

Implementation Guide: Funding

This guide can be used for teams who are in the process of developing an integrated approach. Teams are encouraged to link work to measurable outcomes and develop a multi-year action plan organized around stages of implementation.

Exploration Phase: Need for change identified, possible solutions are explored, learning about what it takes to implement the innovation effectively, stakeholders identified, decision is made to move forward.

ISF Funding Workgroup

Outcome: Describe current funding system that includes success and challenges. Provide stakeholders with justification for change/need of improvement.

Current Conditions:

Guiding Prompts/Questions that promote discussion around current condition:

1. Explore and describe current funding sources/system.
2. Describe strengths to current approach.
3. Describe road blocks and challenges.
4. Is current condition effective and efficient for delivering EBP and integration of efforts?

Probable Future:

Guiding Questions:

1. If current status remains the same, what will be the likely result?
2. What research supports this future?
3. Is there a need for change?

Preferred Future:

Guiding Questions:

1. If you were in charge, what would change? Explore possible solutions.

2. What would blending funding structures look like to provide EBP, early intervention, skill development for staff, MH access to flexible role (MH person participates in teams at all three tiers; MH person leads small groups based on data; MH person co-facilitates FBA/BIP or wrap individual teams for students, team facilitation roles, etc.)?

Action Plan for Change:

Guiding Prompts/Questions

1. Provide examples of changes occurring with blending funding sources.
2. Provide examples that have allowed for flexible job roles in MH and education.
3. Is there current legislation proposing such changes?

Installation Phase: Resources needed to implement innovation with fidelity and desired outcomes are in place

ISF Funding Workgroup

Outcome: Identify resources needed to implement change. Provide project team with 2-4 actions that would influence flexibility in funding and enhance promotion of coordinated and collaborative effort.

Guiding Questions:

What are the current and available resources?

How could the resources be made available more readily?

How could access be made more flexible?

Action Plan for Change:

1. Who are the individuals with authority to make necessary changes? (At the federal, state and local level)
2. Brainstorm ways to disseminate/build awareness/influence stakeholders at federal, state and local level for considering change.
3. What would be the outcome(s) of such a change to funding structure/system?

ISF Development Team 2011

Implementation Guide: Evaluation Tools

This guide can be used for teams who are in the process of developing an integrated evaluation plan. The desired outcome of the guide is to create an evaluation system (context, input, fidelity, impact, replication, sustainability, and improvement) used to improve effort, justify integration and access necessary resources required for sustained integrated effort.

ISF Evaluation Plan: “Refining the Tools”

The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1994) holds that evaluations are conducted to establish the worth or merit of a program and to help improve it. Evaluation includes documenting key aspects of a program. In this regard, evaluation should not be viewed as something that is separate from, or added to, a program. It should also not be seen as simply providing “thumbs-up” or “thumbs-down” decisions. Rather, as depicted in the figure below, evaluation is most effective when it is focused on repeated use of evidence or indicators to guide implementation. Effective evaluation starts with development of a plan to achieve desired outcomes within a specific context. It then requires documenting of the resources and action required to perform the plan using a well-crafted timeline, completing assessments that measure the extent to which the program is implemented as intended, and completing analyses to compare actual and desired effects. The information from this process is used to decide to replicate, sustain, and improve the program. Throughout the cycle, four key indicators (Context, Input, Fidelity, and Impact) guide the process and frame the questions that shape an effective evaluation.

Effective evaluations “tell the story” of the program. They document the extent to which the program is meeting its goals, using appropriate activities, being implemented as intended, and succeeding in a manner that is generating evidence suitable for replicating, sustaining, and improving the program

(Horner et al., 2010)

Outcome: Review current evaluation system (context, input, fidelity, impact, replication, sustainability, and improvement) used to in both education and MH settings. Develop actions to integrate evaluation system.

Exploration Phase: Need for change identified, possible solutions are explored, learning about what it takes to implement the innovation effectively, stakeholders identified, decision is made to move forward.

Current Condition:

Guiding Prompts/Questions that promoted discussion around current condition:

1. Explore and describe use of current tools (surveys, self assessment, checklists, etc.).
2. Describe value for having access to data.
3. Describe limitations, road blocks and challenges with using self assessments and surveys.
4. Is current condition (existing tools) effective and efficient for delivering EBP and integration of efforts?

