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# **APPENDIX C**

# Practice Activity Deep Dive Resources

The Practice Activity Deep Dive Resource (PADDR) provides comprehensive information about the 50 practice activities that operationalize the [10 core practice components](https://ictp.fpg.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/core-practice-components-and-practice-activities.docx) (CPCs) of the Implementation Capacity for Triple P (ICTP) implementation support ractice model. Rather than functioning as a list of activities for ICTP implementation support practitioners (ISPs) to systematically complete and “check off,” this resource reflects and should be used to reinforce the dynamic nature of implementation support practice, whereby different contexts, situations, needs, levels of readiness, stages of implementation, and other factors impact the selection of diverse combinations of practice activities for a given support interaction. The use of practice activities within any support interaction should be in alignment with the core concepts of social cognitive theory (i.e., reciprocal determinism, human agency, observational learning, self-regulation, and goal-directed behavior) and the 11 values and eight practice principles of the ICTP practice model. Language reflecting this alignment is embedded in this resource and throughout Brief 7 of the ICTP practice compendium, “[Digging Deeper into the Implementation Support Practice Model at the Regional Level](https://ictp.fpg.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/digging-deeper-into-the-implementation-support-practice-model-at-regional-level.docx).”

DIVE DEEPER

Refer to Brief #6: ICTP Implementation Support Practice at the Regional Level,

Section [Dynamic Implementation Support](https://ictp.fpg.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/dynamic-implementation-support.docx) for more information.

DIVE DEEPER

Refer to Brief #5: Foundations of the ICTP Implementation Support Practice, section, for more information on

[Theoretical Underpinnings](https://ictp.fpg.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/theoreticalunderpinnings.docx)

[Values](https://ictp.fpg.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/values.docx)

[Practice Principles of Implementation Support Practice:](https://ictp.fpg.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/principles.docx)

The PADDR contains 10 sections, one for each CPC, and six columns. The practice activities for each CPC are listed by number in column one. Bold font indicates *essential activities* (i.e., those believed to directly contribute to the achievement of near-term outcomes); plain font indicates *practice enhancers* (i.e., those believed to accelerate or otherwise enhance the realization of near-term outcomes, even if outcomes may be sufficiently achievable in their absence). There are 38 essential activities and 12 practice enhancers across all CPCs. Columns two through six contain the shortened name of the practice activity; a detailed description; the contributions the practice activity makes to practice outcomes and/or to the use of other CPCs; common situations in which the practice activity is used; and key differentiations between the practice activity and others. This last column illuminates the nuances that distinguish each practice activity and, where applicable, indicates when individual or combinations of practice activities might be recorded within the [ICTP implementation support practice tracking system](https://ictp.fpg.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/quality-and-outcome-monitoring-system.docx).

DIVE DEEPER

Refer to Brief #6: ICTP Implementation Support Practice at the Regional Level,

Section [Core Practice Components and Practice Activities](https://ictp.fpg.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/core-practice-components-and-practice-activities.docx)

Refer to Brief #6: **ICTP Implementation Support Practice at the Regional Level**,

**S**ection[Dynamic Implementation Support](https://ictp.fpg.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/dynamic-implementation-support.docx) **for more information.**

## A group of people sitting at a table CPC #1

## Build Collaborative Relationships

Practice Activity 1.1

Establish or revise partnership roles, responsibilities, and expectations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Roles and Responsibilities |
| Detailed Description | Clearly describing partner roles, responsibilities, and expectations for engaging in a successful support partnership, including when interacting with each other and with other support partners and funders during the support engagement. This includes addressing power differentials and developing power-sharing agreements. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Creates an understanding of how partners will work together with clearly differentiated roles and responsibilities, including how power will be shared.  Creates an understanding of what to expect during the support process.  Leads to mutually agreed upon, shared roles, responsibilities, and expectations, which contribute directly to “alliance.” |
| Common Situations for Use | When establishing new partnerships or onboarding new partners (e.g., while using the “Partnering with The Impact Center at FPG” resource).  To address role confusion or role drift (i.e., shifting away from one’s defined role), including when partners (e.g., ISPs) find themselves taking on roles or responsibilities that are typically filled by other partners (e.g., support participants, PSG members).  When expectations about the support relationship or process have gone awry or been frustrated.  When agreeing on tier of support.  When addressing power struggles or empowering support participants to express their voice. |
| Key Differentiations | 1.5 (group agreements): 1.5 focuses on values and behavioral norms to guide partners during support interactions or working sessions. 1.1 focuses on roles, responsibilities, and expectations for each partner within the overall course of the support engagement.  4.1 (strengths, needs, and patterns): 4.1 focuses on support participants’ and ISPs’ shared understanding of implementation strengths, needs, and patterns at organizational or system levels. 1.1 focuses on roles, responsibilities, and expectations of each partner within the overall course of the support engagement.  4.3 (prioritization): 4.3 focuses collectively and specifically on a prioritized order of implementation performance goals on which support will focus. 1.1 focuses on roles, responsibilities, and expectations of each partner within the overall course of the support engagement.    9.2 (accountability): 9.2 is typically used to hold support participants accountable for what was previously established. 1.1 is typically more proactive, used to set roles, responsibilities, and expectations going forward.  10.1 (shared rationale): 10.1 comes into play when a shift in ISP roles and responsibilities (e.g., an end to their intensive engagement with a region due to transitions in regional support assignments, support participants’ achievement of all their implementation performance goals, or the end of funding) results in a shared rationale for transitioning out of intensive implementation support. 1.1 focuses on establishing the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of each partner. 1.1 may occur alongside or in close sequence with 10.1. In this case, both practice activities should be recorded.  10.2 (future support outreach): 10.2 applies when a shift in ISP roles and responsibilities (e.g., an end to their intensive engagement with a region due to transitions in regional support assignments, support participants’ achievement of all their implementation performance goals, or the end of funding) results in the facilitation of support participants’ understanding of when and to whom they might need to reach out for support in the future. 1.1 focuses on establishing the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of each partner. 1.1 may occur alongside or in close sequence with 10.2. In this case, both practice activities should be recorded. |

Practice Activity 1.2

Provide emotional or practical support regarding hopes, concerns, needs, preferences, and/or context factors

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Provide Emotional or Practical Support |
| Detailed Description | Providing emotional support (e.g., validation, compassion, encouragement) or practical support (e.g., guidance, suggestions) for the hopes, concerns, needs, preferences, or context factors (e.g., culture or climate of the organization, economic factors) that a support participant vocalizes or otherwise demonstrates during a support interaction.  The hopes, concerns, needs, preferences, or context factors shared are within the context of shared work or shared work environment. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Fosters a supportive, safe, and trusting relationship. |
| Common Situations for Use | When a support participant shares their thoughts and feelings or asks for general support regarding a hope, concern, need, preference, or context factor.  When an ISP brings forward into conversation a support participant’s stated hopes, concerns, needs, preferences, or context factors. |
| Key Differentiations | **1.3 (readiness):** 1.3 is specifically related to taking the *next action steps in the support process*. 1.2 is focused on *providing support more generally* about the context of shared work or shared work environment. It is not focused on the next action steps in the support process.  **1.4 (check-in):** 1.4 is used when checking in on work or life *outside* the context of shared work or the shared work environment. 1.2 is focused on general emotional or practical support *about or within the context of shared work or shared work environment*.  **7.2 (anticipatory guidance: performance success):** 7.2 is specifically related to *anticipatory guidance ahead of an identified experiential learning activity*. 1.2 is more *general or global* within the context of shared work or shared work environment. Moreover, the intent of 7.2 is not to provide emotional or practical support, *rather to help support participants to visualize and anticipate their actions or responses* to situational factors and perceived or potential threats/challenges that may arise during the experiential learning activity.  **8.3 (specific behavioral feedback: praise):** 8.3 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (an effective implementation practice behavior) and focuses on praising support participants’ specific behaviors during X, such as “I liked when you did X,” “You did a good job doing X,” or “When you did X, did you notice that Y (favorable outcome) happened?” The intent of 8.3 is not to provide emotional or practical support, but *rather to provide supportive behavioral coaching to support participants* following an experiential learning activity. 1.2 is more *general or global* *emotional or practical support* within the context of shared work or about the shared work environment.  **8.4 (specific behavioral feedback: constructive):** 8.4 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (a developmental implementation practice behavior) and focuses on constructive feedback related to support participants’ specific behaviors during X, such as “When you did X, did you notice that Y (unintended or partially intended outcome) happened?” The intent of 8.4 is not to provide emotional or practical support, *rather to provide supportive behavioral coaching to support participants* following an experiential learning activity. 1.2 is more *general or global emotional or practical support* within the context of shared work or about the shared work environment.  **8.6 (normalize):** 8.6 reflects the ISP’s efforts to normalize or temper support participants’ thoughts and/or feelings that emerged during *experiential learning activities*. The intent of 8.6 is not to provide emotional or practical support, *rather to provide supportive behavioral coaching to support participants* following an experiential learning activity. 1.2 is more *general or global emotional or practical support* within the context of shared work or about the shared work environment. |
|  |  |

Practice Activity 1.3

Support emotional and practical readiness for next action steps

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Readiness |
| Detailed Description | Increasing support participants’ willingness and abilities to take the next action steps in the support process. Such action steps may be identified in shared action plans (6.1) or as otherwise relevant to the course of support interactions. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Fosters a supportive, safe, and trusting relationship.  Mitigates or removes barriers to next steps in the support process.  Strengthens alliance by advancing collaboratively designed tasks. |
| Common Situations for Use | When a support participant shares their thoughts and feelings or asks for support regarding their next action steps in the support process.  At the beginning of a support interaction when discussing next steps that were not completed as previously planned together.  At the end of a support interaction when reviewing collaboratively determined next steps. |
| Key Differentiations | **1.2 (provide emotional or practical support):** 1.2 is more *general or global emotional or practical support* within the context of shared work or about the shared work environment. It is not focused on the next action steps in the support process. 1.3 is specifically related to taking *next action steps in the support process*.  **7.2 (anticipatory guidance: performance success):** 7.2 is specifically related to *helping support participants to visualize and anticipate their actions or responses* to situational factors and perceived or potential threats/challenges that may arise *during an experiential learning activity*. 1.3 is specifically related to *increasing support participants’* *willingness and abilities to take* *next action steps as identified in shared action plans (6.1) or as otherwise relevant to the course of support interactions*. To the extent that 1.3 and 7.2 co-occur during a support interaction, they should be dually recorded.  **8.3 (specific behavioral feedback: praise):** 8.3 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (an effective implementation practice behavior) and focuses on praising support participants’ specific behaviors during X, such as “I liked when you did X,” “You did a good job doing X,” or “When you did X, did you notice that Y (favorable outcome) happened?” The intent of 8.3 is not to increase support participants’ readiness for next action steps, *rather to provide supportive behavioral coaching to support participants* following an experiential learning activity. 1.3 is specifically related to *increasing support participants’* *willingness and abilities to take* *next action steps as identified in shared action plans (6.1) or as otherwise relevant to the course of support interactions*.  **8.4 (supportive behavioral feedback: constructive):** 8.4 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (a developmental implementation practice behavior) and focuses on constructive feedback regarding support participants’ specific behaviors during X, such as “When you did X, did you notice that Y (unintended or partially intended outcome) happened?” The intent of 8.4 is not to increase support participants’ readiness for next action steps, *rather to provide supportive behavioral coaching to support participants* following an experiential learning activity. 1.3 is specifically related to *increasing support participants’* *willingness and abilities to take* *next action steps as identified in shared action plans (6.1) or as otherwise relevant to the course of support interactions*.  **8.6 (normalize):** 8.6 reflects the ISP’s efforts to normalize or temper support participants’ thoughts and/or feelings that emerged during *experiential learning activities*. The intent of 8.6 is not to increase support participants’ readiness for next action steps, *rather to provide supportive behavioral coaching to support participants* following an experiential learning activity. 1.3 is specifically related to *increasing support participants’* *willingness and abilities to take* *next action steps as identified in shared action plans (6.1) or as otherwise relevant to the course of support interactions*. |
|  |  |

