### Evidence-Based Practices Strategy Classification & Justification Worksheet

Community:       Coordinator name:

Complete this form for each strategy you are considering implementing to determine the level of evidence supporting it using the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) definitions of evidence-based. Please refer to the instructions in the Evidence-Based Practices Workbook for more information about how to complete this worksheet.

# Program Name and Classification

What is the name of the strategy or approach?

What priority substance use issue would this strategy address?

What local condition(s) would this strategy address?

***After completing the full worksheet***, which of SAMHSA’s definitions of evidence-based programming applies to this particular program?

[ ] Definition 1: It appears in a federal registry of evidence-based programs (Section I of this form)

[ ] Definition 2: It has been positively evaluated in a peer reviewed journal (Section II of this form)

[ ] Definition 3: It is evidence-based according to “other documented sources” (Section III of this form)

[ ] Promising practices: It does not meet any of the above definitions, but there is preliminary evidence of effectiveness available.

[ ] No evidence: There is no evidence of this strategy’s effectiveness available.

# Section I: Criteria for Definition 1 programs

1. Is this strategy in a registry? [ ] Yes [ ] No (SKIP TO SECTION II)

2. Which of the following federally approved registries include your program or practice?

* SAMHSA’s National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP) [ ]
* Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s Guide to Community Preventive Services [ ]
* Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention’s Model Programs Guide [ ]
* AHRQ’s2014 Guide to Clinical Preventive Services [ ]
* County Health Rankings and Roadmap for What Works [ ]
* College AIM [ ]
* Other (Please describe)

3. What specific rating did your selected strategy receive in this registry (e.g. promising, effective, evidence-based, not evidence-based, etc.)?

4. Does the registry include information on whether or not this strategy is appropriate for your population of focus? [ ] Yes [ ] No

5. Does the registry include information on whether or not this strategy is appropriate for your local conditions? [ ] Yes [ ] No

**If you cannot successfully document that your strategy is endorsed by a federal registry of evidence-based programs, move to Section II of this worksheet.**

# Section II: Criteria for Definition 2 programs

6. Is this strategy in at least two peer-reviewed journal articles? [ ] Yes [ ] No (SKIP TO SECTION III)

Complete this table for all articles found for this strategy, even if the article does not demonstrate the outcomes you were seeking. You should review at least two articles per strategy to meet Definition 2. You can remove or add rows to this chart as needed.

| **7. Article citation** | **8. Documentation of peer review** | **9. Study design** | **10. Key outcomes (underline statistically significant outcomes)** | **11. Article relevance** | **12. Study limitations (including lack of article relevance in column 9)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | [ ]  The peer review process is clearly stated in the journal or on its web site[ ]  It is listed as a peer reviewed journal in the appendix of the Evidence-Based Practices Workbook[ ]  Other(Please describe) | Describe population studied:      Setting of the study:     Size of group receiving strategy/treatment:     Size of comparison group (if any):     Were participants tracked over time?[ ]  Yes [ ]  No |  | Check if the article includes:[ ] Information about your population of focus [ ] Information about your local conditions |  |
|  | [ ]  The peer review process is clearly stated in the journal or on its web site[ ]  It is listed as a peer reviewed journal in the appendix of the Evidence-Based Practices Workbook[ ]  Other(Please describe) | Describe population studied:      Setting of the study:     Size of group receiving strategy/treatment:     Size of comparison group (if any):      Were participants tracked over time?[ ]  Yes [ ]  No |  | Check if the article includes:[ ]  Information about your population of focus [ ]  Information about your local conditions |  |
|  | [ ]  The peer review process is clearly stated in the journal or on its web site[ ]  It is listed as a peer reviewed journal in the appendix of the Evidence-Based Practices Workbook[ ]  Other(Please describe) | Describe population studied:      Setting of the study:     Size of group receiving strategy/treatment:     Size of comparison group (if any):      Were participants tracked over time?[ ]  Yes [ ]  No |  | Check if the article includes:[ ]  Information about your population of focus [ ]  Information about your local conditions |  |
|  | [ ]  The peer review process is clearly stated in the journal or on its web site[ ]  It is listed as a peer reviewed journal in the appendix of the Evidence-Based Practices Workbook[ ]  Other(Please describe) | Describe population studied:      Setting of the study:     Size of group receiving strategy/treatment:     Size of comparison group (if any):      Were participants tracked over time?[ ]  Yes [ ]  No |  | Check if the article includes:[ ]  Information about your population of focus [ ]  Information about your local conditions |  |
|  | [ ]  The peer review process is clearly stated in the journal or on its web site[ ]  It is listed as a peer reviewed journal in the appendix of the Evidence-Based Practices Workbook[ ]  Other(Please describe) | Describe population studied:      Setting of the study:     Size of group receiving strategy/treatment:     Size of comparison group (if any):      Were participants tracked over time?[ ]  Yes [ ]  No |  | Check if the article includes:[ ]  Information about your population of focus [ ]  Information about your local conditions |  |

