

Updated Inventory of Evidence-Based, Research-Based, and Promising Practices For Prevention and Intervention Services for Children and Juveniles in Child Welfare, Juvenile Justice, and Mental Health Systems

Revised March 8, 2019 for technical corrections

Budget area	Program/intervention	Manual	Current definitions	Proposed definitions	Cost-beneficial	Reason program does not meet suggested evidence-based criteria (see full definitions below)	Percent minority	
General prevention	Becoming a Man (BAM)	Yes	⊙	●	75%		98%	
	Caring School Community (formerly Child Development Project)	Yes	⊙	Null	61%	Weight of the evidence	47%	
	Child First	Yes	⊙	⊙	44%	Single evaluation	94%	
	Child Parent Enrichment Project (CPEP)	Yes	⊙	⊙	12%	Weight of the evidence	55%	
	Communities That Care	Yes	●	●	85%		33%	
	Conjoint behavioral consultation	Yes	P	Null	25%	Weight of the evidence	21%	
	Coping and Support Training	Yes	●	●	81%		51%	
	Daily Behavior Report Cards	Yes	⊙	⊙		Single evaluation	13%	
	Early Head Start—Home Visiting	Yes	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest		
	Early Start (New Zealand)	Yes	⊙	⊙	P	Single evaluation		
	Family Check-Up (also known as Positive Family Support)	Yes	●	⊙	⊙	Benefit-cost	NR	
	Familias Unidas	Yes	⊙	⊙	⊙	Benefit-cost	61%	
	Family Connects	Yes	⊙	⊙	⊙	Benefit-cost	100%	
	Family Spirit	Yes	⊙	⊙	⊙	Single evaluation	71%	
	Families and Schools Together (FAST)	Yes	P	P	Null	Benefit-cost	100%	
	Fast Track prevention program	Yes	⊙	⊙	⊙	Weight of the evidence	83%	
	Good Behavior Game	Yes	●	●	●	Benefit-cost	53%	
	Guiding Good Choices (formerly Preparing for the Drug Free Years)	Yes	⊙	⊙	⊙	Single evaluation	50%	
	Healthy Beginnings	Yes	P	P	P	76%		
	Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY)	Yes	P	P	P	51%	No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest	1%
	Infant Health and Development Program (IHDP)	Yes	⊙	⊙	⊙	Weight of the evidence	93%	
	Kaleidoscope Play and Learn	Yes	⊙	⊙	⊙	Benefit-cost	58%	
	Maternal Early Childhood Sustained Home-Visiting (MESCH)	Yes	P	P	P	No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest		
	Mentoring: Community-based	Yes	P	P	P	No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest		
	Mentoring: Big Brothers Big Sisters Community-Based (taxpayer costs only)	Yes	●	●	⊙	Benefit-cost	57%	
Mentoring: Community-based (taxpayer costs only)	Varies*	●	●	⊙	Benefit-cost	85%		
Mentoring: School-based								
Mentoring: Big Brothers Big Sisters School-Based (taxpayer costs only)	Yes	●	●	⊙	7%	Benefit-cost	64%	
Mentoring: School-based by teachers or school staff	Varies*	●	●	⊙	71%	Benefit-cost	86%	
Mentoring: School-based by volunteers (taxpayer costs only)	Varies*	P	P	Null	16%	Weight of the evidence	78%	
Minding the Baby	Yes	P	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest		
New Beginnings for children of divorce	Yes	P	P	Null	48%	Weight of the evidence	25%	
Nurturing Fathers	Yes	P	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest		

● Evidence-based ⊙ Research-based P Promising ⊙ Poor outcomes Null Null outcomes NR Not reported See definitions and notes on page 11.

Notes:

- * This is a general program/intervention classification. Some programs within this classification have manuals and some do not. The results listed on the inventory represent a typical, or average, implementation. Additional research will need to be completed in order to establish the most effective sets of procedures within this general category.
- ** This program is an example within a broader category.
- # This program is classified as evidence-based because it meets weight of the evidence and heterogeneity criteria. It was not possible to conduct a benefit-cost analysis for this program, either because program costs are unavailable or because WSIPP's benefit-cost model does not currently include data on an appropriate comparison population for modeling long-term economic impacts.
- ^ Heterogeneity criterion is achieved because at least one of the studies has been conducted on youth in Washington and a subgroup analysis demonstrates the program is effective for minorities (p < 0.20).

The classifications in this document are current as of December 2018.

For the most up-to-date results, please visit the program's page on our website <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost>

Updated Inventory of Evidence-Based, Research-Based, and Promising Practices For Prevention and Intervention Services for Children and Juveniles in Child Welfare, Juvenile Justice, and Mental Health Systems

Revised March 8, 2019 for technical corrections

Budget area	Program/Intervention	Manual	Current definitions	Proposed definitions	Cost-beneficial	Reason program does not meet suggested evidence-based criteria (see full definitions below)	Percent minority
General prevention (continued)	Other home visiting programs for adolescent mothers [#]	Varies*	●	●			58%
	Positive Action	Yes	●	●	95%		57%
	Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS)	Yes	P	Null	63%	Weight of the evidence	49%
	PROSPER	Yes	⊙	⊙	55%	Benefit-cost/heterogeneity	15%
	Pyramid Model	Yes	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest	
	Quantum Opportunities Program	Yes	●	⊙	52%	Benefit-cost	90%
	Raising Healthy Children	Yes	P	Null		Weight of the evidence	18%
	Resources, Education, and Care in the Home (REACH-Futures)	Yes	⊙	P	NA	Single evaluation	100%
	Reconnecting Youth	Yes	⊙	⊙		Weight of the evidence	92%
	Seattle Social Development Project	Yes	⊙	⊙	60%	Benefit-cost	35%
	Strengthening Multi-Ethnic Families and Communities	Yes	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest	
	Strengthening Families for Parents and Youth 10-14	Yes	⊙	Null	58%	Weight of the evidence	19%
	Strong African American Families	Yes	⊙	⊙		Single evaluation	100%
	Strong African American Families—Teen	Yes	⊙	⊙		Single evaluation	100%
	Sunshine Circle Model	Yes	⊙	⊙	91%	Single evaluation	87%
	Youth and Family Link	No	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest	

● Evidence-based ⊙ Promising P Promising ⊙ Poor outcomes Null Null outcomes NR Not reported See definitions and notes on page 11.

Notes:

- * This is a general program/intervention classification. Some programs within this classification have manuals and some do not. The results listed on the inventory represent a typical, or average, implementation. Additional research will need to be completed in order to establish the most effective sets of procedures within this general category.
- ** This program is an example within a broader category.
- # This program is classified as evidence-based because it meets weight of the evidence and heterogeneity criteria. It was not possible to conduct a benefit-cost analysis for this program, either because program costs are unavailable or because WSIPP's benefit-cost model does not currently include data on an appropriate comparison population for modeling long-term economic impacts.
- ^ Heterogeneity criterion is achieved because at least one of the studies has been conducted on youth in Washington and a subgroup analysis demonstrates the program is effective for minorities (p < 0.20)