Practice Activity 1.4

Conduct personal check-ins about work or life more broadly

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Check-In |
| Detailed Description | Checking in about support participants’ activities and well-being beyond the focus of the support engagement or shared work environment.  *Note*. Cultural factors should be considered regarding how much and to what extent this practice activity is expected or acceptable. Some level may be essential across cultures, but the amount and type of activity needs to be culturally inclusive. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Fosters a supportive, safe, and trusting relationship.  Demonstrates interest, consideration, and/or care for the whole person while respecting support participants’ needs and preferences for engaging.  Builds rapport and better understanding of the support participants’ human experience while keeping appropriate boundaries. |
| Common Situations for Use | When there is time for relationship building outside of direct support interactions (e.g., before or after meetings, while participants are settling in to a meeting, during breaks, while engaging in shared activities [1.7]).  During icebreakers. |
| Key Differentiations | 1.2 (provide emotional or practical support): 1.2 is more general or global emotional or practical support within the context of shared work or the shared work environment. 1.4 is used when checking in on support participants’ work or life outside the context of shared work or the shared work environment. |
|  |  |

Practice Activity 1.5

Facilitate the development or revision of group agreements about values and/or behavioral norms for working together

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Group Agreements |
| Detailed Description | Answering the question “How do we show up together?” Allowing all partners to develop working values and norms that account for partners’ preferences and needs, encourage productivity, nurture partners’ well-being, and reflect inclusion in practice activities.  *Note*. Group agreements should be culturally inclusive. This may require exploring cultural values, needs, and preferences. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Creates a safe space that is inclusive and respectful, honors all partners’ needs and preferences, and sets appropriate boundaries for the working relationship.  Promotes trust when group agreements are followed. |
| Common Situations for Use | When establishing new partnerships or onboarding new partners.  When relationship boundaries, practice activities, or progress becomes unbalanced or weakened.  When a partner’s needs and preferences (e.g., for breaks, variety, interaction style) are not being met during support interactions.  May be helpful to post on agendas and revisit periodically (e.g., when agreeing on a tier of support). |
| Key Differentiations | 1.1 (roles and responsibilities): 1.1 focuses on roles, responsibilities, and expectations for each partner within the overall course of the support engagement. 1.5 focuses on values and behavioral norms to guide partners during support interactions or working sessions.  4.3 (prioritization): 4.3 focuses on a prioritized order of implementation performance goals on which support will focus. 1.5 focuses on values and behavioral norms to guide partners during support interactions or working sessions. |

Practice Activity 1.6

During a working meeting, provide or share food on- or off-site

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Share food |
| Detailed Description | Sharing food with support participants.  *Notes*. Sharing food creates a shared cultural experience. It may also slow down support interactions, allowing for more mindful working sessions, accommodation of other known needs, or personal check-ins (1.4).  Cultural factors should be considered regarding how much and to what extent this practice activity is expected or acceptable. Also, sharing food should be designed in ways that are culturally inclusive (e.g., regarding allergies or the presence of certain foods). |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Increases trust and cooperation and demonstrates care for partners’ physical, mental, and cultural needs and preferences. |
| Common Situations for Use | During long working sessions (plan for catered or delivered food for these sessions).  When a portion of a working meeting can be moved to a local restaurant or coffee shop. |
| Key Differentiations | 1.7 (shared activities): Although the activities in 1.7 may include food, 1.7 occurs outside typical working hours and support interactions and reflects a focus outside of the support agenda. 1.6 occurs during typical working hours and while focusing on the working agenda. |
|  |  |

Practice Activity 1.7

Engage in social or professional activities outside the normal working environment

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Shared Activities |
| Detailed Description | Engaging in shared social, cultural, or professional activities without focusing on work/support agendas. This may accommodate other known needs or afford opportunities to engage in personal check-ins (1.4). |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | May increase relationship bonds, trust, and cooperation.  May create space to relieve tension or stress and re-energize relationships.  Shared professional activities create opportunities for co-learning from which partners can draw during support activities. |
| Common Situations for Use | Before or after a working session: going out for coffee/breakfast/drinks/dinner together, visiting a local cultural site, participating in a local social/cultural experience, going for a walk/run/hike together, playing a game/sport together, etc.  While co-participating in conferences, professional development workshops, or outside work meetings (e.g., NCLC and other meetings that occur outside the shared working agenda with support participants/teams). |
| Key Differentiations | 1.6 (share food): 1.6 occurs during typical working hours and while focusing on the working agenda. 1.7 occurs outside typical working hours and support interactions and reflects a focus outside of the working agenda. |

## CPC #2

## Reinforce Leaders’ and Teams’ Self-Regulation of Effective Implementation Processes

Practice Activity 2.1

Reinforce leaders’ and teams’ perceptions of their abilities to apply effective implementation practices to attain desired performance goals and implementation outcomes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Self-Efficacy |
| Detailed Description | Providing verbal or behavioral reinforcement of support participants’ abilities to apply effective implementation strategies to reach their performance goals. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Contributes to leaders’ and teams’ sense of self-efficacy (i.e., belief in their ability to perform necessary actions) in managing their own implementation performance |
| Common Situations for Use | \*Applies to all CPC 2 practice activities  When observing, debriefing, or reflecting on a situation involving support participants’ application of effective implementation practices, resources, or problem solving in a way that demonstrated primary agency. This may be from support participants’ current practice or prior related experiences.  At any time during the support process, including in conjunction with many other practice activities that may afford natural opportunities to reinforce self-regulation, such as:  1.2 (provide emotional and practical support)  1.3 (readiness)  CPC 3 activities  4.1 (strengths, needs, and patterns)  5.3 (just-in-time learning)  6.2 (capacity development)  6.4 (PDSA)  7.2 (anticipatory guidance: performance success)  CPC 8 activities  9.1 (root causes and lessons learned)  9.2 (accountability)  9.3 (technical and adaptive elements)  10.1 (shared rationale) |
| Key Differentiations | \*With the exception of the last differentiation, applies to all CPC 2 practice activities  **7.2 (anticipatory guidance: performance success)**: 7.2 is specifically related to *helping support participants to visualize and anticipate their actions or responses* to situational factors and perceived or potential threats/challenges that may arise *during an experiential learning activity*. CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* “X” (an effective implementation practice behavior), such as “You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X.” To the extent that 7.2 and CPC 2 activities co-occur during a support interaction, they should be dually recorded.  **8.2 (self-reflection: experiential learning activities):** 8.2 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (an implementation practice behavior) and focuses on facilitating support participants’ self-reflection on their behavioral performance. CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X, generally (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”). Self-reflection (8.2) may be facilitated using a self-regulatory framework (see related note under “Description” in 8.2), but CPC 2 activities should be recorded only when the ISP *reinforces support participants’ own self-regulatory behaviors.* For example, during 8.2, support participants may engage in self-monitoring and self-determination of next steps, which the ISP may reinforce (CPC 2).  **8.3 (specific behavioral feedback: praise):** 8.3 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (an effective implementation practice behavior), such as “I like when you did X,” “You did a good job doing X,” or “When you did X, did you notice that Y (favorable outcome) happened?” CPC 2 activities, rather, reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”).  **8.4 (specific behavioral feedback: constructive):** 8.4 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (a developmental implementation practice behavior) and focuses on providing *constructive feedback* regarding support participants’ specific behaviors during X, such as “When you did X, did you notice that Y (unintended or partially intended outcome) happened?” CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X, generally (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”).  **8.7 (self-reflection: generalization):** 8.7 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (a developmental implementation practice behavior) and focuses on *generalizing* *participants’ specific behaviors during X* to implementation contexts or practice situations beyond X. CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X, generally (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”).  **9.3 (technical and adaptive elements):** In 9.3, the *ISP helps support participants* identify, and strategically respond to, technical and adaptive elements of organizational/system challenges that may have emerged in recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences, or that are anticipated to emerge in future performance activities. In **2.4** (problem solving), the *ISP reinforces support participants’ own* identification of, and response to, technical and adaptive elements of such challenges. |

Practice Activity 2.2

Reinforce leaders’ and teams’ use of their organizational/system structures, protocols, measures, and tools to manage and improve implementation performance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Self-Management Resources |
| Detailed Description | Providing verbal or behavioral reinforcement of support participants’ use of the resources they have (e.g., organization/system capacities; learning, application, and measurement resources) to support effective implementation. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Contributes to leaders’ and teams’ use of their available resources to manage their own implementation performance. |
| Common Situations for Use | \*Applies to all CPC 2 practice activities  When observing, debriefing, or reflecting on a situation involving support participants’ application of effective implementation practices, resources, or problem solving in a way that demonstrated primary agency. This may be from support participants’ current practice or prior related experiences.  At any time during the support process, including in conjunction with many other practice activities that may afford natural opportunities to reinforce self-regulation, such as:  1.2 (provide emotional and practical support)  1.3 (readiness)  CPC 3 activities  4.1 (strengths, needs, and patterns)  5.3 (just-in-time learning)  6.2 (capacity development)  6.4 (PDSA)  7.2 (anticipatory guidance: performance success)  CPC 8 activities  9.1 (root causes and lessons learned)  9.2 (accountability)  9.3 (technical and adaptive elements)  10.1 (shared rationale) |
| Key Differentiations | \*With the exception of the last differentiation, applies to all CPC 2 practice activities  **7.2 (anticipatory guidance: performance success)**: 7.2 is specifically related to *helping support participants to visualize and anticipate their actions or responses* to situational factors and perceived or potential threats/challenges that may arise *during an experiential learning activity*. CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* “X” (an effective implementation practice behavior), such as “You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X.” To the extent that 7.2 and CPC 2 activities co-occur during a support interaction, they should be dually recorded.  **8.2 (self-reflection: experiential learning activities):** 8.2 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (an implementation practice behavior) and focuses on facilitating support participants’ self-reflection on their behavioral performance. CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X, generally (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”). Self-reflection (8.2) may be facilitated using a self-regulatory framework (see related note under “Description” in 8.2), but CPC 2 activities should be recorded only when the ISP *reinforces support participants’ own self-regulatory behaviors.* For example, during 8.2, support participants may engage in self-monitoring and self-determination of next steps, which the ISP may reinforce (CPC 2).  **8.3 (specific behavioral feedback: praise):** 8.3 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (an effective implementation practice behavior), such as “I like when you did X,” “You did a good job doing X,” or “When you did X, did you notice that Y (favorable outcome) happened?” CPC 2 activities, rather, reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”).  **8.4 (specific behavioral feedback: constructive):** 8.4 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (a developmental implementation practice behavior) and focuses on providing *constructive feedback* regarding support participants’ specific behaviors during X, such as “When you did X, did you notice that Y (unintended or partially intended outcome) happened?” CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X, generally (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”).  **8.7 (self-reflection: generalization):** 8.7 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (a developmental implementation practice behavior) and focuses on *generalizing* *participants’ specific behaviors during X* to implementation contexts or practice situations beyond X. CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X, generally (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”).  **9.3 (technical and adaptive elements):** In 9.3, the *ISP helps support participants* identify, and strategically respond to, technical and adaptive elements of organizational/system challenges that may have emerged in recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences, or that are anticipated to emerge in future performance activities. In **2.4** (problem solving), the *ISP reinforces support participants’ own* identification of, and response to, technical and adaptive elements of such challenges. |

