Welcome to Today’s Webinar!

Using Evidence-based Registries for Program Selection—
Realities for Bullying Prevention

This event will start at 11:00 a.m. E.T.
Welcome to Today’s Webinar

Audio Information
Dial: 888-942-9044

Conference ID: 3098845

If you have technical difficulties logging into the web-based portion of the event, please contact Live Meeting Customer Support at 1 (866) 493-2825.

If you have any questions about the Live Meeting technology or the Webinar, please contact SSSTA at sssta@air.org.
Questions, Event Feedback & Contact Information

Q&A

If you have a question for the presenters, please type it in the Q & A Pane or email sssta@air.org during the Webinar.

Feedback Form

An event evaluation will appear as the last slide in the presentation. Please input your answers directly into the slide. All answers are completely anonymous and are not visible to other participants.

For assistance during the Webinar, please contact the Safe and Supportive Schools Technical Assistance Center at sssta@air.org.
The Safe and Supportive Schools Technical Assistance Center

- Funded by the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Safe and Healthy Students.*

- Provides training and support to State education personnel, including the 11 Safe and Supportive Schools grantees; district and school administrators; teachers and school support staff; communities and families; and students.

- Goal is to improve conditions for learning in schools through measurement and program implementation, so that all students have the opportunity to realize academic success in safe and supportive environments.

*The content of this presentation was prepared under a contract from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Safe and Healthy Students to the American Institutes for Research (AIR). This presentation does not necessarily represent the policy or views of the U.S. Department of Education, nor do they imply endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education.
Safe and Supportive Schools Website

http://safesupportiveschools.ed.gov

MEETING THE CHALLENGE:
Building & Sustaining Capacity to Improve Conditions for Learning

AUGUST 8-9, 2012
WASHINGTON • MARRIOTT • WARDMANN PARK

Technical Assistance
Need help improving the conditions for learning in your school, district, or state? Get Help

Upcoming Events
Implementation Webinar Series: Using Evidence-based Registries for Program Selection - Realities for Bullying Prevention
July 25, 4:00 pm - 5:00 pm ET
July 26, 11:00 am - 12:00 pm ET
Learn More

U.S. Department of Education's Office of Safe and Healthy Students' National Conference: Meeting the Challenge - Building & Sustaining Capacity to Improve, Conditions for Learning August 8-9, 2012 (Washington DC)
Learn More

Research
The 2011 Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance MMWR Surveillance summary and the 2011 National Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) results have been released. Access Summary, Data File, Fact Sheets

U.S. DOJ study reveals that school officials are more likely to learn of child victimization than police or medical authorities. Access Report

News Clips
July 23, 2012
Students Answer to Peers in L.A.'s Teen Courts
In the teen courts that have operated for two decades in Los Angeles, trained high school students preside over cases, determine guilt and
The Federal Partners in Bullying Prevention is an interagency effort led by the Department of Education that works to coordinate policy, research, and communications on bullying topics, including Webinars like this one.

The Federal Partners include representatives from the U.S. Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Education, Health and Human Services, the Interior, and Justice, as well as the Federal Trade Commission and the White House Initiative on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders.

Polling Question #1

Which of the following best describes your current role?

- State Education Personnel
- District or School Administrator
- Teacher or School Support Staff
- Community or Family Representative
- Student
- Researcher
- Other
Polling Question #2

Which of the following best describes the primary reason you chose to participate in today’s session?

- You are gathering practical information and strategies you’ll be teaching to, or sharing with, colleagues or subordinates.
- You are interested in gaining new information and strategies for your own professional use.
- Both of the above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Using Evidence-based Programs (EBP) Registries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brian K. Bumbarger, Evidence-based Prevention &amp; Intervention Support Center, Penn State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Using CrimeSOLUTIONS.gov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amy Staubs, MPH, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A Community’s Experience in Selecting a Program via a Registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Vaniman, Project Director, Choose Peace/Stop Violence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using Evidence-based Registries for Program Selection

Brian K. Bumbarger, Evidence-based Prevention & Intervention Support Center
Learning Objectives

1. The purpose for EBP registries
2. The definition of “evidence”
3. The benefits of selecting programs from EBP registries
4. The role of registries and evidence in program selection decisions
Using EBP Registries

Using CrimeSOLUTIONS.gov

Community Experience Selecting Program via Registry
SAMHSA’s National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP)

NREPP is a searchable online registry of more than 220 interventions supporting mental health promotion, substance abuse prevention, and mental health and substance abuse treatment. We connect members of the public to intervention developers so they can learn how to implement these approaches in their communities.

