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Uses of Program Effectiveness Web Resources

- Improving program effectiveness
- Developing new strategies
- Funding decisions
- Informing training
- Informing research
SAMSHA/COCE: Evidence-Based Thinking
SAMSHA/COCE Pyramid of Evidence-based Practices
# Criminal Justice Interventions: Programs vs. Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A specific set of activities carried out according to guidelines to achieve a defined purpose.</td>
<td>A general category of programs, strategies or procedures that share similar characteristics with regard to the issues they address and how they address them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Question Answered</th>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How effective is this program according to the most rigorous evaluation(s) available?</td>
<td>How effective is this general practice on average across many evaluations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the ABC Mentoring Program in Anytown, USA achieve its goals?</td>
<td>Does mentoring usually achieve its goals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Ratings</th>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single evidence rating per program</td>
<td>Single evidence rating for each outcome affected by the practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Base</th>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or more rigorous evaluations of a specific program</td>
<td>Meta-analyses that assess the average effectiveness of the practice on various outcomes across a large number of studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Methods</th>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental or quasi-experimental designs</td>
<td>Meta-analyses of experimental or quasi-experimental designs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meta-analysis is a social science method that allows us to look at effectiveness across numerous evaluations of similar, but not necessarily identical, programs, strategies, or procedures - or what we call practices. It examines conceptually similar approaches and answers the question, "on average, how effective are these approaches?"
Commonly Used Websites for Evidence-based Criminal Justice Programs and Practices

- CrimeSolutions.gov
- OJJDP Model Programs Guide
- Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development
- Campbell Collaboration Library of Systematic Reviews
- Washington State Institute for Public Policy Benefit-Cost Results Tables
Review of Websites for Evidence-based Criminal Justice Programs and Practices – Issues of Focus

• Types of Interventions included (programs/ practices/ both) - how are they identified for inclusion?
• What Topics are Covered: CJ, JJ, Prevention, non-CJ, subcategories
• User Search Process
• Criteria Used by websites to identify Evidence (Evaluations, Meta-analyses)
• How are intervention assessments conducted? Are interventions rated? How? By Whom?
• Output of intervention assessments – different options/ formats?
CrimeSolutions.Gov – Overview

• Website: CrimeSolutions.gov
• Sponsored by the National Institute of Justice
• Web-based clearinghouse of evidence-based CJ, JJ, and prevention programs and practices
• Presents programs and practices that have undergone rigorous evaluations (programs) and meta-analyses (practices).
• Process for identifying and rating those programs and practices
CrimeSolutions.gov: Programs and Practices Topics

- Crime and Crime Prevention Strategies
- Victims and Victimization
- Law Enforcement
- Courts
- Corrections/ Reentry
- Juveniles
- Drugs/ Substance Abuse
- Technology
CrimeSolutions.gov: Programs and Practices Sub-Topics – Juveniles

- Child Protection/Health
  - Bullying
  - Case Management
  - Child Abuse & Maltreatment
  - Foster Care/Child Welfare System
  - Mental Health
  - Substance Abuse
  - Underage Drinking
  - Youth Development
- Children Exposed to Violence
- Delinquency Prevention
  - Family & Parenting
  - Home Visiting
  - Mentoring
  - Treatment
- Risk & Protective Factors
- Schools
  - Academics
  - Dropout/Expulsion
  - School Attachment
  - School Climate
  - School Safety
  - Truancy
- Special Populations
  - Foster Care/Child Welfare System Involved Youth
Programs and practices are identified by NIJ for potential inclusion on CrimeSolutions.gov through:

1. Literature searches by staff of relevant databases, journals and publications, including:
   - Social science databases using keywords identified in the areas of criminal justice, juvenile justice and victims of crime;
   - Journals (including peer-reviewed journals) and other relevant resources; and
   - Other web-based databases of effective programs, and meta-analyses of evaluated programs.

