NOTICE: This version of the Program Scoring Instrument was replaced by [CrimeSolutions.gov Program Scoring Instrument Version 2.0](#) in September 2017.

Instructions: Please carefully assess the program in terms of the conceptual framework. **The reviewer should complete Part 1 only once for each program,** regardless of the number of studies to be reviewed. Complete this section by using the pertinent information from the studies and any other program materials you have received. Please record your answers on this form.

PROGRAM NAME:

REVIEWER'S NAME_____ DATE OF REVIEW_____

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

A. *PRIOR RESEARCH* assesses the degree to which previous empirical evidence (formal evaluations and meta-analyses) supports the conceptual framework of *comparable* programs. It is important to note that the scope of comparable programs will vary by program. For instance, Multisystemic Therapy (MST) has undergone numerous evaluations, thus the scope of comparable programs can be narrowed to consist solely of MST rather than include the other family-based treatment models. On the other hand, a program such as the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) is unlikely to have been the subject of repeated evaluation. In this case, the scope of comparable programs can be widened to include other similar community-based policing programs. *(Notes: A meta-analysis will typically include five or more studies on a single practice. Consequently, if a meta-analysis provides evidence to support the program, the research base should receive the highest score. Also note: an independent evaluator is **NOT** required for consideration, but specify the association between the program and evaluator [if known].)*

CHECK	POINTS	DESCRIPTION
	3 =	High (5 or more other studies, or 1 meta-analysis, provide evidence in support of the program).
	2 =	Medium (2 to 4 other studies provide evidence in support of the program).
	1 =	Low (1 other study provides evidence in support of the program).
	0 =	None (No other studies provide evidence in support of the program).

Program-Evaluator Association:

Notes:

B. *THEORETICAL BASE* measures the degree to which the program is based on a well-articulated, conceptually sound program theory. Some programs are designed with little regard to conceptual development other than an implicit appeal to common sense. Instead, a program should provide an explanation of why and how it is expected to achieve its intended results and should be supported by prior conceptual development and empirical research.

CHECK	POINTS	DESCRIPTION
	3 =	Program theory is fully described and conceptually sound.
	2 =	Program theory is adequately described and appears conceptually sound.
	1 =	Very little information is provided about program theory, but it may be conceptually sound.
	0 =	No information about program theory or program theory is invalid.

Notes:

C. *PROGRAM DESCRIPTION* rates the degree to which the program details are described. A full and thorough description should serve as a guide for the implementation of the program. It would include the following information: 1) the logic of the program, 2) the details of all key components, 3) the frequency and duration of the program activities, 4) the targeted population, 5) the targeted behavior(s) (i.e., the intent of the program), and 6) the setting. The rating should reflect the degree to which the provided materials afford an adequate program description and/or direct the reader to references containing such a description.

CHECK	POINTS	DESCRIPTION
	3 =	All program details are specified.
	2 =	Most program details are specified.
	1 =	Some program details are specified.
	0 =	No program details are specified.

Notes: Please specify the targeted population, the targeted behaviors, and the key elements of the program:

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK SCORING TABLE		
	Prior Research Points	
+	Theoretical Base Points	
+	Program Description Points	
=	TOTAL	
/	NUMBER OF ITEMS	3
=	CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK SCORE	