

# Evidence-based Program Guide

## Defining Evidence-based Programs

Programs recognized as evidence-based have demonstrated the highest level of evidence of effectiveness based on the criteria below. These programs, if implemented with adherence to the program developer's model, are likely to produce positive youth outcomes.

- Effectiveness demonstrated in rigorous scientific evaluations
- Effectiveness demonstrated in large studies with diverse populations or through multiple replications
- Significant and sustained effects

### **Caution: Not All Program Lists Have Stringent Inclusion Criteria**

A variety of terms are used to refer to programs or approaches demonstrating varying levels of effectiveness, such as science-based, research-based, empirically supported, best practices, exemplary, model, and promising programs. It is important to realize that there is a continuum of effectiveness and that some programs promoted as effective may not meet all of the above criteria.

Many online lists of prevention programs include programs which have undergone some form of study, whether scientifically rigorous or not, and that have produced some outcome findings, positive or negative. These sites include programs with varying degrees of research and it is left to the reader to make their own judgment about whether the evaluation results represent an effective program.

---

## National Registry for Evidence-Based Prevention Programs

[www.nrepp.samhsa.gov](http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov)

Reviewers use a scale of 0.0 to 4.0, with 4.0 being the highest rating given

- QOR rating criteria
- Reliability of measures
- Validity of measures
- Intervention fidelity
- Missing data and attrition
- Potential confounding variables
- Appropriateness of analysis.

---

## Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development

[www.blueprintsprograms.com](http://www.blueprintsprograms.com)

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 control 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 meet these additional standards:

- **Evaluation Quality**

A minimum of (a) two high quality randomized control trials or (b) one high quality randomized control trial plus one high quality quasi-experimental evaluation.

---

## Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Model Program Guide

<http://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/Default.aspx>

[www.crimesolutions.gov](http://www.crimesolutions.gov)

### Considers:

- The conceptual framework of the program
- The program fidelity
- The evaluation design

### Rating Criteria:

- **Exemplary**

In general, when implemented with a high degree of fidelity these programs demonstrate robust empirical findings using a reputable conceptual framework and an evaluation design of the highest quality (experimental).

- **Effective**

In general, when implemented with sufficient fidelity these programs demonstrate adequate empirical findings using a sound conceptual framework and an evaluation design of the high quality (quasi-experimental).

- **Promising**

In general, when implemented with minimal fidelity these programs demonstrate promising (perhaps inconsistent) empirical findings using a reasonable conceptual framework and a limited evaluation design that requires causal confirmation using more appropriate experimental techniques.