FRIENDS National Center for Community Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) Crosswalk of Evidence-Based Programs with Clearinghouses/Registries

Clearinghouse/Registry *(on the right)* Evidence-Based Program *(below)*	CBCAP Evidence Rating	California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare	Home Visiting Evidence of Effectiveness	Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development	Title IV-E Prevention Services Clearinghouse – FFPSA	Results First Clearinghouse Database	Social Programs that Work
1-2-3 Magic: Effective Discipline	Supported	Promising Research Evidence	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Second Highest Rating	Not Listed
ACT Adults and Children Together Raising Safe Kids Program	Supported	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Second Highest Rating	Not Listed
Active Parenting	Supported	Promising Research Evidence	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Second Highest Rating	Not Listed
Active Parenting of Teens: Families in Action	Supported	Promising Research Evidence	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Second Highest Rating	Not Listed
Al's Pals: Kids Making Healthy Choices	Supported	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Second Highest Rating	Not Listed
AVANCE Parent Child Education Program (PCEP)	Well-Supported	Supported by Research Evidence	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Highest Rating	Not Listed
Big Brothers Big Sisters Community Based Mentoring Program	Supported	Promising Research Evidence	Not Listed	Promising	Not Listed	Second Highest Rating	Suggestive Tier
Body Safety Training Workbook (BST)	Supported	Promising Research Evidence	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Second Highest Rating	Not Listed

*The ratings in this crosswalk were pulled from the registries in August 2022

FRIENDS National Center for Community Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP)
Crosswalk of Evidence-Based Programs with Clearinghouses/Registries

Clearinghouse/Registry *(on the right)* Evidence-Based Program *(below)*	CBCAP Evidence Rank	California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare	Home Visiting Evidence of Effectiveness	Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development	Title IV-E Prevention Services Clearinghouse – FFPSA	Results First Clearinghouse Database	Social Programs that Work
Celebrating Families	*Promising*	*Not Able to Be Rated*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Insufficient Evidence*	*Not Listed*
Child and Family Traumatic Stress Intervention (CFTSI)	Supported	*Promising Research Evidence*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Second Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*
Child First	Well-Supported	*Supported by Research Evidence*	*Meets Criteria*	*Promising*	*Supported*	*Second Highest Rating*	*Near Top Tier*
Circle of Security – Home Visiting 4	*Promising*	*Not Able to Be Rated*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Does Not Meet Criteria*	*Insufficient Evidence*	*Not Listed*
Common Sense Parenting	*Supported*	*Supported by Research Evidence*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Second Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*
COPEing with Toddler Behaviour	Supported	*Promising Research Evidence*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Second Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*
Creating Lasting Family Connections (CLFC)	Supported	*Promising Research Evidence*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Second Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*
Dare to be You	Supported	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Second Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*
Early Head Start	Well-Supported	*Promising Research Evidence*	*Meets Criteria (for home based option)*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*

*The ratings in this crosswalk were pulled from the registries in August 2022

FRIENDS National Center for Community Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP)
Crosswalk of Evidence-Based Programs with Clearinghouses/Registries

Clearinghouse/Registry *(on the right)* Evidence-Based Program *(below)*	CBCAP Evidence Rank	California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare	Home Visiting Evidence of Effectiveness	Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development	Title IV-E Prevention Services Clearinghouse – FFPSA	Results First Clearinghouse Database	Social Programs that Work
Early Intervention Program for Adolescent Mothers	*Well-Supported*	*Not Listed*	*Meets Criteria*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*
Effective Black Parenting Program (EBPP)	*Supported*	*Promising Research Evidence*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Promising*	*Second Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*
Exchange Parent Aide	*Supported*	*Promising Research Evidence*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Second Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*
Families First	*Supported*	*Promising Research Evidence*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Second Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*
Family Check-up for Children/Toddlers	*Well-Supported*	*Well-Supported by Research Evidence*	*Meets Criteria*	*Promising*	*Well-Supported*	*Second Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*
Family Connections	*Supported*	*Promising Research Evidence*	*Did Not Meet Criteria*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Second Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*
Family Connects	*Well-Supported*	*Not Listed*	*Meets Criteria*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*
Family Foundations	*Well-Supported*	*Supported by Research Evidence*	*Not Listed*	*Promising*	*Not Listed*	*Second Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*
Family and Schools Together (FAST) – Elementary School Level	*Well-Supported*	*Promising Research Evidence*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Promising*	*Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*

