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An estimated 20% of youth experience a psychiatric disorder at some point in their lives.

Effective treatments are often time-sensitive, costly, and not available to those who need them.

Schools are in a unique position to promote children’s development and mental health.
BRIEF OVERVIEW OF SCHOOL-BASED MENTAL HEALTH

- Increasing focus on the components of preventive mental health programs in schools:
  - Who delivers
  - Therapeutic modalities
  - Outcomes measured
  - Intervention tier
  - District, state, national level
Preventive mental health interventions have been studied almost exclusively in high income countries.

A number of programs are now operating, at scale, in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).

Now we can consider the effectiveness of these programs from a global perspective.
AIMS

1. Identify and systematically compare some of the larger school-based mental health programs, including similarities among programs and effective components that work across multiple contexts

2. Examine the degree to which large programs have been implemented in LMICs
METHOD

- Literature search electronic databases for articles published before December 2015
- Search terms: “school*” OR “school-based”, “mental health” AND “program” OR “intervention” OR “prevention”, “large-scale” OR “national”
- Searched reference sections of relevant review papers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment of children/adolescents &lt;18 years</td>
<td>• Exclusive focus on social-emotional learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program implemented in school setting</td>
<td>• Any non-mental health primary focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direct measure of mental health outcome in program evaluations</td>
<td>• Just a tier 3 component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program aim explicitly stated mental health term in goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRAMS INCLUDED

- Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS)
- FRIENDS
- Positive Action
- Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS)
- Skills for Life (SFL)
- MindMatters
- Good Behavior Game
- Cognitive-Behavioral Intervention for Trauma in Schools (CBITS)
**Scope:**
- Tier
- Age of children
- Location
- Target mental health problem

**Scale:**
- Total number of children reached
- Number of years active
- District, state, national level
- Currently implemented in LMICs?

**Dose:**
- Number of intervention hours
- Teacher and parent components
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Outcomes Assessed</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PATHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Academic achievement, Aggression/externalizing behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MindMatters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Academic achievement, Internalizing problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Behavior Game</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aggression/externalizing behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Action</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>Academic achievement, Aggression/externalizing behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Internalizing problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills for Life</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Academic achievement, Aggression/externalizing behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBIS</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Academic achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier</td>
<td>Outcomes Assessed</td>
<td>Target Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATHS</td>
<td>Academic achievement, Aggression/externalizing behaviors</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MindMatters</td>
<td>Academic achievement, Internalizing problems</td>
<td>PreK-Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Behavior Game</td>
<td>Aggression/externalizing behaviors</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Action</td>
<td>Academic achievement, Aggression/externalizing behaviors</td>
<td>PreK-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
<td>Internalizing problems</td>
<td>K-Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills for Life</td>
<td>Academic achievement, Aggression/externalizing behaviors</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBIS</td>
<td>Academic achievement</td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBITS</td>
<td>Post-traumatic stress</td>
<td>5-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATHS</td>
<td>Tier</td>
<td>Outcomes Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Academic achievement, Aggression/externalizing behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MindMatters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Academic achievement, Internalizing problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Behavior Game</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aggression/externalizing behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Action</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>Academic achievement, Aggression/externalizing behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Internalizing problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills for Life</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Academic achievement, Aggression/externalizing behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBIS</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Academic achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBITS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Post-traumatic stress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RESULTS: SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>N of students reached</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PBIS</td>
<td>10,500,000</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>National, State, District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Action</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATHS</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFL</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MindMatters</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>National, District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Behavior Game</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBITS</td>
<td>97,000</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LMICs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBIS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Action</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATHS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MindMatters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Behavior Game</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBITS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RESULTS: DOSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. Sessions</th>
<th>Dose (in hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBITS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.5-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Action</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Behavior Game</td>
<td>Daily x 36 weeks</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATHS</td>
<td>36-52</td>
<td>18-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBIS</td>
<td>Continuous support</td>
<td>Continuous support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MindMatters</td>
<td>Continuous support</td>
<td>Continuous support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RESULTS: DOSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Who delivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBITS</td>
<td>Mental health professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
<td>Teacher or mental health professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFL</td>
<td>Mental health professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Action</td>
<td>Teacher or mental health professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Behavior Game</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATHS</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBIS</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MindMatters</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The largest programs in terms of number of children reached contain both Tier 1 and Tier 2 approaches.

