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THE IMPLEMENTATION JOURNEY
IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS MODELS

- Describe and/or guide the process of translating research into practice
- Recognize a temporal sequence of implementation endeavours
- Specify steps (stages, phases) of implementation

IMPLEMENTATION PHASES

AGENTS ALONG THE IMPLEMENTATION JOURNEY

- Developer
- Purveyor
- System
- Agency Leadership
- Program Champion
- Practitioner
- Client/Patient
Implementation of EBP entails extensive planning, training, and quality assurance.

Involves a complex set of interactions between developers, system leaders, front line staff, and consumers.

Recursive process of well defined stages or steps that are not necessarily linear.
AGENTS IN IMPLEMENTATION

- Program Champion
- System
- Developer
- Purveyor
- Agency Leadership
- Practitioners
- Client/Patient
LESSONS FROM THE “OLD” TO INFORM THE “NEW”
Adherence to Key Treatment Components
+
Delivering the Components with Competence

Treatment Integrity

Necessary to Achieve Positive INTERVENTION Outcomes Found in Clinical Trials

VALUE OF UNDERSTANDING MECHANISMS OF ACTION

- Building Blocks for What Makes an Intervention Work
DEFINING IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY

- Performing implementation activities with both adherence and competence

- Goal: To increase positive IMPLEMENTATION outcomes
MECHANISMS OF ACTION

- Building Blocks for What Makes an Implementation Work
Logic Model for Implementation Research

Determinants (CFIR)

- Intervention Characteristics
- Inner Setting
- Outer Setting
- Characteristics of individuals
- Process

Implementation Strategies

Outcomes

Implementation
Serve
Clinical/Patient
DEVELOPMENT OF THE STAGES OF IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION (SIC)

- Created for a head-to-head trial of two different implementation strategies when implementing the same EBP (TFCO)
- Iterative process based on observation of implementation activities/strategies
- 8 Stages: Engagement through Competency (9+ in progress)
- Date Driven
- Spans 3 Phases: Pre-Implementation, Implementation, Sustainment
- Allows for assessment of non-linear progression
STAGES OF IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION (SIC)

8 Stages:

1. Engagement
2. Consideration of Feasibility
3. Readiness Planning
4. Staff Hired and Trained
5. Fidelity Monitoring Established
6. Services and Consultation
7. Ongoing Services, Consultation, Fidelity, Feedback
8. Competency (certification)

Involvement:
- System and/or Agency Leader
- System and/or Agency Leader
- System and/or Agency Leader
- Agency, Practitioner
- Practitioner, Client
- Practitioner, Client
- Practitioner, Client
- System Leader, Agency, Practitioner, Client
1. Engagement
   Date agreed to consider implementation of PrEP protocol
2. Consideration of Feasibility
   Date of Meeting with Health Department Leader for Support
3. Readiness Planning
   Date Selection Criteria Identified for PrEP Care Team
4. Staff Hired and Trained
   Date Home Visitor workshop completed
5. Fidelity and Adherence Monitoring Established
   Date Trained on Dashboard Entry, Use, and Management
6. Services and Consultation Begin
   Date of first patient screened for Eligibility
7. Ongoing Services, Consultation, Fidelity, Feedback
   Date first home visitor/provider obtains 85% fidelity
8. Competency (certification)
   Date Clinic Passes Certification Review
THREE SCORES

- Duration
- Proportion
- Stage Score
MISSING DATA TYPES

Truly Not Completed
Expansion Team
Not Applicable
Completed-Date Unknown
- Operationalizing the Implementation Process
- Collaborative and Iterative
- Defining “Completion” of Implementation Activities
- Defining Decision Rules for Validity Checks
- Comparing Skeletal SIC with Reality and Making Adjustments
- Program onto the SIC website and Training

- 20+ Tailored Adaptations across multiple service sectors

AGENCY/SYSTEM/SITE CHARACTERISTICS

• Site Demographics
• Urban vs Rural
• International or Domestic
• Service Sector
• Population Being Served
• Funding Source
• Policy Mandated
• Expansion Characteristics if Applicable
SIC SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES: REPLICATION

- Reliably distinguish good from poor performers
- Reliably distinguish between implementation strategies
- Pre-implementation SIC behavior predicts successful program start-up (Stage 6)
- Pre-implementation SIC behavior predicts discontinuing program
- Pre-implementation and implementation behavior combined predict development of Competency (Stage 8)
More Similar than Not
UNIVERSAL SIC: ACTIVITIES PER STAGE

