

Thoughtful and Purposeful Implementation: Break Out Session

> Dale Cusumano, Ph.D. Angela Preston, Ph.D. University of North Carolina Chapel Hill

> > June 2017



## **Outcomes for this Session**

- Gain a deeper understanding of implementation science through discussion and application activities
- Identify some Opportunities for Change
- Begin thinking about Action Planning process at the end of these two days





## **Research to Practice Gap**







## Implementation....



*"What it takes for a practice to produce value for its intended beneficiaries?"* 





#### Formula for Success







Fixsen, Blase, Metz, & Van Dyke (2015)



## **Active Implementation**







## **Active Implementation**



 $\bigcirc$ 

**SISEP** 

#### **Integrated Stage-based Planning Resource**



Integrated Stage-Based Conceptual Framework Planning\*

Implementation Component	Exploration	Installation	Initial Implementation	Full Implementation
Implementation Teams	Form team; develop ways of work and communication protocol	Develop team competencies; assure resources to support innovation	Troubleshoot and problem- solve; use data at each team meeting to promote improvement	Use improvement cycles; develop and test enhancements
Data and Feedback Loops	Conduct needs assessment; determine fit and feasibility of approach; assess staff readiness	Assess infrastructure gaps; institute policy-practice feedback loops; assess team competencies	Assess usability testing data to stabilize approach; track and improve fidelity scores	Assess outcomes; collect data to support fidelity monitoring and improvement
Implementation Infrastructure	Identify necessary infrastructure elements to support practice, organizational, and system change	Develop necessary infrastructure elements to support practice, organization, and system change	Improve necessary infrastructure elements to support practice, organizational, and systems change	Maintain skillful practice' produce more efficient and/or effective infrastructure to support outcomes



Adapted from Metz, Naoom, Halle, & Bartley (2015)



## **Implementation Stages**





 $\bigcirc$ 

## **Active Implementation**



 $\bigcirc$ 



### Why an Implementation Team?



SISEP

Sources:

Fixsen, Blase, Timbers, & Wolf, 2001; Balas & Boren, 2000; Green & Seifert, 2005; Saldana & Chamberlain, 2012

anirn

## **Implementation Teams**



## **Linking Team Structure**







# Activity

## Stage-Based Planning Tool

Integrated Stage-Based Conceptual Framework Planning*						
Implementation Component	Exploration	Installation	Initial Implementation	Full Implementation		
Implementation Teams	Form team; develop ways of work and communication protocol	Develop team competencies; assure resources to support innovation	Troubleshoot and problem- solve; use data at each team meeting to promote improvement	Use improvement cycles; develop and test enhancements		
Data and Feedback Loops	Conduct needs assessment; determine fit and feasibility of approach; assess staff readiness	Assess infrastructure gaps; institute policy-practice feedback loops; assess team competencies	Assess usability testing data to stabilize approach; track and improve fidelity scores	Assess outcomes; collect data to support fidelity monitoring and improvement		
Implementation Infrastructure	Identify necessary infrastructure elements to support practice, organizational, and system change	Develop necessary infrastructure elements to support practice, organization, and system change	Improve necessary infrastructure elements to support practice, organizational, and systems change	Maintain skillful practice' produce more efficient and/or effective infrastructure to support outcomes		

#### At your respective table:

- 1. Think about your current work and choose a major initiative/practice you are leading.
- 2. Review the stage based planning tool.
- 3. What activities might you need to revisit? What are 1-2 right next steps?
- 4. Discuss results of your review with your colleagues.

#### **Active Implementation**



anirn

## **Usable Innovations**



## **Usable Innovation**



## **Hexagon Tool**





## Hexagon Tool

## Need

## Capacity

What is needed to **sustain** outcomes?

What is our **need**? How well does the program address our (student, family, system) needs?

## Fit

How does this **fit** with current **initiatives**, priorities, values?

## Readiness

Is this ready for replication? What will it take to **scale** with fidelity? What do **effectiveness** and **efficiency** studies tell us? Can we expect the same?

**Evidence** 

## Resources

Do we have **resources** for needed **training**, coaching, data systems, supports, etc.?



