Best practice portal

Prevention

Evidence base
- Families
- School students
- Community members
- General population
- Methodology

Prevention standards and guidelines

Prevention projects in Europe (EDDRA)

Treatment

Evidence base
- Amphetamines users
- Cannabis users
- Cocaine users
- Opioid users
- Methodology

Treatment standards and guidelines

Treatment projects in Europe (EDDRA)

Harm reduction

Evidence base
- Opioid injectors
- Stimulant injectors
- Non-injecting drug users
- Methodology

Harm reduction standards and guidelines

Harm reduction projects in Europe (EDDRA)

General best practice tools and resources

Standards and guidelines

Exchange on Drug Demand Reduction Action (EDDRA)

Evaluation Instruments Bank (EIB)

Glossary of best practice terms

Related links

About EDDRA

EDDRA resources

Evaluation Instruments Bank (EIB)
A database that contains 170 evaluation instruments in the treatment field and 70 in the prevention field

Glossary of best practice terms

About EDDRA quality levels

The purpose of EDDRA is to compile evaluated practices in drug demand reduction implemented in Member States of the European Union. In order to take into account differences in the quality of evaluated practices, a set of criteria were developed in 2007. These criteria focus on the quality assessment of intervention evaluation. They are used to categorise evaluated projects according to three quality levels:

- Level 1 projects
- Level 2 projects: promising projects
- Level 3: top level projects

Level 2 and 3 are determined via a points system.

The criteria focus primarily on implementation and evaluation design based on the logic model and data collection. Criteria that help to judge the strength of the available evidence on the effectiveness of the intervention will be introduced once the majority of submitted projects are rated as promising or top level projects.

Criteria for Level 1 projects

All projects that meet the following entry criteria will be added to EDDRA:

- The project has been evaluated
- It has a theory base/assumptions that are clearly related to its objectives
- It has clear evaluation indicators in place that relate to its objectives and initial situation
- It contains a clear description of the evaluation design
- The project must be at least one year old

Level 2 and 3 EDDRA Projects

Logic model	Points	Evaluation	Points	Additional information/deliveries	Points
Specific objectives exist	1	Process evaluation*	2	Coordination with other services and programmes*	2
Specific objectives are linked to indicators	1	-		-	
Indicators reduce the objectives into one or more quantifiable dimensions	1	-		-	
Specific objectives connect to initial situation	1	-		-	
The presented results refer to the formulated objectives*	1	Outcome evaluation: Follow-up assessment	2	Instruments used for outcome evaluation are available or delivered to EMCDDA	2
Outcome evaluation results available	1	Pre-post design, no comparison group (naturalistic)	4	Instruments used for outcome evaluation are new (not yet in the EIB)	1
The working hypothesis presented links to the initial situation*	1	Pre-post design AND comparison group (quasi-experimental)	8 (12) [1]	AND are validated instrument(s)	1

Contains definitions for the terms used within EDDRA

The working hypothesis is based on evidence (references to controlled trials at least)*	2	Pre-post design AND comparison group AND randomisation (RCT)	12	Project manual is available and delivered to the EMCDDA*	2
The working hypothesis links to the specific objectives and the indicators*	2	Outcome evaluation with modified instrument based on a validated instrument	2	-	
Activities (programme contents) fit to objectives*	1	Outcome evaluation with validated instrument	4	-	
Activities fit to objectives and working hypothesis*	1	-		-	
Max. sum of points	13	Max. sum of points	18	Max. sum of points	8

* Criteria that can be met also by process evaluations. The points system is arranged in a way that also projects that only conducted a process evaluation can achieve the required points to become a level 2 (promising) project.

1 if this is the best feasible design for that setting

Cut-off points for level 2 and level 3
Cut-off point for level 2: >12 (“Promising project”)
Cut-off point for level 3: >28 (“Top level” projects)

Sine qua non criteria for level 3: RCT (if not feasible: quasi experimental and validated instruments)