NREPP is not an exhaustive list of interventions, and inclusion in the registry does not constitute an endorsement. (More about NREPP.)

Find an Intervention - Advanced Search
Select criteria below to run an advanced search of NREPP-reviewed interventions.

Areas of Interest
- Mental health promotion
- Mental health treatment
- Substance abuse prevention
- Substance abuse treatment

Outcome Categories
- Alcohol
- Cost
- Crime/delinquency
- Drugs

Geographic Locations
- Urban
- Suburban
- Rural and/or frontier
- Tribal

Ages
- 0-5 (Early childhood)
- 6-12 (Childhood)
- 13-17 (Adolescent)
- 18-25 (Young adult)

Races/Ethnicities
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino

Settings
- Inpatient
- Residential
- Outpatient
- Correctional
Prevention & Treatment

The Prevention of Mental Disorders in School-Aged Children: Current State of the Field

Mark T. Greenberg, Colene Dornstecher, Pennsylvania State University

ABSTRACT
The authors reviewed scores of primary preventive interventions that had undergone trials and been found to reduce symptoms of depression, anxiety, or factors commonly for later mental disorders. In this review, the usual universal and targeted interventions that have under rigorous evaluation. The authors go on to describe characteristics of successful prevention programs based on these characteristics for policy and based prevention of childhood psychopathology.

This report was supported by funds from the Prevention Research Development in the College of Health and Human Development, Pennsylvania State University.

A portion of this article originally appeared in the report: Prevention: A Review of the Effectiveness of Prevention Programs for Mental Health and Human Services, Violence and Abuse, Center for Mental Health Services.

Report prepared by María M. Ttofi, David P. Farrington and Anna C. Baldry.

Effective Programmes to Reduce School Bullying

Safe and Supportive Schools
Engagement | Safety | Environment

Citations ▪ 1, 2, 3, & 4
Page ▪ 15
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EBP Registries are a tool for a job – a means to an end.

They’re only useful if you understand the tool, AND understand the job.
Programs can be placed along a continuum of confidence based on their evidence or theory.

- **Very Confident**
  - Evidence-based: “This program has been rigorously evaluated and shown to work.”
  - Research-based: “This program is based on sound theory informed by research.”
  - Promising Approaches: “We really think this will work… but we need time to prove it.”
  - Best Practices: “We’ve done it and we like it.”
- **Promising**
  - Iatrogenic (Harmful): “This program has been rigorously evaluated and shown to be harmful.”
  - Effective
  - Harmful

How confident are we that this program or practice is a good use of resources AND improves outcomes for children and families?
Continuum of Confidence

- Programs can be placed along a continuum of confidence based on their evidence or theory.

\[ \text{Very Confident} \rightarrow \text{EFFECTIVE} \rightarrow \text{Best Practices} \rightarrow \text{Research-based} \rightarrow \text{Unknown} \rightarrow \text{Promising Approaches} \rightarrow \text{Evidence-based} \rightarrow \text{Ineffective} \rightarrow \text{Iatrogenic (Harmful)} \rightarrow \text{HARMFUL} \rightarrow \text{Very Confident} \]

- **Evidence-based**
  - “This program has been rigorously evaluated and shown to have no positive or negative effect.”

- **Research-based**
  - “This program is based on sound theory informed by research.”

- **Best Practices**
  - “We’ve done it and we like it.”

- **Promising Approaches**
  - “We really think this will work... but we need time to prove it.”

