**Module Four:
Worksheet: Program Fit, Feasibility, and Effectiveness Study**

**Objective: Better understand prevention program landscape by analyzing potential programs to determine fit, feasibility, and effectiveness and guide program selection**

**Directions:** When exploring different program options, use this tool to rate a program’s fit, feasibility, and effectiveness which will lead to better program selection. Complete a worksheet for each program you are considering implementing.

* Answer each of the questions in Sections #1-3. If you are unsure of an answer, consult one of the online programming listings found in Module #4 to gain more knowledge about the program
* After answering the questions in each section, use your best judgement and rate the section
* Once all sections are rated, combine the ratings in Section #4 for an overall rating
* Consult the rating rubric to see if the program should be considered for selection

**Program Name:**

**What priority or target does the program address?**

**Section #1: Understanding & Rating Program** **EFFECTIVENESS**

**Section #1 Rating**

Based on your responses to questions in Section One, place a rating in the box of the program’s evidence of **EFFECTIVENESS** on a scale of 1-10:

1 = having the least credible evidence of effectiveness

10 = having the most credible evidence of effectiveness

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions to Explore** | **Yes** | **No** | **Not Sure** | **Notes** |
| Does the program have a well-articulated underlying theory of behavior change?  |  |  |  |  |
| Are specific risk and/or protective factor(s) and developmental/causal pathway(s) targeted by the program identified? |  |  |  |  |
| Has the program been evaluated using a rigorous evaluation such as a control or comparison group that can adequately attribute the evaluation’s findings? |  |  |  |  |
| Has the program published study results that have been peer reviewed in a scientific journal? |  |  |  |  |
| Are the published evaluation results generalizable to your community or the specific population you are targeting? |  |  |  |  |
| Have the results of the program’s evaluation been replicated in more than one study, and/or by more than one researcher (or someone other than the program’s developer)? |  |  |  |  |
| Are there findings from other research on similar types of programs that support the program’s theory *(i.e. programs with a similar logic model or theory of behavior change)*?  |  |  |  |  |
| Are the positive findings from the program’s evaluation(s) not only statistically significant but also practically significant *(i.e. sufficient effect size and impact to justify the investment in the program)*,and have program effects been found to be sustained beyond immediate post-test? |  |  |  |  |
| Has research shown any unintended negative effects of the program? *If so, the program should NOT be considered until additional research has been conducted.* |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions to Explore** | **Fits Very Well** | **Somewhat Fits** | **Does****Not****Fit** | **Not Sure** | **Notes** |
| How well does the program’s theory of behavior change, targeted risk and protective factors, and target population match your identified needs? |  |  |  |  |  |
| How well do the program’s theory, goals and approach fit with other existing programs and priorities in your community? |  |  |  |  |  |
| How well does the program seem to fit with the culture and beliefs of your community and target population? |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Questions to Explore** | **Open-Ended Answers** |
| Will the program have to be significantly adapted in order to be adequately adopted and implemented in your community? Will the required adaptations maintain program fidelity?  | *If adaptions will be needed, we suggest you reach out the developer to see if these adaptions will maintain the proven-effectiveness of the program and/or explore other program options.*  |
| How difficult will it be to recruit and retain the necessary staff with appropriate qualifications? |  |
| How supportive will key administrators and stakeholders be of the program? |  |
| Will the commitment of time and resources both for training and program delivery be acceptable? |  |
| How difficult will it be to sustain the program long-term? |  |

**Section #2: Understanding & Rating Program FIT**

**Section #2 Rating**

Based on your responses to the questions above, place a rating in the box of the program’s **Fit** on a scale of 1-10:

1 = being the worst fit

10 = being the best fit

**Section #3: Understanding & Rating Program FEASIBILITY**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions to Explore** | **Yes** | **No** | **Not Sure** | **Notes** |
| Are training and program materials readily available and of sufficient quality? |  |  |  |  |
| Is there ongoing technical assistance available beyond initial training? |  |  |  |  |
| Is there a network of peer support among other communities who are also implementing this program? |  |  |  |  |
| Are there resources that will be required for program start-up *(i.e. training, curriculum, etc.)*? If yes, list what resources will be needed in the notes section. |  |  |  |  |
| Are there resources that will be required to sustain the program *(i.e. consumable materials, refresher trainings, new-staff training, etc.)*? If yes, list what resources will be needed in the notes section. |  |  |  |  |
| Does the program meet the requirements of common funding sources/initiatives? |  |  |  |  |
| Given the potential outcomes expected, is the program likely to represent a positive return on investment? |  |  |  |  |

Based on your responses to the questions above, place a rating in the box of the program’s **FEASIBILITY** on a scale of 1-10:

1 = not feasible

10 = very feasible

**Section #3 Rating**

**Section #4: Total Program Rating for EFFECTIVENESS, FIT, AND FEASIBILITY**

**Section #4 Rating**

Add the scores from Sections #1-3 to find the total rating for your program. See the rubric below to review how your program rates overall.

**Now, think about your total score for program EFFECTIVENESS, FIT, AND FEASIBILITY.**

**Where does it fall on this rubric? Hint: You are aiming for a score of 24 or higher!**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Score****24-30** | **Total Score****20-23** | **Total Score****Below 20** |
| Indicates good effectiveness, fit & feasibility | Has limited effectiveness and/or poor fit/feasibility | Should not be considered |
| Likely to be well-implemented and sustained | Could result in implementation challenges and acceptability | Unlikely to result in positive behavior change |

**Where does your program land on this matrix?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **FIT & FEASIBLITY (F&F)** |
| **Poor ------------------------------------------------> Good** |
| **EVIDENCE** | **Strong <-------------- Weak** | **UNTESTED or INEFFECTIVE and poor F&F** | **UNTESTED or INEFFECTIVE and some challenges to F&F** | **UNTESTED OR INEEFECITVE but good F&F** |
| **PROMISING EFFECTIVENESS but poor F&F** | **PROMISING EFFECTIVENESS but some challenges to F&F** | **PROMISING EFFECTIVENESS and good F&F** |
| **EVIDENCE-BASED but poor F&F** | **EVIDENCE-BASED but some challenges to F&F** | **EVIDENCE-BASED and good F&F** |

\*Bumbarger, B. K., Moore, J. E., & Cooper, B. R. (2013). Examining adaptations of evidence-based programs in natural contexts.

The Journal of Primary Prevention, 34(3), 147-161. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10935-013-0303-6

For more information on program selection and finding a balance between fit, feasibility, and evidence of effectiveness, please see the following documents, which guided the development of this planning tool:

* Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP, 2009). Identifying and Selecting Evidence-based Interventions, 2009. Revised Guidance Document for the Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant Program. HHS Pub. No. (SMA)09-4205. Rockville, MD: Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.
* Small, S.A., Cooney, S.M., Eastman, G., & O’Connor, C. (2007). Guidelines for Selecting an Evidence-based Program: Balancing community needs, program quality, and organizational resources. What Works, Wisconsin Research to Practice Series, 3. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison/Extension.
	+ - * Developed by Brian K. Bumbarger. (2012). Evidence-based Prevention and Intervention Support Center (EPISCenter), Prevention Research Center, Penn State University.