

## Comparison of Organizations that Offer Program Reviews

Name	Focus	Program designations	Duration of effects	Replications	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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective</li> <li>• Promising</li> <li>• Unclear</li> <li>• Ineffective</li> </ul>	<p><b>Effective:</b> Effect(s) lasting <math>\geq</math> two years from the beginning of the program, or <math>\geq</math> one year from program completion.</p> <p><b>Promising:</b> Effect(s) lasting <math>\geq</math> one year from the beginning of the program, or <math>\geq</math> 6 months from program completion.</p> <p><b>Unclear:</b> Sustainability not assessed or established.</p> <p><b>Ineffective:</b> Program effects not sustained.</p>	External replication required for <b>Effective</b> designation only.	<p><b>Effective:</b> RCT or well-matched quasi-experimental.</p> <p><b>Promising:</b> Quasi-experimental.</p>	Must meet all four of the following for <b>Effective</b> designation, and at least two for <b>Promising</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representative sample</li> <li>• Modest attrition</li> <li>• Practical significance</li> <li>• Adequate measurement</li> </ul>	Full literature review.	Review limited to peer-reviewed publications.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rigorous review process</li> <li>• Full lit review</li> <li>• Replications and duration of effects emphasized</li> <li>• Concise fact sheets</li> <li>• Broad range of youth, adult, family programs</li> </ul>
Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development	Prevention programs that target problem behavior, education, emotional well-being, physical health, and positive relationships.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Model</li> <li>• Promising</li> </ul>	<p><b>Model:</b> Effects lasting 12 months beyond program completion.</p> <p><b>Promising:</b> No long-term effects necessary.</p>	External replication required for <b>Model</b> designation only.	<p><b>Model:</b> Two RCTs or one RCT and one high quality quasi-experimental.</p> <p><b>Promising:</b> One RCT or two quasi-experimental.</p>	Major considerations for all programs include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proper group assignment</li> <li>• Adequate measures</li> <li>• Intent to treat analysis</li> <li>• Appropriate statistics</li> <li>• Equivalent groups</li> <li>• Program fidelity</li> <li>• Modest attrition</li> <li>• Independent data reports</li> <li>• Ready for dissemination</li> </ul>	Full literature review.	No requirement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rigorous review process</li> <li>• Full lit review</li> <li>• Replications and duration of effects emphasized</li> <li>• Comprehensive summaries</li> <li>• Specific focus on youth programs</li> </ul>

Name	Focus	Program designations	Duration of effects	Replications	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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> <li>*Previous designations as model, effective, and promising have not been made since 2004.</li> </ul>	Duration of effects is noted in reviews, but there is no minimum duration necessary to be listed on the NREPP site.	Not required.	RCTs and quasi-experimental designs are preferred, although other designs are considered.	Programs are reviewed based on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive effects (<math>p &lt; .05</math>)</li> <li>• Reliability of measures</li> <li>• Validity of measures</li> <li>• Intervention fidelity</li> <li>• Missing data/attrition</li> <li>• Confounding variables</li> <li>• Appropriate analysis</li> <li>• Implementation materials</li> <li>• Training/support</li> <li>• Quality assurance</li> </ul>	Program developers submit all materials that are reviewed.	Peer-reviewed publications, books, or technical reports are preferred.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All studies considered, even with inferior designs</li> <li>• Only material submitted by developer is reviewed</li> <li>• Broad range of youth, adult, family programs</li> </ul>
Crimesolutions.gov	Interventions that seek to prevent or reduce crime, delinquency, and related problems.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective</li> <li>• Promising</li> <li>• No effects</li> </ul> *crimesolutions.gov 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.	Programs are reviewed based on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conceptual framework</li> <li>• Type of research design</li> <li>• Sample size</li> <li>• Statistical adjustment</li> <li>• Instrumentation</li> <li>• Internal validity</li> <li>• Follow-up period</li> <li>• Displacement/diffusion</li> <li>• Outcome evidence</li> <li>• Program fidelity</li> </ul>	Full literature review.	Peer-reviewed publication or evaluation reports published 1980 or later. Up to three best studies are reviewed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full lit review</li> <li>• Duration of effects emphasized</li> <li>• Specific focus on crime and delinquency</li> </ul>

Name	Focus	Program designations	Duration of effects	Replications	Study design	Methodological considerations	Methods for review	Peer review	Summary of key features
What Works Clearing-house (WWC)	Programs, products, practices, and policies that improve outcomes in education.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets Evidence Standards w/o Reservations</li> <li>Meets with Reservations</li> <li>Does Not Meet Evidence Standards</li> </ul> <p>Several secondary ratings are also included.</p>	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.	<p>Programs are placed following an assessment of the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Study design (RCT or not)</li> <li>Sample attrition</li> <li>Group comparability</li> <li>Baseline equivalence</li> <li>Quality of measures</li> <li>Confounding factors</li> </ul> <p>*WWC includes information on numerous other methodological considerations in their comprehensive written summaries of programs.</p>	Full literature review.	Includes published and unpublished literature.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full lit review</li> <li>Comprehensive and very detailed reports provided for each program</li> <li>Specific focus on education outcomes</li> </ul>
Promising Practices Network	Child health, school readiness and success, strong families.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proven</li> <li>Promising</li> <li>Other (if reviewed by other organizations)</li> </ul>	Not considered for placements.	Not required.	<p><b>Proven:</b> RCT or high-quality quasi-experiment.</p> <p><b>Promising:</b> Weaker quasi-experiments.</p>	<p>The following factors are considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant outcomes</li> <li>Large effect size</li> <li>Statistical significance</li> <li>Quality control group</li> <li>Adequate sample size</li> <li>Proper documentation</li> </ul>	Full literature review.	Any publicly available documentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full lit review</li> <li>Comprehensive reports</li> <li>Specific focus on programs for children and their families</li> </ul>
National Dropout Prevention Center/ Network	School dropout and graduation outcomes.	<p>Evidence rated as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong</li> <li>Moderate</li> <li>Limited</li> <li>Insufficient</li> </ul>	Not considered for placements.	External replication required for <b>Strong</b> evidence.	<p><b>Strong:</b> RCT.</p> <p><b>Moderate:</b> Quasi-experimental.</p>	Programs must have existed for at least three years for <b>Strong</b> or <b>Moderate</b> placement. In addition, reviewers consider quality of research design.	Program developers submit all materials that are reviewed.	No requirement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitted materials only</li> <li>Replications emphasized</li> <li>Specific focus on school dropout outcomes</li> </ul>

