Evidence-Based Practice Clearinghouse Review Process

Introduction

The purpose of this document is to provide the process the Iowa Department of Education (Department) used to develop the Reviewed List of Nationally Peer-Reviewed Clearinghouses of Evidence-Based Interventions resource for schools. The resource provides schools with clearinghouses meeting established criteria for evidence-based practices or programs (EBPs) that address unfinished learning (federally referred to as "learning loss") caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and respond to students' social, emotional, mental health, and academic needs, as detailed by the evidence-based American Rescue Plan Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ARP ESSER or ESSER III) guidance, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Clearinghouse Review Criteria

Clearinghouses were reviewed based on the following five criteria:

(a) *Does the clearinghouse address at least one of the ESSA or ESSER III domains (i.e., Unfinished Learning, Literacy, Mathematics, Mental Health, Graduation, Drop Out, Transition, Subgroup Needs, Disproportionality, Achievement Gaps, Attendance or Absenteeism)?*
The review process did not specifically review each listed program reported in the clearinghouse for accuracy but identified whether at least one of the listed domains was identified. Some sites offered topics for specific academic content domains, while others included a general "Education" topic. If the clearinghouse did not address at least one of the ESSA or ESSER III domains, the remaining criteria were not considered (and the clearinghouse was not recommended for use).

(b) *Does the clearinghouse indicate the targeted domains, age or grade spans, or intended outcomes?*
The clearinghouse did not need to address all of these to mark "yes," but the Department considered how ease of use could be affected. It is desirable for there to be multiple options for consideration after a clearinghouse search filter is applied.

(c) *Is the clearinghouse available to anyone with an internet connection and not restricted (i.e., available to non-members, a cost to use it)?*

(d) *Is there a potential conflict of interest for the EBPs included in the clearinghouse (e.g., preference for specific tools, other conflicting commercial interests)?*

(e) *Is there some type of standardized process that includes a quantifiable or categorical measure of effectiveness (e.g., full bubble, half-bubble, empty bubble; green, yellow, red)?*
Criterion is marked "yes" only if a clearinghouse provided some type of effectiveness data or perceived potential effectiveness. The Department did not evaluate actual effectiveness (e.g., effect size, pre- and post-performance change) between programs and interventions; it only reported if the clearinghouse provided some information about how effectiveness was evaluated.

Consensus

If, after two independent reviewers answered each question, the consensus answer to any of these items was "no," the clearinghouse was not recommended for identifying EBPs. It is possible that while not recommended for use in identifying EBPs, a clearinghouse could be helpful for other purposes.

Ease of Use

Next, an "Ease of Use" decision was made. A clearinghouse that is more usable supports school decision-making and helps schools retrieve relevant information easily. The Department considered questions, such as:

- Does the clearinghouse have a search or filter feature?
- Can programs be ordered and sorted?
- Does it include some information about cost, required training, who can implement it, or program duration?
- How easy is it to access reviews within the clearinghouse?
- Are the reviews easy to consume, or are they embedded within a lengthy technical report?

If the clearinghouse was identified as easy to use, it was marked with a "+." Those rated as less usable were marked with a "0." Please note, this review only evaluated the clearinghouse, not the programs and interventions themselves.

Date of Information

Finally, the Department considered the date of the information provided within each clearinghouse. Schools are encouraged to note how recent the review was conducted.

Clearinghouse Review Worksheet

Purpose

This worksheet may be used locally to review additional clearinghouses not listed in the Reviewed List of Nationally Peer-Reviewed Clearinghouses of Evidence-Based Interventions document:

1. <u>Identification of Clearinghouse</u>. Clearinghouse is identified or referred for potential inclusion.
2. <u>Quality Review</u>. Two or more team members with knowledge and skills to use the Clearinghouse Review Worksheet conduct a review of items (a)-(e):

Criteria	Response
(a) Does the clearinghouse provide interventions in at least one of the ESSA/ESSER III domains (i.e., Unfinished Learning, Literacy, Mathematics, Mental Health, Graduation, Drop Out, Transition, Subgroup Needs, Disproportionality Needs, Achievement Gaps, Attendance/Absenteeism)?	☐ Yes ☐ No
(b) Does the clearinghouse have an indication of the targeted domains, age or grade spans, and intended outcomes?	☐ Yes ☐ No
(c) Is this clearinghouse available to anyone with an internet connection (i.e., no membership, no registration or other fees required to view)?	☐ Yes ☐ No
(d) Is the clearinghouse free of sponsorship by a vendor and/or avoids preference for specific tools and potential conflicting commercial interest(s)?	☐ Yes ☐ No
(e) Does the clearinghouse use at least some type of standardized process that includes a quantifiable or categorical (e.g., full bubble, half-bubble) method to identify EBP effectiveness?	☐ Yes ☐ No

Iowa Department of Education guidance should be viewed as advisory unless it's specifically authorized by state statute, according to Iowa Code section 256.9A. This does not apply to administrative rules, declaratory orders, or materials required by federal law or courts.

Page | 2

Criteria	Response
(f) Is the clearinghouse easy to use? (How easy is it to navigate and filter to locate information? Does the clearinghouse include information about usability, required training, qualifications, needed materials, and/or implementation time?)	☐ More Usable ☐ Less Usable
(g) When was the clearinghouse most recently updated?	

3. <u>Ease-of-Use Review</u>. Two or more reviewers with knowledge of ease of use review item (f).
4. <u>Final Determination</u>. Use the following to establish the review determination. If:
   a. "No" to <u>any</u> criteria (a)-(e), the clearinghouse status is "***Did Not Meet Criteria***."
   b. "Yes" to <u>all</u> criteria (a)-(e) <u>and</u> "More Usable," then the clearinghouse status is "***Met Review Criteria***" and "**+**."
   c. "Yes" to <u>all</u> criteria (a)-(e) and "Less Usable," then the clearinghouse status is "***Met Review Criteria***" and "**0**."
5. <u>Clearinghouse Date</u>. Identify the date of clearinghouse development or most recent update (i.e., Criterion (g)). Information that has been kept updated is preferable.

Questions and Additional Guidance

If you have questions, please contact Kathy Bertsch at kathy.bertsch@iowa.gov. For additional guidance on ESSER III and evidence-based requirements, see the ARP Act for PK-12 Schools section of the Emergency Relief for PK-12 Schools webpage.

Iowa Department of Education guidance should be viewed as advisory unless it's specifically authorized by state statute, according to Iowa Code section 256.9A. This does not apply to administrative rules, declaratory orders, or materials required by federal law or courts.

Page | 3