- Stage 1: Engagement 4
- Stage 2: Feasibility Assessment 4
- Stage 3: Readiness Planning 10
- Stage 4: Hiring and Training 5
- Stage 5: Fidelity Monitoring Established/Set-Up 4
- Stage 6: Program Start-Up 4
- Stage 7: Ongoing Service Delivery, Quality Assurance 11
- Stage 8: Demonstration of Competency 4
UNI-SICS

- SCHOOLS
- LINKED SCALE-UPS
- STATE/REGIONAL/COUNTRY SCALE-UPS
- CHILD WELFARE
- ADULT JUSTICE
- JUVENILE JUSTICE
- PRIMARY CARE/PEDIATRIC HEALTHCARE
- HOSPITAL HEALTHCARE
- GLOBAL HEALTH
- EARLY EDUCATION
1,481 SITES (ACROSS PRACTICES*): 63% HAVE DISCONTINUED

* Includes Universal

Stages of Implementation Completion

1. Engagement: Learn and Decide
2. Feasibility: Review Expectations and Capacity
3. Readiness Planning: Collaborate and Prepare
4. Staff Hired and Trained: Support
5. Fidelity Monitoring: Feedback
6. Consultation: Launch Critical Components
7. Ongoing Services: Support and Monitor

8. Competency: Sustainment

55%
16%
14%
85% do so in pre-implementation
1,481 SITES (ACROSS PRACTICES*): 39% GET THROUGH PRE-IMPLEMENTATION

OF THOSE WHO COMPLETE PRE-IMP:

1. Engagement
   Learn and Decide

2. Feasibility
   Review Expectations and Capacity

3. Readiness Planning
   Collaborate and Prepare

4. Staff Hired and Trained
   Support

5. Fidelity Monitoring
   Feedback

6. Consultation
   Launch Critical Components

7. Ongoing Services
   Support and Monitor

8. Competency
   Sustainment

31% 12%**

77% 30%**

* of the original 1,481
Stage 1 – Engagement

1_01  Date site is informed/learns services/program available
1_02  Date of interest indicated
1_03  Date agreed to consider implementation
1_04  Date initial cost information sent
ENGAGEMENT STAGE
1,481

Probability of Achieving Program Start-Up

N = 1,390

Probability
Proportion
Stage 2 – Consideration of Feasibility

2_01 Date of 1st site planning contact
2_02 Date Stakeholder meeting #1
2_03 Date Feasibility Questionnaire completed
2_04 Date liaison/Program Champion representative identified to purveyor
ASSESSMENT OF FEASIBILITY STAGE
1,481

Probability of Achieving Program Start-Up

Probability

Proportion

Stage 1

Stage 2
### Stage 3 – Readiness Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3_01</th>
<th>Date of cost calculator / funding plan review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3_02</td>
<td>Date of staff sequence, timeline, hire plan review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_03</td>
<td>Date of recruitment review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_04</td>
<td>Date of referral criteria review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_05</td>
<td>Date of communication plan review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_06</td>
<td>Date Stakeholder #2 and/or leadership meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_07</td>
<td>Date written implementation plan completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_08</td>
<td>Date Service Provider selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_09</td>
<td>Date of signed contract received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_10</td>
<td>Date of initial materials sent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3_x  | Did site discontinue their implementation process in this stage? If yes, please indicate the date |
Probability of Achieving Program Start-Up

- **Stage 1**
- **Stage 2**
- **Stage 3**

**READINESS STAGE**
1,481

*N = 1,390*
PRE-IMPLEMENTATION DURATION BETWEEN THOSE THAT MAKE IT THROUGH PRE-IMPLEMENTATION

Across 8 EBPs in Different Service Sectors
Certified sites (n=70)
Discontinue (n=214)
WHY THE EMPHASIS ON PRE-IMPLEMENTATION?

- Presents the Greatest Opportunity to Move the Needle on Successful Implementations

- Recent SIC outcomes suggest that high implementation fidelity during active implementation, in the absence of high pre-implementation fidelity, yields a low probability of achieving sustainment.
PROCESS MODELS

- Can help to answer questions about “how” an implementation works
  - What are the steps needed to be taken?
  - What is the most efficient yet effective strategy for accomplishing successful implementation?
    - SIC research suggests developing and monitoring pre-implementation plans
  - How is successful implementation/competence defined?

Implementation Process Plays a Critical Role in the Achievement of Service and Client Outcomes
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