Practice Activity 2.3

Reinforce leaders’ and teams’ perceptions of their responsibility for, ownership of, and influence over adaptive organizational change and implementation performance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Personal Agency |
| Detailed Description | Providing verbal or behavioral reinforcement of support participants’ responsibility for using effective implementation strategies and reaching their desired improvements. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Contributes to leaders’ and teams’ sense of personal agency (i.e., belief that they are the ones generating an outcome) in realizing their implementation performance goals. |
| Common Situations for Use | \*Applies to all CPC 2 practice activities  When observing, debriefing, or reflecting on a situation involving support participants’ application of effective implementation practices, resources, or problem solving in a way that demonstrated primary agency. This may be from support participants’ current practice or prior related experiences.  At any time during the support process, including in conjunction with many other practice activities that may afford natural opportunities to reinforce self-regulation, such as:  1.2 (provide emotional and practical support)  1.3 (readiness)  CPC 3 activities  4.1 (strengths, needs, and patterns)  5.3 (just-in-time learning)  6.2 (capacity development)  6.4 (PDSA)  7.2 (anticipatory guidance: performance success)  CPC 8 activities  9.1 (root causes and lessons learned)  9.2 (accountability)  9.3 (technical and adaptive elements)  10.1 (shared rationale) |
| Key Differentiations | \*With the exception of the last differentiation, applies to all CPC 2 practice activities  **7.2 (anticipatory guidance: performance success)**: 7.2 is specifically related to *helping support participants to visualize and anticipate their actions or responses* to situational factors and perceived or potential threats/challenges that may arise *during an experiential learning activity*. CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* “X” (an effective implementation practice behavior), such as “You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X.” To the extent that 7.2 and CPC 2 activities co-occur during a support interaction, they should be dually recorded.  **8.2 (self-reflection: experiential learning activities):** 8.2 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (an implementation practice behavior) and focuses on facilitating support participants’ self-reflection on their behavioral performance. CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X, generally (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”). Self-reflection (8.2) may be facilitated using a self-regulatory framework (see related note under “Description” in 8.2), but CPC 2 activities should be recorded only when the ISP *reinforces support participants’ own self-regulatory behaviors.* For example, during 8.2, support participants may engage in self-monitoring and self-determination of next steps, which the ISP may reinforce (CPC 2).  **8.3 (specific behavioral feedback: praise):** 8.3 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (an effective implementation practice behavior), such as “I like when you did X,” “You did a good job doing X,” or “When you did X, did you notice that Y (favorable outcome) happened?” CPC 2 activities, rather, reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”).  **8.4 (specific behavioral feedback: constructive):** 8.4 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (a developmental implementation practice behavior) and focuses on providing *constructive feedback* regarding support participants’ specific behaviors during X, such as “When you did X, did you notice that Y (unintended or partially intended outcome) happened?” CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X, generally (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”).  **8.7 (self-reflection: generalization):** 8.7 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (a developmental implementation practice behavior) and focuses on *generalizing* *participants’ specific behaviors during X* to implementation contexts or practice situations beyond X. CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X, generally (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”).  **9.3 (technical and adaptive elements):** In 9.3, the *ISP helps support participants* identify, and strategically respond to, technical and adaptive elements of organizational/system challenges that may have emerged in recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences, or that are anticipated to emerge in future performance activities. In **2.4** (problem solving), the *ISP reinforces support participants’ own* identification of, and response to, technical and adaptive elements of such challenges. |

Practice Activity 2.4

Reinforce leaders’ and teams’ abilities to identify and respond to adaptive and technical challenges to implementation performance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Problem Solving |
| Detailed Description | Providing verbal or behavioral reinforcement of support participants’ ability to identify and respond effectively to implementation challenges using technical and adaptive problem-solving strategies. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Contributes to leaders’ and teams’ problem-solving capabilities when navigating the inevitable challenges that arise while working toward their implementation performance goals. |
| Common Situations for Use | \*Applies to all CPC 2 practice activities  When observing, debriefing, or reflecting on a situation involving support participants’ application of effective implementation practices, resources, or problem solving in a way that demonstrated primary agency. This may be from support participants’ current practice or prior related experiences.  At any time during the support process, including in conjunction with many other practice activities that may afford natural opportunities to reinforce self-regulation, such as:  1.2 (provide emotional and practical support)  1.3 (readiness)  CPC 3 activities  4.1 (strengths, needs, and patterns)  5.3 (just-in-time learning)  6.2 (capacity development)  6.4 (PDSA)  7.2 (anticipatory guidance: performance success)  CPC 8 activities  9.1 (root causes and lessons learned)  9.2 (accountability)  9.3 (technical and adaptive elements)  10.1 (shared rationale) |
| Key Differentiations | \*With the exception of the last differentiation, applies to all CPC 2 practice activities  **7.2 (anticipatory guidance: performance success)**: 7.2 is specifically related to *helping support participants to visualize and anticipate their actions or responses* to situational factors and perceived or potential threats/challenges that may arise *during an experiential learning activity*. CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* “X” (an effective implementation practice behavior), such as “You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X.” To the extent that 7.2 and CPC 2 activities co-occur during a support interaction, they should be dually recorded.  **8.2 (self-reflection: experiential learning activities):** 8.2 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (an implementation practice behavior) and focuses on facilitating support participants’ self-reflection on their behavioral performance. CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X, generally (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”). Self-reflection (8.2) may be facilitated using a self-regulatory framework (see related note under “Description” in 8.2), but CPC 2 activities should be recorded only when the ISP *reinforces support participants’ own self-regulatory behaviors.* For example, during 8.2, support participants may engage in self-monitoring and self-determination of next steps, which the ISP may reinforce (CPC 2).  **8.3 (specific behavioral feedback: praise):** 8.3 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (an effective implementation practice behavior), such as “I like when you did X,” “You did a good job doing X,” or “When you did X, did you notice that Y (favorable outcome) happened?” CPC 2 activities, rather, reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”).  **8.4 (specific behavioral feedback: constructive):** 8.4 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (a developmental implementation practice behavior) and focuses on providing *constructive feedback* regarding support participants’ specific behaviors during X, such as “When you did X, did you notice that Y (unintended or partially intended outcome) happened?” CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X, generally (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”).  **8.7 (self-reflection: generalization):** 8.7 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (a developmental implementation practice behavior) and focuses on *generalizing* *participants’ specific behaviors during X* to implementation contexts or practice situations beyond X. CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X, generally (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”).  **9.3 (technical and adaptive elements):** In 9.3, the *ISP helps support participants* identify, and strategically respond to, technical and adaptive elements of organizational/system challenges that may have emerged in recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences, or that are anticipated to emerge in future performance activities. In **2.4** (problem solving), the *ISP reinforces support participants’ own* identification of, and response to, technical and adaptive elements of such challenges. |

Practice Activity 2.5

Reinforce leaders’ and teams’ perceptions of their abilities to autonomously manage implementation performance, with ongoing support only as needed from external support providers

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Self-Sufficiency |
| Detailed Description | Providing verbal or behavioral reinforcement of support participants’ ability to effectively manage their implementation performance without dependence on external implementation support. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Contributes to leaders’ and teams’ abilities to effectively pursue their implementation performance goals with a healthy degree of autonomy. |
| Common Situations for Use | \*Applies to all CPC 2 practice activities  When observing, debriefing, or reflecting on a situation involving support participants’ application of effective implementation practices, resources, or problem solving in a way that demonstrated primary agency. This may be from support participants’ current practice or prior related experiences.  At any time during the support process, including in conjunction with many other practice activities that may afford natural opportunities to reinforce self-regulation, such as:  1.2 (provide emotional and practical support)  1.3 (readiness)  CPC 3 activities  4.1 (strengths, needs, and patterns)  5.3 (just-in-time learning)  6.2 (capacity development)  6.4 (PDSA)  7.2 (anticipatory guidance: performance success)  CPC 8 activities  9.1 (root causes and lessons learned)  9.2 (accountability)  9.3 (technical and adaptive elements)  10.1 (shared rationale) |
| Key Differentiations | \*With the exception of the last differentiation, applies to all CPC 2 practice activities  **7.2 (anticipatory guidance: performance success)**: 7.2 is specifically related to *helping support participants to visualize and anticipate their actions or responses* to situational factors and perceived or potential threats/challenges that may arise *during an experiential learning activity*. CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* “X” (an effective implementation practice behavior), such as “You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X.” To the extent that 7.2 and CPC 2 activities co-occur during a support interaction, they should be dually recorded.  **8.2 (self-reflection: experiential learning activities):** 8.2 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (an implementation practice behavior) and focuses on facilitating support participants’ self-reflection on their behavioral performance. CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X, generally (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”). Self-reflection (8.2) may be facilitated using a self-regulatory framework (see related note under “Description” in 8.2), but CPC 2 activities should be recorded only when the ISP *reinforces support participants’ own self-regulatory behaviors.* For example, during 8.2, support participants may engage in self-monitoring and self-determination of next steps, which the ISP may reinforce (CPC 2).  **8.3 (specific behavioral feedback: praise):** 8.3 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (an effective implementation practice behavior), such as “I like when you did X,” “You did a good job doing X,” or “When you did X, did you notice that Y (favorable outcome) happened?” CPC 2 activities, rather, reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”).  **8.4 (specific behavioral feedback: constructive):** 8.4 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (a developmental implementation practice behavior) and focuses on providing *constructive feedback* regarding support participants’ specific behaviors during X, such as “When you did X, did you notice that Y (unintended or partially intended outcome) happened?” CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X, generally (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”).  **8.7 (self-reflection: generalization):** 8.7 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (a developmental implementation practice behavior) and focuses on *generalizing* *participants’ specific behaviors during X* to implementation contexts or practice situations beyond X. CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* X, generally (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”).  **9.3 (technical and adaptive elements):** In 9.3, the *ISP helps support participants* identify, and strategically respond to, technical and adaptive elements of organizational/system challenges that may have emerged in recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences, or that are anticipated to emerge in future performance activities. In **2.4** (problem solving), the *ISP reinforces support participants’ own* identification of, and response to, technical and adaptive elements of such challenges. |

*Note.* CPC = core practice component; PDSA = Plan-Do-Study-Act; ISP = implementation support practitioner.

## CPC #3

## Assess Implementation Capacity, Implementation Performance, and Progress Toward Intended Outcomes

Practice Activity 3.1

Conduct qualitative assessments of implementation capacity and performance within the primary organization receiving support

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Qualitative Assessment |
| Detailed Description | Conducting initial and follow-up structured, semi-structured, or unstructured interviews, qualitative observations, and other qualitative assessments related to the region/community’s Triple P implementation capacity, performance, and/or outcomes (implementation, program, or population). This may include assessments with co-creation partners outside the primary organization receiving support (e.g., community partners, practitioners, or Triple P providers). |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | \*Applies to all CPC 3 practice activities  The information, data, and learning generated by CPC 3 practice activities are used by ISPs and support participants to conceptualize how current individual, team, organizational, and system factors are working together to produce current progress toward, and barriers to, intended outcomes. This enables a shared understanding of strengths, needs, and patterns (4.1), helps to establish performance goals on which to focus support (4.2), and aids in planning subsequent CPC 4 practice activities.  May also be useful for:  determining and monitoring learning objectives (5.1)  affording opportunities to provide just-in-time learning (5.3)  linking assessment items to action plans in capacity development (6.3)  planning measurement strategies for PDSA cycles during capacity development (6.4)  including data during debriefing related to experiential learning activities (7.1)  using data to analyze root causes of barriers and challenges and identify lessons learned (9.1)  establishing a shared rationale for transitioning out of intensive support (10.1) |
| Common Situations for Use | \*Applies to all CPC 3 practice activities  When forming or revising case conceptualizations.  When forming or revising a conceptualization of a specific situation or scenario.  When evaluating progress toward learning objectives, capacity development, performance improvements, program outcomes, or population outcomes during the support engagement.  When evaluating the effectiveness of an implementation resource or strategy applied by support participants during a PDSA improvement cycle. |
| Key Differentiations | **3.4 (secondary qualitative assessment):** 3.4 is used when focusing on *a service provider organization’s* Triple P implementation capacity, performance, and/or outcomes*.* 3.1 is used when focusing on the *region/community’s* Triple P implementation capacity, performance, and/or outcomes.  **7.1 (experiential learning):** 7.1 may be used to facilitate experiential learning opportunities structured around the organization/system’s *prior existing* capacities to determine areas of existing strength or needed improvement. When this use of 7.1 involves qualitative assessments, 3.1 is dually recorded*.*  **8.1 (observe and/or debrief):** 8.1 is used when directly observing or debriefing specific episodes of support participants’ using or applying an implementation strategy or practice (e.g., “Tell me what happened when you did X”; “Tell me what that looked like when you did X”). *The focus of 8.1 is on the individual/team level for the supportive behavioral coaching processes.* 3.1 is used when assessing strengths, needs, and patterns related to the region/community’s Triple P implementation capacity, performance, and/or outcomes. *The focus of 3.1 is on the organizational/system level for assessment purposes.*  **8.2 (self-reflection: experiential learning activities):** 8.2 is used when providing supportive behavioral coaching to individuals and teams on their application of an implementation strategy or practice during an experiential learning activity (per 7.1). *The focus of 8.2 is on the individual/team level.* 3.1 is used when assessing strengths, needs, and patterns related to the region/community’s Triple P implementation capacity, performance, and/or outcomes. *The focus of 3.1 is on the organizational/system level.* |
|  |  |