- 6 programs have a teacher deliver the intervention.
- 2 programs use short-term interventions delivered by mental health professionals.
- 3 programs implemented in both high income and low/middle income countries.
This review identified 8 programs that appear to have reached the largest numbers of youth.

Programs embedded within the school create an environment of integrated care and easy access to services:
- Trained teachers
- Broad target age range
- Multiple tiers

Using resources already available in the school appears to be both sustainable and scalable across cultural contexts.
LIMITATIONS OF THE CURRENT REVIEW

- Excluded SEL programs
- Definition of dose
- Information from interviews may be biased or unreliable
FUTURE DIRECTIONS

- Continue to assess factors associated with long-term effects
- Need to examine processes that are associated with successful, widely disseminated programs – e.g., fidelity of program implementation, cultural sensitivity, costs
This review was conducted in collaboration with:

J. Michael Murphy, Ed.D.
Sharon Hoover, Ph.D.
Michael Jellinek, M.D.
Mina Fazel, DM, MRC Psych
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HOW THE EIGHT LARGEST SCHOOL MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS GREW TO SCALE: A FOCUSED REVIEW OF FACILITATORS OF GROWTH
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Department of Psychiatry, Massachusetts General Hospital

Mina Fazel, DM, MRC Psych
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IMPLEMENTATION

“Specified set of activities designed to put into practice an activity or program of known dimensions”

Importance:

• To understand if programs can grow to scale through evidence-based processes
• Critical for the validity of evaluation findings

FACTORS THAT SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION

**Feasibility**: availability of space in schools, how teachers and school staff were introduced to the program, and the relationship of the staff to the work

**Fidelity**: program delivered as intended across schools

**Penetration**: how well the intervention reached children it was designed for

**Acceptability**: whether the intervention was welcomed and appreciated

**Sustainability**: how well the interventions were embedded in the schools

**Costs**: funding and economic impacts of the mental health interventions
METHOD

• Structured Interviews with program developers and researchers from these 8 programs:
  • ~60 to 120 minutes
  • 29 questions on feasibility, fidelity, penetration, acceptability, sustainability, and cost
  • 8 additional questions generally explored implementation facilitators & barriers to implementation and growth

• Detailed notes were taken on each call and later analyzed to:
  • Track factors integral to implementation
  • Identify barriers
  • Track similarities and variations in responses
COGNITIVE-BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTION FOR TRAUMA IN SCHOOLS (CBITS)

**Interview:** Dr. Lisa Jaycox

**Scale:** ~100,000 children over 14 years

**Program Summary:** Grades 5-12

* Screening: exposure to violence or Post Traumatic Stress Disorder
* CBT group sessions lead by a mental health professional
* Research: post traumatic stress symptom reduction including youth exposed to violence & natural disasters
CBITS: FACTORS TO IMPLEMENTATION & SCALE

Evidence-Based Program: journal articles & research registries:
• Center’s for Disease Control and Prevention Research Center
• SAMHSA’s National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices
• U.S. Department of Justice’s Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Flexibility:
• Training: In person or online; “train the trainers” framework
• Workshops: Scripts serve as a guide in the CBT sessions, but modifications can be made if need be (culture & language)

Funding

Design of the program
Good Behavior Game (GBG)

Interviews: Dr. Dennis Embry (“PAX GBG”) and Megan Sambolt (“AIR GBG”)

Scale: ~200,000 children (over 10,000 classrooms) over ~45 years

Program Summary: K-6

• Brief game lead by the teacher within the classroom setting with several “teams”
  • 1) Classroom Rules 2) Team Membership 3) Monitoring Behavior 4) Positive Reinforcement

• Research shows reduction in aggressive/disruptive behavior and substance abuse
GBG: FACTORS TO IMPLEMENTATION & SCALE

Evidence-based:
- Based on the principles of Applied Behavior Analysis
- Evidence-based registries:
  - SAMHSA’s National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices
  - Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development
  - Office of Justice: Crime Solutions
  - U.S. Department of Justice’s Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Design of GBG: Straight forward strategy integrated into the curriculum rather than a separate program

Flexibility: “Rigid fidelity prevents feasibility”
- Adaptable to real world teaching situations
MINDMATTERS

Interview: Craig Reid

Scale: 1,444 participating schools (~300,000 children) over 18 years

Program Summary: PreK-Adult

• Framework for mental health promotion, prevention, and early intervention
• Whole-school approach
• Classroom: practice embedded into the everyday school curriculum by teacher
  • Enhancing resilience, dealing with bullying and harassment, grief and loss, and understanding mental illness
• Research: positive impact on behavioral and academic outcomes
MINDMATTERS: FACTORS TO IMPLEMENTATION & SCALE