The ratings in this crosswalk were pulled from the registries in August 2022

FRIENDS National Center for Community Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) Crosswalk of Evidence-Based Programs with Clearinghouses/Registries

Clearinghouse/Registry *(on the right)* Evidence-Based Program *(below)*	CBCAP Evidence Rank	California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare	Home Visiting Evidence of Effectiveness	Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development	Title IV-E Prevention Services Clearinghouse – FFPSA	Results First Clearinghouse Database	Social Programs that Work
Family Spirit	Well-Supported	Promising Research Evidence	Meets Criteria	Not Listed	Promising	Second Highest Rating	Not Listed
Functional Family Therapy	Well-Supported	Well-Supported by Research Evidence	Not Listed	Model Plus	Well-Supported	Highest Rating	Not Listed
Guiding Good Choices	Well-Supported	Supported by Research Evidence	Not Listed	Promising	Well-Supported	Highest Rating	Not Listed
Health Access Nurturing Development Services (HANDS)	Well-Supported	Not Listed	Meets Criteria	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed
Healthy Families America (HFA)	Well-Supported	Well-Supported by Research Evidence	Meets Criteria	Not Listed	Well-Supported	Highest Rating	Not Listed
Healthy & Safe	Supported	Promising Research Evidence	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Second Highest Rating	Not Listed
Helping the Noncompliant Child (HNC)	Supported	Promising Research Evidence	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Second Highest Rating	Not Listed
Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY)	Well-Supported	Supported by Research Evidence	Meets Criteria	Not Listed	Not Listed	Highest Rating	Not Listed
Incredible Years	Well-Supported	Well-Supported by Research Evidence	Not Listed	Promising	Promising – Toddler & School Age	Highest Rating	Not Listed

*The ratings in this crosswalk were pulled from the registries in August 2022

FRIENDS National Center for Community Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP)
Crosswalk of Evidence-Based Programs with Clearinghouses/Registries

Clearinghouse/Registry *(on the right)* Evidence-Based Program *(below)*	CBCAP Evidence Rank	California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare	Home Visiting Evidence of Effectiveness	Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development	Title IV-E Prevention Services Clearinghouse – FFPSA	Results First Clearinghouse Database	Social Programs that Work
Maternal Early Childhood Sustained Home Visiting Program (MECSH)	Well-Supported	Not Listed	Meets Criteria	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed
Minding the Baby Home Visiting	Well-Supported	Not Listed	Meets Criteria	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed
Motivational Interviewing	Well-Supported	Well-Supported by Research Evidence	Not Listed	Not Listed	Well-Supported	Highest Rating	Not Listed
Nurse Family Partnership (NFP)	Well-Supported	Well-Supported by Research Evidence	Meets Criteria	Model	Well-Supported	Highest Rating	Top Tier
Nurturing Parenting Program	Supported	Not Able to Be Rated	Did Not Meet Criteria	Not Listed	Does Not Meet Criteria	Highest Rating – School Aged	Not Listed
ParentChild+	Supported	Promising Research Evidence	Did Not Meet Criteria	Not Listed	Not Listed	Second Highest Rating	Not Listed
Parent-Child Interaction Therapy (PCIT)	Well-Supported	Well-Supported by Research Evidence	Not Listed	Promising	Well-Supported	Highest Rating	Not Listed
Parent Effectiveness Training (PET)	Supported	Promising Research Evidence	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Second Highest Rating	Not Listed
Parent Management Training, Oregon Model (Generation PMTO)	Well-Supported	Well-Supported by Research Evidence	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Highest Rating	Near Top Tier
Parenting from Prison	Supported	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Highest Rating	Not Listed