Practice Activity 3.2

Conduct quantitative assessments of implementation capacity and performance within the primary organization receiving support

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Quantitative Assessment |
| Detailed Description | Administering initial and follow-up quantitative measures or assessments related to the region/ community’s Triple P implementation capacity, performance, and/or outcomes (implementation, program, or population). This may include assessments with partners outside the primary organization receiving support (e.g., community partners, practitioners, or Triple P providers).  *Note.* This practice activity relates to the use of *any* quantitative assessment administered by the ISP, not just the CCA-TP or IDA-TP. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | \*Applies to all CPC 3 practice activities  The information, data, and learning generated by CPC 3 practice activities are used by ISPs and support participants to conceptualize how current individual, team, organizational, and system factors are working together to produce current progress toward, and barriers to, intended outcomes. This enables a shared understanding of strengths, needs, and patterns (4.1), helps to establish performance goals on which to focus support (4.2), and aids in planning subsequent CPC 4 practice activities.  May also be useful for:  determining and monitoring learning objectives (5.1)  affording opportunities to provide just-in-time learning (5.3)  linking assessment items to action plans in capacity development (6.3)  planning measurement strategies for PDSA cycles during capacity development (6.4)  including data during debriefing related to experiential learning activities (7.1)  using data to analyze root causes of barriers and challenges and identify lessons learned (9.1)  establishing a shared rationale for transitioning out of intensive support (10.1) |
| Common Situations for Use | \*Applies to all CPC 3 practice activities  When forming or revising case conceptualizations.  When forming or revising a conceptualization of a specific situation or scenario.  When evaluating progress toward learning objectives, capacity development, performance improvements, program outcomes, or population outcomes during the support engagement.  When evaluating the effectiveness of an implementation resource or strategy applied by support participants during a PDSA improvement cycle. |
| Key Differentiations | **3.5 (secondary quantitative assessment):** 3.5 is used when focusing on *a service provider organization’s* Triple P implementation capacity, performance, and/or outcomes*.* 3.2 is used when focusing on the *region/community’s* Triple P implementation capacity, performance, and/or outcomes.  **7.1 (experiential learning):** 7.1 may be used to facilitate experiential learning opportunities structured around the organization/system’s *prior existing* capacities to determine areas of existing strength or needed improvement. When this use of 7.1 involves quantitative assessments, 3.2 is dually recorded. |

Practice Activity 3.3

Review records related to the primary organization’s broader context, current plans, or progress toward desired outcomes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Records Reviews |
| Detailed Description | Conducting initial and follow-up reviews of region/community-generated data or evaluation reports; strategic or implementation plans; org charts; grant agreements or contracts; MOAs or MOUs; meeting minutes; progress reports; and other records related to the region/community’s Triple P implementation capacity, performance, and/or outcomes (implementation, program, or population). |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | \*Applies to all CPC 3 practice activities  The information, data, and learning generated by CPC 3 practice activities are used by ISPs and support participants to conceptualize how current individual, team, organizational, and system factors are working together to produce current progress toward, and barriers to, intended outcomes. This enables a shared understanding of strengths, needs, and patterns (4.1), helps to establish performance goals on which to focus support (4.2), and aids in planning subsequent CPC 4 practice activities.  May also be useful for:  determining and monitoring learning objectives (5.1)  affording opportunities to provide just-in-time learning (5.3)  linking assessment items to action plans in capacity development (6.3)  planning measurement strategies for PDSA cycles during capacity development (6.4)  including data during debriefing related to experiential learning activities (7.1)  using data to analyze root causes of barriers and challenges and identify lessons learned (9.1)  establishing a shared rationale for transitioning out of intensive support (10.1) |
| Common Situations for Use | \*Applies to all CPC 3 practice activities  When forming or revising case conceptualizations.  When forming or revising a conceptualization of a specific situation or scenario.  When evaluating progress toward learning objectives, capacity development, performance improvements, program outcomes, or population outcomes during the support engagement.  When evaluating the effectiveness of an implementation resource or strategy applied by support participants during a PDSA improvement cycle. |
| Key Differentiations | **6.1 (action plans):** 6.1 is used when *developing shared action plans* *related to the support process*. 3.3 may be used when reviewing existing or previous organizational or system action plan documents *unrelated to current support plans.* |
|  |  |

Practice Activity 3.4

Conduct qualitative interviews to assess implementation capacity and performance within secondary organizations being supported by the primary organization

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Secondary Qualitative Assessment |
| Detailed Description | Conducting initial and follow-up structured, semi-structured, or unstructured interviews related to a local service provider organization’s Triple P implementation capacity, performance, and/or outcomes (implementation or program). This may include interviews with partners outside the local Triple P service provider organization (e.g., the individuals they serve, community leaders). |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | \*Applies to all CPC 3 practice activities  The information, data, and learning generated by CPC 3 practice activities are used by ISPs and support participants to conceptualize how current individual, team, organizational, and system factors are working together to produce current progress toward, and barriers to, intended outcomes. This enables a shared understanding of strengths, needs, and patterns (4.1), helps to establish performance goals on which to focus support (4.2), and aids in planning subsequent CPC 4 practice activities.  May also be useful for:  determining and monitoring learning objectives (5.1)  affording opportunities to provide just-in-time learning (5.3)  linking assessment items to action plans in capacity development (6.3)  planning measurement strategies for PDSA cycles during capacity development (6.4)  including data during debriefing related to experiential learning activities (7.1)  using data to analyze root causes of barriers and challenges and identify lessons learned (9.1)  establishing a shared rationale for transitioning out of intensive support (10.1) |
| Common Situations for Use | \*Applies to all CPC 3 practice activities  When forming or revising case conceptualizations.  When forming or revising a conceptualization of a specific situation or scenario.  When evaluating progress toward learning objectives, capacity development, performance improvements, program outcomes, or population outcomes during the support engagement.  When evaluating the effectiveness of an implementation resource or strategy applied by support participants during a PDSA improvement cycle. |
| Key Differentiations | **3.1 (qualitative assessment):** 3.1 is used when focusing on the *region/community’s* Triple P implementation capacity, performance, and/or outcomes. 3.4 is used when focusing on *a service provider’s* Triple P implementation capacity, performance, and/or outcomes*.* |
|  |  |

Practice Activity 3.5

Conduct quantitative assessment of implementation capacity and performance within secondary organizations being supported by the primary organization

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Secondary Quantitative Assessment |
| Detailed Description | Administering initial and follow-up quantitative measures or assessments related to a local service provider organization’s Triple P implementation capacity, performance, and/or outcomes (implementation or program). This may include assessments with partners outside the local Triple P service provider organization (e.g., the individuals they serve, community leaders).  *Note.* This practice activity relates to the use of *any* quantitative assessment administered by the ISP, not just the IDA-TP. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | \*Applies to all CPC 3 practice activities  The information, data, and learning generated by CPC 3 practice activities are used by ISPs and support participants to conceptualize how current individual, team, organizational, and system factors are working together to produce current progress toward, and barriers to, intended outcomes. This enables a shared understanding of strengths, needs, and patterns (4.1), helps to establish performance goals on which to focus support (4.2), and aids in planning subsequent CPC 4 practice activities.  May also be useful for:  determining and monitoring learning objectives (5.1)  affording opportunities to provide just-in-time learning (5.3)  linking assessment items to action plans in capacity development (6.3)  planning measurement strategies for PDSA cycles during capacity development (6.4)  including data during debriefing related to experiential learning activities (7.1)  using data to analyze root causes of barriers and challenges and identify lessons learned (9.1)  establishing a shared rationale for transitioning out of intensive support (10.1) |
| Common Situations for Use | \*Applies to all CPC 3 practice activities  When forming or revising case conceptualizations.  When forming or revising a conceptualization of a specific situation or scenario.  When evaluating progress toward learning objectives, capacity development, performance improvements, program outcomes, or population outcomes during the support engagement.  When evaluating the effectiveness of an implementation resource or strategy applied by support participants during a PDSA improvement cycle. |
| Key Differentiations | **3.2 (quantitative assessment):** 3.2 is used when focusing on the *region/community’s* Triple P implementation capacity, performance, and/or outcomes. 3.5 is used when focusing on *a service provider’s* Triple P implementation capacity, performance, and/or outcomes*.* |
|  |  |

Note. CPC = core practice component; PDSA = Plan-Do-Study-Act; ISP = implementation support practitioner; CCA-TP = Community Capacity Assessment for the Triple P System of Interventions; IDA-TP = Implementation Drivers Assessment for the Triple P System of Interventions; MOA = memorandum of agreement; MOU = memorandum of understanding.

## CPC #4

## Facilitate Collaborative Agreements About Implementation Performance Goals on Which to Focus Support

Practice Activity 4.1

Facilitate a shared understanding about strengths, needs, and patterns related to the implementation capacity and performance of the primary organization and any secondary organizations.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Strengths, Needs, and Patterns |
| Detailed Description | Ensuring that support participants have a shared understanding—with each other and with ISPs—about:  current regional progress toward, and barriers to, intended outcomes;  historical regional activities, efforts, and patterns of progress;  presenting regional strengths and developmental needs related to implementation capacity and performance in the region; and  how current individual, team, organizational, and system factors are working together to produce current progress toward, and barriers to, intended regional outcomes. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | A shared understanding of strengths, needs, and patterns allows ISPs and support participants to co-design implementation performance goals on which to focus support in ways that are meaningful, responsive to context, and malleable to shared support activities.  Having a shared understanding of these elements increases working alliance.  This practice activity may also be useful for:  determining and monitoring learning objectives (5.1)  affording opportunities to provide just-in-time learning (5.3)  determining and monitoring shared action plans for capacity development (6.1)  establishing a shared rationale for transitioning out of intensive support (10.1) |
| Common Situations for Use | When reflecting with support participants about findings from assessment activities (CPC 3).  Before establishing, adjusting, or transitioning between performance goals on which to focus support (4.2).  As part of establishing a shared rationale for transitioning out of intensive support (10.1).  When there is lack of concurrence among support participants or between support participants and ISPs about organizational/system strengths, needs, and patterns related to implementation.  When support participants and ISPs are determining tier of support (universal; brief, narrow-focused; intensive, broad-focused).  When onboarding a new support participant or ISP to ground them in regional strengths, needs, and patterns as previously identified. |
| Key Differentiations | 1.1 (roles and responsibilities): 1.1 focuses on roles, responsibilities, and expectations of each partner within the overall course of the support engagement. 4.1 focuses on support participants’ and ISPs’ shared understanding of implementation strengths, needs, and patterns at organizational or system levels.  4.3 (prioritization): 4.3 focuses on a prioritized order of implementation performance goals on which support will focus. 4.1 focuses on support participants’ and ISPs’ shared understanding of implementation strengths, needs, and patterns at organizational or system levels.  8.1 (observe and/or debrief): 8.1 is used when debriefing specific episodes of support participants’ using or applying an implementation strategy or practice (e.g., “Tell me what happened when you did X” or “Tell me what that looked like when you did X”). 4.1 is used when reflecting on strengths, needs, and patterns of implementation capacity and performance at organizational or system levels.  9.3 (technical and adaptive elements): In 9.3, the ISP helps support participants identify, and strategically respond to, technical and adaptive elements of organizational/system challenges that may have emerged in recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences, or that are anticipated to occur in future performance activities. 4.1 is used when reflecting on higher-level implementation strengths, needs, and patterns at organizational or system levels. |

