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Implementation is influenced by numerous factors

Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research

- Intervention characteristics
  - Quality, adaptability, complexity, etc.
- Outer setting
  - External policies, client needs, etc.
- Inner setting
  - Culture, climate, readiness, etc.
- Individual characteristics
  - Knowledge and beliefs, stage of change, self-efficacy, etc.
- Process
  - Planning, executing, evaluating, etc.
Inner and outer settings impact Wraparound implementation

• Inner settings:
  • Organizational policies and procedures
  • Organizational culture and climate
  • Staff competence and skills
  • Leadership styles

• Outer setting:
  • Coordination of multiple systems
  • Fiscal policies
  • Political environment
We spend a lot of time tracking implementation fidelity, but...

- Could addressing drivers within inner and outer settings be equally important?
- Could inner and outer settings be even more important?
If inner and outer settings are so important, how can we learn about progress within each setting?

• The Stages of Implementation Completion (SIC) measure draws from multiple popular implementation frameworks

Interactive System Framework (Wandersman et al.):  

NIRN stages of implementation (Fixsen et al.):
Development of the SIC

• Originally created for a head-to-head trial of two different implementation strategies when implementing the same EBP
• Iterative process based on observation of implementation activities/strategies
• 8 Stages from Engagement through Competency
• 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
   - System Leader

2. Consideration of Feasibility
   - System Leader, Agency

3. Readiness Planning
   - System Leader, Agency

4. Staff Hired and Trained
   - Agency, Practitioner

5. Fidelity Monitoring Established
   - Practitioner, Client

6. Services and Consultation
   - Practitioner, Client

7. Ongoing Services,
   Consultation, Fidelity, Feedback
   - Practitioner, Client

8. Competency (certification)
   - System Leader, Agency, Practitioner, Client

Pre-implementation

Implementation

Sustainment
Three scores derived from the SIC

1. Duration
   - Time spent in each stage

2. Proportion:
   - Proportion of activities completed within each stage

3. Stage Score:
   - Number of stages completed
SIC Summary of Outcomes

• Reliably distinguish among different levels of implementation success
• Pre-implementation SIC behavior predicts successful program start-up
  • Completing stages completely and quickly predicts implementation success
• Pre-implementation SIC behavior predicts discontinuing program
• Pre-implementation and implementation behavior combined predict development of Competency (Stage 8)

Chamberlain et al., 2011; Saldana et al., 2012; 2015
Adapting the SIC for use with Wraparound

• Adapted SIC items drawn from:
  • SIC Universal
  • Wraparound Implementation Standards – State (WISS)
  • Wraparound Implementation Standards – Program (WISP)

• Consultations with NWIC partners to tailor items to Wraparound
  • Iterative process
  • Input gathered from national coaches, NWIC administrators, and evaluation team members
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th># items original SIC</th>
<th># items “Wrap-SIC”</th>
<th>Sample item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Date agreed to consider implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feasibility Assessment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Date first stakeholder meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Readiness Planning</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Date of referral criteria review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hiring and Training</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Date supervisor trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fidelity Monitoring Established/Set-Up</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Date state established a CQI plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Program Start-Up</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Date of first family served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ongoing Service Delivery, Quality Assurance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Date first coaching session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Demonstration of Competency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Date first local coach certified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 46  52
Pilot test of WrapSIC
The two pilot states represent different approaches to implementing Wraparound care coordination and building supportive systems:

• State 1
  • Midwest
  • CMHC structure
  • CANS at intake
  • Received intensive coaching and training from NWIC
  • First connected with NWIC in 2011

• State 2
  • Southeast
  • CME structure
  • CAFAS/CALOCUS at intake
  • Received intensive coaching and training from NWIC
  • First connected with NWIC in 2011
There are small differences in completion rates across the states.
State 1 spent considerably more months within each stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Months in each stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feasibility Assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Readiness Planning</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hiring and Training</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fidelity Monitoring Established</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Program Start-Up</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ongoing Service Delivery</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Demonstration of Competency</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
States vary in levels of completeness at item level

State 1:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Completed Activity
Marked Not Complete
Completed, Data Unavailable
Unknown

