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Framed by the Triple P Implementation Evaluation (TPIE) findings,
1. Illustrate an approach to investigate the “locus of responsibility” for developing and ensuring core implementation capacities to support and sustain the use of Triple P
2. Describe co-creation partners’ assignment of responsibilities for implementation capacity components
3. Consider a co-creation partner approach to share responsibility and accountability across implementation capacities and performance

“Is the implementation [capacity and] infrastructure being put into place to sustainably support the Triple P system of interventions, or is this another example of ‘when the grant funding goes away, the services fade away?’”

“I think you should be more explicit here in step two.”
NCIC-TP’s Integrated Theory of Change for the supporting the implementation and scale-up of the Triple P system of interventions

Primary Goals of Direct Implementation Support

Co-Creation Partner Support → Local Implementation Capacity → Performance → Triple P System Optimization → Population-level Child & Family Outcomes

(Aldridge, Boothroyd, Veazey, Powell, Murray, & Prinz, 2016)
Co-Creation Partner Support

(Co-Creation: Metz & Albers, 2014; Metz, 2015)
(TPIE-Qualitative: Aldridge, Boothroyd, Skinner, Veazey, Murray, & Prinz, 2016)
Integrated Theory of Change for Successful, Sustainable Implementation & Scale Up

Co-Creation Partner Support
- Service agency leadership & staff
- State/local funders & policymakers
- Triple P America
- Intermediary organizations
- Local community members
- Triple P developers & researchers

Local Implementation
- Leadership & implementation teams
- Workforce development infrastructure
- Quality & outcome monitoring
- Media & networking capacity

Capacity → Performance
- Leading & supporting implementation
- Developing confident & competent practitioners
- Gathering, analyzing, & reporting data
- System-wide learning & improvement
- Mobilizing knowledge & behavior change

Triple P System Optimization
- Accessibility
- System alignment
- Feasibility
- Appropriateness
- Fidelity
  - Adherence
  - Quality
  - Caregiver engagement
  - Dosage
- Acceptability
- Reach
- Cost
- Sustainability

Population-level Outcomes
- State Triple P evaluation indicators
- Other selected child wellbeing indicators
- Other selected family wellbeing indicators
- Selected community wellbeing indicators

Sustainability
### Capacity & Drivers Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Capacity Assessment for Coalitions Scaling-up Triple P (CCA-TP)</th>
<th>Implementation Drivers Assessment for Agencies Implementing Triple P (IDA-TP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provides an assessment of key abilities and related resources in communities scaling the Triple P system of interventions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assesses the presence of implementation infrastructure and best practices among service agencies to support the intended delivery of Triple P interventions</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNITY CAPACITY ASSESSMENT**

**IMPLEMENTATION DRIVERS ASSESSMENT**
1. Recruiting and selecting practitioners well-suited to attend Triple P training and deliver Triple P
2. Training practitioners to deliver Triple P
3. Ongoing coaching to strengthen the skills and confidence of practitioners to deliver Triple P after accreditation
4. Assessing the fidelity or intended delivery of Triple P
5. Gathering, sharing, and using data to inform decisions and improve implementation of Triple P
6. Improving the policies and practices inside the organization to expand successes and reduce barriers to implementing Triple P
7. Identifying and addressing larger county system needs and successes to improve and sustain Triple P implementation
Who is responsible for what? (n=96)

- **Recruitment & Selection**: 1 (Triple P America), 7 (Lead Agency), 44 (Service Agency), 1 (Unknown)
- **Training**: 1 (Triple P America), 5 (Lead Agency), 37 (Service Agency), 1 (Unknown)
- **Ongoing Coaching**: 7 (Triple P America), 10 (Lead Agency), 33 (Service Agency), 7 (Unknown)
- **Fidelity Assessment**: 19 (Triple P America), 5 (Lead Agency), 28 (Service Agency), 2 (Unknown)
- **Data**: 16 (Triple P America), 5 (Lead Agency), 3 (Service Agency), 1 (Unknown)
- **Policies Inside Organization**: 12 (Triple P America), 3 (Lead Agency), 3 (Service Agency), 3 (Unknown)
- **Larger System Needs**: 19 (Triple P America), 5 (Lead Agency), 69 (Service Agency), 3 (Unknown)

Legend:
- Blue: Triple P America
- Red: Lead Agency
- Green: Service Agency
- Violet: Practitioner
- Cyan: Unknown
• **Lead Agencies** and **Service Agencies** were the most frequently cited PARTNER across all components, while **Practitioners** were the *least* cited.

• The greatest number of **Unknown** responses were provided for the **Coaching** component.

• The **MOST** consensus in responses provided for:
  - ✓ **Policies Inside Organization** *(Service Agency)*
  - ✓ **Larger System Needs** *(Lead Agency)*

• The **least** consensus in responses provided for
  - o **Fidelity Assessment** *(Lead Agency? Service Agency? Triple P America?)*
  - o **Data** *(Lead Agency? Service Agency? Triple P America?)*
Some Considerations

Taking a Deeper Dive

• Would breaking down each component into responsibility for “doing”, “assessing the quality of”, and “ensuring” provide more clarity?

Future Considerations

• Ask about other co-creation partners, particularly state-level partners.
• How do we support role clarity within a system?
• Does locus of responsibility have an impact on local implementation capacity and performance?
Qualitative Evaluation of Implementation Capacities: Some Recommendations (*and Implications?*)

1. Ensure systematic exploration and readiness processes for Triple P implementation at each level of the system
2. Reinforce and sustain peer support networks, local Triple P coalitions, and cross-community learning networks
3. Ensure access to active implementation support from Triple P America and other intermediaries
4. Secure sustainable resources to relieve tension from local service delivery and implementation systems
Locus of Responsibility(ies): The WE for “What it takes” to Support Effective Implementation

- What do we have? What do we need?
  - Organize, align, create implementation infrastructure and capacities to support leadership and implementation teaming, workforce development, using data for understanding and improvement, and media and networking
  - Ensure capacities and performance for “the doing” and “the quality” of “what it takes”

- Priority roles for some co-creation partners? Shared roles among and across sets of co-creation partners?

- How do we start and keep the conversations going?
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