2. Nominations from the field. External researchers may submit a program or practice for consideration.
Research staff review program materials to determine whether the goals of the program fall within the scope of CrimeSolutions.gov. To fall within the scope, the program must:

- Aim to prevent or reduce crime, delinquency or related problem behaviors;
- Aim to prevent, intervene, or respond to victimization;
- Aim to improve justice systems or processes; and/or
- Target offender population or at-risk population.
CrimeSolutions.gov: Criteria for Program Evaluations

Initial Screening (Research Staff)
• At least 1 RCT or QED (with comparison condition)
• Outcomes must relate to crime, delinquency, or victimization
• Published in peer-reviewed publication – 1980 or later

Selection of Evidence Base (Lead Researcher)
• Up to three studies with most rigorous designs and methods
  • Strength of research design
  • Breadth of documentation
  • Type of analytic procedures used
  • Sample size
  • Independence of evaluator
  • Year of publication.
CrimeSolutions.gov: Criteria Evidence Screening: Meta-analyses (Research Staff)

- Intervention studies
- Aggregation studies
- Primary aim of intervention
- Literature search
- Primary Outcomes
- Control groups

- Reporting of results
- Combining effect sizes
- Publication Date
- Age of samples
CrimeSolutions.gov: Expert Review (Certified Study Reviewers with Utilization of Scoring Instruments)

**Programs (evaluations)**
- At least 2 reviewers utilize Program Scoring Instrument
- Program conceptual framework
- Study design quality
- Study outcome evidence
- Study program fidelity

**Practices (meta-analyses)**
- At least 2 reviewers utilize Practices Scoring Instrument
- Methodological quality
- Main analysis
- Eligibility and search
- Reliability, outliers, and publication bias
CrimeSolutions.gov Evidence Continuum

- Effective
- Promising
- Inconclusive Evidence
- No Effects

Strong to Weak: STRENGTH OF EVIDENCE

High to Low: EFFECTIVENESS

These two categories would benefit from additional research.
**CrimeSolutions.gov Evidence Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Rating</th>
<th>Icon*</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective</strong></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Icon" /></td>
<td>Programs have strong evidence indicating they achieve their intended outcomes when implemented with fidelity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promising</strong></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Icon" /></td>
<td>Programs have some evidence indicating they achieve their intended outcomes. Additional research is recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Effects</strong></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Icon" /></td>
<td>Programs have strong evidence indicating that they did not achieve their intended outcomes when implemented with fidelity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A single study icon is used to identify programs that have been evaluated with only one study. A multiple studies icon is used to represent a greater extent of evidence supporting the evidence rating. The icon depicts programs that have more than one study in the evidence base demonstrating effects in a consistent direction.
Drugs & Substance Abuse

- Overview
- Programs
- Practices

In 2012, an estimated 23.9 million Americans aged 12 and older were current (past month) illicit drug users; this represents 9.2% of the population aged 12 or older.\textsuperscript{[1]} Illicit drugs include marijuana, cocaine, heroin, hallucinogens, inhalants, and prescription drugs used for non-medical purposes.

References

Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Evidence Rating</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Randomized Controlled Trial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drugs &amp; Substance</td>
<td>An outpatient program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OJP Publications

- Novel Technique Improves Analysis of Thermally Unstable Ilicit Drugs, NIJ, June 2020
- In Focus: Drug Courts, OJJDP, April 2020
- Just Science Podcast: Just Analyzing Beverages for Cannabinoids, NIJ-Sponsored, April 2020
- Drug Courts, NIJ, OJJDP, BJA, January 2020
## Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Evidence Rating</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Randomized Controlled Trial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent Community</td>
<td>![Green Check]</td>
<td>Drugs &amp; Substance Abuse</td>
<td>An outpatient program targeting 13 to 25 year olds that aims to replace activities supporting alcohol and drug use with positive behaviors that support recovery. The program is rated Effective. Participants were more likely to seek out and continue care services, abstain from substance use.</td>
<td>Randomized Controlled Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcement Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Juveniles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Drugs & Substance Abuse Programs at a Glance**

- 28% No Effects
- 57% Promising
- 15% Effective

Total Number of Programs: 205

See All Programs

**Questions and Answers**

- Do you have funding opportunities for drug prevention efforts?  
  See Answer

- Can I receive funding opportunity notifications via email?  
  See Answer

- Is there a resource to help locate information about evidence-based programs in the justice field?  
  See Answer
Program Profile: Adolescent Community Reinforcement Approach

Evidence Rating: Effective - More than one study

Date: This profile was posted on June 10, 2011

Program Summary

An outpatient program targeting 13 to 25 year olds that aims to replace activities supporting alcohol and drug use with positive behaviors that support recovery. The program is rated Effective. Participants were more likely to seek out and continue care services, abstain from substance use (in particular, marijuana), had less reported depression and internalized behaviors problems, and more social stability (i.e., working, receiving education, in a home or shelter, or receiving medical care).

