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The Parenting Programme Evaluation Tool (PPET) has been developed with reference to international standards of best practice in the delivery of early intervention and prevention programmes (see Appendix 1 for a review of this evidence).

These standards indicate that good quality parenting programmes contain several key elements:

1. They clearly specify their targeted population and include explicit processes to ensure that appropriate families (as determined by their level of need or risk) can be recruited into and participate in the programme.
2. The content (what information parents learn) and processes (how information is delivered to parents) of the programme are based on an explicit and sound theoretical framework.
3. They have carefully considered and detailed the training, supervision and implementation procedures that will allow the programme to be readily set up and implemented in new and independent settings.
4. They have robust evidence that participation in the programme results in positive, substantial and long-lasting gains for parents (and/or their children).

The PPET can be used to determine the quality of parenting programmes or approaches delivered in England. A Quality Rating (QR) can be calculated for a programme by assessing how closely it meets the standards or criteria for a quality parenting programme. Within each element, programmes can be evaluated on a scale ranging from 4 (high level of match with the criteria) to 0 (low level of match with the criteria).

This document summarises the key criteria and rating scales for each element. Detailed explanations of each Element are contained in the Commissioning Toolkit for Parenting Programmes submission form.
Element 1:

Who is the programme/approach designed for and for what level of need?

Evaluation Criteria: Quality of the specification of the target population and matching to the programme.

Who is the programme / approach designed for?
[Description of the targeted population]

The characteristics of the participants at which the programme is aimed are clearly stated and described. Characteristics which may be specified include: parent factors (e.g. all parents or lone parents); child factors (e.g. all children aged 4-7 years or parents of children with a diagnosis of ADHD); social, cultural or economic factors (e.g. parents of Bangladeshi ethnicity).

What is the process for checking if parents are suitable for participation in the programme / approach?
[Needs analysis or assessment]

There is a process to identify the needs of parents wishing to participate in the programme that is appropriate to the characteristics of the target population. Examples of such a process may range from an informal chat at a drop-in centre or the use of a diagnostic interview. The needs of parents may be categorised by level of risk (e.g. low, moderate, high, or critical).

Based on this checking process, there is a process to determine if the parent is suitable for participation in the programme and a referral process is described for parents that are not suitable for the programme/approach.

What change is likely when parents participate in the programme?
[Expected outcomes]

Outcomes are identified for each targeted group stated above (child, parent, family and/or social, cultural or economic variables) that are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely given the target population characteristics. For example, participants will gain the knowledge and skills to manage child behaviour problems using non-punitive strategies.
What is the classification of the programme?
[Programme classification]

The overall classification of the programme is stated and this corresponds to the target population description. Universal interventions: (address the entire population of parents), targeted (focus on specific groups considered at higher risk for future problems), and specialist (focus on preventing the onset or development of problems for individuals demonstrating acute or high level needs otherwise at risk for poor outcomes). Intervention or treatment a programme or approach designed to alter the course of an existing or diagnosed problem.

All inquiries about the Commissioning Toolkit should be emailed to toolkit@kcl.ac.uk

Element 1: Rating Scale

4 – All criteria are met.
The programme/approach specifies all the criteria of best practice for this element. The target population(s) is clearly specified; the needs assessment/checking process is appropriate to the target population description; the target outcomes are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely given the target population characteristics; and the classification level matches to the target population description.

3 – Most criteria are met.
The programme/approach specifies most of the criteria of best practice for this element.

2 – Some criteria are met.
The programme/approach specifies some of the criteria of best practice for this element.

1 – A few criteria are met.
The programme/approach specifies a few of the criteria of best practice for this element.

0 – No criteria are met.
The programme/approach does not meet any of the criteria for best practice for this element.
Element 2:

What is the content of the programme and how do you deliver it?

Evaluation Criteria: Quality of the programme content and processes.

What is the theoretical framework or assumption/s that the programme is based on?
[Validity of the theoretical framework]

A strong theoretical framework/s that has support for being effective when working with the targeted parents and their children underpins both the content and the process elements of the programme. Example theories include: social learning theory, attachment theory, family systems theory.

What do parents learn during the course of the programme?
[Content of the programme]

Content components (what participants learn or develop) of the programme are directly linked to the theoretical framework. For example, a programme grounded in attachment theory principles teaches the rationale and techniques for increasing sensitive responding.

How do parents learn during the course of the programme?
[Format of the programme]

The format of the programme is clearly specified and directly linked to the theoretical framework. Factors to be reported include: method of delivery (individual, group, self, phone and online); duration of the programme; duration of contact sessions (number of hours); intervals between contact sessions; location (home; children’s centre; clinic setting; school; other specialised settings); and recommended number and credentials of practitioners required to deliver the programme.

