

Date of Review:		Study 1						Study 2													
Program Name:		Targeted Outcomes						Risk & Protective Factors			Targeted Outcomes						Risk & Protective Factors				
Follow up Date		Substance Abuse	Teen Pregnancy	School Dropout	Delinquent Behavior	Depression & Anxiety	Suicide	Other				Substance Abuse	Teen Pregnancy	School Dropout	Delinquent Behavior	Depression & Anxiety	Suicide	Other			

Program Level	Criterion	Rating of Criterion			Notes	Suggested Changes Before Next Review
Level 1: Developing Program	Level 1 Criteria	Below Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard		
Program narrative	Target Population Identified (including selection criteria)					
	Structure of program identified (dosage, program delivery, # of sessions, length of sessions, criteria of facilitators)					
	Synopsis of interventions used					
	History of the program implementation (# of years, # of cycles, # of participants)					
	Describes what this program provides that other EBP's do not (why did they choose not to use an already established EBP)					
	Identifies expected outcomes					
	Theoretical explanation of why the program should be effective					
Logic model	Utilizes an EBW approved logic model format					
	Employs plausible logic					
	Is complete in linking intervention to outcomes through causal chain					
Assessment of harm	Does not include practices known or likely to cause harm					
Program materials	Follows basic principles of proven prevention practices (developmentally appropriate strategies for target population, addresses risk and protective factors, culturally appropriate for target population, participant materials are at appropriate reading level)					
	Describes all interventions in detail/Curriculum is provided					
	Core components of the program are clearly identified as well as any optional activities.					
	Program materials are supported by relevant literature					
	The program curriculum is established and sufficiently manualized for consistent delivery					
Description of evaluation design	Evaluation design maps to logic model					
	Evaluation design is appropriate					

	Targeted outcomes are identified within the broader goals and context of the program and align with assessed/evaluated outcomes.					
Evaluation instrumentation						
	Measures are expected to be valid					
	Instrumentation appears to be unbiased					
	Instrumentation measures targeted outcome(s)					
Observed outcomes	Achieved positive results for desired outcomes					
	interpretations of outcomes are appropriate					

Level 1 (if no stop here, if yes continue with level 2 criteria)

No	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Level 2: Emerging Program	Level 2 Criteria	Below Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Notes	Suggested Changes Before Next Review
Data analysis report	Statistically significant/effect size analysis support results on targeted outcomes in desirable direction.					
	At minimum it has an appropriate research simple design (without comparison group)					
	Change in at least one of these four: Attitude, Behavioral Intent, Beliefs and/or Knowledge					
	Evaluation was conducted in the last 2 years					
Assessment of harm	Innovative or novel interventions were properly monitored					
	A plan is in place to properly monitor and understand negative outcomes.					
	Interventions with negative behavioral outcomes have been discontinued					
Statistical conclusion validity	Study has sufficient statistical power					
	Statistical tests are appropriate to the type of analysis, levels of measurement, and data quality					
	Models are complete and justifiable (no evidence of fishing)					
	Data cleaning procedures are described and meet professional standards					
	Missing data do not create suspicion of bias					
Construct validity	Measures for outcomes are clear					
	Measures for outcomes are unbiased					
	Measures use appropriate levels of measurement					
Internal validity	Temporal precedence (intervention before outcome) is established					

Selection bias is reasonably minimized					
Study includes appropriate controls for variation in treatment					
Study includes appropriate controls for alternative plausible explanations of the effect on outcomes					
Study mitigates possible maturation and/or regression effects					
Study attrition is accounted for					

No Yes

Level 2 (if no stop here; if yes move to level 3 criteria)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------

Level 3: Supported Program

considered evidence based

Level 3 Criteria	Below Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Notes	Suggested Changes Before Next Review
Commitment from submitter to continue evaluation of the program					
Replication study that meets all the requirements of previous levels *replication may not be needed with a strong longitudinal design					
Appropriate advanced evaluation design: Check type below					
Experimental					
Quasiexperimental (comparison groups, natural experiment, interrupted time series, regression discontinuity)					
Has fidelity tools and plans to measure fidelity in future (if not doing that now)					
Measures for intervention fidelity are clear					

No Yes

Level 3 (if no stop here; if yes move to level 3 criteria)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------

Level 4: Well Supported Program

considered evidence based

Level 4 Criteria	Below Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Notes	Suggested Changes Before Next Review
Program has at least 1 of these two: Results show behavior change and/or Multiple evaluation reports with an advanced design measuring the same outcomes					
Study includes appropriate controls for variation in individuals					
Fidelity measured and reported in evaluation report					
Measures for intervention/fidelity are unbiased					

No Yes

Level 4

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------