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Goals

• Define Implementation Science

• Describe lessons learned from seven states using Implementation Science with PBIS.
  – Getting Started
  – Building to 40%
  – Moving from 40% to 80%
Basic Message

• When building **Interventions and Strategies** consider not just of initial effectiveness but **sustainability** and large-scale **dissemination**.
Formula for Success

WHAT
Effective Innovations

HOW & WHO
Effective Implementation

WHY
Educationally Significant Outcomes
What is School-wide Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS)?

• **School-wide PBIS is:**
  – A multi-tiered framework for establishing the **social culture** and additional behavioral supports needed for a school to achieve behavioral and academic outcomes for all students.

• **Evidence-based features of SWPBIS**
  – Prevention
  – Define and teach positive social expectations
  – Acknowledge positive behavior
  – Arrange consistent consequences for problem behavior
  – On-going collection and use of data for decision-making
  – Continuum of intensive, individual intervention supports.
  – Implementation of the systems that support effective practices
School-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (SWPBIS)

- The social culture of a school matters.

- A continuum of supports that begins with the whole school and extends to intensive, wraparound support for individual students and their families.

- Effective practices with the systems needed for high fidelity and sustainability

- Multiple tiers of intensity
Implementation Science Frameworks

WHO
Teams

WHEN
Stages

WHAT
Interventions

HOW
Drivers

HOW
Cycles
Successful Student Outcomes

Program/Initiative/Framework (e.g. RtI)

- Performance Assessment (Fidelity)
- Coaching
- Systems Intervention
- Facilitative Administration
- Decision Support Data System

Implementation Drivers

- Leadership
  - Adaptive
  - Technical

- Competency Drivers
  - Training
  - Selection

- Organization Drivers
  - Adaptive Technical

© Fixsen & Blase, 2008
# Stages of Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should we do it!</td>
<td>Exploration/Adoption</td>
<td>Decision regarding commitment to adopting the program/practices and supporting successful implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work to do it right!</td>
<td>Installation</td>
<td>Set up infrastructure so that successful implementation can take place and be supported. Establish team and data systems, conduct audit, develop plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work to do it better!</td>
<td>Initial Implementation</td>
<td>Try out the practices, work out details, learn and improve before expanding to other contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Implementation</td>
<td>Expand the program/practices to other locations, individuals, times- adjust from learning in initial implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuous Improvement/Regeneration</td>
<td>Make it easier, more efficient. Embed within current practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership Team

Active Coordination

Funding
Visibility
Political Support
Policy

Training
Coaching
Technical Expertise
Evaluation

Local School Demonstrations
Schools using PBIS
August, 2014
21,611
Number of Schools Implementation SWPBIS (Tier I) by State
August, 2014

14 States with more than 500 schools
Proportion of Schools Implementing SWPBIS by State
August, 2014

14 States with more than 40% of schools
Time in Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Schools Implementing</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model Demonstrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Steve Goodman
Scaling up School-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports: The Experiences of Seven States with Documented Success


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exploration</th>
<th>Installation</th>
<th>Initial Imp</th>
<th>Full Imp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviews and Data Reviews with the PBIS implementers from Seven States that had at least 500 schools using PBIS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Team (coordination)</th>
<th>Exploration and Adoption</th>
<th>Installation</th>
<th>Initial Implementation</th>
<th>Full Implementation</th>
<th>Innovation and sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a state leadership team?</td>
<td>What were critical issues that confronted the team as it began to install systems changes?</td>
<td>What were specific activities the team did to ensure success of the initial implementation efforts?</td>
<td>Did the team change personnel or functioning as the # of schools/districts increased?</td>
<td>What has the Leadership team done to insure sustainability?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you do, how was your first leadership team developed?</td>
<td>Who were members?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who supported/lead the team through the exploration process?</td>
<td>Was any sort of self-assessment completed (e.g. the PBIS Implementation Blueprint Assessment)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In what areas is the State “innovating” and contributing to the research and practice of PBIS (e.g. linking PBIS with literacy or math)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptive Summary: Oregon

Exploration / Installation / Initial Imp / Full Imp & Innovate
Descriptive Summary: Missouri