The ratings in this crosswalk were pulled from the registries in August 2022

FRIENDS National Center for Community Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP)
Crosswalk of Evidence-Based Programs with Clearinghouses/Registries

Clearinghouse/Registry *(on the right)* Evidence-Based Program *(below)*	CBCAP Evidence Rank	California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare	Home Visiting Evidence of Effectiveness	Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development	Title IV-E Prevention Services Clearinghouse – FFPSA	Results First Clearinghouse Database	Social Programs that Work
Parenting Inside Out	*Supported*	*Not Able to Be Rated*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Insufficient Evidence*	*Not Listed*
Parenting Together Project (PTP)	*Well-Supported*	*Supported by Research Evidence*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*
Parenting Wisely	*Supported*	*Promising Research Evidence*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Does Not Meet Criteria*	*Second Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*
Parents Anonymous	*Supported*	*Promising Research Evidence*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Supported*	*Second Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*
Parents as Teachers (PAT)	*Well-Supported*	*Promising Research Evidence*	*Meets Criteria*	*Not Listed*	*Well-Supported*	*Second Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*
Partners in Parenting (PIP)	*Promising*	*Not Able to Be Rated*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Second Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*
Period of Purple Crying	*Supported*	*Promising Research Evidence*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Second Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*
Perry Preschool Project	*Well-Supported*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Highest Rating*	*Suggestive Tier*
Play and Learning Strategies (PALS)	*Supported*	*Promising Research Evidence*	*Meets Criteria*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Second Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*

*The ratings in this crosswalk were pulled from the registries in August 2022

FRIENDS National Center for Community Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP)
Crosswalk of Evidence-Based Programs with Clearinghouses/Registries

Clearinghouse/Registry *(on the right)* / Evidence-Based Program *(below)*	CBCAP Evidence Rank	California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare	Home Visiting Evidence of Effectiveness	Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development	Title IV-E Prevention Services Clearinghouse – FFPSA	Results First Clearinghouse Database	Social Programs that Work
Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS)	Well-Supported	Well-Supported by Research Evidence	Not Listed	Model	Not Listed	Highest Rating	Not Listed
Promoting First Relationships	Supported	Promising Research Evidence	Meets Criteria	Not Listed	Not Listed	Highest Rating	Not Listed
Safe Care	Well-Supported	Supported by Research Evidence	Meets Criteria for Safe Care Augmented	Not Listed	Supported	Highest Rating	Not Listed
Safe Child Program	Supported	Promising Research Evidence	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed
Safe Children	Promising	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Highest Rating from NREPP	Not Listed
Safe Environment for Every Kid (SEEK)	Well-Supported	Well-Supported by Research Evidence	Not Listed	Not Listed	Does Not Meet Criteria	Highest Rating	Not Listed
Second Step: A Violence Prevention Curriculum	Supported	Supported by Research Evidence	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	No Effects	Not Listed
Step by Step Parenting Program	Supported	Promising Research Evidence	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Second Highest Rating	Not Listed
Stewards of Children (Darkness to Light)	Supported	Promising Research Evidence	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Second Highest Rating	Not Listed

*The ratings in this crosswalk were pulled from the registries in August 2022

FRIENDS National Center for Community Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP)
Crosswalk of Evidence-Based Programs with Clearinghouses/Registries