This program’s rating is based on evidence that includes at least one high-quality randomized controlled trial.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Evidence Rating (by Outcomes)</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief Alcohol Interventions for Adolescents and Young Adults</td>
<td>- Drugs &amp; Substance Abuse - Alcohol consumption by adolescents</td>
<td>This practice seeks to reduce alcohol use or alcohol-related problems for adolescents and young adults via a short-term intervention (one to five sessions). The practice is rated Effective for reducing alcohol consumption and alcohol-related problem outcomes for adolescents and young adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Drugs &amp; Substance Abuse - Alcohol-related problems of adolescents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Drugs &amp; Substance Abuse - Alcohol consumption by young adults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Drugs &amp; Substance Abuse - Alcohol-related problems of young adults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buprenorphine Maintenance Treatment</td>
<td>- Drugs &amp; Substance Abuse - Heroin/opioids</td>
<td>This is a medication-assisted treatment for individuals with opioid dependence. Similar to methadone, buprenorphine works by occupying the opioid receptor and blocking the high that usually comes from illicit drugs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Practice Profile

Brief Alcohol Interventions for Adolescents and Young Adults

Evidence Ratings for Outcomes:
- Drugs & Substance Abuse - Alcohol consumption by adolescents
- Drugs & Substance Abuse - Alcohol-related problems of adolescents
- Drugs & Substance Abuse - Alcohol consumption by young adults
- Drugs & Substance Abuse - Alcohol-related problems of young adults

Practice Description

Practice Goals/Target Population
The goal of Brief Alcohol Interventions (BAIs) is to reduce participants’ alcohol use or alcohol-related problems via a short-term intervention. The target population for this practice includes adolescents, ages 11 to 17, and young adults, ages 18 to 30. BAI can be delivered as universal, selective, or indicated prevention strategies (CSAT 1999).

Practice Theory
BAIs seek to motivate and provide resources to help participants moderate their drinking in the short term and seek more intensive treatment in the long term, if needed. This practice is based on elements from cognitive-behavioral therapy, motivational interviewing (Miller and Rollnick 1991), the transtheoretical model of behavior change (Prochaska and DiClemente 1984), or social norms theory (Berkowitz 2004). BAI are designed to harness participants’ abilities, capabilities, and motivations to help them evaluate and regulate their drinking behavior.
Most BAIs include at least one of the following components: a discussion of alcohol consumption, feedback on risk or levels of alcohol use, comparisons with local or national norms, information on potential harms, or coping strategies and goal-setting plans for dealing with drinking situations.

Specific types of BAIs include

- **Therapy-based brief interventions** such as motivational enhancement/motivational interviewing therapy (MET), psychoeducational therapy, cognitive–behavioral therapy (CBT), or a combination of CBT plus MET.
- **Other brief interventions** such as alcohol expectancy challenges for adolescents and young adults, or programs providing personalized feedback/information about drinking or a mailed 21st birthday informational card for young adults.
• Website: https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/
• Sponsored by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)
• Web-based clearinghouse of evidence-based programs, about juvenile justice and youth prevention, intervention, and reentry.
• Uses CrimeSolutions.gov process for reviewing and rating programs; share a common database of juvenile-related programs; produces CrimeSolutions.gov profile.
• Presents programs that have undergone rigorous evaluations.
**Model Programs Guide vs. CrimeSolutions.gov**

**Model Programs Guide**:

- More detailed juvenile-justice search options related to topical categories and other search criteria.
- Literature reviews included with each program profile.
- Implementation information included with more program profiles.
- Tools and resources for improving program effectiveness specifically designed JJ-oriented practitioners.
- Covers programs, not practices.
Model Programs Guide: Programs and Practices Topics

- Child Protection, Health, Welfare
- Children Exposed to Violence and Victimization
- Delinquency Prevention
- Detention, Confinement and Supervision
- Offending by Juveniles
- Particular Juvenile Populations
- Schools
Model Programs Guide: Programs and Practices
Sub-Topics – Particular Juvenile Populations

- Boys/Males
- Foster Care/Child Welfare System Involved Youth
- Girls/Females
- Racial and Ethnic Minorities
- Tribal Youth
- Youth Gang Members
- Youth with Disabilities
Model Programs Guide: Additional Search Criteria

**Age**
- Adults 18+
- Early Childhood (0-4)
- Elementary School (5-10)
- High School (14-17)
- Middle School (11-13)
- Older Adults 55+
- Young Adults (18-24)

**Risk Factors**
- Community +
- Peer +
- School +
- Family +
- Individual +

**Protective Factors**
- Community +
- Peer +
- School +
- Family +
- Individual +
Model Programs Guide: Shared processes with CrimeSolutions.gov

• Selection process for programs included
• Selection process for evaluations
• Evidence synthesis (same scoring instruments)
• Rating process, criteria, and labels
• Same output format
Description of specific “Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention” program (not the broader “practice”)

### Substance Abuse Prevention

Interventions can involve the family, school, and community and may provide substance abuse prevention for an individual or a population of youth by focusing on environmental and community factors and policies, developmental factors, or skill development.

