*A Center Brief**

Implementation Science and Innovative Transformation of Schools and Communities

(March, 2013)

Abstract

Increasing attention to *Implementation Research* and the *Implementation Problem* has given rise to confusion about matters such as the role of *empirically-supported practices, fidelity of implementation,* and *monitoring fidelity* of implementation. To clarify the matters, we approach these topics from the broad perspective of efforts to transform schools and their relationship to the surrounding community and with reference to the literature on diffusion of innovations and enabling major systemic changes. Such a perspective points to the need to expand implementation research and practice in ways that focus on the complexities of (a) facilitating essential systemic changes for implementing a comprehensive approach at specific sites, (b) replicating the approach across a school district, and (c) sustaining and evolving what has been implemented.

*The Center co-directors are Howard Adelman and Linda Taylor; it operates under the auspices of the School Mental Health Project, Dept. of Psychology, UCLA,

Write: Center for Mental Health in Schools, Box 951563, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1563
Phone: (310) 825-3634 email: smhp@ucla.edu website: http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu

Implementation Science and Innovative Transformation of Schools and Communities

With the increasing attention to *Implementation Research* and the *Implementation Problem,* some confusion has arisen, especially with reference to the emphasis on *empirically-supported practices, fidelity of implementation,* and *monitoring fidelity* of implementation. The intent here is to help clarify these matters. We do so from the broad perspective of efforts to transform schools and how they relate to the surrounding community.

Clearly, the state of the art related to the above matters is still quite narrow and limited in its nature and scope. As the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) has stressed:

> "... very little is known about the processes required to effectively implement evidence-based programs on a national scale. Research to support the implementation activities that are being used is even scarcer."

The field is at a stage where many of us are just becoming more knowledgeable about the complexities and strategies related to diffusion of innovations, enabling major systemic changes, and developing a sophisticated understanding of the role of empirically-based practices (Flaspohler, Lesesne, Puddy, Smith, & Wandersman, 2012; Norcross, Beutler, & Levant, 2005; Rabin & Brownson, 2012; Rogers, 2003).

At its roots, the *implementation problem* refers to efforts to ensure a practice is carried out. A special case of the implementation problem involves taking prototypes that are found efficacious under highly controlled conditions and moving them into the real world. Much of the recent research on implementation has focused on this special case. This has resulted in the tendency for some researchers, practitioners, and policy makers to skip by fundamental considerations that are at the core of efforts to transform public education, public health, and community development. The deficiencies become apparent when implementation efforts are analyzed in terms of the complexities related to (1) diffusing comprehensive and multifaceted innovations and (2) doing so in the context of organized settings with well-established institutional cultures and infrastructures that must change if effective widespread application is to take place (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2012; Institute of Education Sciences, 2013).

The following discussion approaches the implementation problem from the vantage point of the growing bodies of literature on diffusion of innovations and systemic change. Moreover, the focus is on the complexities of transforming how a school district and community implement an innovative, comprehensive strategy designed to unify related interventions into and cohesive system for addressing the many barriers interfering with learning and teaching (as contrasted to implementing a discrete service or program to address a narrowly defined problem).

From this perspective, the implementation problem is framed as a process of diffusing a comprehensive innovative strategy through major systemic changes. Such a perspective focuses research and practice on the complexities of (a) facilitating essential systemic changes for implementing an appropriate and effective adoption/adaptation of a comprehensive prototype at specific sites, (b) replication-to-scale across a school district, and (c) sustaining and evolving what has been implemented.

Understanding the Limitations of Empirically-Supported Practices

Empirically-supported practices also are referred to as evidence-based and science-based practices. The terms refer to any intervention that has been identified as having research data generated using methods that meet scientific standards and that demonstrate a level of *efficacy* deemed worthy of application in natural settings. Ideally, such application is to be followed by an evaluation of *effectiveness* and, as appropriate, replication on a large scale (Institute of Education Sciences, 2013; Kratochwill & Shernoff, 2004; La Roche & Christopher, 2009).