Practice Activity 4.2

Set realistic, jointly determined goals for establishing or improving specific domains of implementation performance within the primary organization and any secondary organizations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Regional Performance Goals |
| Detailed Description | Establishing a shared understanding—among support participants and ISPs—of one or more specific, motivating, attainable, relevant, trackable, inclusive, and equitable (SMARTIE) implementation performance goals on which support will focus. Developing one or more Aim Statements (per the model for improvement) may also be a useful way to conduct this practice activity.  Note. Goals are typically set within the following two areas from the ICTP integrated theory of change for implementing and scaling Triple P: system implementation performance and implementation outcomes. While goals may be set in the intervention outcome or population outcome areas of the ICTP integrated theory of change, these goals are more distal and may be less malleable to the support process. ISPs should, in these cases, encourage support participants to consider system implementation performance and implementation outcomes that may be related to these more distal outcomes. Reducing disparate experiences or outcomes in any of these areas may also be the focus of established goals. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Directly contributes to the establishment of implementation performance goals on which to focus support.  Having jointly determined goals increases working alliance.  May also be useful for:  planning future assessment activities (CPC 3) to ensure that change-related activities (CPCs 5–9) lead to improvements  starting an improvement process that can lead to using PDSA cycles during capacity development (6.4) |
| Common Situations for Use | When establishing, adjusting, or transitioning between implementation performance goals on which to focus support.  When the goals of support are unclear or there is lack of buy-in to the support process.  When support activities have drifted outside of established roles, responsibilities, and expectations.  When there is lack of concurrence among support participants or between support participants and ISPs about organizational/system implementation performance goals on which to focus support. |
| Key Differentiations | **4.4 (strategies):** 4.4 is used to establish *strategies* on which support will focus, *typically related to the capacity or structural drivers* needed to advance longer-term implementation performance goals. 4.2 is used to establish longer-term implementation *performance goals* in areas listed in the note under “Description.”  **5.1 (learning objectives):** 5.1 focuses on setting implementation practice *learning objectives for support participants to achieve* *while working toward their implementation performance goals*. 4.2 is used to establish *longer-term implementation performance goals* *at organizational or system levels*.  **6.1 (action plans):** 6.1 is used to develop or adapt *shared action plans* to advance collective efforts to achieve prioritized implementation performance goals. 4.2 is used to establish the longer-term implementation performance goals *themselves*. |
|  |  |

Practice Activity 4.3

Facilitate prioritization of implementation performance goals according to organizational/system needs, natural sequences, and/or effective implementation practices

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Prioritization |
| Detailed Description | Establishing a priority-based order of performance goals on which support will focus. This may be particularly important when participants feel overwhelmed and/or support participants’ or ISP teams’ capacities limit the breadth of the support process.  Note. Both support participants and ISPs may influence the prioritization process from their own perspectives, though support participants are ensured ownership of final decisions. Tier of support and prioritization of goals on which to focus support may influence each other (e.g., setting priorities based on available tier of support, setting tier of support based on prioritized goals). |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Provides clearer parameters for focusing support.  Increases working alliance by ensuring that support priorities are shared by support participants and ISPs and top priorities are being addressed first. Relatedly, may help with the shared pacing of the support process, which increases alliance. |
| Common Situations for Use | When establishing, adjusting, or transitioning between implementation performance goals on which to focus support.  When there is lack of concurrence among support participants or between support participants and ISPs about the order in which implementation performance goals are being supported.  When support participants’ or ISP teams’ capacities require decreasing the number of goals on which to focus more immediate support. |
| Key Differentiations | 1.1 (roles and responsibilities): 1.1 focuses on roles, responsibilities, and expectations for each partner within the overall course of the support engagement. 4.3 focuses more specifically on a prioritized order of implementation performance goals on which support will focus.  1.5 (group agreements): 1.5 focuses on values and behavioral norms to guide partners during support interactions or working sessions. 4.3 focuses on a prioritized order of implementation performance goals on which support will focus.  4.1 (strengths, needs, and patterns): 4.1 focuses on support participants’ and ISPs’ shared understanding of implementation strengths, needs, and patterns at organizational or system levels. 4.3 focuses on a prioritized order of implementation performance goals on which support will focus. |
|  |  |

Practice Activity 4.4

Set realistic, jointly established strategies focused on developing organizational or system structures, resources, policies, or practices in the primary organization to meet a prioritized

Implementation performance goal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Strategies |
| Detailed Description | Establishing strategies to improve capacity or structural drivers (i.e., structures, resources, policies, or practices) at organization or system levels that, if improved, will advance prioritized implementation performance goals on which support will focus. This involves establishing a shared understanding—among support participants and ISPs—of what these capacity or structural drivers are. Developing a case conceptualization, creating a driver diagram, or using other root cause mapping activities (e.g., per the model for improvement) can be useful when conducting this practice activity.  Note. Strategies are typically set within the following two areas from the ICTP integrated theory of change for implementing and scaling Triple P: (1) co-creation partners and process, and (2) system implementation capacity. Strategies may also be set as related to structural inequities that may be perpetuating disparate performance, implementation, intervention, or population outcomes. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Helps to begin operationalizing the ways in which support will focus on prioritized implementation performance goals.  Having jointly determined goals increases working alliance.  Directly sets up 4.5 (early wins) and all practice activities related to CPCs 5 and 6.  May also help set up collective learning and adaptive problem-solving activities (CPC 9). |
| Common Situations for Use | When establishing, adjusting, or transitioning between implementation performance goals on which to focus support.  When the activities of support are unclear or there is lack of buy-in to the support process as related to prioritized implementation performance goals.  When there is lack of concurrence among support participants or between support participants and ISPs about capacity or structural drivers that will advance implementation performance goals.  As collective learning and adaptive problem solving (CPC 9) reveals new elements of capacity or structural drivers related to prioritized performance goals. |
| Key Differentiations | 4.2 (goals): 4.2 is used to establish longer-term implementation performance goals in areas mentioned in the note under “Description” for practice activity 4.2. 4.4 is used to establish strategies on which support will focus, typically related to the capacity or structural drivers needed to advance longer-term implementation performance goals.  5.1 (learning objectives): 5.1 focuses on establishing learning objectives for support participants to achieve while working to improve capacity or structural drivers related to implementation performance goals. 4.4 is used to establish the strategies, themselves, aimed at improving capacity or structural drivers related to implementation performance goals.  6.1 (action plans): 6.1 is used to develop or adapt shared action plans to improve capacity or structural drivers related to implementation performance goals. 4.4 is used to establish the strategies, themselves, to improve capacity or structural drivers related to implementation performance goals. Action plans (6.1) are detailed plans involving who does what, when, and why, whereas strategies (4.4) are more general approaches aimed at what changes will improve capacity or structural drivers. |
|  |  |

Practice Activity 4.5

Facilitate the identification of multiple “early wins”: initial action steps that can easily be accomplished to build positive momentum toward the achievement of prioritized implementation performance goals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Early Wins |
| Detailed Description | Establishing two or more early wins related to near-term implementation performance goals on which support will focus. Early wins are easily achievable action steps within short timelines that will jump-start progress toward achieving implementation performance goals.  *Note*. Both support participants and ISPs may influence the identification of early wins from their own perspectives, though support participants are ensured ownership of final decisions. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Jump-starts the action planning process (6.1) related to prioritized implementation performance goals. This creates a bridge between CPC 4 activities and CPCs 5 and 6 activities.  May increase working alliance and buy-in to the support process by identifying easily achievable, early action steps for support participants and ISPs. |
| Common Situations for Use | When establishing, adjusting, or transitioning between implementation performance goals on which to focus support.  When establishing or adjusting the capacity or structural drivers needed to meet a prioritized implementation performance goal.  When support participants need a taste of success related to working on their implementation performance goals.  When support activities are unclear or support participants lack buy-in to the support process as related to prioritized implementation performance goals. |
| Key Differentiations | **6.1 (action plans):** 6.1 focuses on *comprehensive action plans, typically shared by several co-creation partners,* needed to achieve implementation performance goals. 4.5 focuses on a *small set of easily achievable, early action steps that support participants and ISPs might take* to jump-start progress toward achieving implementation performance goals. 4.5 is typically a precursor to 6.1 and done more contemporaneously with other CPC 4 activities than with CPC 6 activities. |
|  |  |

*Note.* CPC = core practice component; ISP = implementation support practitioner; ICTP = Implementation Capacity for Triple P; PDSA = Plan-Do-Study-Act.

## CPC #5

## Provide Learning to Support Leaders’ and Teams’ Acquisition of New Implementation Practice Knowledge and Skills

Practice Activity 5.1

Set and monitor the progress of implementation practice learning objectives related to prioritized implementation performance goals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Learning Objectives |
| Detailed Description | Using ICTP content frameworks, identify knowledge, skill, and/or application learning objectives for leaders and teams to achieve to advance their implementation performance goals. The identified learning objectives will be used to scaffold structured learning of new knowledge and skills (5.2), experiential learning (7.1), and structured learning of knowledge and skill refinement (8.5).  Monitoring the progress of learning objectives involves empirical and/or observational assessment of the degree to which leaders and teams have achieved previously identified learning objectives. This may be done through pre-post quantitative or qualitative learning assessments, observing or debriefing experiential learning activities (8.1), or other learning assessment methods. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Operationalizes the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) that leaders and implementation teams will need to acquire to advance their implementation performance goals. |
| Common Situations for Use | When identifying early wins (4.5).  Before planning structured learning: new knowledge and skills activities (5.2).  Following structured learning: new knowledge and skills activities (5.2).  As a part of ISPs’ ongoing observation or debriefing of leaders’ and teams’ experiential learning activities (8.1).  Before planning structured learning: knowledge and skill refinement activities (8.5).  Following structured learning: knowledge and skill refinement activities (8.5). |
| Key Differentiations | 4.2 (regional performance goals): 4.2 is used to establish longer-term implementation performance goals at organizational or system levels. 5.1 focuses on setting implementation practice learning objectives for support participants to achieve while working toward their implementation performance goals.  4.4 (strategies): 4.4 is used to establish strategies to improve capacity or structural drivers related to implementation performance goals. 5.1 focuses on setting implementation practice learning objectives for support participants to achieve while working to improve capacity or structural drivers related to implementation performance goals.  6.1 (action plans): 6.1 focuses on comprehensive action plans, typically shared by several co-creation partners, needed to achieve implementation performance goals. 5.1 focuses on setting and monitoring implementation practice learning objectives for support participants to achieve while working toward their implementation performance goals.  8.1 (observe and/or debrief): 8.1 is used when observing or debriefing specific episodes of support participants’ using or applying an implementation strategy or practice (e.g., “Tell me what happened when you did X” or “Tell me what that looked like when you did X”). 5.1 is used for setting and monitoring support participants’ implementation practice learning objectives. To the extent that 8.1 involves qualitative or quantitative assessment of the degree to which support participants have achieved relevant learning objectives, these practice activities may be dually recorded. |