State 2:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Completed Activity
Marked Not Complete
Completed, Data Unavailable
Unknown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Months to completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3_01</td>
<td>Date state leadership identified potential financing streams to support workforce development, needed system supports such as IT, and installation of Wraparound.</td>
<td>State 1: 31 State 2: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_02</td>
<td>Date of initial review between state and NWIC staff regarding staff role expectations (staffing, qualifications, roles and responsibilities, timelines, resources, etc.)</td>
<td>State 1: 5 State 2: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_03</td>
<td>Date state leadership established a communications plan to engage stakeholders.</td>
<td>State 1: ?? State 2: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_04</td>
<td>Date all partners agreed on population of focus, referral plan and flow.</td>
<td>State 1: 32 State 2: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_05</td>
<td>Date feedback loops established with local implementation teams around progress of Wraparound installation system level change needs.</td>
<td>State 1: 11 State 2: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_06</td>
<td>Date state leadership team first brought state child serving agencies, families and youth together to collaboratively plan or govern SOC implementation (full governance group).</td>
<td>State 1: 11 State 2: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_07</td>
<td>Date documentation developed representing elements of an implementation plan.</td>
<td>State 1: 11 State 2: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_09</td>
<td>Date state - NWIC contract finalized</td>
<td>State 1: 11 State 2: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_10</td>
<td>Date introductory project materials were provided to the site</td>
<td>State 1: 11 State 2: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_11</td>
<td>Date NWIC coach assigned to state</td>
<td>State 1: 5 State 2: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_12</td>
<td>Date Fiscal structures identified</td>
<td>State 1: 11 State 2: XX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

?? = unknown date
XX = not complete
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Months to completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4_01       | Date first wraparound facilitators hired or re-assigned                                                                                                                                                       | 5  
|            |                                                                                          | 4                  |
| 4_02       | Date first wraparound supervisor trained on their role                                                                                                                                                    | 21  
|            |                                                                                          | 5                  |
| 4_03       | Date first Intro to Wraparound training held                                                                                                                                                   | 6  
|            |                                                                                          | 4                  |
| 4_04       | Date of first orientation to wraparound for community team members and system partners (e.g., case workers, P.O.s, education)                                        | 5  
|            |                                                                                          | 3                  |
| 4_06       | Date state established role expectations for WPOs regarding care coordinators and supervisors and provided guidance to WPOs on role expectations and hiring protocols.                                            | 29  
|            |                                                                                          | 1                  |
| 4_07       | Local Wraparound Organization expectations defined: Date state leadership provided direction to or procured expert implementation support for local organizations on specific steps to translate the Wraparound philosophy into policies, practice elements, and achievements | 53  
|            |                                                                                          | 1                  |
| 4_08       | Care Coordinator onboarding process established: Date state provided guidance or expectations on development of a Care Coordinator onboarding plan that includes an initial apprenticeship (typically first 30-days prior to solely partnering with families), timeline for training completion, and expectations for performance | XX  
|            |                                                                                          | 6                  |
| 4_09       | Staff skill-building expectations defined regarding coaching and demonstrating competency: State provides expectations on staff training, coaching, competencies, and measurement-based skill attainment and certification | 29  
|            |                                                                                          | 6                  |

XX = not complete
Conclusions related to adapting and using the SIC

• Wraparound-specific implementation activities map well onto the SIC stages
• Those who work closely with Wraparound states can retrospectively gather SIC data with reasonable accuracy (to the month level)
• Prospective data collection will allow for more precise estimates
Conclusions related to Wraparound implementation

• Outer context matters:
  • The CME state had systems in place to facilitate Wraparound implementation

• The CMHC state (State 1) dealt with more state bureaucracy than the CME state (State 2)
  • The SIC has captured this in longer times to completion in State 1

• Both states have successfully implemented systems of care, although there are differences in financing strategies and practice outcomes
Future directions and next steps include examining the predictive value of the SIC:

• What is the ideal rate of completion?
  • Is there a proper balance between too slow and too fast?

• Which data points are most influential?
  • Is stage duration or completion most important, or are both equally important?
  • Are there particular activities that are more important than others?

• How does the outer context impact implementation outcomes?
  • Are certain activities particularly influenced by the outer setting?
  • How do these activities impact implementation and ultimately behavioral outcomes?

• How can we prospectively gather data with new implementation efforts?
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