

# 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
	<b>Intervention</b>						
	Alternatives for Families (AF-CBT)	Yes	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest	
	Attachment & Biobehavioral Catch-up	Yes	⊙	⊙		Single evaluation	19%
	Family dependency treatment court	Yes	⊙	⊙	7%	Benefit-cost	35%
	Fostering Healthy Futures	Yes	⊙	⊙		Single evaluation	56%
	Functional Family Therapy—Child Welfare (FFT-CW)	Yes	P	Null		Weight of the evidence	95%
	Including Fathers—Father Engagement Program	Yes	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest	
	Intensive Family Preservation Services (HOMEBUILDERS®)	Yes	●	●	97%		58%
	Kinship care compared to traditional (non-kin) foster care	No	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest	
	Locating family connections for children in foster care	Yes	P	Null		Weight of the evidence	66%
	Multisystemic Therapy (MST) for child abuse and neglect	Yes	⊙	⊙		Single evaluation	82%
	Other Family Preservation Services (non-HOMEBUILDERS®)	Varies*	⊙	⊙	0%	Weight of the evidence	76%
	Parent-Child Assistance Program	Yes	P	P		Single evaluation	52%
	Parent-Child Interaction Therapy (PCIT) for families in the child welfare system	Yes	●	●	96%		48%
	Parents for Parents	Yes	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest	
	Partners with Families and Children	Yes	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest	
	Pathway to Reunification	Yes	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest	
	SafeCare	Yes	●	●	93%		33%
	Youth Villages LifeSet	Yes	⊙	⊙	21%	Benefit-cost	49%
	<b>Prevention</b>						
	Circle of Security	Yes	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest	
	Circle of Security—Parenting (COS-P)	Yes	P	P	56%	Single evaluation	89%
	Healthy Families America	Yes	●	⊙	58%	Mixed results/benefit-cost	63%
	Nurse Family Partnership	Yes	●	⊙	62%	Benefit-cost/heterogeneity	20%
	Other home visiting programs for at-risk families	Varies*	●	⊙	51%	Mixed results/benefit-cost	63%
	Parent-Child Home Program	Yes	P	P		Single evaluation	NR
	Parent Mentor Program	Yes	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest	
	Parents and Children Together (PACT)	Yes	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest	
	Parents as Teachers	Yes	⊙	⊙	30%	Benefit-cost	66%
	Promoting First Relationships	Yes	P	P	47%	Single evaluation	43%
	Safe Babies, Safe Moms	Yes	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest	
	Triple-P Positive Parenting Program (System)	Yes	⊙	⊙	64%	Benefit-cost	33%

● 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)