Practice Activity 5.2

Provide structured learning activities focused on the acquisition of new implementation practice knowledge and skills related to prioritized implementation performance goals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Structured Learning: New Knowledge and Skills |
| Detailed Description | Providing structured learning activities using resources or activities operated by the ISP and focused on support participants’ acquisition of knowledge and skill learning objectives (5.1), particularly as related to learning for the first time or wanting to learn more. Learning methods typically involve introducing new learning material; illustrating or demonstrating new knowledge and skills, including through role playing/ simulation; and practicing through problem-solving tasks.  Note. Learning activities may occur in person, virtually, or by setting up leaders’ and teams’ independent learning. Blended learning occurs (1) when practice activity 5.2 or 8.5 is used for the same or similar sets of learning objectives in both virtual and in-person formats, or (2) when 5.2 or 8.5 is used in person alongside past, current, or future use of online learning resources (5.4) for the same or similar sets of learning objectives. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Leads to *moderate* gains in achievement of adult learning outcomes [1].  The use of in-person learning activities in addition to virtual instruction creates the context for *blended learning*. Blended learning has demonstrated significantly larger impacts on learning compared to face-to-face and online-only learning [2]. These advantages were attributed to the differences in content, pedagogy, and learning time afforded in blended learning conditions and not to the use of the online delivery medium itself. |
| Common Situations for Use | When there is a shared understanding that leaders and implementation team members may need to acquire new knowledge and skills to successfully carry out capacity development activities (6.2) or experiential learning activities (7.1).  When acquisition of new knowledge and skills related to effective implementation practice would enhance leaders’ and implementation teams’ progress toward their implementation performance goals. |
| Key Differentiations | **5.3 (just-in-time instruction):** 5.3 represents the *opportunistic acquisition* *of new learning*, often by making connections between real-time discussions or activities and effective implementation practice. 5.2 represents the acquisition of new learning through *structured, typically planned, learning activities*.  **5.4 (online learning resources):** 5.4 represents the *independent* *use of online learning resources*,typically in combination with face-to-face learning activities. When 5.4 is used to record a practice activity, 5.2 is also recorded when the online learning activities are a part of *structured learning activities operated by the ISP*. 5.2 is also used to reflect learning activities not involving the use of online learning resources.  **5.5 (broker learning):** 5.5 represents arranging *external partnerships or learning resources or events operated by third parties* for learning. 5.2 represents structured learning activities using resources or activities *operated by the ISP*.  **6.2 (capacity development):** In 6.2, the ISP facilitates support participants’ *use of* acquired knowledge and skills related to effective implementation practice to develop or refine organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices. In 5.2, the ISP facilitates support participants’ *acquisition of new learning* through structured learning activities.  **7.1 (experiential learning):** In 7.1, the ISP facilitates experiential learning through support participants’ *application* *of new or previously acquired implementation knowledge and skills in the context of their own organizational or system environment*. In 5.2, the ISP facilitates support participants’ *acquisition of new implementation knowledge and skills through* *structured learning activities*.  **8.5 (structured learning: knowledge and skill refinement):** 8.5 represents *structured learning activities that promote knowledge and skill refinement*, typically in the context of supportive behavioral coaching following a recent experiential learning activity or past performance experience. 5.2 represents the *acquisition of new learning through* *structured learning activities related to learning for the first time or wanting to learn more.* |
|  |  |

Practice Activity 5.3

Use incidental or “just-in-time” learning to strengthen connections between effective implementation practices and real-time discussions or activities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Just-in-time Learning |
| Detailed Description | Enabling opportunistic learning by making connections for support participants between real-time discussions or activities and effective implementation practice. Support participants may approach the ISP for information, or ISPs may identify the connections themselves. During these opportunities, support participants are typically motivated and ready for specific learning and its application. This type of learning may or may not be aligned with previously identified learning objectives (5.1). |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Provides immediate opportunities for support participants, who typically are motivated and ready to learn, to apply the learning. |
| Common Situations for Use | During:  CPC 3 and 4 activities,  structured learning: new knowledge and skills activities (5.2),  capacity development activities (6.2),  observing or debriefing experiential learning activities (8.1),  structured learning: knowledge and skill refinement activities (8.5),  root causes and lessons learned activities (9.1), and  technical and adaptive problem-solving activities (2.4, 9.3). |
| Key Differentiations | **5.2 (structured learning: new knowledge and skills):** 5.2 represents the acquisition of new learning through *formal, typically planned, instructional activities*. 5.3 represents the *opportunistic acquisition* *of new learning*, often by making connections between real-time discussions or activities and effective implementation practice.  **7.1 (experiential learning):** In 7.1, the ISP facilitates experiential learning through support participants’ *application* *of new or previously acquired implementation knowledge and skills* in the context of their own organizational or system environment. 5.3 involves the *opportunistic acquisition* *of new learning*, often by making connections between real-time discussions or activities and effective implementation practice.  **8.5 (structured learning: knowledge and skill refinement):** 8.5 represents *structured learning activities that promote knowledge and skill refinement*, typically in the context of supportive behavioral coaching following a recent experiential learning activity or past performance experience. 5.3 represents the *opportunistic acquisition* *of new learning*, often by making connections between real-time discussions or activities and effective implementation practice. 5.3 may occur during the context of 8.5 if new learning is introduced opportunistically (not formally). *In such cases, both practice activities should be recorded.* |
|  |  |

Practice Activity 5.4

Facilitate the independent use of online learning resources

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Online Learning Resources |
| Detailed Description | Facilitating support participants’ access to, and independent use of, online learning resources before, after, or separate from face-to-face learning activities (in-person or virtual) on the same topic. This use of online learning enables self-paced instruction and the ISP to “flip the classroom,” wherein the majority of instruction occurs outside face-to-face support time. During face-to-face support time, the ISP can therefore spend more time on deeper understanding and application of learning activities. Online learning resources may include web-based courses, online learning modules, online simulation or application programs, and online instructional videos or podcasts.  *Note*. Blended learning occurs (1) when practice activity 5.2 or 8.5 is used for the same or similar sets of learning objectives in both virtual and in-person formats, or (2) when 5.2 or 8.5 is used before, during, or after the use of online learning resources (5.4) for the same or similar sets of learning objectives. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | The use of online learning resources for independent instruction in the context of regular face-to-face implementation support adds to *blended learning*. Blended learning has demonstrated significantly larger impacts on learning compared to face-to-face and online-only learning [2]. These advantages were attributed to the differences in content, pedagogy, and learning time afforded in blended learning conditions and not to the use of the online delivery medium itself. |
| Common Situations for Use | As a precursor or follow-up to face-to-face (in-person or virtual) learning activities.  In lieu of face-to-face learning activities (although blending online and in-person learning activities may have stronger effects). |
| Key Differentiations | **5.2 (structured learning: new knowledge and skills):** 5.2 represents *the acquisition of new learning* through structured learning activities. 5.4 represents the *use of online learning resources,* typically in combination with face-to-face learning activities. When the online learning activities are a part of *structured learning activities operated by the ISP*, 5.2 and 5.4 are dually recorded.  **5.5 (broker learning):** 5.5 represents *arranging external partnerships or learning resources or events* operated by third parties to advance support participants’ learning. 5.4 represents the *use of online learning resources,* typically in combination with face-to-face learning activities. *When brokered resources or events involve online learning resources*,5.4 is also *recorded*.  **7.1 (experiential learning):** In 7.1, the ISP facilitates experiential learning through support participants’ *application* *of new or previously acquired implementation knowledge and skills in the context of their own organizational or system environment*. In 5.4, the ISP facilitates support participants’ independent *use of online learning resources to support the acquisition of new implementation knowledge and skills.*  **8.5 (structured learning: knowledge and skill refinement):** 8.5 represents *structured learning activities that promote knowledge and skill refinement*, typically in the context of supportive behavioral coaching following a recent experiential learning activity or past performance experience. 5.4 represents the *acquisition of new knowledge and skills through* the independent use of online learning resources. |
|  |  |

Practice Activity 5.5

Broker external learning resources, events, or partnerships

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Broker Learning |
| Detailed Description | Brokering, or making arrangements for, (1) learning resources or events operated by third parties or (2) connections to new or existing partners to advance support participants’ acquisition of new knowledge and skills related to effective implementation practice. This type of learning may or may not be aligned with previously identified learning objectives (5.1).  *Note*. If the ISP is using, with permission, a learning resource owned by a third party *during a supported learning activity* *operated by the ISP*, then practice activity 5.2 would be recorded instead. Practice activity 5.5 only relates to *learning activities using resources or activities operated by third parties*. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Expands the content, perspectives, and voices to which support participants are exposed related to their acquisition of new implementation knowledge, skills, and abilities. This may broaden or deepen their acquisition of new knowledge.  *Note*. This also reduces the necessity of ISPs’ owning or operating all learning resources to which support participants are exposed. |
| Common Situations for Use | When the ISP does not operate learning resources or learning activities important to identified learning objectives (5.1) or just-in-time learning opportunities (5.3).  When the ISP does not have the capacity (time, effort, resources) or scope of work to provide instruction around a particular topic or topics to support participants.  When brokering connections to other Triple P system partners (e.g., TPA, PCANC, PSG, NCLC, other regions) or co-creation partners (e.g., community members) for learning resources or learning activities important to identified learning objectives (5.1) or just-in-time learning opportunities (5.3). |
| Key Differentiations | **5.2 (structured learning: new knowledge and skills):** 5.2 represents structured learning activities using resources or activities *operated by the ISP*. 5.5 represents brokering external partnerships or learning resources or events *operated by third parties* for learning.  **5.4 (online learning resources):** 5.4 involves *the use of online resources that may be operated either by the ISP or by a third party* (i.e., when brokered by the ISP). 5.5 involves *only brokered resources or events*. When 5.5 involves online learning resources, 5.4 is also recorded.  **6.5 (broker capacity development):** 6.5 represents brokering *external partnerships or resources to advance support participants’ development of their organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices*. 5.5 represents brokering *external partnerships or learning resources or events* operated by third parties to *advance support participants’ acquisition of new knowledge and skills*.  **9.4 (engage partners for shared learning and problem solving):** In 9.4, the ISP facilitates leaders’ and teams’ engagement of key partners *to advance organizational or system learning or to help address organizational or system problems* typically identified through organizational/system improvement activities (CPCs 6 and 7). In 5.5, the ISP brokers *external partnerships or* *learning resources or events* operated by third parties for *individual or teams of support participants’* *acquisition of new learning related to effective implementation practice.* |
|  |  |

*Note.* CPC = core practice component; ICTP = Implementation Capacity for Triple P; ISP = implementation support practitioner; TPA = Triple P America; PCANC = Prevent Child Abuse North Carolina; PSG = Partnership for Strategy and Governance; NCLC = North Carolina Triple P Learning Collaborative.