- **Ineffective**
  - “This program has been rigorously evaluated and shown to have no positive or negative effect.”

- **Iatrogenic (Harmful)**
  - “This program has been rigorously evaluated and shown to be harmful.”

How confident are we that this program or practice is a good use of resources AND improves outcomes for children and families?
Evidence-based Programs

- Theoretically sound interventions that have been evaluated using a well-designed study (randomized controlled trial or strong quasi-experimental design) and have demonstrated significant improvements in the targeted outcome(s).

- Evidence is strengthened by independent replication and sustained benefits.

- These EBPs give us the greatest confidence they will be effective at promoting better youth outcomes…. …if they’re a good fit AND are implemented well.
Randomized Controlled Trial

Randomization

Pre-test

Prevention Program

Post-test

Pre-test

Prevention Program

Post-test
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Safe and Supportive Schools
Engagement | Safety | Environment
Simple Pre-Post Comparison

We can compare the difference between pre-test and post-test, But...

- What if something else caused the change?
- If the post-test isn’t better, does that mean the program didn’t work?
- What would have happened in the absence of the program?
- Are these kids representative of all kids?
Effective Programs…

- …are based on a theory of the etiology of the outcome to be prevented.
- …are based on a logic model of intervening in and changing the pathway.
- …rely on implementation that does not violate that logic model (fidelity).
"I think you should be more explicit here in step two!"
Polling Question #3

If you are currently looking for a program to address a problem (such as bullying) in your school or community, how much background data do you have to inform your selection decision?

- We don’t have any specific data, but there have been some “high profile” incidents and we need to act.
- We’ve collected some data on how much of the problem (e.g. bullying) exists.
- We have data on who is being bullied, who is doing the bullying, how often, and where.
- We have data on the above and data on known risk factors for bullying and victimization, to understand the underlying causes for OUR school.
Effective Programs

Using EBP Registries
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A Theoretical Risk Factor Pathway

- Impulsivity/Low Self Control
- Low Emotion Regulation
- Lack of Social Problem Solving Skills

Anxiety, Depressive Symptoms, Frustration, Social Isolation
A Theoretical Risk Factor Pathway

- Impulsivity/Low Self Control
- Low Emotion Regulation
- Lack of Social Problem Solving Skills

Anxiety, Depressive Symptoms, Frustration, Social Isolation

- Academic Difficulty Beginning in Elem School
- Early and Persistent Antisocial Behavior
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A Theoretical Risk Factor Pathway

- Impulsivity/Low Self Control
- Low Emotion Regulation
- Lack of Social Problem Solving Skills

Anxiety, Depressive Symptoms, Frustration, Social Isolation

- Academic Difficulty Beginning in Elem School
- Early and Persistent Antisocial Behavior

Low School Commitment
A Theoretical Risk Factor Pathway

1. Impulsivity/Low Self Control
2. Low Emotion Regulation
3. Lack of Social Problem Solving Skills

- Anxiety, Depressive Symptoms, Frustration, Social Isolation
  - Academic Difficulty Beginning in Elem School
  - Early and Persistent Antisocial Behavior

- Low School Commitment

- Friends Who Engage In Problem Behavior
Evidence + Fit + Feasibility = Best Program Choice

- **Evidence**: How confident can I be that this program is an effective intervention for the problem I’m trying to address?

- **Fit**: How well does this program match the context and population I’m trying to impact?

- **Feasibility**: How likely is it that this program can be delivered (and sustained) with the same level of quality that was necessary to be effective?
Evidence + Fit + Feasibility = Best Program Choice

Fit & Feasibility (F&F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untested or Ineffective and poor F&amp;F</td>
<td>Untested or Ineffective but good F&amp;F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promising Effectiveness but poor F&amp;F</td>
<td>Promising Effectiveness and good F&amp;F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based but poor F&amp;F</td>
<td>Evidence-based and good F&amp;F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promising Effectiveness but some challenges to F&amp;F</td>
<td>Evidence-based but some challenges to F&amp;F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untested or Ineffective &amp; some challenges to F&amp;F</td>
<td>Untested or Ineffective but good F&amp;F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based but poor F&amp;F</td>
<td>Evidence-based and good F&amp;F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promising Effectiveness but some challenges to F&amp;F</td>
<td>Evidence-based but some challenges to F&amp;F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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All “Model Programs” Are Not Equal

