

MATRIX OF PROGRAMS AS IDENTIFIED BY VARIOUS FEDERAL AND PRIVATE AGENCIES

The following document identifies various federal and private agencies that have rated the effectiveness of prevention programs designed to reduce or eliminate problem behaviors such as delinquency, aggression, violence, substance use, school behavioral problems, mental health problems, and risk factors identified as predictive of these problems. This document describes the criteria that have been identified for program inclusion by each agency. Information about each agency's selection criteria was gathered directly from the agency's website.

The Matrix of Prevention Programs is a table listing approximately 700 programs that have been rated by each agency. The Matrix can aid the practitioner by showing how various programs have been rated across different agencies. It should be noted that just because a program has been reviewed by one of the agencies does not necessarily mean it is a "best" program, as some programs rate low and have minimal evidence. Greater confidence can be placed in programs with consistently higher ratings *across multiple agencies*, since their outcomes have been achieved using more rigorous evaluation. Whenever possible, use programs that have achieved the highest ratings.

It is our hope that this document will shed some light on the many programs that have been reviewed by various agencies promoting school safety, child and adolescent development and well-being.

For information about specific programs, contact:

Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence
483 UCB
Boulder, CO 80309
email: blueprints@colorado.edu
www.blueprintsprograms.com

Updated: April 2017

CENTER FOR THE STUDY AND PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE
Matrix Overview of Focus and Program Criteria Standards

1) Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy

Contact Information: Social Programs That Work
www.toptierevidence.org

Jon Barron
202-683-8049
jbaron@coalition4evidence.org

*Ratings System: **Top Tier, Near Top Tier***

Description: The Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy seeks to identify those social interventions shown in rigorous studies to produce sizable, sustained benefits to participants and/or society. The purpose is to enable policymakers and practitioners to readily distinguish the few interventions that are truly backed by rigorous evidence from the many that claim to be so that they can use such knowledge to improve the lives of the people they serve.

Top Tier interventions have been demonstrated effective, through two or more well-conducted randomized controlled trials or, alternatively, one large multi-site trial. Additionally, these interventions must have been evaluated in real-world community settings with appropriate sample sizes and produce sizeable, sustained benefits to participants and/or society.

Near Top Tier interventions have been shown to meet all elements of the Top Tier standard in a single site, and which only need one additional step to qualify as Top Tier - a replication trial establishing that the sizeable, sustained effects found in that site generalize to other sites.

2) Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development

Contact Information: Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development
www.blueprintsprograms.com

Sharon Mihalic, Director
303-492-2137
blueprints@colorado.edu

*Ratings System: **Model Plus Programs, Model Programs, Promising Programs***

Description: The Blueprints mission is to identify truly outstanding violence and drug prevention (and most recently mental and physical health, education, and self-regulation)

programs for children and adolescents that meet a high scientific standard of effectiveness. In doing so, Blueprints serves as a resource for governments, foundations, businesses, and other organizations trying to make informed judgments about their investments in violence and drug prevention programs. Blueprints staff systematically and continuously review the research on programs to determine which are exemplary and grounded in evidence. To date, it has assessed more than 1,000 programs. Criteria are:

Promising Programs: Promising programs meet the following standards

- **Intervention specificity:** The program description clearly identifies the outcome the program is designed to change, the specific risk and/or protective factors targeted to produce this change in outcome, the population for which it is intended, and how the components of the intervention work to produce this change.
- **Evaluation quality:** The evaluation trials produce valid and reliable findings. This requires a minimum of (a) one high quality randomized controlled trial or (b) two high quality quasi-experimental evaluations.
- **Intervention impact:** The preponderance of evidence from the high quality evaluations indicates significant positive change in intended outcomes that can be attributed to the program and there is no evidence of harmful effects.
- **Dissemination readiness:** The program is currently available for dissemination and has the necessary organizational capability, manuals, training, technical assistance and other support required for implementation with fidelity in communities and public service systems.

Model Programs: Model programs meet these *additional* standards

- **Evaluation Quality:** A minimum of (a) two high quality randomized controlled trials or (b) one high quality randomized control trial plus one high quality quasi-experimental evaluation.
- **Positive intervention impact is sustained for a minimum of 12 months after the program intervention ends.**

Model Plus Programs: Model Plus programs meet *one additional* standard

- **Independent Replication:** In at least one high quality study demonstrating desired outcomes, authorship, data collection, and analysis has been conducted by a researcher who is neither a current or past member of the program developer's research team and who has no financial interest in the program.