## CPC #6

## Facilitate Leaders’ and Teams’ Development of Organizational and System Implementation Capacities

Practice Activity 6.1

Working together with leaders and teams, develop, adapt, and/or monitor the progress of shared action plans to advance previously identified strategies focused on the development of organizational resources and abilities to meet prioritized implementation performance goals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Action Plans |
| Detailed Description | Collaboratively developing, adapting, and/or monitoring detailed shared action plans needed to move forward identified strategies (4.4) to achieve implementation performance goals (4.2). Action plans may involve a wide array of actions by ISPs and support participants, including those in CPCs 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. Additional co-creation partners—such as funders, policymakers, community members, leaders and staff from provider organizations, program purveyors, intervention developers, researchers and evaluators, and other support providers—may also be designated in action steps. Action plans may be revised or expanded at any time.  Note. Monitoring the progress of shared action plans involves reviewing the completion of action steps as the work proceeds. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Breaks down into a feasible, well-paced series of action steps:  strategies to improve identified capacity or structural drivers, and  achievement of implementation performance goals.  This helps all involved partners more clearly see their necessary roles, responsibilities, timing, and contributions to improving organizational or system capacity and performance. |
| Common Situations for Use | When creating or updating a shared process for working toward the achievement of prioritized implementation performance goals (i.e., a change management process).  Following the completion of CPC 4 activities.  While identifying learning objectives (5.1) and planning structured learning: new knowledge and skills activities (5.2).  As the need to revise action plans is revealed by:  results from recent mixed-methods assessments (CPC 3),  capacity development activities (6.2),  PDSA activities (6.4),  broker capacity development activities (6.5),  experiential learning activities (7.1),  related coaching interactions (CPC 8),  related collective learning and adaptive problem-solving activities (CPC 9), and  support participants in other situations. |
| Key Differentiations | **3.3 (records reviews):** 3.3 may be used when reviewing existing or previous organizational or system action plan documents *unrelated to current support plans.* 6.1 is used when *developing shared action plans* *related to the current support process*.  **4.2 (regional performance goals):** 4.2 is used to establish the longer-term implementation performance goals on which support will focus. 6.1 is used to develop or adapt *shared action plans* to advance collective efforts to achieve prioritized implementation performance goals.  **4.4 (strategies):** 4.4 is used to establish *strategies to improve capacity or structural drivers* related to implementation performance goals. 6.1 is used to develop or adapt *shared action plans* to move forward identified strategies related to implementation performance goals.  **4.5 (early wins):** 4.5 focuses on a *small set of easily achievable, early action steps that support participants and ISPs might take* to jump-start progress toward implementation performance goals. 4.5 is typically a precursor to 6.1 and is more often done concurrently with CPC 4 activities than with CPC 6 activities. 6.1 focuses on *comprehensive action plans, typically shared by several co-creation partners,* needed to achieve implementation performance goals.  **5.1 (learning objectives):** 5.1 focuses on setting implementation practice *learning objectives for support participants to achieve* while working toward their implementation performance goals. 6.1 focuses on developing or adapting *comprehensive action plans, typically shared by several co-creation partners,* needed to achieve implementation performance goals.  **8.7 (self-reflection: generalization):** 8.7 reflects the ISP’s efforts to *generalize* *support participants’ specific skills and professional judgments* *from* *prior experiential learning activities to diverse future applied contexts*. 6.1 involves developing or adapting *shared action plans to advance collective efforts* *to achieve prioritized implementation performance goals*.  **9.1 (root causes and lessons learned):** 9.1 may be used when *reflecting on performance challenges* related to the completion of identified action steps. 6.1 more specifically involves the development or adaptation of the *shared action plans themselves*. |
|  |  |

Practice Activity 6.2

Building on support participants’ implementation practice knowledge and skill, facilitate the development or refinement of contextually relevant organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices related to prioritized implementation performance goals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Capacity Development |
| Detailed Description | Facilitating support participants’ use of acquired knowledge and skills related to effective implementation practice to develop or refine organizational/system implementation structures, resources, policies, or practices. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Improved organizational/ system implementation structures, resources, and practices directly reflect greater implementation capacity. When support participants can use and maintain such capacities as intended, they are more likely to achieve their implementation performance goals. |
| Common Situations for Use | When support participants have, or are in the process of gaining, the knowledge and skills to develop or refine the previously identified organizational/ system capacities needed to achieve implementation performance goals. |
| Key Differentiations | **5.2 (structured learning: new knowledge and skills):** 5.2 involves *support participants’ acquisition of new learning* through structured learning activities. 6.2 involves the ISP’s facilitation of support participants’ *use of* acquired knowledge and skills to develop or refine organizational/system implementation structures, resources, policies, or practices.  **6.5 (broker capacity development):** 6.5 represents *brokering external partners or resources* for the development or refinement of organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices. 6.2 represents *the ISP’s facilitation* of co-creation partners’ development or refinement of organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices.  **7.1 (experiential learning):** 7.1 represents experiential learning through which support participants *apply* *their acquired implementation knowledge and skills* in the context of their own organizational or system environment. 6.2 involves support participants’ use of their acquired knowledge and skills *to develop or refine organizational/system implementation structures, resources, policies, or practices*. 6.2 inherently involves facilitating experiential learning activities (7.1); *therefore,* *7.1 is always dually recorded along with the occurrence of 6.2.*  **However**, in situations where 7.1 represents experiential learning through which support participants *operate or manage* theirnew or previously established organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices in the context of their own organizational or system environment, 6.2 would not be simultaneously recorded. This is because 6.2 involves *the development or refinement of organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices* *themselves (independent of their operation)*. In other words, 6.2 is *not always* dually recorded with 7.1.  **9.1 (root causes and lessons learned):** *9.1 may occur alongside 6.2* when the development or refinement of organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices (6.2) *results in the ISP’s facilitating concurrent collective activities* to identify and analyze root causes of barriers or challenges and identify lessons learned at organizational/system levels (9.1).  **9.3 (technical and adaptive elements)**: *9.3 may be used alongside 6.2* when the development or refinement of organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices (6.2) *results in the ISP’s facilitating concurrent collective activities* to identify the technical and adaptive elements of challenges and the use of appropriate strategies to address them (9.3).  **9.4 (engage partners for shared learning and problem solving)**: *9.4 may be used alongside 6.2* when the development or refinement of organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices (6.2) *results in the ISP’s concurrently facilitating* support participants’ engagement of key partners for shared learning and help with problem solving (9.4). |
|  |  |

Practice Activity 6.3

Facilitate leaders’ and teams’ linking of relevant items from capacity assessments (CCA-TP/IDA-TP) to shared action plans

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Link Assessments |
| Detailed Description | Facilitating for leaders and teams the linking of relevant items from capacity assessments (CCA-TP/IDA-TP) to specific action steps within shared action plans (6.1). Typically, this involves linking assessment items in which elements of implementation capacity or performance were scored “not in place (0)” or “partially in place (1)” to action steps intended to increase those elements of capacity or performance. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Ensures direct efforts to develop essential elements of implementation capacity or performance as reflected in ICTP capacity assessments and related to prioritized improvement goals. |
| Common Situations for Use | When developing or adjusting shared action plans (6.1).  When reviewing and interpreting scores from recent capacity assessments (per ongoing 3.2 activities), particularly in relation to monitoring and adjusting shared action plans. |
| Key Differentiations | Not applicable. |

Practice Activity 6.4

Facilitate leaders’ and teams’ incorporation of Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) methods into shared action plans for systematically improving organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | PDSA |
| Detailed Description | Facilitating leaders’ and teams’ incorporation of Plan-Do-Study-Act cycles within shared action plans (6.1); this enables leaders and teams to create small tests of change and integrate improvement best practices within capacity development efforts related to prioritized implementation performance goals. Utilizing small tests of change may reduce the complexity of the organization/system change process, increase opportunities for learning and course correction during capacity development efforts (CPC 9), and increase buy-in across organization/system partners for the change process. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Integrating small tests of change into capacity development efforts may increase the likelihood that support participants will ultimately reach their implementation performance goals. |
| Common Situations for Use | When developing or adjusting shared action plans (6.1) |
| Key Differentiations | **CPC 3 (mixed- methods assessment activities)**: The ISP may incorporate future CPC 3 activities into the design of planned PDSA cycles, which should thus be reflected in shared action plans (6.1). However, *the CPC 3 activities themselves are recorded separately when they occur, unrelated to the present use of 6.4.*  **7.1 (experiential learning)**: The ISP may facilitate experiential learning activities (7.1) while planning PDSA cycles (6.4); *thus, 7.1 may be recorded alongside 6.4.* To the extent that these experiential learning activities are planned, they should be reflected in shared action plans (6.1).  **9.1 (root causes and lessons learned)**: The ISP may incorporate the future use of 9.1 into planned PDSA cycles, which should thus be reflected in shared action plans (6.1). However, *when used in the future, 9.1 is recorded separately when it occurs, unrelated to the present use of 6.4.* |
|  |  |

Practice Activity 6.5

Broker external partnerships or resources to advance the development of organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Broker Capacity Development |
| Detailed Description | Brokering external partnerships or resources operated by third parties to advance support participants’ development of organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices.  *Note*. The ISP may or may not interact with the external partner or resource within the context of completing shared action plans. Regardless, this practice activity is recorded whenever the brokering activity is used. Shared action plans (6.1) should be updated to reflect co-creation partners’ action steps connecting and engaging with the external partner and/or connecting to and using the external resource for capacity development. |
|  | Expands the content, perspectives, and voices to which support participants are exposed related to their capacity development efforts. This may broaden or deepen their organizational/system capacities and increase their self-regulation capabilities (e.g., self-management tools), reducing their dependency on ICTP ISPs.  *Note*. This also reduces the need for ISPs to partner with support participants on all supported capacity development action steps. |
|  | When the ISP does not operate capacity-building resources or capacity-building activities important to identified action steps (6.1).  When the ISP does not have the role or capacity (time, effort, resources) to partner with support participants around a particular series of action steps.  When brokering connections to other Triple P system partners (e.g., TPA, PCANC, PSG, NCLC, other regions) or co-creation partners (e.g., funders, community members) for a particular action step or series of action steps related to capacity development. |
|  | **5.5 (broker learning):** 5.5 represents brokering external partnerships or learning resources or eventsoperated by third parties *for support participants’ independent acquisition of new implementation knowledge and skills*. 6.5 represents brokering external partnerships or resources *to advance support participants’ development of their organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices*.  **6.2 (capacity development):** 6.2 represents *the ISP’s facilitation* of co-creation partners’ development or refinement of organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices. 6.5 represents *brokering external partners or resources* for the development or refinement of organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices.  **9.4 (engage partners for shared learning and problem solving):** In 9.4, the ISP facilitates leaders’ and teams’ engagement of key partners to advance *organizational or system learning or to help address organizational or system problems* typically identified through organizational/system improvement activities (including CPC 6 and 7). In 6.5, the ISP brokers external partners or resources for *the development or refinement of organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices* *themselves*. |
|  |  |

Note. CPC = core practice component; ISP = implementation support practitioner; CCA-TP = Community Capacity Assessment for the Triple P System of Interventions; IDA-TP = Implementation Drivers Assessment for the Triple P System of Interventions; ICTP = Implementation Capacity for Triple P; TPA = Triple P America; PCANC = Prevent Child Abuse North Carolina; PSG = Partnership for Strategy and Governance; NCLC = North Carolina Triple P Learning Collaborative.

