Scaling an Effective Intervention

How to Build Implementation Capacity, Replicate with Fidelity, and Produce Consistent Outcomes

Audio will be broadcast over your computer speakers. A dial in number available upon request.
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## Implementation Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Expert Impl. Team</th>
<th>NO Impl. Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>80%, 3 Yrs</td>
<td>14%, 17 Yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective use of Implementation Practice &amp; Science</td>
<td>Letting it Happen</td>
<td>Helping it Happen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHO**

- Fixsen, Blase, Timbers, & Wolf, 2001
- Saldana & Chamberlain, 2012
- Balas & Boren, 2000
- Green, 2008
# Implementation Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Drivers</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
<td>1.89*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.50*</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.73*</td>
<td>1.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf. Assessment</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSDS</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac. Administration</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Intervention</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.86*</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Average Composite Score

- **Score**: 1.1
- **Fidelity (% of cases)**: 18%
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- **Score**: 1.68*
- **Fidelity (% of cases)**: 83%
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Implementation Assessment

http://implementation.fpg.unc.edu/resources/implementation-drivers-assessing-best-practices
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent are best practices being used?</th>
<th>In Place</th>
<th>Partially In Place</th>
<th>Not In Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Accountability</strong> for performance assessment measurement and reporting system is clear (e.g. a lead person is designated and supported)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transparent Processes – <strong>Proactive staff orientation</strong> to the process and procedures used for performance assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Performance assessment measures are <strong>highly correlated</strong> with (predictive of) intended outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Performance assessments are <strong>conducted on a regular basis</strong> for each practitioner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The organization has a practical and efficient performance assessment measurement and reporting system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Performance assessment measures extend beyond the measurement of context and content to <strong>competence</strong> (e.g. competency requires observation).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Use of <strong>multiple data sources</strong> (e.g. practitioners, supervisors, consumers).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Positive <strong>recognition</strong> processes in place for participation (e.g. performance assessment is seen as a source of data to improve quality; not a punitive process).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Performance assessments of practitioners are used to assess the effectiveness of coaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are best practices being used?</td>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>Partially In Place</td>
<td>Not In Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Accountability for development and monitoring of quality and timeliness of coaching services is clear (e.g. there is a lead person who is accountable for assuring coaching is occurring as planned)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Coaches are fluent in the innovation(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is a written Coaching Service Delivery Plan (where, when, with whom, why)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coaches use multiple sources of information for feedback to practitioners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches directly observe practitioners using the innovations(s) (in person, audio, video)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches review records to obtain information to inform coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching information is obtained from interviews with others associated with the practitioner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Accountability structure and processes for Coaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to Coaching Service Delivery Plan is regularly reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence that practitioners’ abilities to deliver the intervention routinely improve as a result of coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMPETENCY DRIVER - Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent are best practices being used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Place</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Accountability</strong> for development and monitoring of quality and timeliness of training services <strong>is clear</strong> (e.g. lead person designated and supported)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Timely</strong> (criteria: Training occurs <strong>before</strong> the person attempts to or is required to use the new program or practice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Skill-based</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior Rehearsals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Qualified Rehearsal Leaders who are <strong>Content Experts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practice critical interactions skills to feel confident and competent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Trainers</strong> have been trained and coached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Outcome data collected and analyzed (pre and post testing) of knowledge and/or skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Performance assessment measures</strong> collected and analyzed related to training (e.g. schedule, content, processes, qualification of trainers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Feed Forward of pre/post data to Coaches/ Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Feedback of pre/post data to Selection and Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCY DRIVER - Recruitment and Selection of Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are best practices being used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Accountability</strong> for development and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of quality and timeliness of selection services is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear (e.g. lead person designated and supported)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Job description</strong> clarity re: accountability and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Pre-Requisites</strong> for employment are related to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“new practices” and expectations (e.g. basic group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management skills)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Interactive Interview Process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral vignettes and Behavior Rehearsals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of <strong>ability to accept feedback</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of <strong>ability to change own behavior</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Interviewers</strong> who understand the skills and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abilities needed and can assess applicants accurately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. A regular process is in place to feed forward</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interview data to training staff &amp; administrators &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coaches (integration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. A regular process is in place to feedback</strong> from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exit interviews, training data, turnover data, opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of administrators &amp; coaches, and staff evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data to evaluate effectiveness of this Driver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISTRICT CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

WHO

Teams

HOW

Drivers
DISTRICT CAPACITY ASSESSMENT
Active Implementation Frameworks

- Usable Interventions
- Implementation Stages
- Implementation Drivers
- Improvement Cycles
- Implementation Teams
Upcoming Webinar

November 11, 2014, 3 pm EST
Growing Smart: How an Organization Teaching “Heart Smarts” is Scaling Effectively
• Bridget Laird, CEO, WINGS for Kids
• Laura Brock, Evaluator & Assistant Professor in Teacher Education, College of Charleston

Register at www.performwell.org.

January 2015
Join PerformWell, the National Human Services Assembly and FrameWorks Institute to learn what efforts can build greater public understanding of and support for policies and programs that improve the effectiveness of the human services field.
Q&A

Speaker: ________________

Dr. Dean Fixsen
Founder, National Implementation Research Network (NIRN)
Co-Director, State Implementation and Scaling up of Evidence-based Practice Center (SISEP)
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Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute  
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