Probable Future:

Guiding Questions:

1. If current status remains the same, what will be the likely result?
2. Should new tools be developed or current tools be enhanced?
3. What research supports this future?
4. Is there a need for change?

Preferred Future:

Guiding Questions:

1. If you were in charge, what would change? Explore possible solutions.
2. What improvements can be made to increase use of tools to promote change?
3. What improvements can be made to obtain regular feedback from range of stakeholders?

Action Plan for Change:

Guiding Prompts/Questions:

1. Provide examples of expanded tools- (POI expanded).
2. Provide return on investment.

Installation Phase: Resources needed to implement innovation with fidelity and desired outcomes are in place

ISF Evaluation Plan: "Refining the Tools"

Outcome: Identify resources needed to implement change. Develop two to four actions that would influence improvement in effective and efficient evaluation to enhance promotion of coordinated and collaborative effort.

Guiding Questions:

1. What are the current and available resources?
2. How could the resources be made available more readily?
3. How could access be made more flexible?

Action Plan for Change:

1. Who are the individuals with authority to make necessary changes? (At the federal, state and local level)?
2. Brainstorm ways to disseminate/build awareness/influence stakeholders at federal, state and local level for considering change.
3. What would be the outcome(s) of such a change to structure/system?

ISF Development Team 2011

Implementation Guide: District and Community Cross Systems Team

This guide can be used for teams who are in the process of developing an integrated approach. Teams are encouraged to link work to measureable outcomes and develop a multi-year action plan organized around stages of implementation.

Exploration Phase: Need for change identified, possible solutions are explored, learning about what it takes to implement the innovation effectively, stakeholders identified, decision is made to move forward.

ISF District and Community Leadership Team (DCLT) Workgroup

Outcome: Describe current DCLT structure that includes success and challenges. Provide stakeholders with justification for change.

Current Condition:

Guiding Prompts/Questions that promote discussion around current condition:

1. Explore and describe who (by position) is currently attending DCLT meetings.
2. Describe strengths and benefits to current positions at the table. Describe limitations, road blocks and challenges with using self assessments and surveys.
3. Describe whom/what positions you believe would be a benefit to participation (i.e. to support implementer's blueprint with visibility, political support, policy making, funding, etc.. Also, consideration of prevention and intervention across tiers for SMH integration).
4. Is current condition (composition of team) effective and efficient for delivering EBP and integration of efforts?

Probable Future:

Guiding Questions:

1. If current status remains the same, what will be the likely result?

2. What research supports this future?
3. Is there a need for change?

Preferred Future:

Guiding Questions:

1. If you were in charge, what would change? Explore possible solutions.
2. Whom would you invite to join your team and why?
3. Through resource mapping, what support do you or have you had from community organizations? (i.e., child serving system agencies; community agencies or organizations; mental health providers; local business; university partners; etc.) This could be from programs, funding, etc.

Action Plan for Change:

Guiding Prompts/Questions:

1. Provide examples of how your current team is attempting to reach out to other community stakeholders to join your group.
2. Provide examples of how you have attempted to engage families in your team.
3. Provide examples of any gaps you have as you move forward to sustain and scale your work.

Installation Phase: Resources needed to implement innovation with fidelity and desired outcomes are in place

ISF District and Community Leadership Team (DCLT) Workgroup

Outcome: Identify resources needed to implement change. Provide stakeholders with two to four actions that would influence district and community support and participation and enhance promotion of coordinated and collaborative effort.

Guiding Questions:

1. What are the current and available resources?
2. How could the resources be made available more readily?

3. How could access be made more flexible?

Action Plan for Change:

1. Who are the individuals with authority to make necessary changes? (At the federal, state and local level)?
2. Brainstorm ways to disseminate/build awareness/influence stakeholders at federal, state and local level for considering change.
3. What would be the outcome(s) of such a change to structure/system?

ISF Development Team 2011

<http://www.pbis.org/common/cms/files/Current%20Topics/Final-Monograph.pdf>