A subgroup of empirically-supported practices, referred to as empirically-supported or evidence-based *treatments*, focuses on differentially diagnosed illnesses and disorders. According to the American Psychological Association, the designation of evidence-based *treatment* should be reserved for those interventions that have been tested in more than one scientifically rigorous study (either multiple case studies or randomized control trials) and consistently have been found to work better than a placebo or no treatment (American Psychological Association, 2012). Such treatments usually are applied using a manual and are time-limited.

Most evidence-based practices are discrete interventions designed to meet narrow-band goals. A few are complex sets of interventions intended to meet several related goals, and these usually are referred to as programs.

An empirically-supported practice may or may not be a *best* practice. A best practice is one that decision makers view as the most productive (e.g., cost-effective) approach that has been identified for achieving some desired results. Identifying such a practice usually involves extrapolating from available research and drawing on the experience of those with special expertise. When formal research is inadequate for extrapolation, the empirical support for best practices usually stems from experiential expertise.

Simply because an intervention has produced positive findings is not a sufficient rationale for adoption by schools and communities.

Empirically-supported interventions all can be seen as helping to advance research and theory about intervention, and efforts to implement such practices can help inform implementation science. However, simply because an intervention has produced some positive findings is not a sufficient rationale for adoption by schools and communities. Similarly, research on implementation of such practices is too narrow in nature and scope to provide detailed guidance for making major systemic changes in the context of schools and communities.

Some Implications for Schools and Community

From a systemic, public education, public health, and community development perspective, a major concern is that the science-base for many practices is limited to discrete services and programs, has been developed under highly controlled conditions, and for a relatively brief period of time. There is no guarantee that such practices will produce the same outcomes when applied widely or that they can be sustained over time. In effect, until researchers demonstrate that a prototype is effective under "real world" conditions, it is a promising not a proven practice. And, even then it must be determined whether it is a best practice.

Findings from highly controlled studies are referred to as data on *efficacy*; findings from studies conducted under common conditions of daily practice are designated as data on *effectiveness***.** In both instances, concern about generalizability arises when studies have not included samples representing major subgroups with whom the practice is to be used. Another major concern is that certain interventions increasingly are officially prescribed and others are proscribed by policy makers and funders, and only those practitioners who adhere to official lists are sanctioned and rewarded. This is a particular concern in sectors where individual needs come into conflict with powerful social, political, and economic forces.

Moreover, introduction of any new practice into an organization raises questions about where the proposed practice fits and how best to weave it into a comprehensive continuum of interventions. For example, with respect to children and adolescents, most schools and communities offer a range of programs and services oriented to youngsters' needs and problems. Introducing something new can add to the widespread problems of fragmented and marginalized approaches and counterproductive competition for resources.

Of more fundamental importance, the nature and scope of currently available empirically-supported practices are insufficient for accomplishing the type of innovative transformation needed to ensure equity of opportunity for all

(Cont.)

(Cont.)

students to succeed at school and beyond. This is illustrated by the U.S. Department of Education's *What Works Clearinghouse.* The Clearinghouse seeks out all research studies on discrete interventions, reviews each against evidence standards, and summarizes the findings of those that meet their standards in *Intervention Reports*. At the same time, they compile *Practice Guides* to aid educators in dealing with general classroom and school concerns, These guides are "based on reviews of research, the experiences of practitioners, and the expert opinions of a panel of nationally recognized experts." It is noteworthy that the guides for turning around low performing schools all have minimal evidence.

Given all this, as schools and communities seek to add best practices, they need to adopt an overall intervention *framework*. And if the aim is innovative transformation of current systems, the framework must provide a big picture vision of both a full continuum and general arenas of intervention. In contrast to discussing discrete practices in narrow ways and often out of context, such a framework provides a big picture vision that guides analyses about critical gaps and decisions about priorities and emphasizes the weaving together of school and community resources. As an example, see our work related to framing and operationalizing a unifying and comprehensive system of interventions for schools and communities focusing on addressing barriers to learning and teaching and re-engaging disconnected students (e.g., see Adelman & Taylor, 2006, 2010).

Empirical research on the entire package of interventions outlined by any comprehensive intervention framework is difficult under the best of circumstances, and a continued overemphasis on discrete interventions makes it unlikely that the right circumstances will forthcoming in the near future.

