DUAL OBJECTIVES

I. Preview of Pre-Session Workshop to facilitate your table leadership.

Afternoon Objectives:

I. Describe the purposeful application of implementation science to scaling effective innovations in education
   a) SISEP Intentions and Outcomes

II. Explore the Use of Active Implementation Frameworks at State and District Levels
   a) Infrastructure for implementation
   b) Stages and Drivers at work in education
   c) Aligning practice and policy to achieve student outcomes

III. Explore Potential and Current Use in TA & D Efforts (Table Conversations)
OSEP Goals

- Improve student outcomes by making full and effective uses of a variety of evidence-based programs and other effective innovations in education
- Establish system capacity to reach all students statewide
SISEP Intentions

- Develop implementation capacity in 6 States
  - Establish a protocol for selecting States that are ready
  - Select evidence-based programs ready for scaling
- Evaluate the state-level application of the approach
  - Assess State capacity; improve outcomes for students
- Extend findings to additional States
  - Work with RRC and TA Centers
  - Develop Communities of Practice
- Disseminate findings
  - Make presentations and write papers
  - Develop web-based resources and share tools
SISEP and TA&D

- **SISEP Center**
  - RRCP collaboration
    - Shared Staff
    - Mutual Learning
  - Active Scaling CoP
  - State Readiness CoP
    - Out of this group: NC a new Active Scaling State
  - Coaching for Competence CoP
Current methods for supporting the broad use of evidence-based programs and other innovations in education are not yet well-developed

- Islands of excellence

Implementation science and best practices are universal and apply in education

- A sea of change
Formula for Success

Effective **Intervention** practices

\[ \times \]

Effective **Implementation** practices

=  

Effective **Outcomes**
Cascading Logic Model

- Improve **student outcomes**
- Improve **teacher instruction**
- Improve **school supports** for teachers
- Improve **district supports** for schools
- Improve **regional supports** for districts
- Improve **State supports** for outcomes

**Re-define relationships** among system components

**Focus fully on** **student outcomes**
“A serious deficiency is the lack of expertise to implement best practices and innovations effectively and efficiently to improve student outcomes.”

Rhim, Kowal, Hassel, & Hassel (2007)
State Management Team

STSs and State Transformation Workgroup

Regional Implementation Team
“District” Impl.Teams
N = 50 – 100 Schools
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 IMPLEMENTATION CAPACITY FOR SCALING UP EBPs

SISEP Support & 2 STSs
## Implementation Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVENTION</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Effective use of Implementation Science &amp; Practice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>80%, 3 Yrs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>14%, 17 Yrs</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fixsen, Blase, Timbers, & Wolf, 2001

Balas & Boren, 2000
Green & Seifert, 2005
SISEP Lessons Learned

- Exploration Stage is critical
  - Expand time with SMT up front
- Resources to fund Regional Implementation Teams are essential
  - Re-purposing regional resources takes too long; secure funds (re-purpose) up front for first three (3) RITs
SISEP Lessons Learned

Start preparing the first generation RIT members by quickly going to work in Districts

- “Hands lead the head” when it comes to learning and doing implementation in complex education environments
- Need “early wins” to generate greater buy-in for system change, re-allocation of resources, re-purposing of regional entities
Active Implementation Frameworks

- Implementation Teams
- Implementation Stages
- Implementation Drivers
- Improvement Cycles
Implementation Teams

State, Regional, District, Building Teams

- **Know innovations** very well (formal and craft knowledge)
- **Know implementation** very well (formal and craft knowledge)
- **Know improvement cycles** to make interventions and implementation methods more effective and efficient over time
Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) – Executive Team

Common Principles of Effective Practice (CPEP) Leadership Team

MDE 1st Generation Regional Implementation Team

District Leadership & Implementation Teams (Assistant Superintendent, Title I Intervention Specialist, Principal, Teacher, Parent Representation)

Building Leadership and Implementation Teams (School Principals, Staff Development, PBIS, RtI, Curriculum and Development)

Elementary  Middle  High School  Other/EC
Effective Implementation

Implementation Team members make effective use of:

✓ Implementation Stages
✓ Implementation Drivers
✓ Improvement Cycles
How long at a district level?
How long at a state level?
How long at a national level?