**If you cannot successfully document that your strategy has demonstrated strong outcomes in more than one peer review journal, move to Section III.**

# Section III: Criteria for definition 3

According to SAMHSA’s latest guidance, when an intervention is being selected based on “other sources of supporting information,” ALL FOUR OF THE FOLLOWING GUIDELINES MUST BE MET:

1. *The intervention must be based on a theory of change that is documented in a clear logic model or conceptual model.*
2. *The intervention must be similar in content and structure to interventions that appear in registries and peer review journals.*
3. *The intervention must be supported by documentation that it has been effectively implemented in the past, and multiple times, in a manner attentive to scientific standards of evidence and with results that show a consistent pattern of credible and positive effects.*
4. *The intervention must be reviewed and deemed appropriate by a panel of informed prevention experts that includes well-qualified prevention researchers who are experienced in evaluating prevention efforts similar to those under review, local prevention practitioners, and key community leaders as appropriate (e.g., officials from law enforcement or the school system or elders from indigenous cultures*).

11. Does the strategy have a program logic model that clearly lays out your target problems and local conditions and links them logically to your selected strategy and expected results?

 [ ] Yes (Attach the logic model to this form) [ ] No [ ] Not sure

12. Is your selected strategy similar to other interventions that have been positively evaluated in peer review journals and online registries?

 [ ] Yes [ ] No (Skip to Q13) [ ] Not sure

12a. What strategy is it similar to?

12b. What is the level of evidence for the similar strategy? [ ]  Definition 1 [ ]  Definition 2

12c. How is it similar?

12d. How does it differ?

12e. What positive outcomes have been documented for the similar strategy?

13. Has this strategy been evaluated?

 [ ] Yes [ ] No (Skip to Q14) [ ] Not sure

13a. Describe population studied:

13b. Setting of the study:

13c. Size of group receiving strategy/treatment:

13d. Size of comparison group (if any):

13e. Were the participants tracked over time? [ ] Yes [ ] No

13f. What were the key outcomes? (underline statistically significant outcomes)

14. Has this strategy been reviewed and deemed appropriate by a panel of informed prevention experts? (Note: the Minnesota SPF Evidence Based Practices Workgroup may serve as the body of experts)

 [ ] Yes, by a panel in our community [ ] Yes, by the SPF EBPW (end worksheet) [ ] No (end worksheet) [ ] Not sure (end worksheet)

14a. Complete this grid for all members of the expert panel (if not using SPF EBPW)

| **Name** | **Position or role** | **Organization or agency** | **Area(s) of expertise** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|       |       |       | [ ] Substance use prevention[ ] Research[ ] Evidence-based practices[ ] Cultural or community knowledge |
|       |       |       | [ ] Substance use prevention[ ] Research[ ] Evidence-based practices[ ] Cultural or community knowledge |
|       |       |       | [ ] Substance use prevention[ ] Research[ ] Evidence-based practices[ ] Cultural or community knowledge |
|       |       |       | [ ] Substance use prevention[ ] Research[ ] Evidence-based practices[ ] Cultural or community knowledge |
|       |       |       | [ ] Substance use prevention[ ] Research[ ] Evidence-based practices[ ] Cultural or community knowledge |
|       |       |       | [ ] Substance use prevention[ ] Research[ ] Evidence-based practices[ ] Cultural or community knowledge |
|       |       |       | [ ] Substance use prevention[ ] Research[ ] Evidence-based practices[ ] Cultural or community knowledge |

**Please note if you cannot successfully document that your strategy fits all four of the criteria for Definition 3, but there is some evidence of effectiveness for your strategy, it may be considered a Promising Practice.**