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Learning Objectives

Identify at least 2 implementation drivers that are critical to the successful implementation of Tier 3 supports.

Identify the key features and values behind a research-based, intensive intervention for youth with significant emotional and behavioral disorders.

Identify at least 2 data collection tools and measures that can be used to support effective implementation of a research-based practice.
Turn and Talk

Think about a time you implemented a research-based intervention for youth and families with individualized, intensive needs.

Discuss:

– What were some of the challenges in delivering the intervention?
– What technical assistance was available to support the person delivering the intervention?
– What was needed to improve the implementation of this practice?
Relationship Between Fidelity and Child/Parent Outcomes

Implementation Fidelity → Intervention Fidelity → Child/Parent Outcomes
RENEW: Model Elements

Self-Determination

Youth and Family
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Education Transition

Youth and Family
Vision: By targeting youth who are in out-of-home placements or who are not succeeding in school or at home and providing them with the tools, supports, and relationships they need to develop and direct their own transition from high school to adult life, we hope to create more positive outcomes for those youth including high school completion, employment at their full potential, postsecondary education and training participation, stable independent living, and improved mental health.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population/Context</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Guiding Principles:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Desired Outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Youth ages 15-21 with emotional or behavioral disorders</td>
<td>• Self-determination</td>
<td>Youth:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Poor functioning at school, home or in the community</td>
<td>• Community inclusion</td>
<td>• High school graduation, increased post-secondary education, and increased employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context:</strong></td>
<td>• Strengths-based care</td>
<td>• Improved functioning in home and community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth: Lack of engagement in programs, services; mismatch between needs and perceived programs and services</td>
<td>• Unconditional care</td>
<td>• Increased satisfaction with self and relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families: Lack of support for or involvement with supports and services</td>
<td>• Flexible Funding/resources</td>
<td>• Increased social connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems: Lack of coordination and collaboration</td>
<td><strong>Capacity Building</strong></td>
<td>Families:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets:</td>
<td>• Training and support for RENEW Facilitators and Implementation Teams</td>
<td>• Increased positive involvement with child long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Supports from schools and mental health centers to provide intensive services</td>
<td>• Outreach and collaboration with schools and families</td>
<td>Systems:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Well-developed training resources</td>
<td>• State level policy &amp; program leaders and parents involved in policy analysis and revision</td>
<td>• Reductions in placements, incarcerations, and better utilization of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>1. Personal futures planning including choice-making and problem-solving.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Individualized team development and facilitation</td>
<td>2. Individualized team development and facilitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personally relevant school-to-career development, support, and progress monitoring</td>
<td>3. Personally relevant school-to-career development, support, and progress monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The NIRN

Implementation Research: A Synthesis of the Literature


© Dean Fixsen, Karen Blase, Robert Horner, George Sugai, 2008
The Science of Implementation

Framework 1: Usable Innovations
Framework 2: Implementation Stages
Framework 3: Implementation Drivers
Framework 4: Implementation Teams
Framework 5: Improvement Cycles
Implementation Gap

What is adopted is not used with fidelity resulting in poor 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.
Two components, when combined, result in successful and sustainable outcomes.

Program/Initiative (Innovation)

Set of evidence-based practices
Selected on: Need, Fit, Resource Availability, Evidence, Readiness for Replication, Capacity to Implement

Supporting Infrastructure (Implementation)

Ensuring that the interventions are implemented correctly with the “right people”, at the “right time”, in the “right amounts” (Implementation Fidelity)

…. This infrastructure begins with your team
Implementation Team

- Prepare Communities
- Prepare Districts
- Work with Researchers
- Parents and Stakeholders

Assure Implementation

Assure Student Benefits

Create Readiness

© Fixsen & Blase, 2009
“Discovering what works does not solve the problem of program effectiveness. Once models and best practices are identified, practitioners are faced with the challenge of implementing programs properly. A poorly implemented program can lead to failure as easily as a poorly designed one.”

