

NREPP READINESS FOR DISSEMINATION REVIEW DOCUMENTATION GUIDELINES

To address the RFD criteria, program developers should consider the information in the following table and ensure the materials are available for review by NREPP. This documentation is not requested at the time of submission.

RFD Criterion	Factors Contributing to Reviewer Ratings	Examples of Documentation
<p><i>Availability of implementation materials</i></p>	<p>Availability and accessibility of all information and materials required for successful implementation by potential implementers</p> <p>Note: Materials that are of high general quality will receive higher ratings on this criterion.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Manuals, guidebooks, workbooks, curricula, and videos ▶ Outline of core components required to implement the program ▶ Description of target participants ▶ Qualifications required for implementers ▶ Description of the organizational structures that must be in place to implement the program effectively, with guidance for ensuring organizational readiness for implementation
<p><i>Availability of training and support resources</i></p>	<p>Availability and accessibility of the training necessary to support implementation by potential implementers</p> <p>The level of technical assistance, consultation, and/or other developer support available to ensure implementation success at new sites</p> <p>Note: Training and support that are of high general quality will receive higher ratings on this criterion.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Description of training available to implementers, including locations (e.g., on site, off site, online), frequency, and type (e.g., initial, booster, clinician, supervisor) ▶ Explanation, if not evident from materials, of how new implementers learn about training and support opportunities ▶ Materials used in training (e.g., training agenda, PowerPoint presentation, trainers manual, participant materials, videos, handouts, recommended readings, activity outlines) ▶ Description of technical assistance, consultation, and/or coaching available to new implementers, including format (e.g., phone, email, off site, on site), source (e.g., program developer, developer proxy, source unregulated by developer), and level of support (e.g., brief questions answered, comprehensive coaching system, content of support varying on the basis of the site’s needs) ▶ Outside resources for implementation development (e.g., related trainings, Web forum for communication for implementers across sites)

RFD Criterion	Factors Contributing to Reviewer Ratings	Examples of Documentation
<i>Availability of quality assurance procedures</i>	Provision of tools to support outcome measurement and to ensure fidelity at new implementation sites, along with clear guidance for use of the tools Note: Tools and quality assurance systems that are of high general quality will receive higher ratings on this criterion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Full outcome and fidelity measures created for use by implementers ▶ Protocol for using measures (e.g., who administers the measures, when they are administered, how they are administered, to whom they are administered) ▶ Guidance for using data to improve program delivery ▶ Description of any other program component that contributes to quality assurance (e.g., required training, required evaluation support, site certification by developer, computerized program delivery, highly scripted manual)

Descriptive Information Component	Information Needed
<i>Implementation history</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Year of first implementation ▶ Approximate number of sites (e.g., schools, clinics, practices, organizations, agencies) that have implemented the intervention ▶ Approximate number of clients (e.g., individuals, families, couples, communities) who have received or participated in the intervention and the unit used to define the client ▶ List of States and/or U.S. territories where the intervention has been implemented ▶ List of all countries outside the United States where the intervention has been implemented ▶ Approximate number of implementations that have been evaluated (1) in the United States and (2) internationally ▶ Note: Descriptions are required for international studies, along with citations for any published articles or reports.
<i>Costs</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Itemized costs for all materials and services provided to support implementation ▶ Yes or no: Is each item required for implementation?

Program developers are expected to submit dissemination materials in the format in which they are disseminated to the public. For example, if materials are sent to interested implementers by email, these materials should be sent to NREPP via email when requested; if materials are disseminated in hardcopy format, program developers should be prepared to submit three copies of these materials to support the RFD review (one copy for each reviewer and one copy for NREPP staff). Two copies will be returned after the review, with one remaining in the NREPP internal review library.

Developers of programs with voluminous materials may choose to submit a representative sample of materials for review. NREPP staff will provide further guidance to program developers who choose to submit in this fashion.

The RFD review assesses the ability of the developer to disseminate the intervention to the public to support implementation success. RFD reviewers do not assess the appropriateness and content of each individual dissemination component; rather, they assess the ability of each component to contribute to a successful overall dissemination package. For this reason, research articles documenting the development of materials, information on the theoretical background of the intervention, or assessments of the reliability and validity of quality assurance tools are not relevant for this portion of the review.