## Hexagon Tool







## **Active Implementation**



 $\bigcirc$ 



## What are Implementation Drivers?

Drivers Support and maintain successful implementation of an EBP

Drivers support and initiate change at all levels

**Drivers = Infrastructure** 

**Drivers done well = Fidelity** 

Improve competence and confidence, create systems that enable the innovation to be implemented with fidelity



Fixsen et al., 2005



#### **Implementation Drivers**





### **Implementation Drivers**



## Assessing Capacity to Implement





District Capacity Assessment



Implementation Drivers: Assessing Best Practice

Na tional Implementation Science Network (NIRN Version 1-1

Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institu UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA CHAPEL HIL



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill



## **Active Implementation**









#### Get started...

#### Get better

## **Rapid Cycle Problem Solving**



Shewhart (1931); Deming (1986); Taylor et al. (2014)





## **Usability Testing**

A **planned series** of tests of an innovation or of implementation processes that **test** the **feasibility and impact** of a new way of work prior to rolling out more broadly





## **Usability Testing Example**

## Break Out Activity for Initial Implementation: PDSA Case Study

State Implementation & Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices

#### onirr

#### Case Study: PDSA Cycles

PDSA cycles are fundamental to the work of implementation Teams with the intentional use of data for decision-making. Implementation Teams use PDSA cycles to help them make meaningful changes, alleviate barriers, and achieve expected outcomes. We often start by getting clear about what we want to do; then we make a plan (PLAN), engage in behavior as planned (DO), evaluate (STUDY) how effective our behavior was, then we make more plans based on how well we did (ACT). In a team setting, these roles and functions may be performed by different team members.

#### Instructions

This case provides an example of an approach to developing the necessary implementation supports for a evidence based practice for socio-emotional functioning. Review the case example, then go through the discussion questions yourself and then with your group.

#### Case Example

A large school district in an urban area recently noted an increased rate over the past two years in student behavior challenges across its preschool and kindergarten classrooms. This concerned the district greatly. Staff, children and families are frustrated with the current process for supporting children with challenging behaviors and wanted to ensure effective strategies were put into place to keep all staff and children safe.

With support from their local TA provider, the district formed an Implementation Team to focus on this issue. The TA provider helped the center form their team by providing guidance about the function and role of the team, identifying who would be most important to be on the team, and assuring team members had the time and resources to meet. The TA Provider worked with the team to explore a number of comprehensive strategies to promote positive behavior and social-emotional health for children in order to promote safety and meet standards.

The Implementation Team decided to implement an evidence-based practice to support positive behaviors as part of the center's approach to discipline. The team selected the evidence-based practice based on a number of factors, including its evidence base and alignment with the needs of the center, chidren and families, readiness for replication, and available resources to support implementation. The practice has previously been used in other similar large districts, and there are alfordable training and materials available from a local intermediary. However, the practice does not provide ongoing supervision, or data collection support; the team has also identified the need to revise some of its district policies in order to align with the practice and standard expectations.

The implementation Team has now moved into thinking about how to install the necessary supports and align center policies with the new practice and standards. The implementation team identified selection criteria for 2-3 schools to participate in the first cohort. Selection criteria for the schools included diversity of need, variety in size and populations served. Based on selection criteria, the schools' leadership and staff were engaged in a series of meetings with the district's implementation team members to exchange information regarding the initiative to assess need, fit, and readiness for the work of adopting, implementing, and sustaining this initiative. As a result of these exploration activities, two schools were "mutually selected" for the work. The district's implementation team engaged in a debrief process after each exploration were insetting with school's leadership to determine effectiveness of activities, identify changes and implications for future meetings with that school, as well as implications and changes with subsequent schools.

The implementation team then executed their training plan for the selected for the selected schools and began to collect fidelity data on a weekly basis. The team was still determining the necessary coaching supports and how to provide them. Following the training and after collection of 4 data points, the implementation team met and determined specific changes needed to training and scheduled a follow up training session. They also identified implications for the coaching supports in development.





## What is next? Activities



ənirn



## **Voices from the Field**



Have you used a stage-based approach for implementation of an early childhood initiative?

How has the approach facilitated your work as a systems leader in your respective agency?

From a systems perspective, how does use of a stage-based approach address equity for your service beneficiaries?





# **Take Away Question**

# What does this look like in early childhood education?





# **Resources for Further Inquiry**

## **Evidence-based Implementation**

Implementation Research: A Synthesis of the Literature



Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M. & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation Research: A Synthesis of the Literature*. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, The National Implementation Research Network



HTTP://NIRN.FPG.UNC.EDU



#### NIRN | AI HUB | SISEP

Search

# The National Implementation Research Network's HUB Active Implementation Hub

Modules and Lessons Site Help Resource Library Workgroups Home Get Started A set of quick start videos and guides developed to help you and your team get started with Active Implementation. Implementation The Al Hub Learning Quick Start (see more) Quick Start (see more) Quick Start (see more) Video Introduction (see more) Video Introduction (see more) Learning Plan (see more) Get Better Learning materials, tools and work spaces designed to give you and your team deeper dives into Active Implementation Modules & Lessons **Resource Library** Workgroups A searchable listing of evaluation & An area to help groups work together to Self-paced content, activities and assessments designed to promote the planning tools, handouts, activites and learn, try and apply new active knowledge and practice of implementation implementation skills. more. science and scaling-up. Go there > Go there > Go there >

http://implementation.fpg.unc.edu/

The Active Implementation Hub is a free, online learning environment for use by any stakeholder practitioners, educators. coaches, trainers. purveyors involved in active implementation and scaling up of programs and innovations.