- Mihalic, Irwin, Fagan, Ballard & Elliott, 2004
Institute on Disability: RENEW Implementation Model

Exploration & Adoption

Create Administrative Buy In-
1. RENEW Implementation Team
2. School/site selection process
3. RENEW Facilitator Selection Process
4. Data system development
5. Site application & Approval

Installation

1. Train Implementation Team and Facilitators
2. Team creates system to select youth
3. RENEW Facilitators are trained- 3 days
4. Install data collection systems

Implementation

Sustainability:
1. School has a system in place to help students access RENEW
2. Site systems and procedures established
3. Build collaboration with community resources to meet need

Work with school, agency, state or region to develop a plan
RENEW IMPLEMENTATION STRUCTURE

FEEDBACK LOOPS
Provide feedback and data on implementation efforts

- Facilitator Reflection Tool
- Student Outcome data
- Implementation Process Data
- Youth/Team Plan

SUPPORT LOOPS
Provide supports for effective practices implemented with fidelity

- Aggregated RIT v.7
- Student Outcome data
- Implementation Process Data
- RIC

- Aggregated Student Outcome data & Implementation Process Data
- Aggregate RIC
- RCIT
- Training Surveys
- New tools developed by IOD, UNH

- Aggregated Student Outcome data &
  Implementation Process Data
- Aggregate RIC
- RCIT
- Training Surveys
- New tools developed by IOD, UNH

- RIT v.7
- Facilitator Reflection Tool
- Student Outcome data
- Implementation Process Data
- RIC

- Aggregated RIT v.7
- Student Outcome data
- Implementation Process Data
- RIC

- RIT v.7
- Facilitator Reflection Tool
- Student Outcome data
- Implementation Process Data
- Youth/Team Plan

- RIT v.7
- Facilitator Reflection Tool
- Student Outcome data
- Implementation Process Data
- Youth/Team Plan
Coaching

- Ensures fidelity
- Ensures implementation
- Develops clinical and practice judgment
- Provides feedback to selection and training processes
- Grounded in “Best Practices”
Training and Coaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAINING COMPONENTS</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skill Demonstration</th>
<th>Use in the Classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory and Discussion</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..+ Demonstration in Training</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...+ Practice &amp; Feedback in Training</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...+ Coaching in Classroom</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joyce and Showers, 2002
Tools Used By RENEW Coaches to Reach Fidelity

- RENEW Implementation Checklist (RIC)
- RENEW Integrity Tool (RIT)
- RENEW Facilitator Reflection Tool
We use this tool to assess the systems features of RENEW Implementation:

Assess the elements that need to be in place prior to implementing an intervention (Installation)?

Identify the training and coaching support is needed for successful implementation.

Assess progress (or slippage) of systems support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Foundations-</td>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• RENEW has been</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carefully selected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a</td>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representative team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a point</td>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selection processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for youth and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitators are</td>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trained and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matched to youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RENEW Integrity Tool (RIT)

- 3 sections (38 Items | 152 Points)
  - Phase 1: Engagement and Mapping
  - Phase 2: Initial Plan Development
  - Phase 3: Plan Implementation & Refinement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Every youth who enrolled and his or her parents signed school/agency consent documents required to participate in RENEW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Roles and Responsibilities agreement was discussed with each youth who enrolled in RENEW &amp; signed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The facilitator’s schedule allowed for youth to choose the mapping meeting times, frequencies and locations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Practice Reflection Checklists

- Specify the **practice by creating indicators** for each project component
- Help facilitators understand **key characteristics** of the practices
- Serve as the **standards against which** learners examine and improve their practices
Example of RENEW Implementation Data (RIT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Startup adherence</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement &amp; youth-led plan</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating effective meetings</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building supports</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example of Student Outcome Data
OSS & ISS  2012-2017

