



CAYT Database of Evidence-based Programmes Scoring Application Form

Please complete the following sections as part of your submission and email it along with a signed copy of the Terms of Agreement and any other supporting material to Richard.lynas@mentoruk.org

Section 1. CONTACT DETAILS

One named individual should be designated as the person responsible for the submission and feedback process for each programme reviewed. This person must have the authority to: serve as the main point of contact; gather and submit all research required for evaluation; and approve the final feedback report for inclusion in the CAYT database and website.

Person Responsible for Submission*

First Name

Last Name

Position Held

Organisation

Address

Telephone Number

Alternative Number/ Mobile

Email Address

Please provide the name, role and organisation for each person, other than yourself, who was instrumental in developing the programme, creating particular implementation components, or researching / evaluating the programme. If this is not provided we will assume that you wish your email address and contact details to be publicly available.

* If you are not the main point of contact for questions related to programme implementation etc. from the general public please provide these details below - in addition to your own.

Section 2. PROGRAMME DESCRIPTION

Programme Name

Website Address (if applicable)

Please provide a clear outline of the programme (Max 500 words) including information on how the programme is implemented, core components, target group and the theoretical or conceptual origins of the programme. Please also list your expected and add numbers if required

Programme Outline

Expected Outcomes

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Additional Descriptive Information and Activities (these will not be considered in the scoring process but will be made available to assist those considering using the programme.

Implementation history

Adaptations (including foreign translations)

Costs Involved

Section 3. EVIDENCE

Applicants are required to provide full-text documents at the time of submission that demonstrate the programme meets the requirements outlined in the [Terms of Agreement](#). Other research articles, published or unpublished evaluation reports, grant reports, lesson plans, training resources and replication studies may be submitted as additional supporting documents.

How many research outputs are you submitting as evidence for consideration?

Please provide the following information for each output submitted

1. *Reference – example below:*

Hawking, S. W. (1998). A brief history of time: From the big bang to black holes (10th ed.). New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group.

2. *Research Output Details – example below:*

Substance Abuse Prevention Among Guatemalan Young People: A Qualitative Evaluation of the Big Programme								
Title	Sample Size	Settings	Location (s)	Age Range	Methodological Approach	Data Collection Methods*	Date of publication	Publication Type
	40	4 (Schools) 2 (Youth Clubs)	London	14 to 16	Qualitative	Observations Focus Groups	30.11.16	External Evaluation

* *Please reference any surveys, instruments or evaluation tools which have been used e.g. the GHQ 12-item*

Please provide the file names of all attachments including any content you have sent in addition to the research outputs (an acknowledgement receipt will be sent to you with the names of the files received).

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Please submit this application form along with a scanned copy of the CAYT Terms of Agreement and any research outputs or other material for consideration.

Appendix

Scoring and Feedback

In addition to some general feedback and suggestions, we will provide two separate scores for a) Standard of Evidence and b) Programme Impact. Based on this we will provide an overall performance rating. Grading tables can be seen in the appendix.

For the purposes of scoring we will consider the overall quality of the evidence provided and the extent to which the programme identifies needs and is achieving the intended outcomes in the short, medium and long-term (knowledge, actions, conditions). We will also consider if the participants are being reached as intended.

We will share a courtesy copy of the programme profile with the contact person / developer who maintains the right to suggest revisions to the profile. The final profile will then be submitted to CAYT for final review, approval, inclusion in the database and posting on the CAYT website.



The scoring for all three sections will be displayed on a thermometer image and will range from 0 to 4.

1: impact grades

	Impact grade	Description
Very weak	0	No impact in terms of reach and significance; or the impact was not eligible; or the impact was not underpinned by quality research produced by the submitted research outputs.
Weak	1	Impact is of little reach and significance
Acceptable	2	Recognised but modest reach in terms of reach and significance
Good	3	High impact in terms of reach and significance
Excellent	4	Very high impact in terms of reach and significance for all of the intended outcomes

When assessing impact grades, we take into specific consideration the following:

Reach: the extent to which the programme attracts its intended audience

Significance: the effect that the programme is having on young people to influence health and wellbeing

2. Level of evidence grades

In this section, we will consider the quality of all material submitted. Also below is guidance on what we believe the required criteria to be to reach a high score in this category.