Clearinghouse/Registry *(on the right)* Evidence-Based Program *(below)*	CBCAP Evidence Rank	California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare	Home Visiting Evidence of Effectiveness	Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development	Title IV-E Prevention Services Clearinghouse – FFPSA	Results First Clearinghouse Database	Social Programs that Work
Strengthening Families (Parenting Training)	Well-Supported	Not Able to Be Rated	Not Listed	Promising for 10-14 years	Supported for Parents and Youth	Second Highest Rating	Not Listed
Strong African American Families (SAAF)	Well-Supported	Well-Supported by Research Evidence	Not Listed	Promising	Well-Supported	Highest Rating	Not Listed
Strong Communities for Children	Supported	Promising Research Evidence	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Insufficient Evidence	Not Listed
Supporting Father Involvement (SFI)	Well-Supported	Supported by Research Evidence	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Highest Rating	Not Listed
Syracuse Family Development Research Program (FDRP)	Supported	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Second Highest Rating	Not Listed
Systematic Training for Effective Parenting (STEP)	Supported	Promising Research Evidence	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Second Highest Rating	Not Listed
Triple P – Positive Parenting Program System (Level 4)	Well-Supported	Supported by Research Evidence	Not Listed	Promising	Supported – Triple P Online Promising – Group, Self-Directed, Standard	Highest Rating	Near Top Tier
Tuning Into Kids (TIK)	Well-Supported	Supported by Research Evidence	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Highest Rating	Not Listed

*The ratings in this crosswalk were pulled from the registries in August 2022

FRIENDS National Center for Community Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP)
Crosswalk of Evidence-Based Programs with Clearinghouses/Registries

Clearinghouse/Registry (on the right) Evidence-Based Program (below)	CBCAP Evidence Rank	California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare	Home Visiting Evidence of Effectiveness	Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development	Title IV-E Prevention Services Clearinghouse – FFPSA	Results First Clearinghouse Database	Social Programs that Work
Upstate New York Shaken Baby Syndrome (SBS) Education Program	*Promising*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*
Who Do You Tell	*Supported*	*Promising Research Evidence*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Not Listed*	*Second Highest Rating*	*Not Listed*

9

**FRIENDS National Center for Community Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP)
Crosswalk of Evidence-Based Programs (EBP) with Clearinghouses/Registries**

DESCRIPTIONS AND DEFINITIONS

Evidence-based Practice in CBCAP

There are many different clearinghouses/registries available for identifying evidence-based programs. FRIENDS encourages CBCAP Leads to access information from multiple sources so that they are confident in their ability to meet the needs of their target population and communities; however understanding the differences and similarities between the various clearinghouse/registry ratings can be confusing. The purpose of this document is to provide a simple summary of the key distinctions between clearinghouses/registries for evidence-based programs to help CBCAP Leads understand their rating scales and how they relate to the CBCAP evidence-based levels for the CBCAP Annual Report.

For CBCAP programs, evidence-based practice (EBP) is defined as the integration of the best available research with child abuse prevention program expertise within the context of the child, family, and community characteristics, culture, and preferences. Evidence-informed programs and practices (EIP) is the use of the best available research and practice knowledge to guide program design and implementation within this same context. CBCAP programs should invest in programs and practices with evidence showing that the programs and practices produce positive outcomes for children and families. **The CBCAP ratings below were developed specifically for use by CBCAP funded programs to determine the best program for the population that they serve. These ratings focus on child abuse prevention programs and may be different than ratings in other clearinghouses/registries as they are looking at different outcomes.**

CBCAP Ratings for Evidence-based Practices

Emerging: The program has a strong theoretical foundation and is considered generally accepted practice for preventing abuse or neglect. It has ongoing collection of pre/post data and has documented all implementation activities.

Promising: The program has all elements of emerging plus 1 study/quasi-experimental design with control or comparison group and has model fidelity.

Supported: The program has all elements of promising plus 2 rigorous randomized control trials (or comparable methodology) and one-year sustained effect.

