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An Implementation Evaluation of the Triple P System in Two North Carolina Counties, USA

The Triple P Implementation Evaluation project is supported by funding from The Duke Endowment.

Disclosure: Ron Prinz, Ph.D., is a paid consultant to Triple P International, which is the technology transfer entity commissioned by the University of Queensland to disseminate the Triple P system, and to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, which is involved in implementation/dissemination projects related to Triple P.
The Triple P system of parenting and family support interventions is currently being scaled-up in 33 counties in North Carolina.
The primary aims of the project are to assess, in two counties:

1) county-level implementation capacity to support the effective use of the Triple P system of interventions;

2) within service agencies delivering Triple P to children and families, the presence of core implementation components and quality of implementation climate to support the intended use of chosen Triple P interventions; and

3) among trained Triple P practitioners, adherence to chosen Triple P intervention protocols and the reach of Triple P service delivery within the county.

4 Assessments Points
Across 2 Years
Spring & Fall
2014, 2015
Primary Aims and County Characteristics

The primary aims of the project are to assess, in two counties:

1) county-level implementation capacity to support the effective use of the Triple P system of interventions;

2) within service agencies delivering Triple P to children and families, the presence of core implementation components and quality of implementation climate to support the intended use of chosen Triple P interventions; and

3) among trained Triple P practitioners, adherence to chosen Triple P intervention protocols and the reach of Triple P service delivery within the county.

4 Assessments Points Across 2 Years
Spring & Fall 2014, 2015

- Population: 184,173
  - 12,524 children under 5; 37,019 youth 5-17
  - 19,817 families (assumes 2-3 children)
- Mix of urban and rural settings
- Cabarrus Triple P Coalition (Since 2012)
  - 4 member county implementation team (2.675 FTE)
  - 19 active agencies (64 practitioners) + 9 private practitioners
  - $325,581/yr for 4 years ($6.57 per child/youth)
The primary aims of the project are to assess, in two counties:

1) county-level implementation capacity to support the effective use of the Triple P system of interventions;

2) within service agencies delivering Triple P to children and families, the presence of core implementation components and quality of implementation climate to support the intended use of chosen Triple P interventions; and

3) among trained Triple P practitioners, adherence to chosen Triple P intervention protocols and the reach of Triple P service delivery within the county.

**4 Assessments Points**

**Across 2 Years**

**Spring & Fall 2014, 2015**

- **Population: 967,971**
  - 70,662 children under 5; 171,331 youth 5-17
  - 96,797 families (assumes 2-3 children)
- **Home to North Carolina’s largest city, Charlotte**
- **Mecklenburg Triple P Coalition (Since 2013)**
  - 4 member county implementation team (1.25 FTE)
  - 15 active agencies (40 practitioners) + 2 private practitioners + 4 inactive agencies
  - $147,000/yr for 3 years ($0.61 per child/youth)
Strong Leadership and Implementation Teams

* Fall 2014 Agency Implementation Capacity and Coaching subscales were changed for Spring 2015 and are therefore not directly comparable.
**Cabarrus County**

### Fall 2014 & Spring 2015 Results

**Agency Implementation Drivers Assessment Results: Cabarrus County**

**Fall 2014 & Spring 2015**

$\bar{m} \pm sd$

---

- **Agency Infrastructure:**
  - Agency infrastructure generally lags county implementation team capacity

- **Recruitment & Selection:**
  - Fall 2014: $67\% \pm 15\%$
  - Spring 2015: $76\% \pm 26\%$

- **Fidelity Assessment:**
  - Fall 2014: $96\% \pm 7\%$
  - Spring 2015: $95\% \pm 7\%$

- **Facilitative Administration:**
  - Fall 2014: $63\% \pm 16\%$
  - Spring 2015: $63\% \pm 27\%$

- **Systems Intervention:**
  - Fall 2014: $63\% \pm 16\%$
  - Spring 2015: $60\% \pm 19\%$

- **Decision Support Data System:**
  - Fall 2014: $57\% \pm 30\%$
  - Spring 2015: $57\% \pm 30\%$

