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The “evidence-based movement” is an international experiment to make better use of research findings in typical service settings.

The purpose is to produce greater benefits to children, families, individuals, and society.
The Golden Age

During the Golden Age of research in human services, the field has been dominated by the randomized, controlled experimental paradigm.
The Golden Age

A key lesson from the Golden Age is that the effects of social programs in practice hover near zero, a devastating discovery for social reformers.
The Golden Age

A consequence of these findings is the recognition of the importance of implementation research in overall evaluations of social programs.
The Golden Age


Teaching–Family Replications

Fixsen, Blase, Timbers, & Wolf (2001)

Cumulative Couples

Cumulative Homes
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The New Golden Age

After “the interlude” (1982-1992)
(Backer, 1992) …

… here we are again

In 1992 APA reviewed and designated “model programs”

1992-2012 is the New Golden Age: evidence-based movement
Evidence-based

For the past decade the National Institutes of Health have spent over $100 billion a year on research to develop evidence-based programs.

Other federal agencies (e.g. IES; USAID) and philanthropies add to this total each year.
Evidence-based

What defines “evidence”

- Two or more high quality research studies using randomized group designs (rigor; effect sizes)
- Preferably done by two or more independent research groups
- Preferably summarized in meta-analyses of findings across studies
The OLD Golden Age

During the Golden Age of research in human services, the field has been dominated by the randomized, controlled experimental paradigm.
Effects on Social Problems

MH & SA prevention programs in 5,847 schools; 2004-2005 school year

Avg. 9 innovations per school

7.8% were evidence-based

3.5% used with fidelity

US Department of Education, 2011

- Funding only for interventions
- No fidelity criteria insisted upon by the developers (e.g. Kinney, Haapala, Booth)
- National evaluation = not effective
  - Over 25% was spent on in-office interventions with parents or children (< 0 fidelity)
  - An implementation failure labeled Homebuilders as an intervention failure

Chapin Hall Center for Children, 2002
National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP)

40 Years of Variation Around a Mediocre Mean
A key lesson from the Golden Age is that the effects of social programs in practice hover near zero, a devastating discovery for social reformers.
Implementation

A series of meta-analysis of experimental and quasi-experimental studies of the effects of CBT

“...a well-implemented intervention of an inherently less efficacious type can outperform a more efficacious one that is poorly implemented” (Lipsey, 2009)
Implementation

Longitudinal Studies of a Variety of Comprehensive School Reforms

**Evidence-base**
- Every Teacher Trained
- Every Teacher Continually Supported

**Actual Supports**
- Years 1-3
- Fewer than 50% of the teachers received some training
- Fewer than 25% of those teachers received support

**Outcomes**
- Years 4-5
- Fewer than 10% of the schools used the CSR as intended
- Vast majority of students did not benefit

Aladjem & Borman, 2006; Vernez, Karam, Mariano, & DeMartini, 2006
Implementation

Best Data Show These Methods, When Used Alone, Are Insufficient:

- Diffusion/ Dissemination of information
- Training
- Passing laws/ mandates/ regulations
- Providing funding/ incentives
- Organization change/ reorganization

About 5% to 20% Realize Intended Benefits
A consequence of these findings is the recognition of the importance of implementation research in overall evaluations of social programs.
Current Federal Funding

- $100 billion for innovative programs (USDE)
- $63 billion for maternal health programs (USAID)
- $4 billion for home visiting programs (ACF)
- No funding set aside for implementation supports for these program initiatives
EBP Movement is …

Is the “evidence-based movement” dead?

Since 1962 it has not delivered on the promise to produce socially significant benefits to children, families, individuals, and society.
EBP Movement is ...

Is the “evidence-based movement” dead?

An emphasis on rigor and statistical significance

Has not “translated” to socially significant impacts

Not then (1962-1982) and not now (1992-2012) – a replication
What we are learning

• Programs
• Practitioners
• Implementation science
• System reinvention
Evidence-based Programs

What is a “program?”

- Clear description of the program
  - Philosophy, values, principles
  - Inclusion – exclusion criteria
- Identified essential functions that define the program & are linked to outcomes
- Operational definitions of essential components (do and say)
- Evidence that it is effective (worth it)
- Practical performance assessment
  - Highly correlated with/ predictive of outcomes
Programs

- About 18% of outcome studies (N=1,200+) assessed the independent variable
- About 7% linked essential components to outcomes
- Few studies measure fidelity
- Fewer yet link fidelity to outcomes

Dane & Schneider, 1998; Durlak & DuPre, 2008
Programs

Know a lot about **Scientific rigor**

- Standards for rigor are not used by practitioners to impact the lives of people

Know little about **Programs**

- Programs are used by practitioners to impact the lives of people
Practitioners

Human services involve interaction-based sciences and services

Inherently more complex than atom-based sciences

e.g., atom-based ingredients don’t talk back or run away
Practitioners

In human services, the **PRACTITIONER IS THE INTERVENTION**

Everyone / everything else needs to be aligned to provide effective supports so **all practitioners** can produce desired outcomes for **all recipients of services**

