

Aligning Evidence-based Clearinghouses with Non-Regulatory ESSA Tiers of Evidence

Clearinghouse Characteristics

Clearinghouse	Focus Areas	Types of studies included	Criteria factored into ratings	How conflicting outcomes are handled	Contextual information provided
What Works Clearinghouse (Institute for Education Sciences)	Academic, behavioral, student subgroups, teacher excellence, dropout prevention, postsecondary success	Experimental (RCTs) and Quasiexperimental designs, including Regression Discontinuity Designs (RDD) and Single Case Designs (SCD)	Strength of the study methodology (design, outcome requirements, confounding factors)	They are reported in intervention reports, but do not factor into ratings.	Intervention report and evidence snapshot pages provide sample size, setting, and student demographic breakdowns for each intervention.
Top Tier Evidence (Coalition for Evidence-based Policy)	All areas of social policy: Early childhood, K-12 & postsecondary education, employment/training, health, community, international development	RCTs only	Design, implementation fidelity, setting, magnitude of effect with sustained benefits, replicability	Interventions require "no strong countervailing evidence"— evidence of negative effect or absence of effect from a well- conduced RCT.	Evidence summaries (~ 4-10 pages) provide sample sizes, settings, benefit/cost information, and demographics
Blueprints Programs (Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development)	Programs designed to reduce antisocial behavior, and promote healthy youth development	Experimental (RCTs) and Quasiexperimental designs	Design, implementation, dissemination, magnitude of effect with sustained	Interventions require "an absence of iatrogenic effects for intervention participants"; in	Sample sizes provided in detailed evaluation abstracts, provide searchable dashboard by

Clearinghouse	Focus Areas	Types of studies included	Criteria factored into ratings	How conflicting outcomes are handled	Contextual information provided
	and adult maturity.		benefits,	other words, no	outcomes, target
	Specific outcomes in		replicability	harmful effects on	population, program
	the areas of problem			specified Blueprint	specifics,
	behavior, education,			outcomes, either as a	risk/protective
	emotional well-			whole or for any	factors. Some
	being, physical			subgroups	programs have
	health, & positive				cost/benefit data.
	relationships.				



ESSA Tiers of Evidence				
Strong Evidence	Moderate Evidence	Promising Evidence	Demonstrates a Rationale	
 Well designed & implemented experimental study (RCT, RDD, SCD) Significant favorable effect on relevant outcome No overriding negative effects from causal studies Large, multisite sample Overlaps with population 	 Well designed & implemented QED or RCT with high attrition Significant favorable effect on relevant outcome No overriding negative effects from causal studies Large, multisite sample Overlaps with population 	 Well designed & implemented correlational study or well designed & implemented RCT or QED without a large/multisite sample Statistical controls for selection bias Significant favorable effect on relevant outcome No overriding negative effects from causal studies 	Well specified logic model An effort to study the effects is currently or soon to be underway	

Alignment of Clearinghouses with ESSA Evidence Tiers

Clearinghouse	Study/Program ratings	Criteria	Alignment with Every Student Succeeds Act Evidence Tiers
What Works Clearinghouse	Meets standards without reservations	 Well designed, well implemented experimental study with low attrition Well-designed, well-implemented Regression Discontinuity Design (RDD) 	If positive effects with large multisite sample = Strong Evidence . If positive effects without large multisite sample = Promising Evidence
	Meets standards with reservations	Well designed, well implemented quasi- experimental design with baseline equivalence (or an RCT with high attrition, can be reviewed as a quasi-experimental design)	If positive effects with large multisite sample = Moderate Evidence . If positive effects without large multisite sample = Promising Evidence
Top Tier Evidence	Top Tier	 Well designed, well implemented RCTs in replicable setting. Large, sustained effects. Must be multi-site. 	If sample size is 350 or more for studnets or 50 or more for groups = Strong Evidence If sample size is smaller than parameters above = Promising Evidence
	Near Top Tier	• Meet most Top Tier standards, only need one additional step to qualify (such as replication).	Promising Evidence
Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development	Model + Programs	 At least two high quality RCTs or one RCT and one QED Significant sustained positive impact on intended outcomes, No evidence of negative effects, Intervention specificity, outcomes, risk/protective factors, and logic model all specifically described. 	If large/multisite sample = Strong Evidence If no sample size information is available or sample is not large/multisite = Promising Evidence

REL Midwest

Clearinghouse Study/Program ratings		Criteria	Alignment with Every Student Succeeds Act Evidence Tiers
		Results have been independently replicated	
	Model Programs	 At least two high quality RCTs or one RCT and one QED, Significant sustained positive impact on intended outcomes, No evidence of negative effects, Intervention specificity, outcomes, risk/protective factors, and logic model all specifically described. 	If large/multisite sample = Strong Evidence If no sample size information is available or sample is not large/multisite = Promising Evidence
	Promising Programs	 One high quality RCT or two high quality QEDs Significant positive impact on intended outcomes No evidence of negative effects Intervention specificity, outcomes, risk/protective factors, and logic model all specifically described. 	If large/multisite sample and RCT = Strong Evidence If large/multisite sample and 2 QEDs = Moderate Evidence If no sample size information is available or sample is not large/multisite = Promising Evidence