RENEW in PA  2013-2017  44 Students

OSS

- Baseline: 55
- 3rd Semester: 14
- 75%

ISS

- Baseline: 81
- 3rd Semester: 21
- 74%

renew.unh.edu
Example of Student Outcome Data

Courses Passed
RENEW in PA 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Courses Passed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem 1</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem 2</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem 3</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 22
High School Example: RENEW Benchmarks (n= 17)

- Youth with Teams: 71%
- Youth Who Met Goals: 100%
- Youth Who Met All Goals: 53%
- Youth Who Obtained Jobs: 53%
- Youth Who Obtained Internships: 41%
Renew Youth Employment, Internships, and Goals

- Employed
- Internships
- 1+ Futures Goals Met

Prior (N=29)
Enrolled (N=29)
1 After (N=29)
2 After (N=21)
3 After (N=13)
4 After (N=10)
5 After (N=9)
Renew Youth Avg. Discipline Outcomes

- Prior (N=28)
- Enrolled (N=28)
- 1 Semester Post (N=17-19)
- 2 Semesters Post (N=9)

- Avg. ODR
- Avg. ISS
- Avg. OSS
Renew Youth Avg. GPA

Prior (N=26): 1.4
Enrolled (N=29): 1.7
1 Semester Post (N=20): 1.7
2 Semesters Post (N=10): 2.1
Case Examples

• What worked and what didn’t work in setting up and ensuring strong RENEW implementation teams?

• What worked and didn’t work in terms of accepting coaching?

• What were the factors that distinguished staff who implemented RENEW effectively from those who did not?
Elgin
Huntley
Kankakee
Streamwood
Henry Lackey
Maurice McDonough
North Point
Thomas Stone
ConVal
Kingswood
Somersworth
Implementation Varied by School

RIC Scores by School

Sep-15  Jan-16  Sep-16  Jan-17  Sep-17  Jan-18  Sep-18  Jan-19
Randomized Controlled Trial Funded by the Institute of Educational Sciences

Title: Efficacy of RENEW for High School Students with Emotional and Behavioral Challenges

July 2015 - June 2020

243 High school age youth enrolled between September 2015 and June 2018
1. Implementation Outcome Measures

• **Acceptability of Intervention Measure (AIM)**
  – RENEW meets my approval.
  – RENEW is appealing to me.
  – I like RENEW.
  – I welcome RENEW.

• **Intervention Appropriateness Measure (IAM)**
  – RENEW seems fitting for our students.
  – RENEW seems suitable for our students.
  – RENEW seems applicable to the student needs.
  – RENEW seems like a good match for the student needs.

• **Feasibility of Intervention Measure (FIM)**
  – RENEW seems implementable.
  – RENEW seems possible.
  – RENEW seems doable.
  – RENEW seems easy to use.

**SCALE**

| 1 = Completely disagree, | 2 = Disagree, |
| 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, | 4 = Agree, |
| 5 = Completely agree |
Take home:
On average, 92 facilitators, Coordinators, and Principals agreed RENEW was acceptable, appropriate, and feasible.

School differences?
Simple one-way ANOVAs showed significant mean differences between schools for appropriateness (range 3.7 to 4.8) and feasibility (range 3.4 to 4.6)
2. Expectations for students and RENEW

(Malloy, 2018)

- I believe that students in RENEW will successfully graduate from high school.
- I believe that RENEW has made a positive impact on students in RENEW.
- I believe students in RENEW will find it difficult to support themselves as adults. (reversed)
- I feel that there is little I can do to help students in RENEW. (reversed)
- I want to help students in RENEW.
- I feel I do not benefit from helping my students in RENEW. (reversed)

SCALE
1 = Completely disagree,
2 = Disagree,
3 = Neither agree nor disagree,
4 = Agree,
5 = Completely agree
IES: Expectations for Students and RENEW

Take home:
On average, 92 facilitators, Coordinators, and Principals agree with these items. Items about their support and impact of RENEW show higher agreement than future expectations for students.