Well-Supported: The program has all elements of supported plus multiple site replication with positive effects.

https://friendsnrc.org/evaluation/matrix-of-evidence-based-practice/

Note: *The ratings above are intended to educate those in the CBCAP field and guide their decision on adopting a specific program. The CBCAP ratings listed assume that the Evidence-Based/Evidence-Informed programs are implemented with fidelity (sometimes called adherence or integrity) to the prescribed models. If the evidence-based program has been or will be modified during implementation, this may impact the evidence level. You should consult with the model developers if you have questions about implementation of the evidence-based program.*

The California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse (CEBC) for Child Welfare

California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse is funded by the California Department of Social Services to advance the effective implementation of evidence-based practices for children and families involved in the child welfare system. The CEBC is a critical tool for identifying, selecting, and implementing evidence-based child welfare practices that will improve child safety, increase permanency, increase family and community stability, and promote child and family well-being. The CEBC offers various way to locate programs: alphabetical list of programs, list of topic areas, and an advanced search. In the advanced search, programs can be searched using one or all of the following criteria: CEBC Scientific Rating, Child Welfare System Relevance Level, Child Welfare Outcomes, Topic Areas, Age of Child, and Delivery Setting.

CEBC Ratings
1 – Well-Supported by Research Evidence: At least 2 rigorous randomized controlled trials (RCTs) with nonoverlapping analytic samples were carried out in the usual care or practice settings. They have found the program to be superior to an appropriate comparison program on outcomes specified in the criteria for that particular topic area. In at least one of these RCTs, the program has shown to have a sustained effect of at least one year beyond the end of treatment, when compared to a control group.

2 – Supported by Research Evidence: At least one rigorous RCT in a usual care or practice setting has found the program to be superior to an appropriate comparison program outcomes specified in the criteria for that particular topic area. In that RCT, the program was shown to have a sustained effect of at least six months beyond the end of treatment, when compared to a control group.

3 – Promising Research Evidence: At least one study utilizing some form of control (e.g., untreated group, placebo group, matched wait list) has done one of the following: (1) established the program's benefit over the control on the outcomes specified in the criteria for that particular topic area, (2) found it to be comparable on outcomes specified in the criteria for the topic area to a program rated 3 or higher on this rating scale in the same topic area, OR (3) Found it to be superior on outcomes specified for that particular topic area to an appropriate comparison program.

4 – Evidence Fails to Demonstrate Effect: Two or more RCTs with nonoverlapping analytic samples that were carried out in usual care or practice settings have found that the program has not resulted in improved outcomes specified in the criteria for that particular topic area, when compared to usual care.

The overall weight of evidence does not support the benefit of the program on the outcome specified in the criteria for that particular topic area.

5 – Concerning Practice: One or more of the following statements is true: (1) if multiple outcome studies have been conducted, the overall weight of evidence suggests the program has a negative effect on the target population being served or on outcomes specified in the criteria for that particular topic area; (2) there is case data suggesting a risk of harm that: a) was probably caused by the program and b) was severe and/or frequent; OR (3) there is a legal or empirical basis suggesting that, compared to its likely benefits, the program constitutes a risk of harm to those receiving it.

NR – Not Able to be Rated: The program does not have any published, peer-reviewed study utilizing some form of control (e.g., untreated group, placebo group, matched wait list study) that has established the program's benefit over the control on outcomes specified in the criteria for that particular topic area, or found it to be comparable to or better than an appropriate comparison program on outcomes specified in the criteria for the topic area. The research evidence for programs listed NR cannot be established at this time. This does not mean the programs are ineffective, but rather that there is not research evidence that meets the criteria for any other level on this rating scale.

http://www.cebc4cw.org/

Home Visiting Evidence of Effectiveness (HomVEE)

The United States Department of Health and Human Services' (US DHHS) Home Visiting Evidence of Effectiveness (HomVEE) conducts a thorough and transparent review of the home visiting research literature. HomVEE provides an assessment of the evidence of effectiveness for early childhood home visiting models that serve families with pregnant women and children from birth to kindergarten (through age 5). HomVEE provides information about which early childhood home visiting models are evidence based (as defined by HHS), as well as detailed information about the samples of families that participated in the research, the findings in each manuscript, and the implementation guidelines for each early childhood home visiting model. The HomVEE Research Database may be searched by keywords, model, outcomes examined, and rating.

