Throughout decades of creativity research, a range of creativity training programs have been developed, tested, and analyzed. In 2004 Scott and colleagues published a meta-analysis of all creativity training programs to date, and the review presented here sat out to identify and analyze studies published since the seminal 2004 review. Focusing on quantitative studies of creativity training programs for adults, our systematic review resulted in 22 publications. All studies were analyzed, but comparing the reported effectiveness of training across studies proved difficult due to methodological inconsistencies, variations in reporting of results as well as types of measures used. Thus a consensus for future studies is called for to answer the question: Which elements make one creativity training program more effective than another? This is a question of equal relevance to academia and industry, as creativity training is a tool that can contribute to enhancement of organizational creativity and subsequently innovation. However, to answer the question, future studies of creativity training programs need to be carefully designed to contribute to a more transparent landscape. Thus this paper proposes a methodological research standard consisting of three criteria, to which researchers can look when designing future studies of the effectiveness of creativity training.