Reviewed from [Substance Abuse Prevention](#).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filter</th>
<th>Substance Abuse Prevention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>Interventions can involve the family, school, and community and may provide substance abuse prevention for an individual or a population of youth by focusing on environmental and community factors and policies, developmental factors, or skill development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protective Factors</strong></td>
<td>Interventions can involve the family, school, and community and may provide substance abuse prevention for an individual or a population of youth by focusing on environmental and community factors and policies, developmental factors, or skill development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Factors</strong></td>
<td>Interventions can involve the family, school, and community and may provide substance abuse prevention for an individual or a population of youth by focusing on environmental and community factors and policies, developmental factors, or skill development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multiple Literature Reviews**

- Alcohol and Drug Prevention and Therapy/Education
- Drug Court
- Residential Treatment Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Reviews</th>
<th>Substance Abuse Prevention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcohol and Drug Prevention and Therapy/Education</strong></td>
<td>Interventions can involve the family, school, and community and may provide substance abuse prevention for an individual or a population of youth by focusing on environmental and community factors and policies, developmental factors, or skill development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug Court</strong></td>
<td>Interventions can involve the family, school, and community and may provide substance abuse prevention for an individual or a population of youth by focusing on environmental and community factors and policies, developmental factors, or skill development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Treatment Centers</strong></td>
<td>Interventions can involve the family, school, and community and may provide substance abuse prevention for an individual or a population of youth by focusing on environmental and community factors and policies, developmental factors, or skill development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults in the Making (AIM)</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>A family-centered preventive intervention designed to enhance the family protective process and self-regulatory competence to lessen escalation of alcohol use and development of substance use problems. The program is rated Effective. Overall, the preponderance of evidence indicates that the program has a positive impact on deterring the use of alcohol, drugs, and involvement in other risky behaviors among participants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Brothers Big Sisters (BBBS) Community-Based Mentoring (CBM) Program</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>This program offers one-to-one mentoring in a community setting for at-risk youth between the ages of 6 and 18. This program is rated Effective. It was associated with a statistically significant reduction in initiating drug and alcohol use and antisocial behavior among mentored youth, compared with non-mentored youth. Mentored youth also showed statistically significant improvement in relationships with parents and academic performance (i.e., better grades and fewer absences).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention of College Students (BASICS)</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>This is a preventive intervention designed to help college students make better decisions about alcohol use. The program is rated Effective. The intervention group showed statistically significant reductions in negative consequences of drinking (for example, accidents, violence, or academic problems) and peak blood alcohol content. However, findings were mixed with regard to quantities consumed, and there was no statistically significant difference between groups in frequency of drinking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development and Crime Prevention – Overview

• Website: https://www.blueprintsprograms.org
• Operated by the Institute of Behavioral Science at the University of Colorado Boulder since 1996
• Formerly called Blueprints for Violence Prevention
• Web-based clearinghouse of evidence-based “interventions” that are “effective in reducing anti-social behavior and promoting a healthy course of youth development and adult maturity.
• Presents and certifies only interventions that those have met those standards.
Blueprints: Searching by *Intervention Outcomes*

- Problem Behavior
- Education
- Emotional Well Being
- Physical Health
- Positive Relationships
- Intervention Specifics (program components/activities)
- Setting
- Continuum of Intervention
- Risk and Protective Factors
- Participant Demographics
Blueprints: Searching by *Intervention Setting* or by *Continuum of Intervention* Sub-Topics

**Setting**
- Adult Corrections
- Community
- Correctional Facility
- Home
- Hospital/Medical Center
- Mental Health/Treatment Center
- Online
- Residential Facility
- School
- Social Services
- Transitional Between Contexts
- Wilderness

**Continuum of Intervention**
- Indicated Prevention
- Selective Prevention
- Universal Prevention
Blueprints: Searching by *Risk and Protective Factors* or by Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk and Protective Factors</th>
<th>Participant Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Individual</td>
<td>• Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peer</td>
<td>• Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Family</td>
<td>• Race/Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Neighborhood/Community Adult Corrections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Blueprints Assessment Initiation is based on both Program and Evaluation Criteria

Assessments are initiated in 2 ways:

1. Blueprints staff search scientific literature for studies of social interventions.

2. External researchers and others may nominate a program for review. The only preliminary general requirement is that the intervention evaluation has a treatment and control group.
A detailed intervention description is written that summarizes the methodological strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation studies, along with program impact information.