Understanding the Limitations of Narrowly Focusing on Fidelity of Implementation

Many researchers interested in having schools adopt evidence-based practices have discussed the implementation problem mainly in terms of enhancing fidelity of implementation Carroll, Patterson, Wood, Booth, Rick, & Balain, 2007; O'Donnell, 2008). From this perspective, fidelity is discussed as involving implementation of a prototype in accordance with its conceptualization and the specifics of its design. Sometimes the emphasis on fidelity is broadened to encompass implementation of at least a prototype's essential principles, core components, or "active agents" (Beutler & Johannsen, 2005; Chorpita & Daleiden, 2009).

Formulating the implementation problem in terms mainly of fidelity ignores the many fundamental complexities related to diffusing comprehensive innovations that require fundamental systemic changes (e.g., such as those that are essential in transforming how schools and communities weave together resources to address barriers to learning and teaching and re-engage disconnected students). For example, with reference to schools and their relationship to the surrounding community, concerns arise about valid *adaptation* to ensure successful systemic change. Back in 2004, Castro, Barrera Jr. & Martinez Jr (2004) described the matter as a dynamic tension regarding two imperatives: (a) fidelity of implementation and (b) program adaptation – the modification of program content to accommodate the needs of a specific consumer group. As Richard Price (1997) states the matter:

> "Effective implementation depends not on exclusive and narrow adherence to researcher definitions of fidelity, but on mutual adaptation between the efficacious program features and needs and competencies of the host organization."

In almost all instances where a prototype design is to be implemented in schools, some adaptation is required.

From this perspective, the implementation problem expands to include facilitating effective adoption/adaptation of a prototype at a particular site.

Moreover, when implementation involves major changes in an institutional setting (such as a school), it is essential to account for the reality that such settings have well-ingrained policies, culture, and infrastructures. Stated differently, it is unrealistic and inappropriate to expect established organizations to make major systemic changes without adapting prototypes so that they fit or reworking policies, culture, and infrastructures to improve the fit. Related to this, it is important to consider the renewed and growing interest in replacing prescriptive practices with approaches that emphasize essential principles and critical elements of what makes an approach effective.

Good ideas and missionary zeal are sometimes enough to change the thinking of individuals; they are rarely, if ever, effective in changing complicated organizations (like the school) with traditions, dynamics, and goals of their own.

Seymour Sarason

Then come the added complexities of system-wide replication-to-scale, sustainability, and creative renewal. Such concerns, of course, are compounded when introducing comprehensive initiatives (as contrasted to specific, narrowly-focused programs and services). And are further complication when interventions are novel.

All this requires processes and mechanisms conceived in terms of implementation, systemic change, transformation, replication to scale, sustainability, and creative renewal. The tasks related to each of these matters usually require policy revisions and significant changes in existing operational infrastructures. The work also calls for the skills of a well-trained change agent and well-designed capacity building (e.g., technical assistance, coaching, stakeholder development). Also important is an appreciation of psychological considerations that influence effectiveness (e.g., motivation, interpersonal dynamics).

At the same time that so much emphasis has been placed on fidelity, a growing body of literature is exploring the problem of applying science to advance practice (e.g., Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2012; Flaspohler, Lesesne, Puddy, Smith, & Wandersman, 2012; Greenhalgh, Robert, Macfarlane, Bate, & Kyriakidou, 2004; Institute of Education Sciences, 2013; Layde, Christiansen, Peterson, Guse, Maurana, & Brandenburg, 2012). This work stresses the complexities of the implementation problem and is offering broad frameworks to guide implementation research.

Discussion of Fidelity Often Diverts Attention from More Fundamental Concerns

Not only does the narrow focus on fidelity often limit implementation research, the discussion of fidelity tends to divert attention from the more fundamental question of whether introduction of another discrete practice is premature. For example, schools have many needs and limited budgets. In general, school and related community decisions about what interventions to pursue should be based on what is likely to account for major progress toward ensuring the greatest good for the many and not just another specific practice for a relatively small number of students. The complex problem for school decision makers, of course, is how to address the needs of all students in ways that support commitment to social justice and enhancing equity.

