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“Implementation”

A specified set of activities designed to put into practice an activity or program of known dimensions (Fixsen et al. 2005)

The science, practice, and policy of getting science into practice and policy (GIC 2011)
Programs Defined

- Description of the philosophy, values, & principles that underlie a “lived” program
  - And, inclusion/exclusion criteria that describe who is most likely to benefit from the program

- Description of the essential functions that must be present (what “it” is/is not)

- Operational definitions of the core activities (teachable, learnable, doable)

- Evidence the program is effective when used as intended
  - Practical performance assessments (fidelity) are highly correlated with outcomes
Definition of Fidelity

The degree to which the program or practice is implemented ‘as intended’ by the program developers/researchers

- Adherence
- Integrity
- Delivered in a “comparable” manner

SO THAT it is more likely that comparable outcomes will be more consistently achieved
What Do We Mean By Evidence-Based?

A program or practice that has been demonstrated through scientific studies to be effective in improving outcomes for a specific population.
Evidence-Based Practices

There are **intervention and caregiver support evidence-based practices**

🌟 Rosalynn Carter Institute for Caregiving:
http://www.rosalynncarter.org/caregiver_intervention_database/

🌟 National Resource Center on Evidence-Based Prevention:
http://www.healthyagingprograms.com/
The usability of a program or a practice has little to do with the weight of the evidence regarding program outcomes.

Evidence on effectiveness helps us select what we want to implement.

Evidence on outcomes does not help us implement the program.
Science-to-Service Gap

**Implementation Gap**

- What is adopted is not used with **fidelity** and good outcomes
- What is used with fidelity is not **sustained** for a useful period of time
- What is used with fidelity is not used on a **scale** sufficient to impact social problems
Evidence for the Implementation Gap (a.k.a. what does not work)

- **Dissemination of information by itself does not** lead to successful implementation (research literature, mailings, promulgation of practice guidelines)

- **Training alone**, no matter how well done, **does not** lead to successful implementation
The impact of training alone
Evidence for what does not work

- Implementation by laws/compliance by itself does not work
- Implementation by “following the money” by itself does not work
- Implementation without changing supporting roles and functions does not work

Paul Nutt (2002). *Why Decisions Fail*
Active Implementation

Letting “It” happen…
- Innovation occurs without intervention

Helping “It” happen…
- Interested innovators figure it out on their own

Making “It” happen…
- Active use of strategies to support the adoption of the innovation
- Active installation of supports for the implementation of the innovation

Based on Greenhalgh, Robert, MacFarlane, Bate, & Kyriakidou, 2004
How will we get There? “Making It Happen”

To successfully implement and sustain evidence-based practices, we need to know:

- The WHAT - What is the innovation(s)
- The HOW - Effective Implementation and Sustainability Frameworks (install and improve implementation infrastructure; scale-up implementation capacity; align systems and functions)
- The WHO – Organized, expert implementation assistance
Formula for Success

Effective Programs \( \times \) Effective Implementation = Outcomes that Benefit Individuals and Society

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Effective Programs} & \quad 1.0 \\
\times & \\
\text{Effective Implementation} & \quad 0.0 \\
= & \\
\text{Outcomes that Benefit Individuals and Society} & \quad 0.0
\end{align*}
\]
Effective interventions do not always result in effective outcomes. From Mark Lipsey’s 2009 meta-analytic overview of the primary factors that characterize effective juvenile offender interventions – “... in some analyses, the quality with which the intervention is implemented has been as strongly related to recidivism effects as the type of program, so much so that a well-implemented intervention of an inherently less efficacious type can outperform a more efficacious one that is poorly implemented.”
Why Focus on Implementation?

“Individuals cannot benefit from interventions they do not experience.”
What is implementation science?

- The study of the process of implementing evidence-based programs and practices
- Implementation is NOT the validation of evidence-based programs
- Effective implementation bridges the gap between science and practice by helping to ensure that EBP’s validated in the “laboratory” produce similar outcomes in the “real world”
Implementation

Implementation Research: A Synthesis of the Literature


Download all or part of the monograph at:
http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~nirn/resources/detail.cfm?resourceID=31
Common components of successful implementation attempts = **Drivers**

Common developmental phases of successful implementation attempts = **Stages**
Stages of Implementation

🔥 Implementation is not an event

🔥 A mission-oriented process involving multiple decisions, actions, and corrections
Stages of Implementation

Implementation occurs in (additive) stages:

- Exploration
- Installation
- Initial Implementation
- Full Implementation

2-4 Years

Fixsen, Naoom, Blase, Friedman, & Wallace, 2005
Stages of Implementation

Implementation occurs in (additive) stages:

- Exploration
- Installation
- Initial Implementation
- Full Implementation

Stages and Outcomes Interact

Fixsen, Naoom, Blase, Friedman, & Wallace, 2005
Implementation Drivers

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

  - Build Competency and Confidence
    - Develop, improve, and sustain competent & confident use of innovations

  - Change Organizations and Systems
    - Create and sustain hospitable organizational and system environments for effective services
Improved Outcomes

Initiative, Program or Practice

Why:

What:

How:

Core Implementation Components

Leadership

Capacity to provide direction/vision of process

Staff capacity to use selected effective practices

Institutional capacity to support staff in implementing practices with fidelity

© Fixsen & Blase, 2008
Improved Outcomes

Evidence-Based Practices

Performance Assessment (Fidelity)