Evidence-based Framework

Flexible Framework:
• Structure, guidance, and support for implementation in a wide range of settings
• Four Components: Positive school community, skills for resilience, engagement with parents and families, support for students experiencing mental health difficulties

Whole school approach: “Everyone is a teacher of wellbeing”
• 2-3 year implementation process through the 4 components

Fully government funded: Resources, training, support are free of charge
**SKILLS FOR LIFE (SFL)**

**Interview:** Javier Guzmán

**Scale:** ~1 million children (20% of Chilean primary schools) over ~18 years

**Program Summary:** Grades 1-4

- Lead by the National Department of Education in Chile
- Screening in 1st grade: brief parent and teacher surveys
- For students screened at risk, workshops in 2nd grade: skill-based with a cognitive-behavioral approach lead by trained mental health professional
- Research: associated with positive impact on behavioral and academic outcomes
SFL: FACTORS TO IMPLEMENTATION & SCALE

Government and political will:
• When democracy returned to Chile in the 1990’s, there was a new push for preventive mental health action

Public Policy:
• Experts in the field of psychology utilized knowledge from the UK and US on interventions for young children
• Led to some grants for original program development and then government funding

Evidence-Based:
• 10+ year collaboration with Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH), published papers, and formal evaluations
• Provides an argument to the government to continue to fund the program
PROMOTING ALTERNATIVE THINKING STRATEGIES (PATHS):

**Interview:** Dr. Mark Greenberg

**Scale:** ~2 million children (~4,000 schools) over ~15 years

**Program Summary:** K-6

- Based on the Affective-Behavioral-Cognitive-Developmental model
  - Integrates affect, emotion language, behavior and cognitive understanding to promote social–emotional competence
- Teachers are provided lesson objectives and scripts
- Research: shows reduced disciplinary infractions and aggression; improvement in non-violent interpersonal functioning and academic achievement
Evidence-based:
• Research registries: (examples) & journal articles (+40)
  o “Model Program” by Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development
  o Highest rating by Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL)
  o Highest rating by Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)

High quality training:
• In-person training and ongoing support that promotes implementation and sustainability (two sessions)

School-wide approach:
• Principal manual on implementation
• Encourages each school to form a committee to oversee implementation
**Interviews**: Dr. Carol Allred & Dr. Brian Flay

**Scale**: ~5 million children in more than 15,000 settings over 35 years

**Program Summary**: K-12

- Theory of self-concept:
  - Positive and healthy behavior (more than thoughts/feelings) → feelings of self-worth.
- Teacher: All materials called for in each lesson are included in a kit
- Research: shows a decrease in violence-related behaviors, bullying, drug use; disciplinary behavior reductions; academic improvements
Evidence-based: research registries (examples):
  - U.S. Dept. of Education What Works Clearinghouse (WWC)
  - Model Program by Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development
  - “Select Program” by Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL)
  - Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)

Principal/Administrative Support:
  - Administrators: manual on implementation
  - Creating a school-wide climate & promoting teacher buy-in

Simple & intuitive: “When you feel good about yourself you do positive actions.”

Complete and appealing materials:
  - Teachers are provided a manual with planned lessons
**FRIENDS**

**Interview:** Dr. Paula Barrett

**Scale:** ~8 million students over 19 years

**Program Summary:** K-Adult

- Manualized cognitive-behavioral based program with a specific sequence, structure, and topic delivered by the teacher or mental health professional
- Manuals for various ages (4-7, 8-11, 12-15, 16+)
- Research: reduction in internalizing problems
Evidence-based & research registries:
• CBT-based manuals & research registries

Practical & relevant program:
• Addresses issues children are dealing with

Comprehensive training program:
• In person or online; ongoing support
• Closely monitored: Individuals must be trained and accredited under a FRIENDS licensee
• “Train the Trainers” framework: promotes sustainability and implementation from within the school

Flexibility “Emphasize the fidelity of the CBT program while allowing flexibility”
• Manual that adapts the cultural context and setting
POSITIVE BEHAVIOR INTERVENTION & SUPPORTS (PBIS):

**Interview:** Dr. Robert Horner

**Scale:** ~10.5 million in 21,000 schools in US over 19 years

**Program Summary:** K-12

- Emphasizes a positive social culture and behavioral support for all students through a three-tiered prevention model
- All school leadership (teachers, school administration) are trained to adopt PBIS
- Research: shows positive management of school culture; promotes academic achievement; reduction of suspensions
PBIS: FACTORS TO IMPLEMENTATION & SCALE