Formative Evaluation: Beyond Monitoring Fidelity

Clearly, the implementation problem is highly complex, especially when viewed from the intent to apply comprehensive and innovative approaches on a large-scale (e.g., the type of comprehensive and cohesive set of transformative interventions needed to ensure equity of opportunity for all students to succeed at school and beyond). Clearly, the process goes well beyond the matter of fidelity. As a result, monitoring fidelity becomes just one facet of comprehensive *formative evaluation* and *rapid problem-solving* (Rossi, Lipsey, & Freeman, 2004).

Effective formative evaluation grows out of strategic planning designed to ensure that the vision for innovative transformation is effectively and efficiently implemented. The plan spells out an answer to: *How do we get there from here?*

Given that the work involves major systemic changes, the focus is on four major phases (Adelman & Taylor, 2007):

Summative evaluation is done only after effective implementation.

(1) *Creating Readiness and Commitment* – enhancing the climate/culture/conditions for innovative systemic change

(2) *Start-up and phase in* – initial implementation (which includes decision making to adopt/adapt and phase-in an innovation with well-designed infrastructure and capacity building)

(3) *Sustaining, evolving, and enhancing outcomes* – ensuring institutionalization, maintenance, momentum, replication to scale, and progress

(4) *Ongoing evolution and creative renewal.*

For each phase, given prevailing antecedent conditions, *strategic planning* clarifies the actions to be taken (e.g., the who, what, when, and how) with respect to such matters as:

- leadership and staffing for overseeing, steering, and implementing the strategic plan,
- capacity building,
- establishing ways to monitor all facets of implementation (e.g., benchmarks and processes for assessing progress),
- formulating ways to evaluate effective implementation (e.g., indicators, standards, deliverables, immediate and longer-term impact in terms of costs-benefits).

Given the presence of relevant antecedent conditions, key formative evaluation concerns include whether intended processes actually transpire and whether potent unintended processes occur. Findings related to such matters are basic in deciding what implementation changes are needed.

Examples of Formative and Summative Evaluation Aids

An example of benchmark indicators from our work is included as Appendix A. Also see:

>*Monitoring Progress in Developing a Comprehensive System to Address Barriers to Learning and Teaching – Quick Overview Guide for Self-Evaluation*
http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/studentsupport/toolkit/selvevaltool.pdf

Examples of standards and related indicators are in

>*Common Core Standards for a Learning Supports Component*
http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/commcore.pdf

With respect to impact/outcome data related to addressing barriers to learning and teaching, see Appendix B. Also see:

>*About Short-term Outcome Indicators for School Use and the Need for an Expanded Policy Framework*
http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/outind.pdf

>*Expanding the Accountability Framework for Schools*
http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/account.pdf

Concluding Comments

The intent of this brief has been to underscore that efforts to transform schools and their relationship to the surrounding community require dynamic, comprehensive transactional approaches that go beyond the available science-base. Analyses of the literature make it clear that restricting the focus to practices that have undergone rigorous study is too limiting. Prototypes for comprehensive and innovative strategies are yet to be researched. This also the situation with respect to implementing such approaches at specific sites, replicating them to scale, and sustaining and evolving them over time.

So, while policy makers continue to push for applying science to help make *fundamental* improvements to schools and communities, they also must accept that it will be some time before the science-base is sufficient to prescribe and proscribe the what and the how. The desire of decision makers to apply science needs to be balanced with solid endorsement of well-designed rational innovation and with much greater financial support for systemic change processes. Doing so will provide new opportunities to improve the science-base (assuming evaluation studies are sufficiently underwritten). And doing so is essential to moving forward in transformative ways.

References

Adelman, H.S. & Taylor, L. (2006). *The school leader's guide to student learning supports: New directions for addressing barriers to learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Adelman, H. S. & Taylor, L. (2007). Systemic Change and School Improvement. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 17*, 55-77.

Adelman, H.S. & Taylor, L. (2010). *Mental health in schools: Engaging learners, preventing problems, and improving schools.* Thousand oaks, Ca: Corwin Press.