What is your role?
Implementation Science


- Multi-disciplinary
- Multi-sector
- Multi-national
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Implementation Science

Implementation Research: A Synthesis of the Literature


Download all or part of the monograph at:
http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~nirn/resources/publications/Monograph/
Formula for Success

Effective intervention \times \text{Effective implementation} = \text{Positive outcomes}

Brown & Flynn, 2002
Clancy, 2006
An intervention is one thing
Implementation is something else altogether
Like serum and a syringe
Very different evidence bases
Each is necessary
Neither one is useful without the other
Implementation Science

Letting it happen (diffusion)
- Recipients are accountable

Helping it happen (dissemination)
- Recipients are accountable

Making it happen (implementation)
- Implementation Teams are accountable

Based on Hall & Hord (1987); Greenhalgh, Robert, MacFarlane, Bate, & Kyriakidou (2004); Fixsen, Blase, Duda, Naoom, & Van Dyke (2010)
ACTIVE Implementation

Purposeful, Active, and Effective

- Implementation Teams
- Implementation Drivers
- Implementation Stages
- Improvement Cycles
Implementation Team

- Minimum of three people (four or five preferred) with the expertise to promote effective, efficient, and sustainable implementation and organization change work

- Tolerate turnover; teams are sustainable even when the players come and go (Higgins, Weiner, & Young, 2012; Klest & Patras, 2011)
Implementation Team

Simultaneous, Multi-Level Interventions

- Practitioner/Staff Competence
- Organization Supports
- Management (leadership, policy)
- Administration (HR, structure)
- Supervision (nature, content)
- Regional Authority Supports
- State and Community Supports
- Federal and National Supports
Implementation Team

Prepare Organizations

Prepare Practitioners and Staff

Prepare Regions

Work with Researchers

Parents and Stakeholders

Assure Implementation

Assure Intended Benefits

Create Readiness

80%

© Fixsen & Blase, 2009
### Implementation Team

**IMPLEMENTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Impl. Team</th>
<th>NO Impl. Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>80%, 3 Yrs</td>
<td>14%, 17 Yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective use of Implementation Science &amp; Practice</td>
<td>Letting it Happen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping it Happen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fixsen, Blase, Timbers, & Wolf, 2001

Balas & Boren, 2000

**Substantial Return on Investment**
Active Implementation

Implementation Drivers

Common features of successful supports to help make full and effective uses of a wide variety of innovations
Reliable Benefits
Consistent uses of Innovations
Performance Assessment (fidelity)

Interventions meet Implementation

Implementation Drivers

Coaching
Systems Intervention
Facilitative Administration
Decision Support Data System

Competency Drivers
Training
Organization Drivers
Selection

Integrated & Compensatory

Leadership Drivers
Technical
Adaptive

© Fixsen & Blase, 2008
## Training, Coaching, Performance

### OUTCOMES

(% of Participants who Demonstrate Knowledge, Demonstrate new Skills in a Training Setting, and Use new Skills in the Classroom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAINING COMPONENTS</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skill Demonstration</th>
<th>Use in the Classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory and Discussion</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..+Demonstration in Training</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..+ Practice &amp; Feedback in Training</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..+ Coaching in Classroom</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joyce and Showers, 2002
Stages of Implementation

Implementation occurs in stages:

- Exploration
- Installation
- Initial Implementation
- Full Implementation

0% to 100% Intervention Outcomes

Type III Error
Dobson & Cook, 1980

Fixsen, Naoom, Blase, Friedman, & Wallace, 2005
System Reinvention

Innovative practices do not fare well in existing organizational structures and systems

Organizational and system changes are essential to successful use of innovations

- Expect it
- Plan for it
System Reinvention

Supply side: Effective programs go where they are most welcome
- Let it happen; Help it happen
- Islands of excellence

Demand side: Effective programs go where they are most needed
- Make it happen
- Whole populations; A sea of change
State Implementation & Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices

Dean Fixsen and Karen Blase
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Rob Horner and George Sugai
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University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
System Reinvention

Existing System

Effective Innovations Are Changed to Fit The System

Existing System Is Changed To Support The Effectiveness Of The Innovation

Effective Innovation
System Reinvention

Adaptive Challenges
- Duplication
- Fragmentation
- Hiring criteria
- Salaries
- Credentialing
- Licensing
- Time/scheduling
- Union contracts
- RFP methods
- Federal/State laws

Implementation Team

State Management Team

Practitioners

Innovations

Children, Families

External System Change Support

Policy Enabled Practice

Practice-Policy Communication Loop
Formula for Success

Effective intervention \( \times \) Effective implementation = Social impact

1.00 \( \times \) 1.00 = 1.00

LONG LIVE THE EBP MOVEMENT!
For More Information

Karen A. Blase, Ph.D.
- 919-966-9050
- karen.blase@unc.edu

Dean L. Fixsen, Ph.D.
- 919-966-3892
- dean.fixsen@unc.edu

Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC

http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/
www.scalingup.org
www.implementationconference.org
Implementation Science

Implementation Research: A Synthesis of the Literature


HTTP://NIRN.FPG.UNC.EDU
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