

## Evidence Scoring Guide

This guide’s primary goal is to support agencies in identifying if their package is 0, 1, 2, etc. on the evidence scale. Please use the following grid as a checklist to identify how the evidence provided in your decision package aligns with the RI Evidence Scale. The criteria listed below are primarily intended to be a **guide** in helping to score your decision package; it may not cover all relevant examples. In these cases, we encourage you to use your best judgment to apply the criteria as it applies but still base the rating you give your package on the evidence you believe is available. If doing so, please be sure to clearly articulate this rationale in your decision package.

| Rating  | Criteria  |
|---|---|
| <b>N/A</b><br><b>(Not Applicable)</b>             | <b>(N/A) Falls into one of the criteria listed below</b> <i>(select at least one)</i> :   |
|   | You want to shift the amount of federal funds used to fund the initiative.  |
|   | You want to shift funds internally or to another agency and this requires approval but does not inherently change the structure of the initiative.  |
|   | Your agency is requesting an increase to existing fees to generate more revenue and can reasonably argue this will not lead to any changes to services provided or impacts to the public. |
| <b>0</b><br><b>(Evidence of negative impacts)</b> | <b>(0) Includes any of the following</b> <i>(select at least one)</i> :   |
|   | The program shows evidence of negative outcomes on identified populations or evidence of null (zero) impacts.   |
|   | The package is cutting program costs and you can describe how this will lead to potentially negative long-term outcomes.  |
| <b>1</b><br><b>(Theory-based)</b>                 | <b>(1) Includes any of the following pieces of evidence</b> <i>(select at least one)</i> :  |
|   | An audit, process evaluation, or other studies of current operations showing that a lack of resources is leading to reduced outcomes.   |
|   | There is at least one example of a pilot program of the intervention showing success, but it was not rigorously studied.  |
|   | There is a reasonable argument your agency can lay out for why the initiative should be tested.   |
| <b>2</b><br><b>(Theory-Based +)</b>               | <b>(2) Includes either of the following:</b> <i>(select at least one)</i> :   |
|   | Your agency can show internal data collected over time tying the intervention in question to positive outcomes.   |
|   | Your agency can clearly communicate how funding the program in Rhode Island is connected to positive outcomes for participants and/or the public.   |

|                                       |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>3</b><br><b>(Promising)</b>        | <b>(3) Includes either of the following (select at least one):</b>         |  |
|                                       |  | There is at least one piece of available evidence of the intervention being rigorously studied, (most often through a randomized controlled trial, but also other quasi-experimental methods), and this study shows a causal link between participation and positive outcomes.   |
|                                       |  | In the case of expanding an existing initiative, the intervention has a robust amount of internal data directly tracking key performance indicators over time that are associated with positive outcomes for the public. This can be supplemented with studies from other States showing similar correlations.   |
| <b>4</b><br><b>(Promising +)</b>      | <b>(4) Includes either of the following (select at least one section):</b> |  |
|                                       |  | You can link to evidence of the intervention being rigorously studied, (most often through a randomized controlled trial), and this study shows a causal link between participation and positive outcomes. And one of the following:<br>1. You can provide reference to additional case studies or a pre-post comparison to support this study.<br>2. In the case of expanding an initiative, you can supplement a rigorous study with robust internal data directly tracking performance metrics over time proving its success. |
|                                       |  | There is only one study available showing the initiative is causally efficacious, but this was done locally and so proves that it is successful in the State of Rhode Island. There is evidence that the program scales up well and does not have diminishing returns from additional dollars invested.  |
| <b>5</b><br><b>(Proven Effective)</b> | <b>(5) Includes either of the following (select at least one section):</b> |  |
|                                       |  | Multiple studies are available showing the intervention leads to positive outcomes, and the design of the intervention is replicable in Rhode Island.  |
|                                       |  | The intervention has already been proven successful with a rigorous causal evaluation in Rhode Island and there is evidence from other geographies showing it scales up well.  |