Addresses a highly valued outcome:
• Establishing social competence → academic competence
• “Exemplar Schools”

Organizational Systems to Support Implementation:
• “Blueprints” on stages of implementation for whole-school approach to build local capacity
  • Exploration, installation, initial to full implementation, innovation, sustainability
  • >80% acceptability

Flexibility in Implementation: PBIS is “not a curriculum”
• 2-3 year implementation process
## FACILITATORS ACROSS PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Evidence-based</th>
<th>Flexibility in implementation</th>
<th>Practical program design</th>
<th>Whole school implementation and support</th>
<th>Training program</th>
<th>Government support &amp; funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PBIS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATHS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MindMatters</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBITS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# BARRIERS ACROSS PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Overcrowded curriculum/workload</th>
<th>Lack of buy-in</th>
<th>Lack of admin. support</th>
<th>Narrow academic focus</th>
<th>Competing programs</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Stigma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PBIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATHS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MindMatters</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBITs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERACTING FACTORS THAT SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION

Feasibility: Acceptability/buy-in; flexibility in implementation; administrative support

Fidelity: Program manuals; monitoring implementation (funding)

Penetration: Acceptability/buy-in; administrative support

Acceptability: Training; administrative support

Sustainability: Training models; whole school approach; funding; administrative support

Costs: Grants; government funding; impact of research
DISCUSSION

This review explored the **implementation factors** of the 8 programs that appear to have reached the largest numbers of youth.

Implementation appears to be **multi-faceted** with many interacting factors.

Programs which have reached the largest scale emphasized the **importance of**:

- Organizational supports
- Whole-school approach
- Sustaining implementation from within the school

**What we can learn from these programs**: the facilitators and barriers of implementation to improve program quality and impact mental health.
LIMITATIONS

Developer Bias

Implementation factors may help grow the program to scale, but for most programs there is a lack of evidence on the fidelity of implementation on a large and dispersed scale

• School’s choice to monitor fidelity

Lack of unified assessment and outcome measures among programs

Other factors that support implementation

• Examples: policy; charismatic leadership
FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Explore potential differences in implementation quality between types of school-based mental health interventions:

- Comparing implementation of programs tailored to a specific environment vs. those adapted from existing interventions.

Additional sources of data: speak with representatives from schools implementing the programs

Conflicting evidence: how do developers reconcile and integrate conflicting evidence?
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Skills for Life: Background

Mental Health Experts from Ministry of Health

Developmental Epidemiology 1990

Two research projects 1992-1998

EPIDEMIOLOGIC DIAG.

QUESTIONNAIRES FOR MENTAL HEALTH SCREENING

DISORDERS

PREDICTORS

Concept of Mental Health

Promotion and Prevention in MH

MH at Schools: Manual 1997

• Developmental Psychology
• Clinical Psych.

SFL today

LOCAL TEAM WITH PSYCHOLOGISTS AND SOCIAL WORKERS

Pilot Projects MH at Schools 1995-98

COSAM
• PUDAHEUL
• ÑUNOA
• E. CENTRAL

RISKS BEHAVIOR

EARLY SCHOOL INTERVENTION

PROFILES OF LOCAL TEAMS
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AIMS

Short-Term:
To improve academic performance and learning outcomes, and decrease school dropout rates.

Long-Term:
To enhance social emotional functioning, increase personal abilities and life expectancy, and decrease health problems (depression, suicide, drug abuse, violent behaviors).

Target Population: elementary school children attending public and government-subsidized private schools with indicators of high socioeconomic risk.
THREE-TIER INTERVENTION MODEL
SKILLS FOR LIFE PROGRAM

Mental Health Promotion / Primary Prevention

Secondary Prevention

Referrals for Tertiary Prevention

- Primary healthcare for children who have internalizing or externalizing symptoms.
- Child welfare centers for children who were maltreated, abused, or neglected.

Whole School Approach

- Self-Care Activities for Teachers
- Classroom supports
- Parents’ meetings
- MH Screening

15 session workshops
- 10 sessions with students
- 3 sessions with parents
- 2 sessions with teachers

• Self-Care Activities for Teachers
• Classroom supports
• Parents’ meetings
• MH Screening

10% Self-Care Activities for Teachers

3% Classroom supports

20% Parents’ meetings
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Primary Prevention Activities

Self-care activities for elementary school teachers

- To promote the teachers’ well-being, exploring their ability to cope with challenging work conditions (e.g., high-risk environments, organizational difficulties, students with several adversities).