- Relevance of the conceptual model (theory of change)
- Quantity and quality of evidence
- Generalizability of evidence
- Economic feasibility
- Local “fit”
- Breadth of impact
- TA and training infrastructure
- Peer network
- Sustainability
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Questions to Ask When Considering a Program

- How strong is the evidence?
- Do we need it?
- What are the other options?
- Does the evidence apply to our population?
- Is it worth the investment, and can we afford it?
- Can we assemble the necessary resources and stakeholders?
- Will our community find it acceptable?
- How broad might the impact be?
- Can the developer support our site?
- Do we know others who have used it?
- What will it take to sustain it?
A free tool “Reducing Youth Problems and Promoting Positive Youth Development: Choosing the best program for your community” is available for download from the EPISCenter website at: http://bit.ly/OjjwQF

Other resources are available at: www.EPISCenter.psu.edu
If you have a question for the presenter, please type it in the Q & A pane or email sssta@air.org.
Using CrimeSOLUTIONS.gov
Amy Staubs, MPH, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice
Using EBP Registries
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RELIABLE RESEARCH. REAL RESULTS.
E2I Goal: Translating Evidence into Practice

- A single, credible, online resource to inform practitioners and policymakers about what works in criminal justice, juvenile justice and crime victim services
- Launched June 2011
CrimeSolutions.gov Users

- Legislators and Legislative Staff
- Mayors
- Police Chiefs & Law Enforcement
- State Administering Agency Representatives
- Congressional Staff
- Judges & Court Personnel
- Justice Practitioners & Service Providers
- Researchers & Academics
What CrimeSolutions.gov Offers

- Research on program effectiveness reviewed and rated by expert reviewers
- Easily understandable ratings based on the evidence that indicates whether a program achieves its goals
  - Effective ✔
  - Promising ✔
  - No Effects 🗑
- Key program information and research findings
CrimeSolutions.gov Uses

- Find an effective or promising program to replicate (search by keyword, advanced search, or topic).
- Find a program to adapt (based on a community’s unique needs, population, etc.).
- Inform funding priorities and decisions.
- Identify areas in need of further research.
Impact on the Field

- Increase the use of evidence-based programs in criminal justice, juvenile justice and victim services settings.
- Inform practitioners and policy makers about what works using the best available evidence.
- At a time of budget cutbacks and fiscal shortfalls, help state and local jurisdictions address crime effectively and efficiently.
Justice-Related Program Topics

- Corrections & Reentry
- Courts
- Crime & Crime Prevention
- Drugs & Substance Abuse
- Forensics & Technology
- Juvenile Justice
- Law Enforcement
- Victims & Victimization
CrimeSolutions.gov Programs

To fall within the scope, a program must:

- Aim to prevent or reduce crime, delinquency, or related problem behaviors (such as aggression, gang involvement, or school attachment);
- Aim to prevent, intervene, or respond to victimization;
- Aim to improve justice systems or processes; and/or
- Target an offender population or an at-risk population (that is, individuals who have the potential to become involved in the justice system).
Minimum Evidence

- The program must be evaluated with **at least one quasi-experimental research design** with a comparison condition (including time series).

- Evaluations must assess one or more outcomes related to crime and delinquency, victimization, or justice system improvements.

- Evaluations must be published in a peer-reviewed journal or comprehensive research report.