**3) National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP)
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services (SAMHSA),
US Department of Health and Human Services**

Contact Information: National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices
<http://nrepp.samhsa.gov>

866-436-7377
nrepp@samhsa.hhs.gov

Ratings System:

Effective, Promising, Ineffective, Inconclusive for individual outcomes.

0 – 4 for individual outcomes for programs reviewed prior to November 23, 2015 and labeled as “legacy” programs on the NREPP website. These programs will be re-reviewed over a four-year period (2015-2018) using the newer ratings above.

Description: The National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP) is a searchable online registry of mental health and substance abuse interventions that have been evaluated and rated by independent reviewers. The purpose of this registry is to assist the public in identifying scientifically evaluated approaches to preventing and treating mental health and/or substance use disorders. NREPP seeks to improve access to information on tested interventions and thereby reduce the lag time between the creation of scientific knowledge and its practical application in the field.

NREPP certified reviewers use the NREPP Outcome Rating Instrument to review each eligible outcome in the program’s evidence base of evaluation studies. Program outcomes are reviewed on the following four dimensions: rigor, effect size, program fidelity, and conceptual framework.

Effective programs have an evidence base that produces strong evidence of a favorable effect.

Promising programs have an evidence base that produces sufficient evidence of a favorable effect.

Ineffective programs have an evidence base that produces sufficient evidence of a negligible effect or a possibly harmful effect.

Inconclusive programs have an evidence base with insufficient methodological rigor to determine program impact and/or the inability to calculate the size of the short-term effect. Programs in this category are not included in the Matrix of Programs.

Prior to November 23, 2015, NREPP used a ‘quality of research’ rating for each criminal and substance abuse outcome, ranging from 0 to 4, on six criteria: reliability, validity,

intervention fidelity, missing data and attrition, potential confounding variables, and appropriateness of analysis. An overall rating for each outcome was provided. Readiness for dissemination was also rated on a scale from 0-4, based upon three criteria: availability of implementation materials, availability of training and support resources, and availability of quality assurance procedures.

4) OJJDP Model Programs Guide

Contact Information: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)
www.ojjdp.gov/mpg

Rating System: **Effective, Promising, No Effects**
Now uses the Crime Solutions rating criteria.

Description: The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's Model Programs Guide (MPG) is designed to assist practitioners and communities in implementing evidence-based prevention and intervention programs that can make a difference in the lives of children and communities. The MPG database of evidence-based programs covers the entire continuum of youth services from prevention through sanctions to reentry. Study reviewers analyze the most rigorous evaluation research available to assess the quality, strength, and extent of the evidence that indicates the program achieves its goals. The reviewers use a standard Scoring Instrument for each study reviewed and assign scores across four dimensions: (1) the program's conceptual framework, (2) study design quality, (3) study outcomes and (4) program fidelity.

Effective programs have strong evidence to indicate they achieve their intended outcomes when implemented with fidelity. These programs have at least one evaluation study that is rigorous, well-designed and finds significant, positive effects on justice-related outcomes.

Promising programs have some evidence to indicate they achieve their intended outcomes. These programs have at least one well-designed evaluation, but it is slightly less rigorous and/or there may be limitations in the design. However, they find significant, positive effects on justice-related outcomes.

Programs that have No Effects have evaluations that are rigorous and well-designed, but find no significant effects on justice-related outcomes. Programs in this category are not included in the Matrix of Programs.

5) Office of Justice Programs – Crime Solutions

Contact Information: Office of Justice Programs,
U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs
www.crimesolutions.gov

Rating System: **Effective, Promising, No Effects**

Description: The Office of Justice Programs (OJP) sponsors CrimeSolutions.gov as a resource to help justice practitioners determine what works in criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services. Study reviewers analyze the most rigorous evaluation research available to assess the quality, strength, and extent of the evidence that indicates the program achieves its goals. The reviewers use a standard Scoring Instrument for each study reviewed and assign scores across four dimensions: (1) the program's conceptual framework, (2) study design quality, (3) study outcomes and (4) program fidelity.

Effective programs have strong evidence to indicate they achieve their intended outcomes when implemented with fidelity. These programs have at least one evaluation study that is rigorous, well-designed and finds significant, positive effects on justice-related outcomes.

Promising programs have some evidence to indicate they achieve their intended outcomes. These programs have at least one well-designed evaluation, but it is slightly less rigorous and/or there may be limitations in the design. However, they find significant, positive effects on justice-related outcomes.

Programs that have No Effects have evaluations that are rigorous and well-designed, but find no significant effects on justice-related outcomes.

Excluded from this Matrix of Programs are programs with No Effects as well as those categorized under Forensics/Evidence and Technologies.