- **Training:**
  - Fall 2014: $48\% \pm 21\%$
  - Spring 2015: $36\% \pm 31\%$

- **Coaching:**
  - Fall 2014: $81\% \pm 19\%$
  - Spring 2015: $29\% \pm 26\%$

---

**Drivers Composite Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67% ±15%</td>
<td>76% ±26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96% ±7%</td>
<td>95% ±7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63% ±16%</td>
<td>63% ±27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48% ±21%</td>
<td>36% ±31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81% ±19%</td>
<td>29% ±26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63% ±16%</td>
<td>60% ±19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68% ±17%</td>
<td>65% ±12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63% ±27%</td>
<td>57% ±30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48% ±21%</td>
<td>36% ±31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81% ±19%</td>
<td>29% ±26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63% ±16%</td>
<td>60% ±19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68% ±17%</td>
<td>65% ±12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63% ±27%</td>
<td>57% ±30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Fall 2014 Agency Implementation Capacity and Coaching subscales were changed for Spring 2015 and are therefore not directly comparable.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>FID</th>
<th>DSDS</th>
<th>FAC</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>Drivers Composite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fall 2014 & Spring 2015 Results

Mecklenburg County Implementation Capacity Assessment Results
Fall 2014 & Spring 2015

* Fall 2014 Agency Implementation Capacity and Coaching subscales were changed for Spring 2015 and are therefore not directly comparable.
**Fall 2014 & Spring 2015 Results**

Mecklenburg County agency infrastructure more severely lags their county implementation team capacity.

**Agency Implementation Drivers Assessment Results: Mecklenburg County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AIC</strong></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RS</strong></td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.598*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong></td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>0.598*</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FID</strong></td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DSDS</strong></td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAC</strong></td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SI</strong></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drivers Composite</strong></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fall 2014 Agency Implementation Capacity and Coaching subscales were changed for Spring 2015 and are therefore not directly comparable.
## Climate, Reach, and Adherence

### Cabarrus County

* Implementation Climate (Time 1, 2, 3)
  * 91%, 94%, 89% of agencies were rated by practitioners as hospitable for Triple P (≥3 on 1-5 scale)

* Service Reach since 2012 (Time 1, 2, 3)
  * 86 total practitioners trained in 5 Triple P interventions; 83% remain active
  * Estimated 86% (maximum) of active practitioners had used Triple P at Time 3
  * Available data suggested they have made a modest, but meaningful reach to families at Time 3

* Adherence to Session Content* (Time 1, 2, 3)
  * 84%, 87%, 86% average self-reported completion of session checklist items

### Mecklenburg County

* Implementation Climate (Time 1, 2)
  * 100%, 72% of agencies were rated by practitioners as hospitable for Triple P (≥3 on 1-5 scale)

* Service Reach since 2013
  * 64 total practitioners trained in 8 Triple P interventions; 66% remain active (Time 1, 2, 3)
  * Estimated 70% (maximum) of active practitioners had used Triple P at Time 2
  * Available data suggested they are still in the process of establishing a meaningful reach to families at Time 2

* Adherence to Session Content* (Time 1, 2)
  * 84%, 84% average self-reported completion of session checklist items

* Recollection of most recent session has been utilized in prior work, but is limited by self-report and lack of practitioner competency assessment.
Key Learnings and Local Messages

- **How to evaluate implementation capacity and infrastructure for social impact**
  - Use assessment strategies designed to address multiple levels within a county-wide prevention system
  - Early indicators suggest the validity and reliability of key county and agency assessments

- **Key findings to date**
  - Agency implementation infrastructure may lag behind county implementation capacity
  - Well developed implementation teams at the county and perhaps agency levels may:
    - Sustain agency involvement in implementation activities
    - Advance agency implementation infrastructure across the county

---

**Mecklenburg County, NC**

Click to watch Cathy Henderson, Mecklenburg County Triple P Coordinator, discuss lessons learned, key challenges, and the importance of co-creation partners.

**The Duke Endowment**

Click to watch Phil Redmond, Associate Director for Child Care at The Duke Endowment, discuss funders’ interest and role in supporting implementation infrastructure.

**Cabarrus County, NC**

Click to watch Gina Hofert, Director & Evaluator, Cabarrus County Triple P, discuss lessons learned, key challenges, and the importance of co-creation partners.