Interventions that meet requirements for strong methods and positive evidence undergo a second review by the Blueprints Advisory Board, made up of a panel of methodological experts with a variety of expertise.
The Board reads the articles and the summary evaluation compiled during our internal review, discusses strengths and weaknesses of the studies, and makes a decision to approve, ask for more information, or reject.

For those interventions approved by the Board, Blueprints staff gather information on readiness of the intervention for dissemination to users.

Approved interventions that are ready for dissemination are added to the Blueprints comprehensive database program registry as Promising, Model or Model Plus.
Promising interventions meet the following standards:

- **Intervention specificity**: The intervention description clearly identifies the intended outcome(s), whether specific risk and/or protective factors are targeted to produce this change, the population for which the intervention 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 a significant positive change in intended outcomes that can be attributed to the intervention and there is no evidence of harmful effects.

- **Dissemination readiness**: The intervention 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.
Blueprints Standards for Programs Rated as Model

In addition to meeting Promising standards, Model interventions also meet these standards:

• Replication: 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.

• Long-term follow-up: Positive intervention impact is sustained for a minimum of 12 months after the program intervention ends.
Blueprints Standards for Programs Rated as Model Plus

In addition to meeting Promising and Model standards, Model Plus interventions also include:

- **Independent Replication:** In at least one high-quality study demonstrating desired outcomes, authorship, data collection, and analysis has been conducted by a researcher who is neither a current or past member of the program developer’s research team and who has no financial interest in the program.
# Fact Sheet

## Program Outcomes
- Close Relationships with Parents
- Conduct Problems
- Delinquency and Criminal Behavior
- Externalizing
- Illicit Drug Use
- Internalizing
- Mental Health - Other
- Positive Social/Prosocial Behavior
- Prosocial with Peers
- Violence

## Program Type
- Family Therapy
- Juvenile Justice - Other

## Program Setting
- Transitional Between Contexts
- Social Services
- Home
- Correctional Facility
- School
- Mental Health/Treatment Center

## Continuum of Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Continuum of Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late Adolescence (15-18) - High School</td>
<td>Indicated Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Adolescence (12-14) - Middle School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Gender
- Both

## Race/Ethnicity
- All

## Endorsements
- Blueprints: Model Plus
- Crime Solutions: Effective
- OJJDP Model Programs: Effective
- SAMHSA: 2.9.3.2

## Program Information Contact

**Tom Pietkiewicz**  
Director of Business Development  
MST Services, Inc.  
3490 Piedmont Road NE, Suite 1250  
Atlanta, GA 30305  
Office: (843) 352-4306  
Cell: (404) 395-6038  
Email: tom.pietkiewicz@mstservices.com

## Program Developer/Owner

**Scott W. Henggele, Ph.D.**  
Medical University of South Carolina
Blueprints Program and Evaluation Profile

- Fact Sheet (Summary of Evaluation Abstract)
- Program Costs
- Funding Strategies
- ***Evaluation Abstract***
Blueprints Evaluation Abstract

- Program Developer
- Program Outcome Types
- Summary of Program “Specifics” (general parameters)
  - Program type
  - Program setting
  - Continuum of intervention
- Program Goals
- Target Population
- Population Demographics
- Risk/Protective Factors by Domain
- Full and summary program descriptions
- Theoretical Rationale
- Theoretical Orientation
- Summary of evaluation methods employed (all studies)
- Summary of evaluation outcomes (all studies)
- Summary of program outcomes, by geographical site
Blueprints Evaluation Abstract (cont’d.)

• Effect Size
• Mediating Effects
• Generalizability
• Potential Limitations
• Endorsements
• Program Implementation
• Contact
• References (all studies)

For each study:
• Design
• Sample
• Measures
• Analysis
• Outcomes
• If available: implementation fidelity; baseline equivalence; differential attrition; post-test notes; evidence of long-term impact
Campbell Collaboration – Overview

- Website: https://campbellcollaboration.org
- Campbell Collaboration’s work began in 2000. International organization with regional centers in Belfast and New Delhi
- Web-based clearinghouse of systematic reviews of research evidence on the effectiveness of social interventions – programs and practices.
- Multiple program reviews across several domains published in Campbell Systematic Reviews academic journal.
- Program reviews adhere to specific principles but are produced by outside researchers, and overseen and formatted according to the procedures determined by domain-specific coordinating groups.
Campbell Collaboration: Search Categories for Systematic Reviews

• Methods
• Business & Management
• Crime & Justice
• Disability
• Education
• International Development (including Nutrition)
• Knowledge Translation & Implementation
• Social Welfare

* No sub-topics for program searching
Outside researchers submit proposals to Campbell Collaboration to author a program systematic review as well as an Evidence and Gap Map (EGM).

