

**December 2018**  
**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>Prevention</b>						
	Alcohol Literacy Challenge (for high school students)	Yes	P	P	58%	Single evaluation	33%
	Athletes Training and Learning to Avoid Steroids (ATLAS)	Yes	P	Null		Weight of the evidence	22%
	Brief intervention for youth in medical settings	Yes	⊙	⊙	41%	Benefit-cost	65%
	Compliance checks for alcohol	Varies*	⊙	⊙		Heterogeneity	25%
	Compliance checks for tobacco	Varies*	●	⊙		Heterogeneity	28%
	Family Matters	Yes	⊙	⊙	73%	Benefit-cost/heterogeneity	22%
	keepin' it REAL	Yes	P	Null	61%	Weight of the evidence	83%
	LifeSkills Training	Yes	●	⊙	59%	Benefit-cost	38%
	Lions Quest Skills for Adolescence	Yes	⊙	⊙	65%	Benefit-cost	74%
	Marijuana Education Initiative	Yes	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest	
	Multicomponent environmental interventions to prevent youth alcohol use	Varies*	⊙	⊙	28%	Benefit-cost/heterogeneity	19%
	Multicomponent environmental interventions to prevent youth tobacco use	Varies*	⊙	⊙	85%	Heterogeneity	21%
	Project ALERT	Yes	●	⊙	70%	Benefit-cost/heterogeneity	12%
	Project Northland	Yes	●	⊙	70%	Benefit-cost	36%
	Project STAR	Yes	●	⊙	67%	Benefit-cost/heterogeneity	5%
	Project SUCCESS	Yes	P	Null	43%	Weight of the evidence	38%
	Project Toward No Drug Abuse	Yes	●	⊙	56%	Benefit-cost	70%
	Protecting You/Protecting Me	Yes	P	P		Single evaluation	92%
	SPORT	Yes	⊙	⊙	70%	Benefit-cost	49%
	STARS (Start Taking Alcohol Risks Seriously) for Families	Yes	P	P		Single evaluation	66%
	Teen Intervene	Yes	●	⊙	49%	Benefit-cost/heterogeneity	29%

Substance use disorder

● 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).

**December 2018**  
**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 <small>(see full definitions below)</small>	Percent minority
Substance use disorder (continued)	<b>Treatment</b>						
	Adolescent Assertive Continuing Care (ACC)	Yes	⊙	⊙	37%	Benefit-cost/heterogeneity	27%
	Adolescent Community Reinforcement Approach (A-CRA)	Yes	⊙	⊙		Single evaluation	59%
	Dialectical behavior therapy for substance abuse: Integrated treatment model	Yes	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest	
	Functional Family Therapy (FFT) for adolescents with substance use disorder	Yes	⊙	⊙	35%	Benefit-cost	74%
	Matrix Model treatment for adolescents with substance use disorder	Yes	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest	
	MET/CBT-5 for youth marijuana use	Yes	⊙	Null		Weight of the evidence	33%
	Multidimensional Family Therapy (MDFT)	Yes	⊙	⊙	25%	Benefit-cost	87%
	Recovery Support Services	Yes	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest	
	Seven Challenges	Yes	P	P		No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest	
	Teen Marijuana Check-Up (TMCU)	Yes	●	⊙	48%	Benefit-cost	35%
	<i>Treatment for youth involved in the juvenile justice system</i>						
	Multisystemic Therapy (MST) for juveniles with substance use disorder	Yes	●	⊙	52%	Benefit-cost	65%
	Other substance use disorder treatment for juveniles (non-therapeutic communities)	Varies*	P	Null	48%	Weight of the evidence	68%
	Therapeutic communities for juveniles with substance use disorder	Varies*	⊙	⊙	56%	Benefit-cost	54%

● 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).