American Psychological Association (2012). *Resolution on the recognition of psychotherapy effectiveness.* http://www.apa.org/about/policy/resolution-psychotherapy.aspx

Beutler, L. E. & Johannsen, B. E. (2005). Principles of change. In J. C. Norcross, L. E. Beutler, & R. F. Levant (Eds.), *Evidence-based practices in mental health: Debate and dialogue on the fundamental questions*. (pp. 226-234) Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Carroll, C., Patterson, M., Wood, S., Booth, A., Rick, J., & Balain, S. (2007). A conceptual framework for implementation fidelity. *Implementation Science, 2*, 1-9.

Castro, F.G., Barrera Jr., M., & Martinez Jr, C.R. (2004). The cultural adaptation of prevention interventions: Resolving tensions between fidelity and fit. *Prevention Science, 5*, 41-45.

Center for Mental Health in Schools (2007). *Systemic change and empirically-supported practices: The implementation problem*. Los Angeles: Author at UCLA. http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/systemic/implementation%20problem.pdf

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2012). *Applying science, advancing practice: Understanding the interactive systems framework for dissemination and implementation*. Author. http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/ASAP_Issue-a.pdf

Chorpita, B. F., & Daleiden, E. L. (2009). Mapping evidence-based treatments for children and adolescents: Application of the distillation and matching model to 615 treatments from 322 randomized trials. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 77*, 566-579.

Fixsen, D.L., Naoom, S.F., Blase, K.A., Friedman, R.M., & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature*. Tampa, FL: The National Implementation Reserach Network, University of South Florida. Retrieved November 22, 2006 from http://nirn.fmhi. usf.edu/resources/publications/Monograph.

Flaspohler, P., Lesesne, C.A., Puddy, R.W., Smith, E., & Wandersman, A. (2012). Advances in bridging research and practice: Introduction to the second special issue on the interactive system framework for dissemination and implementation. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 50*, 271–281.

Greenhalgh, T., Robert, G., Macfarlane, F., Bate, P., & Kyriakidou, O. (2004). Diffusion of Innovations in Service Organizations: Systematic Review and Recommendations. *Milbank Quarterly, 82*, 581-629.

Institute of Education Sciences (2013). *What Works Clearinghouse website*. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/

Kratochwill, T.R., & Shernoff, E.S. (2004). Evidence-Based Practice: Promoting Evidence-Based Interventions in School Psychology, *School Psychology Review, 33*, 34-48.

La Roche, M. J., & Christopher, M. S. (2009). Changing paradigms from empirically supported treatment to evidence-based practice: A cultural perspective. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40,* 396-402.

Layde, P. M., Christiansen, A. L., Peterson, D. J., Guse, C. E., Maurana, C. A., & Brandenburg, T. (2012). A model to translate evidence-based interventions into community practice. *American Journal of Public Health, 102*, 617–624.

Meyers, D.C., Durlak, J.A., & Wandersman, A. (2012). The quality implementation framework: A synthesis of critical steps in the implementation process. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 50,* 462-80.

Norcross, J.C., Beutler, L.E., & Levant, R.F. (Eds.), (2005). *Evidence-based practices in mental health: Debate and dialogue on the fundamental questions.* Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

O'Donnell, C. L. (2008). Defining, conceptualizing, and measuring fidelity of implementationand its relationship to outcomes in K-12 curriculum intervention research. *Review of Educational Research, 78*, 33-84.

Price, R.H. (1997). In praise of cumulative prevention science. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 25,* 169–176.

Rabin, B.A. and Brownson, R.C. (2012). Developing the terminology for dissemination and implementation research in health. In Brownson, R.C., Colditz, G.A., & Proctor, E.K. (Eds.), *Dissemination and Implementation Research in Health: Translating Science to Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rogers, E.M. (2003) *The diffusion of innovations*, fifth edition. New York: The Free Press.

Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W., & Freeman, H.E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach*, 7th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sarason, S.B. (1996). *Revisiting "The culture of school and the problem of change."* NewYork: Teachers College Press.