School Level Implementation Takes Time: 2 – 4 Years
IMPLEMENTATION DRIVERS

Common features of successful supports to help make full and effective uses of a wide variety of innovations
Reliable Student Benefits

Consistent Use of Education Innovations

Performance Assessment (fidelity)

Leadership Drivers
- Technical
- Adaptive

Organization Drivers
- Facilitative Administration
- Decision Support Data System

Competency Drivers
- Selection
- Training
- Coaching

Interventions Meet Implementation

Consistent Use of Education Innovations

© Fixsen & Blase, 2008
Improvement Cycles

**ACT**
- Plan the next cycle
- Decide whether the change can be implemented

**PLAN**
- Define the objective, questions and predictions. Plan to answer the questions (who? what? where? when?)
- Plan data collection to answer the questions

**STUDY**
- Complete the analysis of the data
- Compare data to predictions
- Summarise what was learned

**DO**
- Carry out the plan
- Collect the data
- Begin analysis of the data
Types of Improvement Cycles

Plan-Do-Study-Act Cycles

✓ Rapid cycle problem solving (Shewhart; Deming)

✓ Usability testing (Neilson; Rubin)

✓ Practice-policy communication loops
Stage – Based Work

- Exploration Stage
  - Installation Stage
  - Initial Implementation
  - Full Implementation
Exploration

Exploration Stage Goals

- Create readiness for change
  - Changing hearts and minds
- Examine degree to which the EBPs and other effective strategies and practices meet the academic and behavioral needs of students
- Determine whether adoption and implementation are desirable and feasible

“Pay now or pay later.”
Assessing Readiness: EBPs and Implementation

**Need**
- Need in Education Setting
- Socially Significant Issues
- Parent & Community Perceptions of Need
- Data indicating Need

**Fit**
- Fit with current -
  - Initiatives
  - Educational Priorities
  - Organizational structures
  - Community Values

**Evidence**
- Outcomes – Is it worth it?
- Fidelity data
- Cost – effectiveness data
- Number of studies
- Population similarities
- Diverse cultural groups
- Efficacy or Effectiveness

**Resource Availability**
- Staffing
- Training
- Data Systems
- Coaching & Supervision
- Administrative & system Supports needed
- Time

**Capacity to Implement**
- Staff meet minimum qualifications
- Able to sustain Imp Drivers
  - Financially
  - Structurally
  - Buy-in process operationalized
  - Practitioners
  - Families
  - Agency and Departments

**Intervention Readiness for Replication**
- Qualified purveyor
- Expert or TA available
- Mature sites to observe
  - # of replications
  - How well is it operationalized?
  - Are Imp Drivers operationalized?

**Capacity**
- Readiness

**Evidence**
- Total Score:

---

EBP:
- 5 Point Rating Scale: High = 5; Medium = 3; Low = 1. Midpoints can be used and scored as a 2 or 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EBP:</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Replication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity to Implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© National Implementation Research Network 2009
Adapted from work by Laurel J. Kiser, Michelle Zabel, Albert A. Zachik, and Joan Smith at the University of Maryland
Use by Regional Resource Centers

Modifying the Hexagon for Planning TA
Minnesota’s Perspectives on…. 