- The date of the evaluation’s publication must be **1980 or later**.
Eight-Step Program Review and Rating Process

1. Preliminary program identification
2. Initial program screening
3. Literature search
4. Initial evidence screening
5. Selection of evidence base
6. Expert review
7. Study classification
8. Program evidence rating
Using EBP Registries
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CrimeSOLUTIONS.gov

- Multiple ways to find information
  - Keyword search
  - Browse by topic
  - Advanced search
  - All programs
Users can “drill down” from brief summary information to:
- Program description
- Outcomes
- Study methodology
- Cost
- Implementation information
- Evidence reviewed
- Additional references
Fulfilling the Mission of the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) and the Evidence Integration Initiative (E2I)

OJP launched E2I in 2009 with three goals to:

1. Improve the quality and quantity of evidence generated by OJP
2. Integrate evidence into program, practice, and policy decisions
3. Improve the translation of evidence into practice

OJP is using two integrated resources to put these goals to action:

- Using EBP Registries
- Using CrimeSOLUTIONS.gov
- Community Experience Selecting Program via Registry
If you have a question for the presenter, please type it in the Q & A pane or email sssta@air.org.
A Community’s Experience in Selecting a Program via a Registry

Nancy Vaniman, Project Director, Choose Peace/Stop Violence
Need for Program

- A youth violence prevention collaborative in Broward County, Florida was formed in 2010 after violent acts received national attention.
  - A youth was set on fire by 3 teens over a dispute concerning money.
  - A middle school student was severely beaten by a teen that exchanged harassing text messages.
  - Study methodology
200 community members met to discuss community-wide strategies to address youth violence

Representatives from agencies including:
- Elected officials
- Students
- Law Enforcement
- Business Leaders
- Funding Agencies
- Educators
- Media
The community partnership is designed to provide guidance in the selection of evidence based programs to address youth violence, including bullying prevention in the schools and community.

Members include:
- School District
- Law Enforcement
- Health Department
- Healthcare Agencies
- Children’s Agencies
- County Government
- Non-Profit Agencies
Broward County has one school district with 235,000 students.

The Broward County Sheriff’s Office provides law enforcement services in 14 jurisdictions.

A Children’s Services Council was formed to provide funding for evidence-based programs throughout the county.

The United Way of Broward County Commission on Substance Abuse is the state prevention partner to coordinate substance abuse prevention initiatives throughout the county to avoid duplication of services and to ensure that evidence-based programs are implemented.
Local Realities

- Broward County is the 2nd largest county in Florida.
- There are 31 jurisdictions within the county.
- Broward County has the highest rate of juvenile delinquency in the state of Florida.
- There are 18 local law enforcement agencies.
- There are over 100 agencies who serve children.
Challenges: Education

- Broward County has numerous funding agencies to support youth violence/bullying initiatives.
  - Not all funding agencies have the expertise or resources to research/select evidence-based programs.

- Service Providers
  - Providers are bombarded with information on “what works” in the area of bullying prevention, including internet sites, private companies, and national organizations.

Solution: Funders have made a commitment to research evidence-based programs AND to invite subject matter experts to provide training to service providers on “what works and what doesn’t work” in the areas of children’s services.
Challenge: Funding

- Evidence-based programs are sometimes cost prohibitive to implement.

Solution: Local funding agencies have collaborated to ensure that resources are distributed to agencies who implement evidenced-based programs.
**Challenge:** Fidelity

- Service providers sometimes lack the training to implement evidence-based programs with fidelity.

**Solution:** Funders are requiring the implementation of evidence based programs AND provides funding to train program staff.

**Challenge:** Commitment

- Most evidence-based programs require long-term commitment to implement with fidelity.
- Providers rely on external funding that doesn’t necessarily support the commitment required to implement the program.

**Solution:** Funders are providing multi-year funding.
Questions?

If you have a question for the presenter, please type it in the Q & A Pane or email sssta@air.org.
Take Aways

1. **Use Evidence-based Registries**
   - Narrow the field of potential programs and strategies.
   - Identify programs and strategies that are ineffective (or even potentially harmful).

2. **Choose Wisely**
   - Because of the difficulty in implementing evidence based programs, understand the required components of the program (i.e., required data collection) before you commit resources to that program.

3. **Community Support**
   - Ensure that you have the support of the community (school officials, after-school providers, funders) to commit to implementing a program.