U.S. Department of Education. (2011). *Prevalence and implementation fidelity of research-based prevention programs in public schools: Final report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Also see the following from the Center at UCLA:

As an introduction to the literature on implementation and systemic change, our Center continues to add to its series of "Information Resources" on enabling systemic change. The series is entitled:

>*Diffusion of Innovations and Science-Based Practices to Address Barriers to Learning & Improve Schools* -
http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/materials/trainingpresentation.htm#fact

The Center's Online Clearinghouse is organized into Quick Find Topics. Many have relevance to the discussions in the brief. Here are a few examples:

>*Systemic Change, and the Diffusion of Innovation in Schools* –
http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/qf/systemicchange.html

>*Change Agent/Organizational Facilitator* –
http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/qf/changeagent.htm

>*Empirically-Supported/Evidence-Based Interventions for Children's MH* –
http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/qf/ests.htm

Appendix A

Benchmark Checklist for Monitoring and Reviewing Progress in Developing a Comprehensive System to Address Barriers to Learning and Teaching

The checklist on the following pages is designed to aid those involved in the process of restructuring education support programs and developing a Learning Supports (Enabling) Component.

This tool was developed as a formative evaluation instrument for use by Steering Groups, Organization Facilitators, and other change agents. It aids in focusing problem solving discussions and planning next steps.

The items should be modified to fit local strategic and action plans

ABOUT THE CENTER FOR MENTAL HEALTH IN SCHOOLS at UCLA

This national Center is co-directed by Howard Adelman and Linda Taylor and operates under the auspices of the School Mental Health Project at UCLA.

Contact us by email at smhp@ucla.edu or call 310/825-3634 or write Center for Mental Health in Schools, Dept. of Psychology, UCLA, Box 951563, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1563.

Website: http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu

Site Name:	Date started	Date Completed if applies	Current Status
I. ORIENTATION AND CREATING READINESS			
DISTRICT LEVEL-- District Name:			
A. **Establishment of a district *Steering Group* ("champions") to facilitate development of the** **Component** Steering Group members identified Names: Position:			
B. Leadership and systemic change training for steering group members			
C. Orienting district stakeholders – initial contacts made with key stakeholders to introduce basic ideas			
(1) "Social marketing" strategies used to introduce basic ideas and relevant research base to key stakeholders >administrators >staff >parent representatives >business and community stakeholders >_____			
(2) Opportunities for interchange provided & additional in-depth presentations made to build a critical mass of consensus for systemic changes			
(3) Ongoing evaluation of interest indicates a critical mass of stakeholders are ready to pursue a policy commitment and/or continuing work to enhance commitment for moving forward			
(4) Ratification and sponsorship elicited from a critical mass of stakeholders			
D. Establishing Policy Commitment & Framework – (follow-up meetings with district leaders to clarify dimensions of the work and how to proceed)			
(1) Negotiation of policy commitment and conditions for engagement (e.g., high level policy established and assurance of leadership commitment – learning supports component adopted as one of the primary and essential components of school improvement – on a par with instructional & management components)			
(2) Policy translated into an inspiring vision, a framework, and a strategic plan that phases in changes using a realistic time line			

Site Name:	Date started	Date Completed if applies	Current Status
(3) Policy translated into appropriate resource allocations (leadership, staff, space, budget, time)			
(4) Incentives for change established (e.g., intrinsically valued outcomes, expectations for success, recognitions, rewards)			
(5) Procedural options established that reflect stakeholder strengths and from which those expected to implement change can select strategies they see as workable			
(6) Infrastructure and processes established for facilitating change efforts			
(7) Establishment of a change agent(s) position			
(8) Change agent(s) identified – indicate name(s): _____ _____			
(9) Initial capacity-building – essential skills developed among stakeholders to begin implementation			
(10) Benchmarks used to provide feedback on progress and to make necessary improvements in the process for creating readiness			
E. Development of phase-in plan for District (see and adapt *Start-up and Phase-in tasks for schools*)			
SCHOOL LEVEL- School Name:			
A. Establishment of Steering Group ("champions") for school to facilitate development of Component Steering Group members identified Names: Position:			
B. Leadership and systemic change training for Steering Group members			
C. Orienting school stakeholders – initial contacts made with key stakeholders to introduce basic ideas			
(1) "Social marketing" strategies used to introduce basic ideas and relevant research base to key stakeholders >administrators >staff >parent representatives >business and community stakeholders _____			