School differences?
Wait to examine until we decide if appropriate to combine as mean score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I want to help students in RENEW.</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that RENEW has made a positive impact on students in RENEW.</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I do not benefit from helping my students in RENEW. (reversed)</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that there is little I can do to help students in RENEW. (reversed)</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that students in RENEW will successfully graduate from high school.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe students in RENEW will find it difficult to support themselves as adults. (reversed)</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Facilitator Choice  (Malloy, 2018)

- **I had full choice over whether or not to be a RENEW facilitator.**

- On average, facilitators agreed
- with a mean of 4.17 ($SD = 1.2$).
- Individual responses ranged from
- 1 to 5, and school means ranged
- from 3 to 4.9.

**SCALE**
- 1 = Completely disagree,
- 2 = Disagree,
- 3 = Neither agree nor disagree,
- 4 = Agree,
- 5 = Completely agree
4. Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Questionnaire (Rizzo et al., 1970)

- **Role Ambiguity (6 items)**
  - I know exactly what is expected of me.
  - I feel certain about how much authority I have.
  - Clear, planned goals exist for my job.
  - I know that I have divided my time properly.
  - I know what my responsibilities are.
  - Explanation is clear of what has to be done.

- **Role Conflict (8 items)**
  - I have to do things that should be done differently.
  - I have to work on unnecessary things.
  - I receive an assignment without the proper manpower to complete it.
  - I receive an assignment without adequate resources and materials to execute it.
  - I work with two or more groups who operate quite differently.
  - I have to buck a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment.
  - I receive incompatible requests from two or more people.
  - I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others.

**SCALE**

1 = Absolutely false, 2 = Mostly false, 3 = Somewhat false, 4 = Neutral, 5 = Somewhat true, 6 = Mostly true, 7 = Absolutely true
Role Conflict and Ambiguity

**Note:** Scoring is confusing, because higher scores are "bad" (i.e., more conflict and more ambiguity AND ambiguity items are reversed.

**Take home:**
On average, facilitators report it is mostly false their roles are ambiguous and somewhat false they experience role conflict.

**School differences?**
Significant mean differences between schools for conflict but not ambiguity.
5. Implementation Leadership Scale
(Aarons et al., 2014)

• **Scale 1: Proactive**
  – Developed a plan to facilitate RENEW implementation
  – Removed obstacles to implementation of RENEW
  – Established clear department standards for implementation

• **Scale 2: Knowledgeable**
  – Is knowledgeable about RENEW
  – Is able to answer staff questions about RENEW
  – Knows what he or she is talking about when it comes to RENEW

• **Scale 3: Supportive**
  – Recognizes and appreciates employee efforts
  – Supports employee efforts to learn more about RENEW
  – Supports employee efforts to use RENEW

• **Scale 4: Perseverant**
  – Perseveres through the ups and downs of implementing RENEW
  – Carries on through the challenges of implementing RENEW
  – Reacts to critical issues regarding implementation of RENEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Not at all, 1 = Slight extent,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Moderate extent, 3 = Great extent,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Very great extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IES: Perspectives on Principals’ Leadership Implementation

**Take home:**
Principals were perceived as providing a *moderate level* of leadership for RENEW implementation (consistent with a recent study using this measure).

School coordinators rated principals higher than facilitators or principals themselves.

Principals received higher ratings for *Supportive Leadership* than other scales. And principals viewed themselves as more *Supportive* but less *Proactive* than facilitators viewed them.
IES: Perspectives on Principals’ Leadership Implementation

**Take home:**
The table below shows mean ratings about principals for each of the Implementation Leadership scales by facilitators, principals, and coordinators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Proactive</th>
<th>Knowledgeable</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Perseverant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCALE**
0 = Not at all, 1 = Slight extent, 2 = Moderate extent, 3 = Great extent, 4 = Very great extent
What do these outcomes mean?

Implementation challenges
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Thanks!

• Like us on Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/IOD.RENEW

• Follow us on Twitter: https://twitter.com/RENEW_IOD

• Websites: www.renew.unh.edu

• For further questions please contact us at iod.renew@unh.edu
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