HHS Criteria for Evidence-Based Models *"Meets Criteria"*

Evidence-based Early Childhood Home Visiting Service Delivery Model: To meet HHS criteria for this, models must meet at least one of the following criteria:

- At least one high- or moderate-quality impact study of the model finds favorable, statistically significant impacts in two or more of the eight outcome domains.

- At least two high- or moderate-quality impact studies of the model using non-overlapping analytic study samples find one or more favorable, statistically significant impacts in the same domain.

In both cases, the impacts must either (1) be found in the full sample or (2) if found for subgroups but not for the full sample, be replicated in the same domain in two or more studies using non-overlapping analytic study samples. Additionally, following the Maternal, Infant, Early Childhood Home Visiting MIECHV-authorizing statute, if the model meets the above criteria based on findings from randomized

controlled trial(s) only, then two additional requirements apply. First, one or more favorable, statistically significant impacts must be sustained for at least one year after program enrollment. Second, one or more favorable, statistically significant impacts must be reported in a peer-reviewed journal.

http://homvee.acf.hhs.gov/

Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development

Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development provides a registry of evidence-based positive youth development programs designed to promote the health and well-being of children and teens. Blueprints is a project within the Institute of Behavioral Science at the University of Colorado Boulder. It identifies, recommends, and disseminates interventions that, based on scientific evaluations, have strong evidence of effectiveness. The ultimate goal of the Blueprints Initiative is to reduce antisocial behavior and promote a healthy course of youth development and adult maturity.

The comprehensive registry of programs allows users to search for programs/interventions that fit a particular need. Users can search by keyword, by selecting outcome or risk/protective factor changed, by target population, and by program specifics such as program type, program setting, continuum of intervention.

Blueprints Ratings

Promising: Interventions meet the minimum standard of effectiveness. Promising interventions must have evidence from one high-quality experimental or two high-quality quasi-experimental designs, clear findings of positive impact, carefully defined goals, and sufficient resources to help users.

Model: Interventions meet a higher standard and provide greater confidence in the program's capacity to change behavior and targeted outcomes. Model interventions must have evidence from two high-quality experimental or one experimental and one quasi-experimental design of high quality, and in addition to the above criteria (positive impact, defined goals, dissemination capacity), have a sustained impact at least 12 months after the intervention ends.

Model Plus +: Interventions meet an additional standard of independent replication. Model interventions which have conducted a high-quality "independent" replication have been labeled as Model Plus.

*Model and Model Plus interventions are deemed ready for widespread use, large-scale implementation, and are listed separately from Promising programs on the website.

https://www.blueprintsprograms.org/

Title IV-E Prevention Services Clearinghouse - FFPSA

The Title IV-E Prevention Services Clearinghouse was established by the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) within the United States Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to conduct an objective and transparent review of research on programs and services intended to provide enhanced support to children and families and prevent foster care placements. The Clearinghouse reviews evidence on mental health, substance abuse prevention and treatment, and in-home parent skill-based programs and services, as well as kinship navigator programs. You may search for a program or service by name, rating, and/or program or service area.

Prevention Services Clearinghouse Ratings

Well-Supported: A program or service is rated as a well-supported practice if it has at least two contrasts with non-overlapping samples in studies carried out in usual care or practice settings that achieve a rating of moderate or high on design and execution and demonstrate favorable effects in a target outcome domain. At least one of the contrasts must demonstrate a sustained favorable effect of at least 12 months beyond the end of treatment on at least one target outcome.

Supported: A program or service is rated as a supported practice if it has at least one contrast in a study carried out in a usual care or practice setting that achieves a rating of moderate or high on design and execution and demonstrates a sustained favorable effect of at least 6 months beyond the end of treatment on at least one target outcome.

Promising: A program or service is designated as a promising practice if it has at least one contrast in a study that achieves a rating of moderate or high on study design and execution and demonstrates a favorable effect on a target outcome.