Site Name:	Date started	Date Completed if applies	Current Status
(2) Opportunities for interchange provided & additional in-depth presentations made to build a critical mass of consensus for systemic changes			
(3) Ongoing evaluation of interest indicates a critical mass of stakeholders are ready to move forward			
(4) Ratification and sponsorship elicited from a critical mass of stakeholders			
D. Establishing Policy Commitment & Framework – (follow-up meetings with school leaders to clarify the dimensions of the work and how to proceed)			
(1) Negotiation of a policy commitment and conditions for engagement (e.g., high level policy established and assurance of leadership commitment – learning supports component adopted as one of the primary and essential components of school improvement – on a par with the instructional and management components)			
(2) Policy translated into an inspiring vision, frameworks, and a strategic plan to phase-in changes using a realistic time line			
(3) Policy translated into appropriate resource allocations (leadership, staff, space, budget, time)			
(4) Incentives for change established (e.g., intrinsically valued outcomes, expectations for success, recognitions, rewards)			
(5) Procedural options established that reflect stakeholder strengths and from which those expected to implement change can select strategies they see as workable			
(6) Infrastructure and processes established for facilitating change efforts			
(7) Establishment of a change agent(s) position			
(8) Current change agent(s) – indicate name(s): _____ _____			
(9) Initial capacity-building – essential skills developed among stakeholders to begin implementation			
(10) Benchmarks used to provide feedback on progress and to make necessary improvements in the process for creating motivational readiness and capability to move forward			

Site Name:	Date started	Date Completed if applies	Current Status
E. Development of phase-in plan for school (based on the following *Start-up and Phase-in tasks*)			
II. START-UP AND PHASE-IN			
A. **Evaluation indicating that Steering Group at the school is ready to facilitate development** of the Component Update Members Name: Position:			
B. Identification of a site leader (equivalent to the leader for the Instructional Component) Name: Position:			
C. Identification of others advocates for the Component Names: Position:			
D. Current Change Agent(s) indicate name(s): _____ _____			
E. Leadership and systemic change training for all taking a lead in developing the component			
F. Survey of administrator, teacher, and other staff regarding attitudes about new directions			
G. ESTABLISHMENT OF LEARNING SUPPORTS RESOURCE TEAM			
(1) Identification of potential team members			
(2) Recruitment of team members. Name: Position:			
(3) Initial team meeting.			
(4) Training for team.			

Site Name:	Date started	Date Completed if applies	Current Status
H. INITIAL MAPPING AND ANALYSIS OF EXISTING RESOURCES			
(1) Initial mapping			
(2) Initial analyses (e.g., of needs, gaps, efficacy, coordination, integration with school improvement planning)			
(3) Initial plans and steps to improve learning supports (enabling) activity (e.g., priorities, intervention development work groups)			
(4) Initial "maps" and plans distributed			
I. INITIAL ENHANCEMENT OF SYSTEMS AND ACTIVITY RELATED TO ENABLING			
(1) Analysis, improvement, documentation, and circulation of info and recommendations on how to use current "systems" – clarification of steps, development of flow charts, written descriptions, training of personnel, etc. (e.g., for work related to >Promoting Healthy Development and Preventing Problems >Response to Intervention (RtI) >Handling Behavior Problems >Referral for Emergency Help-Major Services >Triage >Care Management >Crisis Response (e.g., Crisis Team) >_____			
(2) Training for existing work groups. >Student and Family Assistance Team (e.g., Student Study or Guidance Team) >IEP Team members >Crisis Team >Other (specify)			
J. REFINING INFRASTRUCTURE & PURSUING DEEPER MAPPING AND ANALYSES			
(1) Learning support activity organized into a delineated set of intervention arenas (e.g., six content arenas)			
(2) Standing work groups developed for each arena			

