation is based only on utility and integrity.	Full literature review.	No requirement.	• Full lit review • Specific focus on suicide • SPRC stopped reviewing programs in 2005, when NREPP began reviewing suicide related interventions

Name	Focus	Program Designations	Duration of Effects	Replication	Study Design	Methodological Considerations	Methods for Review	Peer Review	Summary of Key Features
Top Tier Evidence Initiative	K-12 social interventions focusing on youth development, academic outcomes, job training, crime prevention, health, and well-being	• Top Tier • Near Top Tier	Top Tier and Near Top Tier interventions should "produce sizeable, sustained benefits to participants." However, no information available on a required time frame of sustained benefits.	External replication required for **Top Tier** designation only.	**Top Tier:** RCT	• Overall Study Design • Equivalency of Control and intervention group • Outcome measures • Intervention effects	Nominations are solicited. Full literature review.	Published or unpublished RCTs.	• Mission is to help policy makers identify top tier interventions • Develop short case summaries providing an explanation of the reasoning used to review evaluations • Re-reviews not mentioned
Promising Practices Network	Child health, school readiness and success, strong families.	• Proven • Promising • Other (if reviewed by other organizations)	Not considered for placements.	Not required.	**Proven:** RCT or high-quality quasi-experiment. **Promising:** Weaker quasi-experiments.	• Relevant outcomes • Large effect size • Statistical significance • Quality control group • Adequate sample size • Proper documentation	Full literature review.	Any publicly available documentation.	• Full lit review • Comprehensive reports • Specific focus on programs for children and families • PPN concluded in June 2014; no updates have been made since
What Works Clearinghouse (WWC)	Programs, products, practices, and policies that improve outcomes in education.	• Meets Evidence Standards w/o Reservations • Meets with Reservations • Does Not Meet Evidence Standards * Several secondary ratings are also included.	No criteria for duration of effects, although such information is typically included in the comprehensive summaries of each program.	Not required.	RCT or well-matched quasi-experiment in order for programs to receive full review. Only RCTs can reach highest rating.	• Study design (RCT or not) • Sample attrition • Group comparability • Baseline equivalence • Quality of measures • Confounding factors *WWC includes information on numerous other methodological considerations in their program summaries.	Full literature review.	Includes published and unpublished literature.	• Full lit review • Comprehensive and very detailed reports provided for each program • Specific focus on education outcomes • Re-review process unknown

Name	Focus	Program Designations	Duration of Effects	Replication	Study Design	Methodological Considerations	Methods for Review	Peer Review	Summary of Key Features
Youth.gov Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program Directory	Teen pregnancy prevention, STD prevention, and prevention of risky sexual behaviors.	Quality of research rated as high, moderate, or low. Only moderate and high are considered for "evidence-based" list.	Noted, but not required to be placed on list.	Noted, but not required to be placed on list.	**High quality:** RCT **Moderate quality:** Quasi-experimental.	• Quantitative studies only • Conducted since 1989 • Acceptable attrition rates • Baseline equivalence • No reassignment to groups • Limited confounding factors	Full literature review, including searches for unpublished research.	No requirement.	• Full lit review • Summaries of studies • Specific focus on teen pregnancy and STD prevention • Re-reviewing programs considered when new studies are identified
National Dropout Prevention Center/Network	School dropout and graduation outcomes.	Evidence rated as: • Strong • Moderate • Limited • Insufficient	Not considered for placements.	External replication required for **Strong** evidence.	**Strong:** RCT. **Moderate:** Quasi-experimental.	Programs must have existed for at least three years for **Strong** or **Moderate** placement. In addition, reviewers consider quality of research design.	Program developers submit all materials that are reviewed.	No requirement.	• Submitted materials only • Replications emphasized • Specific focus on school dropout outcomes • Re-reviews conducted as needed
Child Trends What Works	Out-of-school social interventions that address a wide variety of youth-focused outcomes.	None	Not considered as a criterion, although duration of effects may be noted in fact sheets.	Not required.	RCT only.	• Random assignment • Intent to treat analysis • Post-test response rates at least 50%	Reviews based on nominations.	No requirement.	• Summaries of individual evaluations • Specific focus on youth programs • Re-reviews conducted through online submissions

References

Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development: http://www.blueprintsprograms.com/programCriteria.php

California Evidence-based Clearinghouse: http://www.cebc4cw.org/ratings/scientific-rating-scale/

Child Trends What Works: http://www.childtrends.org/what-works/eligibility-criteria/

Clearinghouse for Military Family Readiness: http://www.militaryfamilies.psu.edu/understanding-placement-process

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL)
http://static1.squarespace.com/static/513f79f9e4b05ce7b70e9673/t/526a220de4b00a92c90436ba/1382687245993/2013-casel-guide.pdf

Crimesolutions.gov: http://www.crimesolutions.gov/about_starttofinish.aspx

Findyouthinfo.gov Substance Abuse, Violence, and Other Risk Behavior Program Directory: http://youth.gov/program-directory/background-methodology

Findyouthinfo.gov Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program Directory: http://youth.gov/program-directory/background-methodology

National Dropout Prevention Center/Network: https://web.archive.org/web/20141017034825/http://www.dropoutprevention.org/modelprograms/rating-system

National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices: http://nrepp.samhsa.gov/ReviewSubmission.aspx

OJJDP Model Programs Guide: http://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/Home/About#mpg

Promising Practices Network: http://www.promisingpractices.net/criteria.asp

SPRC/AFSP http://www.sprc.org/sites/sprc.org/files/bpr/ebpp_proj_descrip.pdf

Top Tier Evidence Program Initiative http://toptierevidence.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Solicitation-and-Review-Process-July-2012.pdf

What Works Clearinghouse: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/InsidetheWWC.aspx

Created October 2013
Revised February 2016