Exploration                        /         Installation                             /Initial Imp        / Full Imp & Innovate
Descriptive Summary: North Carolina
Descriptive Summary: Florida

- Exploration/Installation
- Initial Imp
- Full Imp
- Innovate

The chart shows a gradual increase from Exploration/Installation to Innovate.
Descriptive Summary: Maryland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (0-2010)</th>
<th>Exploration/Installation</th>
<th>Initial Imp</th>
<th>Full Imp</th>
<th>Innovate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptive Summary: Illinois
Lessons Learned: Moving from 10% to 40%

- Multiple approaches to achieving scaled implementation
  - **Colorado**: Started with Leadership Team
  - **Illinois**: Started with Leadership Advocates and built team only after implementation expanded.
  - **Missouri**: Strong initial demonstrations led to strong state support

- All states began with small “demonstrations” that documented the feasibility and impact of SWPBIS.

- Only when states reached 100-200 demonstrations did scaling occur. Four core features needed for scaling:
  - Administrative Leadership / Support / Funding
  - Technical capacity (Local training, coaching, evaluation and behavioral expertise)
  - Local Demonstrations of feasibility and impact (100-200)
  - Evaluation data system (to support continuous improvement)

- Essential role of Data: Fidelity data AND Outcome data
Districts

• **Coherent District Policy**
  – Social behavior is a **priority** in district improvement plan
  – District commitment to **selecting practices** that are evidence-based
  – District process for **aligning multiple initiatives**.

• **Evaluation Capacity**
  – Data systems that inform decision-making and provide policy feedback
  **Fidelity and Impact**

• **Recruitment, Hiring, Evaluation**
  – “Preference will be given to individuals with knowledge and experience in implementation of multi-tiered academic and behavior supports.”
• **Annual Faculty/Staff Orientation**
  – Defines PBIS as a priority
  – Defines what to expect in a school using PBIS.
  – 30-60 min of annual orientation

• **Professional Development (Training)**
  – PD is always tied to core improvement goals
  – PD typically involves distributed training (multiple events)
  – PD is always linked to on-site coaching.
  – PD is always linked to fidelity measure

• **Coaching**
Moving from 40% to 80%

- **Formal System for Initiative Selection and Alignment**

- **Implement with Depth**
  - Tier I through “classroom”
  - Establish data systems (BOTH data collection and data use)
  - Tiers II and III
  - Greater attention to PBIS Systems

- **Embed and Adapt (with consistent core)**
  - Presence at decision points (which are not always well defined)
  - Make PBIS relevant to current target areas
  - Support new strategies to achieve PBIS core features.

NOTE: The key to effective adaptation is regular measurement of fidelity
Predicted Trajectory based on theory of critical mass

Too often, actual results

Steve Goodman & Justyn Poulos
Compression Implementation

Policy Expectation  Incentive

Technical Assistance Capacity

Grassroots Demand

Network of Trainers
Fidelity Measure
Coaching Network
Outcome Measures
Alignment Protocols
Defined roles at all levels of system

Large Scale, High Fidelity, Sustained Implementation
Valued Outcomes

Implementation

Identifying & Modifying Practices

Data-Based Prob. Solving

Continuous Regeneration

Capacity Building

Continuous Measurement

Efficiency

Priority

Effectiveness

School Context

Sustainability

Kent McIntosh
No “Tipping Point”

• 0-10%: Start with Demonstrations
  – Select evidence-based interventions
  – Define systems as well as strategies
  – Document feasibility and impact

• 10-40%: Build capacity to improve efficiency
  – Improve speed and cost to implement
  – Local trainers, coaches, technical expertise, evaluation
  – Expand range of valued outcomes

• 40%-80%: Scale to Level of Systems Change
  – Adequate technical assistance capacity
  – Alignment strategy
  – Formal presence within decision-making at state level
  – Emphasis on systems (school, district, region, state)
  – Data, data, data, data
There is no tipping point...
Summary

• Select interventions with both evidence of impact, and evidence of efficiency

• Build systems to support effective interventions

• Build capacity of the system while establishing initial demonstrations

• Collect and use both fidelity and impact data to build political support for scaling.

• Getting from 40-80% requires establishing broader political purpose and formal system for alignment with new and competing initiatives.
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