	Score of evidence	Type of study	More Description	Example of a study	How to improve the quality of evidence
Very weak evidence	0	Basic	Studies that describe the intervention and collect data on activity associated with it.	A study that describes the intervention and states how much it cost or how many hours of services young people received.	Collect some “before and after” data on the outcome of interest for those receiving the intervention. If it is too late for that, collect outcome “after” data for the group receiving the services and try to compare these outcomes with comparable youth using other sources of data.
Weak standard of evidence	1	Descriptive, anecdotal, expert opinion	Studies that ask respondents or experts about whether the intervention works.	A study that uses focus groups or expert opinion or indeed surveys those who received the intervention after they received it.	Collect some “before and after” data on the outcome of interest for those receiving the services. If it is too late for that, collect outcome “after” data for the group receiving the services and try to compare these outcomes with comparable youth using other sources of data.
Acceptable	2	Study where a statistical relationship (correlation) between the outcome and receiving services is established	The correlation is observed at a single point in time, outcomes of those who receive the intervention are compared with those who do not get it.	A study that conducts a survey only after the services have been delivered and concludes that youths who received the services responded more positively than those who did not.	This evidence does not allow for the fact that prior to the intervention youths who received the service may have been different from those who did not. Collect some before and after data on the outcome of interest for those receiving the intervention. If it is too late to do that, see if you can compare outcomes for a clearly defined comparison or control group using other “before” data sources, such as administrative data.
	3	Study which accounts for when the services were delivered by surveying before and after	This approach compares outcomes before and after an intervention.	A study that conducts a survey before and after the program.	If you have before-after data you can measure the change in a particular outcome after the services were delivered. Try to determine whether you can compare this gain in the outcome for those who received the youth services to the gain for a similar group of youths who did not receive the services. You might use administrative data for this.
Good standard of evidence	4	Study where there is both a before and after evaluation	These studies use comparison groups, also known as control groups.	A study that matches two locations where both individuals and areas are comparable and	You have most of the data you need. Contact an expert on statistics or econometrics and they will be able to apply various statistical methodologies to improve the robustness of your results e.g. matching methods to define a better

		strategy and a clear comparison between groups who do and do not receive the youth services		surveys them before and after the program e.g. pilot studies.	control or comparison group. NOTE: this is the minimum level of evaluation quality applied by the Social Research Unit et al (2011), which also stipulates that any such study fulfil various quality criteria.
	5	As above but in addition includes statistical modelling to produce better comparison groups and of outcomes to allow for other differences across groups	Study with a before and after evaluation strategy, statistically generated control groups and statistical modelling of outcomes.	A study that uses a statistical method, such as propensity score matching, to ensure that the group receiving the youth services is similar to the comparison group and a statistical model of outcomes (e.g. difference in difference).	Short of a random control trial, this methodology is the most robust. To improve confidence in the results, try to collect additional data, perhaps from administrative sources, on the comparison group to determine any differences between them that may have pre-dated the intervention.
Excellent standard of evidence	6.	Study where intervention is provided on the basis of individuals being randomly assigned to either the treatment or the control group.	Study that compares results from two independent randomly generated groups (one receiving the intervention and the other one not) and uses statistical analysis to determine effectiveness of the programme.	A study which conducts a Randomised Controlled Trial. A study that takes into account the following criteria: <i>i)</i> a fair independent evaluation has to be conducted; <i>ii)</i> transferability and generalisability of the programme; <i>iii)</i> statistical power of the analysis; <i>iv)</i> minimum bias	The gold standard. It is challenging to run a RCT, with cost, ethical and practical issues arising. Even with a RCT you have to think about how generalisable it is to other situations. If the RCT was only males, it cannot tell you about how well the youth service would do for females, for example.
	7	Various studies that evaluate an intervention which has been provided through random allocation at individual level.	The Intervention has been evaluated more than once and its effectiveness is assessed through more than one RCT showing high level of statistical analysis and reporting high quality of evidence	A series of studies which conduct RCT on a particular intervention programme. Studies that take into account the following criteria: <i>i)</i> a fair independent evaluation has to be conducted; <i>ii)</i> transferability and generalisability of the programme; <i>iii)</i> statistical power of the analysis; <i>iv)</i> minimum bias	Same challenges of level 6 apply here. To improve conduct Meta-analysis or Systematic reviews of RCT which compares results from various numbers of studies involving experimental analysis.

3. Global Score

The overall performance rating takes both scores into consideration alongside any other supporting material.