Name	Focus	Program designations	Duration of effects	Replications	Study design	Methodological considerations	Methods for review	Peer review	Summary of key features
OJJDP Model Programs Guide	Prevention, treatment, and sanctions designed to address juvenile justice, mental health, and substance abuse among adolescents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exemplary</li> <li>• Effective</li> <li>• Promising</li> </ul>	OJJDP will begin considering this criterion as they move to become consistent with crimesolutions.gov.	Not required.	RCT or quasi-experimental  *note that programs are being re-reviewed based on crimesolutions.gov standards.	OJJDP now uses the same criteria as crimesolutions.gov to assess the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conceptual framework</li> <li>• Evaluation design</li> <li>• Outcome evidence</li> <li>• Program fidelity</li> </ul>	Reviews based on nominations - materials submitted by nominating organization.	Peer-reviewed or comprehensive evaluation report.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moving towards same criteria as crimesolutions.org</li> <li>• Specific focus on youth programs</li> </ul>
Child Trends What Works	Out-of-school social interventions that address a wide variety of youth-focused outcomes.	None, although individual fact sheets indicate whether a program works or does not work.	Not considered as a criterion, although duration of effects may be noted in fact sheets.	Not required.	RCT only.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Random assignment</li> <li>• Intent to treat analysis</li> <li>• Post-test response rates at least 50%</li> </ul>	Reviews based on nominations.	No requirement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summaries of individual evaluations</li> <li>• Specific focus on youth programs</li> </ul>
Findyouth.info.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 or high quality are considered for “evidence-based” list.	Noted, but not required to be placed on list.	Noted, but not required to be placed on list.	<b>High quality:</b> RCT  <b>Moderate quality:</b> Quasi-experimental.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quantitative studies only</li> <li>• Conducted since 1989</li> <li>• Acceptable attrition rates</li> <li>• Baseline equivalence</li> <li>• No reassignment to groups</li> <li>• Limited confounding factors</li> </ul>	Full literature review, including searches for unpublished research.	No requirement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full lit review</li> <li>• Summaries of studies</li> <li>• Specific focus on teen pregnancy and STD prevention</li> </ul>

Name	Focus	Program designations	Duration of effects	Replications	Study design	Methodological considerations	Methods for review	Peer review	Summary of key features
Findyouth info.gov Substance Abuse, Violence, and Other Risk Behavior Program Directory	Academic problems; aggression; violence; gang involvement; ATOD; delinquency; family functioning; sexual activity/exploitation; trauma.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level 1 = robust empirical findings</li> <li>Level 2 = adequate empirical findings</li> <li>Level 3 = promising empirical findings</li> </ul>	Findyouthinfo.gov will begin considering this criterion as they move to become consistent with crimesolutions.gov.	Noted, but not required.	<p><b>Level 1:</b> RCT.</p> <p><b>Level 2:</b> Quasi-experimental.</p> <p>*note that programs are being re-reviewed based on crimesolutions.gov standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conceptual framework</li> <li>Program fidelity</li> <li>Evaluation design</li> <li>Empirical evidence</li> </ul>	Nominations, literature searches of relevant journals, electronic databases, and other evidence-based repositories.	Peer-reviewed publications or comprehensive evaluation reports.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moving towards same criteria as crimesolutions.org</li> <li>Specific focus on youth programs</li> </ul>
California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse	Variety of topics related to child welfare. An advisory committee selects topics.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well-supported by research</li> <li>Supported by research</li> <li>Promising research evidence</li> <li>Evidence fails to demonstrate effect</li> <li>Concerning Practice</li> <li>Not able to be rated</li> </ul> <p>*Also rated on relevance to child welfare system.</p>	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.	<p><b>Well-supported or Evidence fails to demonstrate:</b> RCT.</p> <p><b>Promising:</b> Quasi-experimental.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No iatrogenic effects</li> <li>Manualized</li> <li>Number of replications</li> <li>Duration of effects</li> <li>Research design</li> <li>Quality of measures</li> <li>Effects across multiple studies</li> </ul>	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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rigorous review process</li> <li>Full lit review</li> <li>Replications and duration of effects emphasized</li> <li>Specific focus on select child welfare topics</li> </ul>

## 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>
- Crimesolutions.gov: [http://www.crimesolutions.gov/about\\_starttofinish.aspx](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>
- What Works Clearinghouse: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/InsidetheWWC.aspx>