- The activities are designed to increase the collaboration among teachers, generating positive experiences throughout the school year.

- To support teachers and increase program buy-in.
PRIMARY PREVENTION ACTIVITIES

Classroom supports for teachers

- To promote strategies for classroom management
- Activities have an orientation for the entire classroom
- Teachers and local teams design classroom activities
PRIMARY PREVENTION ACTIVITIES

Parents’ meetings

- To promote strategies for collaboration with school activities
- The activities include parents and guardians of different classrooms (pre-K and kindergarten)
- Teachers and the SFL team design the sessions
PRIMARY PREVENTION ACTIVITIES

Mental health screening with teachers and parents

- To identify first grade children who screen positive for mental health problems

- First grade teachers spend two-hours reporting the classroom adaptation of their students with TOCA (31-item screening).

- Parents report the behavior of their children with the Pediatric Symptom Checklist-Chilean version (PSC-CI; 33-items)
SECONDARY PREVENTION ACTIVITIES

Preventive workshops for second grade students

- To modify psychosocial risk factors and maladaptive behaviors.
- Students who were identified as at-risk in first grade get a 10-sessions workshop in second grade. Their teachers get two workshop sessions and parents get three workshop sessions.
- The sessions promote social and emotional learning, behavioral training, and prosocial skills.
Tertiary Prevention Activities

Referrals

• To reduce the negative consequences of the lack of access to mental health services for children who need immediate support.

• Most of the referrals are oriented to primary care centers, child welfare centers, or a school psychologist.

• The screening tools provide critical information for early referrals.
Evidence of SFL Effectiveness

- Children who participated in the preventive workshops show reduced mental health risk and better academic outcomes in the third grade (Guzman et al., 2015).
- A study in progress is using a randomized controlled trial design in 130 schools to test outcomes and another is assessing implementation in these schools.
- Children who participated in preventive interventions in 2010 (after a large earthquake in Chile) showed promising outcomes in reducing the negative consequences of trauma (Garfin et al., 2014).
Intervention / Contextual Challenges

- Program size
- Training of SFL professionals
- School buy-in
- Insufficient mental health services
- Permanent educational reform
- Comprehensive approach
The Current Study
Implementation Science Approach

• An implementation science approach shifts focus away from the treatment outcomes/impact of the Skills for Life (SFL) program and centers on the field of evaluation

• This is the first time that concepts like fidelity and implementation drivers were tested in SFL program

• The current study piloted the methods and measures that could explore the relationship between the fidelity of the program’s implementation and a number of workshop characteristics in a larger sample
Participants, Procedure, and Instruments

• Sample of convenience: 46 professionals responsible for executing SFL preventive workshops from 78 elementary schools of more than 2000 participating in the program.

• Participants were primarily female (76.1%), had a professional license of psychologist (71.7%), and had an average of 4.4 years (SD =3.72) of experience implementing SFL.

• Workshops leaders received the survey via email during the 2016 school year through a link to Qualtrics

• An 82-item questionnaire was administered to assess preventive workshops implementation fidelity
Results

• Workshop leaders’ responses were classified according to their level of self-reported fidelity to program design.

• Descriptively, of the 29 items on the Fidelity Scale, 27 questions were endorsed as “Strongly agree” or “Agree” by 66.9% of all respondents.

• Chi-square analyses demonstrated that there were significant differences between workshop leaders’ with low vs. high fidelity ratings.
Results

Workshop leaders with low fidelity ratings were significantly less likely to report:

- High head teacher support (a) *
- High school management support (b) *
- High program satisfaction (c) **
- High personal satisfaction (d) ***

\[ \chi^2 (45) = 5.8, p < .05, \quad * = p < .05 \]
\[ \chi^2 (45) = 5.0, p < .05, \quad ** = p < .01 \]
\[ \chi^2 (45) = 9.2, p < .01, \quad *** = p < .001 \]
Conclusions

• Participants surveyed reported high positive ratings on the Fidelity Scale. This exploratory result opens questions about social desirability and positive attitudes towards SFL activities.

• Higher ratings of implementation fidelity are associated with different dimensions of job satisfaction. This outcome highlights the importance of fidelity in SFL trainings.

• The current study provides initial insights about how SFL implementation can be improved, suggesting areas of future improvements.
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