Campbell policies and guidelines inform author teams about the requirements for Campbell evidence syntheses, guidelines for producing them, and selected sources of further information about systematic reviews that is consistent with those requirements and guidelines.

If accepted, work is overseen by Campbell Coordinating Groups.
Substantive Coordinating Groups

- led by co-Chairs who are “internationally recognized figures” in their field
- responsible for initiating, producing, and promoting Campbell reviews in particular topic areas (including criminal justice).
- provide an Editor for Campbell reviews, organize persons interested in the topic area, ...and generally support high quality reviews.
Campbell Collaboration Review Process: Coordinating Groups

Methods Coordinating Groups
• responsible for organizing persons interested in methods of systematic reviewing

Supportive Coordinating Groups
• responsible for functions related to production dissemination and use of Campbell reviews
Campbell Collaboration Review Process: Coordinating Group Guidelines

A systematic review must have:

- Clear inclusion and exclusion criteria
- An explicit search strategy
- Systematic coding and analysis of included studies
- Meta-analysis (where possible)

Key features

- must include a systematic search for unpublished reports, to avoid publication bias.
- international in scope.
- A project plan for the review is developed in advance, and undergoes peer review.
- Study inclusion and coding decisions are carried out by at least two reviewers who work independently.
- Study quality is appraised.
- Campbell reviews undergo peer review and editorial review.
- Campbell reviews provide answers for decisionmakers by using rigorous methods to synthesize evidence.
Campbell Crime and Justice Coordinating Group (CJCG): Systematic Reviews

• International network of researchers that prepares systematic reviews of high-quality research on methods to reduce crime and delinquency and improve the quality of justice.

• Mission is to develop reviews to inform criminal justice policies, reduce crime, and increase justice in society.

• Prepares systematic reviews on the effects of interventions that are:
  • aimed at the prevention, treatment or control of crime or delinquency
  • designed to improve the criminal justice system, including those relevant to forensics, police, courts, prison, probation, etc. in both civil and criminal law
Problem-oriented policing is associated with reductions in crime and disorder

Problem-oriented policing (POP) is associated with statistically significant reductions in crime and disorder. Place-based POP programs are more likely to produce a diffusion of benefits into areas adjacent to targeted locations than to lead to crime displacement.

What is this review about?
POP is a proactive policing strategy developed by Herman Goldstein, who argued that the standard reactive model of policing was ineffective as it was overly focused on the means of policing (number of arrests, average response time, etc.) rather than the end goal of reducing crime and enhancing community safety. He suggested that police could be more effective if they were more proactive and researched root causes of crime, and developed tailor-made responses.

This review assesses the effectiveness of POP interventions – defined as those programs which generally followed the tenets of the SARA model (scanning, analysis, response, assessment) developed by Spielman and Eck – in reducing crime and disorder and fear of crime, and improving citizen perceptions of police.

What studies are included?
This review includes both randomized and quasi-experimental evaluations of POP where a treatment area or group received a POP approach while a control area or group received standard police services.

Thirty-four studies are assessed in the review – an increase of 24 studies from the original review (Weisburd et al., 2008, 2010). All studies were published between 1969 and 2018. Most studies (28) were conducted in the USA, five in the United Kingdom and one in Canada.
Campbell Full Detailed Systematic Review: Problem-Oriented Policing

PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY

• Problem-oriented policing (POP) is associated with reductions in crime and disorder
• What is this review about?
• What studies are included?
• Does POP reduce crime and disorder?

BACKGROUND

• The issue
• POP in practice
• How might POP work?
• Why is it important to do this review?
• What do the findings of the review mean?
• How up-to-date is this review?