A description of the process recommended to: engage parents; account for different learning styles; determine the success of the programme in reaching the stated outcomes; respond to poor or unexpected post-participation outcomes and respond to premature termination.
What resources are available to enable other practitioners to deliver the programme?  
[Appropriateness and adequacy of the resources]

The content and the process of the programme, including the mechanism(s) of change, can be clearly communicated to other practitioners to enable them to implement or replicate it (e.g. manual, online information, DVD material) in new and independent settings.

Element 2: Rating Scale

4 – All criteria are met.  
The programme/approach specifies all the criteria of best practice for this element. The programme/approach is based on a theoretical framework that has support for being effective when working with the targeted parents and their children; what parents learn is clearly based on the theory; the processes of how parents learn are clearly specified and comprehensive written materials are available to enable independent practitioners to implement the programme/approach.

3 – Most criteria are met.  
The programme/approach specifies most of the criteria of best practice for this element.

2 – Some criteria are met.  
The programme/approach specifies some of the criteria of best practice for this element.

1 – A few criteria are met.  
The programme/approach specifies a few of the criteria of best practice for this element.

0 – No criteria are met.  
The programme/approach does not meet any of the criteria for best practice for this element.
Element 3:

How do you train and support other practitioners to use the programme/approach most effectively and consistently in new and independent settings?

Evaluation Criteria: Quality of the implementation processes – practitioner characteristics, training, supervision and/or support, and dissemination and implementation processes.

What level of experience and qualification do practitioners need to run the programme?
The level of experience, expertise and qualification required by practitioners to deliver the programme is described in detail and is appropriate to the level of need of the population.

What training is available to instruct practitioners to be able to deliver the programme?
Systematic training is available to enable independent implementation of the programme. The format, intensity and duration of the training correspond to the complexity of the programme content and process. A mechanism is available to ensure the transfer of learning from training to implementation (i.e. accreditation procedure).

What mechanism is available to support and supervise practitioners to deliver the programme?
Appropriate supervision is available to enable independent replication of the programme. The format, intensity and duration of supervision correspond to the complexity of the programme content and process.

What mechanisms are available to support organisations wishing to implement the programme in their area?
[Capacity for dissemination]

Mechanisms are recommended to ensure the successful implementation of the programme into the existing service framework. This includes mechanisms to monitor practitioner fidelity to the programme, using proven
methods. For example, practitioner adherence to the programme questionnaire,

**Element 3: Rating Scale**

4 – **All criteria are met.**
The programme/approach meets all the criteria of best practice for this element. The characteristics practitioners should have to deliver the programme/approach are clearly specified and appropriate to the level of need of the target population; systematic training is available to enable independent implementation of the programme and this corresponds to the complexity of the programme; the format of practitioner supervision is described and this corresponds to the complexity of the programme; and other mechanisms are recommended to ensure the successful implementation of the programme/approach in a new and independent setting.

3 – **Most criteria are met.**
The programme/approach meets most of the criteria of best practice for this element.

2 – **Some criteria are met.**
The programme/approach meets some of the criteria of best practice for this element.

1 – **A few criteria are met.**
The programme/approach meets a few of the criteria of best practice for this element.

0 – **No criteria are met.**
The programme/approach does not meet any of the criteria for best practice for this element.
Element 4:

Element 4: What is the effect of the programme/approach on the targeted outcomes?

Evaluation Criteria: Quality of the evaluations used to prove the effectiveness of the programme in achieving its targeted outcomes.

What mechanisms are used to evaluate the outcomes of the programme? Examples of the information which will be considered:

A strong theoretical framework/s that has support for being effective when working with the targeted parents and their children underpins both the content and the process elements of the programme. Example theories include: social learning theory, attachment theory, family systems theory.

- Sample: sufficient size, description of who/what and recruitment methods.
- Design: strongest design possible to allow for causal inferences, assignment procedure (random, matched-sample).
- Outcome measures: multiple methods – direct observation, self-report, parent report, reports by other significant people; psychometrically sound (reliable and valid).
- Data collection procedures: multiple measurement periods to detect durability of results; collection independent of practitioner delivering the intervention.
- Analyses and results: attrition, appropriateness of analysis strategy, statistically significant effects, clinically significant effects.
- Replication studies.

Element 4: Rating Scale

4
An outcome evaluation has been conducted in which there is evidence that the demonstrated positive outcomes for parents and/or their children are due to the effects of the programme/approach. This is demonstrated in at least two randomised controlled trials including at least one conducted independently of the programme developer, using accepted research principles regarding sample size, outcomes measures, data collection procedures and statistical analyses.
3
An outcome evaluation has been conducted in which there is evidence that the demonstrated positive outcomes for parents and/or their children are due to the effects of the programme/approach. Positive outcomes have been demonstrated in at least one randomised controlled trial conducted by the programme developer or an independent investigator.

2
Positive change in parent and/or child outcomes has been demonstrated through scientifically validated assessment methods, collected at multiple time points for at least 20-30 families.

1
Some positive evaluation of the programme has been collected but as yet this has not included scientifically validated assessment methods across multiple time points.

0
No documented evaluation of any kind has been completed.
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