## www.scalingup.org







For more on Implementation Science <u>http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu</u> <u>www.globalimplementation.org</u>

## **Outcomes for Today**

- **Refresh** thinking about **effective implementation**
- Gain an understanding of how to assess capacity to develop
  Implementation Drivers using the District Capacity Assessment (DCA)
- Gain an understanding of how to assess capacity to develop a system of support for districts using the Regional Capacity Assessment (RCA)
- Define **next steps**





## For more information

#### Allison Metz, Ph.D.

Allison. metz@unc.edu

#### Dean L. Fixsen, Ph.D.

dean.fixsen@unc.edu



Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute

**University of North Carolina** 

**Chapel Hill, NC** 

http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/ www.scalingup.org www.globalimplementation.org





Aladjem, D. K., & Borman, K. M. (2006, April). *Summary of Findings from the National Longitudinal Evaluation of Comprehensive School Reform.* Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Balas EA, Boren SA. Yearbook of Medical Informatics: Managing Clinical Knowledge for Health Care Improvement. Stuttgart, Germany: Schattauer Verlagsgesellschaft mbH; 2000.

Carpenter, W. A. (2000). Ten years of silver bullets: Dissenting thoughts on education reform. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 81(5), 383-389.

Fixsen, D., Blase, K., Metz, A., & Van Dyke, M. (2013). Statewide implementation of evidence-based programs. *Exceptional Children (Special Issue), 79(2), 213-230.* 

Nutt, P. (2002). Why decisions fail: Avoiding the blunders and traps that lead to debacles. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers Inc.

Fixsen, D. L., Blase, K. A., Timbers, G. D., & Wolf, M. M. (2001). In search of program implementation: 792 replications of the Teaching-Family Model. In G. A. Bernfeld, D. P. Farrington & A. W. Leschied (Eds.), *Offender rehabilitation in practice: Implementing and evaluating effective programs* (pp. 149-166). London: Wiley.



Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M., & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, National Implementation Research Network. (FMHI Publication No. 231).* 

Girard, N. J. (2013). Nurse Staffing Ratios. AORN Journal, 97(5), 604-538. doi: <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aorn.2013.02.01">http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aorn.2013.02.01</a>.

Green, L. W. (2008). Making research relevant: if it is an evidence-based practice, where's the practice-based evidence? *Family Practice*, 25, 20-24.

Grigg, W. S., Daane, M. C., Jin, Y., & Campbell, J. R. (2003). The nation's report card: Reading 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.

Hidden curriculum (2014, August 26). In S. Abbott (Ed.), The glossary of education reform. Retrieved from <a href="http://edglossary.org/hidden-curriculum">http://edglossary.org/hidden-curriculum</a>

Higgins, M., Weiner, J., & Young, L. (2012). Implementation teams: A new lever for organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior. Retrieved from doi:10.1002/job.1773* 



Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). Student achievement through staff development (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kozol, J. (2005). The shame of the nation: The restoration of apartheid schooling in America (1st ed.). New York: Crown Publishers.

Kutner, M., Greenberg, E., Jin, Y., Boyle, B., Hsu, Y., & Dunleavy, E. (2007). Literacy in everyday life: Results from the 2003 National Assessment of Adult Literacy (NCES 2007–480). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/subject/publications/main2012/pdf/2013456.pdf

Prevalence and Implementation Fidelity of Research-Based Prevention Programs in Public Schools: Final Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Regional School District Organization <u>http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/regional</u>





Saldana, L., & Chamberlain, P. (2012). Supporting implementation: The role of community development teams to build infrastructure. *American Journal of Community Psychology. doi: 10.1007/s10464-012-9503-0* 

Tyack, D., & Cuban, C. (1995). Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ulrich, W. M. (2002). Legacy systems: Transformation strategies. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall PTR.

U.S. Department of Education Office of Planning Evaluation and Policy Development and Policy and Program Studies Service. (2011).

Vernez, G., Karam, R., Mariano, L. T., & DeMartini, C. (2006). *Evaluating comprehensive school reform models at scale: Focus on implementation*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.





#### ©Copyright Dean Fixsen and Karen Blase

This content is licensed under Creative Commons license CC BY-NC-ND, Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs. You are free to share, copy, distribute and transmit the work under the following conditions: Attribution — You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work); Noncommercial — You may not use this work for commercial purposes; No Derivative Works — You may not alter or transform this work. Any of the above conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.

http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0