OBJECTIVES OF THE REVIEW

METHODS

• Criteria for considering studies for this review
  • Types of studies
  • Type of areas/groups
  • Types of interventions
  • Types of outcome measures
• Search strategy for identification of studies
• Data collection and analysis
  • Details of study coding categories
  • Statistical procedure and conventions
• Determination of independent findings
• Treatment of qualitative research
Campbell Full Detailed Systematic Review: Problem-Oriented Policing

RESULTS
- Selection of studies
  - Results of the search (all cited)
  - Characteristics of selected studies
  - Study implementation
  - Risk of bias in included studies
  - Meta-analysis of the effects of POP on crime and disorder
    - Moderator analyses
    - Meta-analysis of displacement and diffusion effects
    - Narrative review of impacts on noncrime/disorder outcomes
      - Financial cost-benefit analysis
      - Police legitimacy/satisfaction
      - Fear of crime
      - Collective efficacy
    - Publication bias
- Meta-analysis of the effects of POP on crime and disorder
  - Moderator analyses
  - Meta-analysis of displacement and diffusion effects
  - Narrative review of impacts on noncrime/disorder outcomes
    - Financial cost-benefit analysis
    - Police legitimacy/satisfaction
    - Fear of crime
    - Collective efficacy
    - Publication bias

DISCUSSION
- Summary of main results
- Overall completeness and applicability of evidence
- Quality of evidence
- Limitations and potential biases in the review process
- Agreements and disagreements with other studies or reviews
- No rating labels

AUTHORS’ CONCLUSIONS
- Implications for practice and policy
- Implications for research
Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) Benefit-Cost Results Tables – Overview

- Website: [www.wsipp.wa.gov/](http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/)
- WSIPP is a team of multi-disciplinary researchers who conduct applied policy research for the Washington state legislature.
- Since the 1990s, the legislature has directed WSIPP to identify “evidence-based” policies. The goal is to provide policymakers and budget writers a list of well-researched public policies that can, with high certainty, lead to better statewide outcomes coupled with a more efficient use of taxpayer dollars.
- The WSIPP research of programs and practices produce a meta-analysis and benefit-cost analysis rather than an intervention rating label.
“To produce a “What Works?” list of evidence-based public policy options available to the Washington State Legislature, ranked by return on investment. The ranked list can help policymakers choose a portfolio of public policies that are evidence-based and have a high likelihood of producing more benefits than costs.”
WSIPP Research Approach

Three-step process to draw conclusions about what works and what does not to achieve particular outcomes of legislative interest.

What works?
- Conduct systematic reviews
- Estimate effectiveness of policy options using meta-analysis

What is the return on investment?
- Monetize program effects
- Compare benefit-to-cost ratios across programs

How risky are the estimates?
- Estimate the chance of programs breaking even
WSIPP: Public Policy Areas for which State Legislature has requested Systematic Reviews and Benefit-Cost Analysis

- Criminal and juvenile justice
- K–12 and early education
- Child welfare
- Substance abuse
- Mental health
- Public health
- Public assistance
- Employment and workforce development
- Health care
- General prevention
- Higher education
General Characteristics of WSIPP’s Approach to Benefit-Cost Modeling