Coaching

Systems Intervention

Training

Facilitative Administration

Selection

Decision Support Data System

Competency Drivers

Integrated & Compensatory

Organization Drivers

Leadership

Adaptive

Technical

© Fixsen & Blase, 2008
Implementation Teams

- Provide accountable structure to move intervention through stages of implementation
- Scope of the initiative determines the development of linked Implementation Teams and communication protocols
- Focus is on
  - Ongoing “buy-in” and readiness
  - Installing and sustaining the Implementation Drivers
  - Fidelity & Outcomes
  - Systems Alignment and Stage-based work
  - Problem-solving and sustainability
Organized, Expert Assistance

Simultaneous, Multi-Level Implementation

- Practitioner /Staff Competence
- Organization Supports
  - Management (leadership, policy)
  - Administration (HR, structure)
  - Supervision (nature, content)
- Regional Authority Supports
- State/ Provincial Supports

Implementation Team
# Implementation Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVENTION</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Impl. Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>80%, 3 Yrs</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effective use of Implementation Science & Practice**

**Letting it Happen**

**Helping it Happen**

Fixsen, Blase, Timbers, & Wolf, 2001

Balas & Boren, 2000

3X to 12X Return on Investment
# Implementation Team Activities

N = 12 Purveyor Groups (N = 579 items)

(Concept Mapping; Nominal Group Process)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Stages</th>
<th>Explore</th>
<th>Install</th>
<th>Init Impl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection/Training</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Development</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Intervention</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are we learning?

Implementation is universal

- Like gravity, implementation influences are always at work (not about intention)

- Implementation principles are not dependent on disciplines, diagnoses, or geography
What are we learning?

- Implementation is universal
- Implementation is in service to Programs that make a difference
  - Evidence-based programs
  - Home-grown programs
  - Innovations in practice
What are we learning?

Implementation is in service to Programs that make a difference

We need to know “exactly what has to be in place to achieve the desired results for consumers and stakeholders, no more and no less” Arthur & Blitz (2000)
What are we learning?

- Implementation is universal
- Implementation is in service to Programs that make a difference
- Everything interacts with everything else
  - Programs, organizations, systems, policy, legislation, socio-economics are interdependent and interact dynamically
  - Chaos, complexity, & cybernetic theories hardly do justice to human services
What are we learning?

- Implementation is universal
- Implementation is in service to Programs that make a difference
- Everything interacts with everything else
- Implementation can be done on purpose

WHO does the work? Purveyors and Implementation Teams
What are we learning?

Implementation can be done on purpose

"Successful programs do not contain the seeds of their own replication“ (Schorr, 1993)
What are we learning?

- Implementation is universal
- Implementation is in service to Programs that make a difference
- Everything interacts with everything else
- Implementation can be done on purpose
- Sustainable benefits require organization and system change
Organizational Change

"All organizations [and systems] are designed, intentionally or unwittingly, to achieve precisely the results they get."

R. Spencer Darling
Business Expert
Effective Innovations Are Changed to Fit The System

Existing System
System Dilemma

- Innovative practices do not fare well in existing organizational structures and systems (legacy systems)

- Organizational and system changes are essential to successful use of innovations

System Reinvention

Adaptive Challenges
- Duplication
- Fragmentation
- Hiring criteria
- Salaries
- Credentialing
- Licensing
- Time/scheduling
- Union contracts
- RFP methods
- Federal/local laws

“External” System Change Support

Policy Enabled Practice

Implementation Team

Practitioners Innovations Recipients

System Reinvention

Executive Management Team

Policy
So, who cares about implementation??
1st Biennial Global Implementation Conference (GIC 2011)

- Held in Washington, D.C.
- August 15-17, 2011
- 784 participants
  - 70% from 42 U.S. states
  - 30% from non-U.S. countries
Purpose of the GIC

- Bring together a multi-disciplinary, multi-national, multi-level group with the unprecedented opportunity to make a difference in the world

- Implementation policy, practice, and research will benefit from collaboration and collective intelligence

- Practice Groups developed prior to GIC: Researcher, Practitioner, Policy Maker, Organizational Leader, Purveyor
Who attended the GIC?

- 67% Women
- 33% Men
GIC participants: Country of Origin

Registrants (Not US)

- Scandinavia: 30%
- Canada: 20%
- Ireland: 19%
- Australia: 11%
- UK: 11%
- Europe: 7%
- 3 Other: 2%

US = 70%; 42 States and DC
GIC participants

Practice Group Interests

- Researchers: 32%
- Purveyors: 17%
- Practitioners: 18%
- Org Leaders: 22%
- Policy: 11%
Disciplines GIC 2011

- Aging
- Autism
- Community Development
- Crime and Delinquency
- Education
- Health, Public Health, Global Health
- Mental Health
- Primary Prevention
- Reproductive Health
- Sexual Orientation Supports & Services
- Social Services
- Substance Abuse Prevention & Treatment
Emergent Themes from GIC 2011

- Ways to effectively evaluate implementation
- Partnerships and relationships
- Communication and use of a common language
- Cultural competency
- Technology and implementation
- Support to practitioners
- Sustainability
- Scaling-up
- Educate to inform and influence
Next Steps for the GIC

- Continuation of Practice Group work
- Planning for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Biennial Global Implementation Conference (GIC) to be held \textbf{August 2013}
- Development of a Global Implementation Initiative to support the expansion of a global implementation network
- To learn more, visit: \texttt{www.implementationconference.org}
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