Scale-up Considerations and “Terms of Reference”
Stage-Based TA Tools

- Guiding Implementation Questions
  - Questions to get started
- Hexagon Assessment Tool
  - More detailed template to guide discussion of six key exploration areas
- Stages of Implementation Analysis
  - Self-Assessment of each Stage of Implementation
ACTIVITY

Right Activities For Each Stage of Implementation

Table Talk for 20 Minutes “Stage-based Technical Assistance”

- What “exploration stage” work needs to be done as our center works with states?
- What are we already doing that is “stage-based” that we’d like to share?
- What are the facilitators and barriers to doing stage-based technical assistance?
Stage – Based Work

- Exploration Stage
- **Installation Stage**
- Initial Implementation
- Full Implementation
Interviews and Self-Assessments to analyze the implementation drivers for action planning:

- What infrastructure exists?
- How implementation-informed is it?
- What additional infrastructure is needed?
- What are the “next right steps” to improve the infrastructure supports?
## Scoring: 0=None, 1=Some, 2=Basic, 3=Advanced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Oregon Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System for Vetting Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operationalized Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection (Teachers, Principals)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training (Teachers, Principals)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching (Teachers, Principals)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring: 0=None, 1=Some, 2=Basic, 3=Advanced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ImapleMap Interviews

**Scoring:** 0=None, 1=Some, 2=Basic, 3=Advanced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oregon Districts</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization Supports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Support Data Systems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitative Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Superintendent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Principals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Implementation Capacity</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD Supports</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Supports (contracted initiatives)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Information for Action Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent are best practices being used?</th>
<th><strong>Academics</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Behavior</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>Partially in Place</td>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>Partially in Place</td>
<td>Not in Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and Selection Items</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Items</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision/Coaching Items</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Assessment/Fidelity</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Items</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage – Based Work

- Exploration Stage
- Installation Stage

☑ Initial Implementation
- Full Implementation
Oregon School District #1
Assessment of District Capacity for Implementation
Subscale Scores: March 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>March 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Assessment</td>
<td>3.7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>3.7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>12.5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>12.5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSDS</td>
<td>3.7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitative Admt. Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oregon School District #2
Assessment of District Capacity for Implementation
Subscale Scores: January 2012

Performance Assessment: 0%
Selection: 0%
Training: 0%
Coaching: 100%
DSDS: 0%
Facilitative Adm. Support: 0%
Systems Intervention: 0%
Benefits of Driver-Based Action Planning

- Infrastructure needed becomes visible to all
- Strengths and progress get celebrated
- Next right steps are planned and results measured
- Resources can be aligned and re-purposed to improve implementation
Using the Drivers in Minnesota

- Developing the RFP for the Statewide System of Support framework
  - Regional Centers of Excellence

- Developing and implementing Minnesota’s comprehensive Birth-Grade 12 Literacy framework
  - Read Well by Third Grade

- Thinking through the implementation of the teacher and principal evaluation systems
Implementation Drivers Tool

- High level tool to get State, Districts, or Buildings thinking about
  - The functions
  - Who is accountable for each of them?
  - How can they be improved to better support implementation?

- More detailed tool on the SISEP web site for scoring best practices in place for each Driver.
ACTIVITY

Table Talk
Infrastructure Insights

- How do we develop or support the infrastructure needed to implement well?
- Do we need to promote ‘competence and confidence’ of educators? How can we build in-state capacity to select, train, coach, and assess performance well?
- How are we engaged in promoting more hospitable organizational environments?
- How relevant are leadership issues? What’s our role?
System Alignment

State Management Team

System Change

Implementation Team

Teachers Innovations Students

SISEP System Change Support

Policy Supports Effective Practice

Practice-Policy Communication Cycle
Capacity Building

Implementation Teams
Organization Change
System Reinvention

YEARS

AMOUNTS

Funding

Capacity
The Flow of the Work
Tools To Create Alignment

- Tool to prompt discussion of systems issues and factors that facilitate or hinder effective implementation.

- Linking communication protocol
  - Guidance document to support developing communication and problem-solving protocol from one “level” to the next (practice-policy communication loop at each “level”)

SISEP

UNC FPG CHILD DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE
Supporting New Ways of Work

Table Talk: Alignment Challenges and Tools

- How can we help create better alignment between ‘initiatives’ and the related administrative practices and support?
- How can we develop more direct communication between levels (e.g. school to District, Districts to State)?
GENERAL DISCUSSION & QUESTIONS
Stay Connected!

www.scalingup.org

For more on Implementation Science
http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu
www.implementationconference.org