Site Name:	Date started	Date Completed if applies	Current Status
(3) Training of Arena work groups Specify Areas:			
(4) Initial mapping and analyses of resources related to each arena accomplished			
(5) Each arena work group formulates priorities for enhancing activity in own area. Delineate by Arena:			
(6) Priorities for enhancing learning supports delineated, evaluated, and ranked by Learning Supports Leadership Team and plans formulated for pursuing top priorities.			
(7) School infrastructure refined so that learning supports (enabling) component is fully integrated with the instructional and management components			
(8) If relevant, plans formulated to establish a Family and/or Parent Center			
K. COMPONENT VISIBILITY, COMMUNICATION, & PROBLEM SOLVING			
(1) Ad hoc work groups developed to enhance component visibility, communication, sharing, & problem solving			
(2) All existing programs, services, and resources listed, circulated (e.g., to all staff, parents),), and for high visibility featured in memos, bulletins, on websites, in a brochure describing the Learning Supports Component and key interventions, in newsletters and on information boards, etc.			
(3) Other steps taken to enhance visibility. (specify)			
(4) Effective *communication mechanisms* in operation			
(5) Effective *problem solving mechanisms* in operation			
(6) Effective *social marketing mechanisms* in operation			

Site Name	Date Started	Date Completed	Current Status
L. OUTREACH TO FILL GAPS & PURSUE ECONOMIES OF SCALE			
(1) Formal collaborative linkages established with other resources in the district (specify)			
(2) Formal collaborative linkages (e.g., a Learning Supports Leadership Council) established with other schools in locale (e.g., a feeder pattern) (specify)			
(3) Formal collaborative linkages (e.g., a school-community collaborative) established with a wide range of community resources (e.g., programs and agencies) (specify)			
M. SYSTEM FOR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT			
Decisions about indicators to be used.			
Members recruited for Quality Improvement Team. Name: Position:			
Training of Quality Improvement Team			
Initial Quality Improvement recommendations. Made. Acted upon.			

Site Name	Date Started	Date Completed	Current Status
III. INSTITUTIONALIZATION (maintenance & evolution) ***& IV. PLANS FOR ONGOING RENEWAL***			
A. Indications of planning for maintenance			
(1) policy commitments			
(2) regular budget allocations			
(3) ongoing administrative leadership			
(4) a key facet of school improvement plans			
B. Strategies in use for maintaining momentum/progress.(sustainability) (List most prominent examples)			
C. Strategies in use and future plans for generating renewal (List most prominent examples)			

An overarching benchmark involves the monitoring of the implementation of evaluation plans.

Appendix B

Examples of Indicators of Impact

Students

Increased knowledge, skills, & attitudes related to academics
- assessed in keeping with curricula standards

Increased knowledge, skills, & attitudes for enhancing
- Acceptance of responsibility (including attending, following directions and agreed upon rules/laws)
- Self-esteem & integrity
- Social and working relationships
- Self-evaluation and self-direction/regulation
- Physical functioning
- Health maintenance
- Safe behavior

Reduced barriers to school attendance and functioning by addressing problems related to
- Health
- Lack of adequate clothing
- Dysfunctional families
- Lack of home support for student improvement
- Physical/sexual abuse
- Substance abuse
- Gang involvement
- Pregnant/parenting minors
- Dropouts
- Need for compensatory learning strategies

Families & Communities
- Increased social and emotional support for families
- Increased family access to special assistance
- Increased family ability to reduce child risk factors that can be barriers to learning
- Increased bilingual ability and literacy of parents
- Increased family ability to support schooling
- Increased positive attitudes about schooling
- Increased home (family/parent) participation at school
- Enhance positive attitudes toward school and community
- Increased community participation in school activities
- Increased perception of the school as a hub of community activities
- Increased partnerships designed to enhance education & service availability in community
- Enhanced coordination & collaboration between community agencies and school programs & services
- Enhanced focus on agency outreach to meet family needs
- Increased psychological sense of community

Programs & Systems
- Enhanced processes by which staff and families learn about available programs and services and how to access those they need
- Increased coordination among services and programs
- Increases in the degree to which staff work collaboratively and programmatically
- Increased services/programs at school site
- Increased amounts of school and community collaboration
- Increases in quality of services and programs because of improved systems for requesting, accessing, and managing assistance for students and families (including overcoming inappropriate barriers to confidentiality)
- Establishment of a long-term financial base