- Internally Consistent Estimates
- Meta-Analysis
- “Linked” Outcomes
- Avoiding Double-Counting Benefits
- Measuring Risk
- Four Perspectives on Benefits and Costs
- The Model’s Expandability
- Peer Review of the Model
### Juvenile Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program name</th>
<th>Date of last literature review</th>
<th>Total benefits</th>
<th>Taxpayer benefits</th>
<th>Non-taxpayer benefits</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits minus costs (net present value)</th>
<th>Benefit to cost ratio</th>
<th>Chance benefits will exceed costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional Family Therapy (FFT) for youth post-release</td>
<td>Mar. 2019</td>
<td>$146,222</td>
<td>$33,597</td>
<td>$112,626</td>
<td>($7,800)</td>
<td>$138,422</td>
<td>$18.75</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT) for youth in state institutions</td>
<td>Jun. 2019</td>
<td>$48,652</td>
<td>$10,241</td>
<td>$38,410</td>
<td>($1,493)</td>
<td>$47,159</td>
<td>$32.59</td>
<td>93 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive supervision for court-involved youth (vs. confinement in state institutions)</td>
<td>Jul. 2019</td>
<td>$16,953</td>
<td>$853</td>
<td>$16,100</td>
<td>$25,629</td>
<td>$42,582</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (non-name brand) family-based therapies for court-involved youth</td>
<td>Jul. 2019</td>
<td>$40,313</td>
<td>$10,520</td>
<td>$29,793</td>
<td>($2,955)</td>
<td>$37,358</td>
<td>$13.64</td>
<td>92 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting with Love and Limits (PLL) for court-involved/post-release youth</td>
<td>Jul. 2019</td>
<td>$31,016</td>
<td>$7,519</td>
<td>$23,497</td>
<td>$2,732</td>
<td>$33,748</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC) (vs. group homes) for court-involved youth</td>
<td>Jun. 2019</td>
<td>$39,973</td>
<td>$11,278</td>
<td>$28,694</td>
<td>($9,311)</td>
<td>$30,661</td>
<td>$4.29</td>
<td>91 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic communities for youth in state institutions with substance use disorder</td>
<td>Aug. 2017</td>
<td>$35,499</td>
<td>$8,435</td>
<td>$27,063</td>
<td>($4,890)</td>
<td>$30,609</td>
<td>$7.26</td>
<td>99 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring for youth post-release (including volunteer costs)</td>
<td>Jun. 2019</td>
<td>$32,834</td>
<td>$7,459</td>
<td>$25,375</td>
<td>($3,499)</td>
<td>$29,335</td>
<td>$9.38</td>
<td>93 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (non-therapeutic communities) substance use disorder treatment for youth in state institutions</td>
<td>Aug. 2017</td>
<td>$28,724</td>
<td>$6,324</td>
<td>$22,401</td>
<td>($3,368)</td>
<td>$25,357</td>
<td>$8.53</td>
<td>73 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step Up for court-involved youth</td>
<td>Feb. 2019</td>
<td>$24,356</td>
<td>$6,250</td>
<td>$18,105</td>
<td>($1,370)</td>
<td>$22,986</td>
<td>$17.78</td>
<td>82 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent Diversion Project (ADP) (vs. traditional juvenile court processing)</td>
<td>Jun. 2019</td>
<td>$22,484</td>
<td>$5,774</td>
<td>$16,710</td>
<td>$347</td>
<td>$22,831</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Employment Training (EET, King County) for court-involved youth</td>
<td>Feb. 2019</td>
<td>$25,254</td>
<td>$6,939</td>
<td>$18,315</td>
<td>($3,002)</td>
<td>$22,252</td>
<td>$8.41</td>
<td>99 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Benefit-Cost Summary Statistics Per Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits to:</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits vs. Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxpayers</td>
<td>$33,597</td>
<td>$138,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>$3,793</td>
<td>$18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>$96,879</td>
<td>Chance the program will produce benefits greater than the costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>$11,953</td>
<td>$100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total benefits</strong></td>
<td><strong>$146,222</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net program cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>($7,800)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits minus costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$138,422</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Detailed Monetary Benefit Estimates Per Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits from changes to:</th>
<th>Taxpayers Participants</th>
<th>Others $2</th>
<th>Indirect $3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>$32,133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$94,614</td>
<td>$16,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor market earnings associated with high school graduation</td>
<td>$1,890</td>
<td>$4,439</td>
<td>$2,458</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of higher education</td>
<td>($426)</td>
<td>($645)</td>
<td>($193)</td>
<td>($213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment for deadweight cost of program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>($3,900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$33,597</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,793</strong></td>
<td><strong>$96,879</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,953</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Detailed Annual Cost Estimates Per Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual cost</th>
<th>Year dollars</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program costs</td>
<td>$7,508</td>
<td>2016 Present value of net program costs (in 2018 dollars)</td>
<td>($7,800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2016 Cost range (+ or -)</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WSIPP Benefit-Cost Output: FFT

Estimated Cumulative Net Benefits Over Time (Non-Discounted Dollars)
Addional Web Resources with Information on Evidence-based CJ-related Programs

- Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy: Social Programs that Work (Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy)
- Evidence-based Practices Resource Center (SAMHSA)
- Guide to Community Preventive Services (U.S. DHHS, CDC)
- Evidence-Based Policing Matrix (George Mason University, Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy)
- Promising Practices Network (Rand Corporation)
- What Works Clearinghouse (U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences)
- What Works in Reentry Clearinghouse (The Council of State Governments)
Additional Web Resources with Information on Evidence-based JJ-related Programs

- Status Offense Reform Center (The Vera Institute)
- National Mentoring Resource Center (U.S. DOJ, OJJDP)
- Youth.gov (Federal Interagency Working Group on Youth Programs)
- The Juvenile Justice Resource Hub (The Juvenile Justice Information Exchange)
- The Robert F. Kennedy National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice (Robert F. Kennedy Children’s Action Corps)
- Youth Engaged 4 Change (Federal Interagency Working Group on Youth Programs)
- Youth Program Impact Tools (IACP’s Youth Focused Policing Resource Center)
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