Does Not Currently Meet Criteria: A program or service that has been reviewed and does not achieve a rating of well-supported, supported, or promising is deemed 'does not currently meet criteria.' This includes (a) programs and services for which all eligible contrasts with moderate or high design and execution ratings have no statistically significant favorable effects and (b) programs and services that do not have any eligible contrasts with moderate or high design and execution ratings.

https://preventionservices.acf.hhs.gov/

Results First Clearinghouse Database

The Results First Clearinghouse Database is an online resource that brings together information on the effectiveness of social policy programs from nine national clearinghouses. It applies color-coding to the clearinghouses' distinct rating systems, creating a common language that enables users to quickly see where each program falls on the evidence-based spectrum from negative impact to positive impact. As such, this database can help users easily access and understand the evidence base for a variety of programs.

Results First maps each program to the categories using information available on the clearinghouses' websites. There are eight categories in the database: 1) Child & family well-being; 2) Crime &

delinquency; 3) Education; 4) Employment & job training; 5) Mental health; 6) Public health; 7) Substance use; 8) Sexual behavior & teen pregnancy. There are eight settings in the database: 1) Correctional facility; 2) Community; 3) Court; 4) Home; 5) Hospital/treatment center; 6) Residential facility; 7) School; 8) Workplace. You may search the database by keyword, categories, settings, rating colors, and clearinghouses.

Results First Clearinghouse Rating Colors

Green Highest Rated: The program had a positive impact based on the most rigorous evidence.

Yellow Second-Highest Rated: The program had a positive impact based on high-quality evidence.

Blue Mixed Effects: The program had inconsistent impacts based on high-quality evidence. That is, study findings showed a mix of positive impact, no impact, and/or negative impact.

Gray No Effects: The program had no impact based on high-quality evidence. That is, there was no difference in outcomes between program participants and those in the comparison group.

Red Negative Effects: The program had a negative impact based on high quality evidence.

Black Insufficient Evidence: The program's current research base does not have adequate methodological rigor to determine impact.

https://evidence2impact.psu.edu/evidence-to-impact-4-cores/research-translation-platform/results-first-resources/clearing-house-database/

Social Programs That Work

Social Programs that Work seeks to identify social programs shown in rigorous studies to produce sizable, sustained benefits to participants and society, so that they can be deployed to help solve social problems. Social Programs that Work have identified these programs through their systematic monitoring of all rigorous evaluations published or posted online across all areas of social policy, and review of the most promising findings in consultation with outside experts. This site focuses on the results of well-conducted randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and whether studies show sizable, sustained effects on outcomes of clear policy importance. Programs are listed on the website and the list is not searchable. Programs are listed by service area (i.e. prenatal/early childhood).

Social Program That Work Ratings

Top Tier: Programs shown in well-conducted RCTs, carried out in typical community settings, to produce sizable, sustained effects on important outcomes. Top Tier evidence includes a requirement for replication – specifically, the demonstration of such effects in two or more RCTs conducted in different implementation sites, or, alternatively, in one large multi-site RCT. Such evidence provides confidence that the program would produce important effects if implemented faithfully in settings and populations similar to those in the original studies.

Near Top Tier: Programs shown to meet almost all elements of the Top Tier standard, and which only need one additional step to qualify. This category primarily includes programs that meet all elements of the Top Tier standard in a single study site but need a replication RCT to confirm the initial findings and establish that they generalize to other sites. This is best viewed as tentative evidence that the program would produce important effects if implemented faithfully in settings and populations similar to those in the original study.

Suggestive Tier: Programs that have been evaluated in one or more well-conducted RCTs (or studies that closely approximate random assignment) and found to produce sizable positive effects, but whose evidence is limited by only short-term follow-up, effects that fall short of statistical significance, or other factors. Such evidence suggests the program may be an especially strong candidate for further research but does not yet provide confidence that the program would produce important effects if implemented in new settings.

https://evidencebasedprograms.org/

The ratings in this crosswalk were pulled from the registries in August 2022.