## CPC #7

## Facilitate Habituation and Experiential Learning Related to the Use of Skills, Resources, and Abilities

Practice Activity 7.1

Facilitate appropriate, naturally occurring or intentionally created experiential learning activities related to prioritized implementation performance goals for leaders and teams to apply knowledge, skills, and organizational/ system structures, resources, policies, or practices within the full context of their system environment

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Experiential Learning |
| Detailed Description | Developing, identifying, and/or facilitating experiential learning activities for support participants—within the full context of their system environment—to apply their implementation knowledge and skills and/or organizational/system capacities to promote learning and insight. Experiential learning activities may focus on support participants’ knowledge and skills or organization/ system capacities *that existed prior to intentional support activities* or *that were developed by way of intentional support activities*.  *Note.* This practice activity is only recorded when the ISP facilitates the identification of experiential learning activities. If support participants act alone, such self-regulated behaviors might be reinforced (CPC 2) but should not be considered 7.1. In 7.1, the ISP and support participants should work together to develop experiential learning activities that reflect *moderately challenging steps in professionally and psychologically safe working environments.* If support participants perceive an experiential learning activity to be too challenging or not challenging enough, 7.1 should be revisited and plans adjusted accordingly. If support participants perceive the work environment to be professionally and psychologically unsafe, the ISP should first work with support participants to test their perception (what evidence exists that supports and that doesn’t support their perception?). If there is reasonable evidence that the work environment is unsafe OR if support participants’ anxieties remain high, an altered work environment may be considered, if possible, or a different experiential learning activity may be planned (7.1). ISPs gain intuition to support this process through supportive interaction and feedback (1.2 and 1.3) and knowledge of support participants and their context (CPCs 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9). |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Expands support participants’ knowledge, skills, and abilities as they put their knowledge, skills, and organizational/system capacities into action.  Real-life application leads to *large* gains in achievement of adult outcomes [1]. Capacity development (6.2) and testing the performance of organizational/system capacities contributes to regional implementation improvement.  Helps to  shape support participants’ learning and their management of organizational/ system capacities to best fit their local context;  identify new areas for learning or ways to refine capacities that will be important moving forward; and  increase support participants’ personal/collective agency, efficacy, management, and sufficiency for implementation processes going forward. |
| Common Situations for Use | When the ISP and support participants think that experiential learning opportunities structured around support participants’ application of *prior existing* knowledge and skills, or around the organization/ system’s *prior existing* capacities, may help determine areas of existing strength or needed improvement as related to prioritized improvement goals.  When support participants are ready to use *newly acquired* implementation knowledge and skills to develop or refine organizational/ system structures, resources, policies, or practices (6.2).  When support participants are ready to test organizational/ system implementation structures, resources, policies, or practices and their ability to manage them when they are put into practice. |
| Key Differentiations | **3.1 (qualitative assessment):** 3.1 is used when assessing strengths, needs, and patterns related to the region/community’s Triple P implementation capacity, performance, and/or outcomes. 7.1 may be used to facilitate experiential learning opportunities structured around the organization/system’s *prior existing* capacities to determine areas of existing strength or needed improvement. When this use of 7.1 happens and involves qualitative assessments, 3.1 is dually recorded*.*  **3.2 (quantitative assessment):** 3.2 is used when assessing strengths, needs, and patterns related to the region/community’s Triple P implementation capacity, performance, and/or outcomes. 7.1 may be used to facilitate experiential learning opportunities structured around the organization/system’s *prior existing* capacities to determine areas of existing strength or needed improvement. When this use of 7.1 happens and involves quantitative assessments, 3.2 is dually recorded.  **5.2 (structured learning: new knowledge and skills):** In 5.2, the ISP provides *structured learning activities through which support participants acquire new learning*. In 7.1, the ISP facilitates experiential learning through support participants’ *application* *of new or previously acquired implementation knowledge and skills in the context of their own organizational or system environment*.  **5.3 (just-in-time learning):** In 5.3, the ISP enables support participants’ *opportunistic acquisition* *of new learning*, often by making connections between real-time discussions or activities and effective implementation practice. In 7.1, the ISP facilitates support participants’ experiential learning through their *application* *of new or previously acquired implementation knowledge and skills* in the context of their own organizational or system environment.  **5.4 (online learning resources):** 5.4 represents support participants’ independent *use of online learning resources*. 7.1 represents ISP facilitation of experiential learning through support participants’ *application* *of new or previously acquired implementation knowledge and skills in the context of their own organizational or system environment*.  **6.2 (capacity development)**: In 6.2, the ISP facilitates support participants’ *development or refinement of organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices*. In 7.1, the ISP facilitates experiential learning through which support participants *apply* *their acquired implementation knowledge and skills* in the context of their own organizational or system environment.  Practice activity 6.2 inherently involves the facilitation of experiential learning activities; therefore, *7.1 is always dually recorded alongside the occurrence of 6.2*. **However**, in situations where 7.1 represents experiential learning through which support participants *operate or manage* theirnew or previously established organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices in the context of their own organizational or system environment, *6.2 would not be simultaneously recorded because it represents the development or refinement of organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices* *themselves (independent of their operation)*. In other words, 6.2 is *not always* recorded alongside 7.1.  **6.4 (PDSA)**: In 6.4, the ISP *facilitates the incorporation of PDSA methods into shared action plans*. In 7.1, the ISP develops, identifies, or facilitates experiential learning opportunities. *7.1 may occur while planning PDSA cycles, and thus may be recorded alongside 6.4.* To the extent that experiential learning activities are planned, they should be reflected in shared action plans (6.1).  **8.5 (structured learning: knowledge and skill refinement):** In 8.5, the ISP provides *structured learning activities that promote knowledge and skill refinement*, typically in the context of supportive behavioral coaching *following an experiential learning activity*. In 7.1 the ISP facilitates *experiential learning opportunities* through support participants’ application of new or previously acquired implementation knowledge and skills in the context of their own organizational or system environment. |
|  |  |

Practice Activity 7.2

Use anticipatory guidance to promote leaders’ and teams’ success, ensure their safety, and facilitate their anticipatory problem solving related to perceived or potential implementation practice challenges

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Anticipatory Guidance: Performance Success |
| Detailed Description | Working with support participants ahead of engaging in an experiential learning activity to envision performance success and how to achieve it; to create specific strategies to promote their professional and psychological safety, if needed; and to anticipate threats to safety or challenges to success that may arise and how to address or respond to them.  *Note.* Anticipatory guidance assumes that ISPs and support participants have designed or chosen an experiential learning activity of moderate challenge (not too difficult) to be carried out in a professionally and psychologically safe working environment. ISPs should never ask support participants to anticipate experiences in unsafe work environments. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | May increase support participants’ confidence in their abilities to fully engage in experiential learning activities and to self-regulate such experiences. |
| Common Situations for Use | *After* an experiential learning activity has been substantially planned *but* *before* support participants carry out the activity.  *Note.* Should anticipatory guidance suggest needed adjustments in an experiential learning activity's original design (e.g., the challenge is too difficult, safety is questionable, participant anxiety is too high), the ISP may return to 7.1. |
| Key Differentiations | **1.2 (provide emotional or practical support):** 1.2 involves more *general or global* support within the context of shared work or shared work environment. 7.2 specifically relates to *anticipatory guidance ahead of an identified experiential learning activity*. Moreover, the intent of 7.2 is not to provide emotional or practical support, *rather to help support participants visualize and anticipate their responses or reactions* to situational factors and perceived or potential threats/challenges that may arise during the experiential learning activity.  **1.3 (readiness):** 1.3 specifically relates to *increasing support participants’* *willingness and abilities to take* *next action steps as identified in shared action plans (6.1) or as otherwise relevant to the course of support interactions*. 7.2 specifically relates to *helping support participants visualize and anticipate their responses or reactions* to situational factors and perceived or potential threats/challenges that may arise *during an experiential learning activity*. To the extent that 1.3 and 7.2 co-occur during a support interaction, they should be dually recorded.  **CPC 2 activities**: CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* “X” (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”). 7.2 specifically relates to *helping support participants visualize and anticipate their responses or reactions* to situational factors and perceived or potential threats/challenges that may arise *during an experiential learning activity* (“X”). To the extent that 7.2 and CPC 2 activities co-occur during a support interaction, they should be dually recorded.  **8.6 (normalize):** 8.6 reflects the ISP’s efforts to normalize or temper support participants’ thoughts and/or feelings that emerged during *prior experiential learning activities*. 7.2 reflects the ISP’s use of anticipatory guidance to promote support participants’ success, ensure their safety, and facilitate their anticipatory problem solving related to perceived or potential threats/challenges *before engaging in* *an experiential learning activity*.  **8.7 (self-reflection: generalization):** 8.7 reflects the ISP’s efforts to generalize support participants’ specific skills and professional judgments *from* *prior experiential learning activities* to diverse future applied contexts. 7.2 reflects the ISP’s use of anticipatory guidance to promote support participants’ success, ensure their safety, and facilitate their anticipatory problem solving related to perceived or potential threats/challenges *before engaging in* *an* *experiential learning activity*.  **9.3 (technical and adaptive elements):** In 9.3, the ISP helps support participants identify technical and adaptive elements of challenges and effective strategies to address them. *9.3 may occur and be recorded alongside 7.2* when support participants perceive or anticipate organizational/system challenges in upcoming experiential learning activities (7.2) that result in the ISP’s facilitation of support participants’ identification of, and anticipated strategic response to, the technical and adaptive elements of such challenges (9.3). |

Practice Activity 7.3

Use anticipatory guidance to promote leaders’ and teams’ habituation to the typical discomforts and anxieties of creating change in their own and their organizational/system environments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Use anticipatory guidance to promote leaders’ and teams’ habituation to the typical discomforts and anxieties of creating change in their own and their organizational/system environments |
| Detailed Description | Anticipatory Guidance: Habituation |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Prior to engaging in an experiential learning activity, helping support participants to anticipate and fully lean into the process of habituating to the typical discomforts and anxieties of creating change in their own and their organizational/system environments—without unwarranted efforts to reduce the discomfort or anxiety. This process typically requires repeated experiential learning activities focused on supportive emotional processing (8.2 and 8.6) alongside coaching for knowledge and skill competency (8.2, 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5).  *Note.* Habituation assumes that ISPs and support participants have designed or chosen an experiential learning activity of *moderate challenge* (not too difficult) to be carried out in a *professionally and psychologically safe working environment*. Choosing activities that are too difficult is likely to hinder success, which, over time, may prevent habituation and lower support participants’ confidence in themselves or the support process. Additionally, ISPs should never encourage support participants to engage in experiential learning activities in unsafe work environments. |
| Common Situations for Use | May increase support participants’ confidence in their abilities to fully engage in experiential learning activities and to self-regulate such experiences.  *Note.* On the contrary, when support participants are not supported through the process of habituating to the typical discomforts and anxieties inherent in changing their own and their organizational/system environments, two outcomes may occur:  (1) they may take unwarranted steps to reduce the discomfort or anxiety, or (2) their efforts to apply implementation knowledge and skills and organizational/ system structures, resources, policies, or practices may be limited, resulting in *incomplete or obscured cognitive, emotional, and/or social* *learning processes.* Such results could unintentionally perpetuate any existing negative beliefs or anxieties support participants may have about their abilities to independently carry out effective implementation processes. Additionally, making decisions about future action steps (6.1) based on incomplete or obscured learning at individual/team or organization/system levels may limit support participants’ progress toward their implementation performance goals. |
| Key Differentiations | **1.2 (provide emotional or practical support):** 1.2 involves more *general or global support* within the context of shared work or shared work environment. 7.3 specifically relates to *anticipatory guidance ahead of an identified experiential learning activity*. Moreover, the intent of 7.3 is not to provide emotional or practical support, *rather to help support participants visualize and anticipate sitting with the typical discomforts or anxieties that may arise during an experiential learning activity*.  **1.3 (readiness):** 1.3 specifically relates to *increasing support participants’* *willingness and abilities to take* *next action steps as identified in shared action plans (6.1) or as otherwise relevant to the course of support interactions*. 7.3 specifically relates to *helping support participants visualize and anticipate sitting with the typical discomforts or anxieties that may arise during an experiential learning activity*. When 1.3 and 7.3 co-occur during a support interaction, they should be dually recorded.  **CPC 2 activities**: CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* “X” (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”). 7.3 specifically relates to *helping support participants visualize and anticipate sitting with the typical discomforts or anxieties that may arise during an experiential learning activity* (“X”). When 7.3 and CPC 2 activities co-occur during a support interaction, they should be dually recorded.  **8.6 (normalize):** 8.6 reflects the ISP’s efforts to normalize or temper support participants’ thoughts and/or feelings that emerged during *prior experiential learning activities*. 7.3 reflects the ISP’s use of anticipatory guidance—*before engaging in* *an experiential learning activity—*to promote support participants’ habituation to typical discomforts or anxieties.  **8.7 (self-reflection: generalization):** In 8.7, the ISP helps support participants generalize specific skills and professional judgments *from* *prior experiential learning activities* to diverse future applied contexts. In 7.3, the ISP uses anticipatory guidance—*before engaging in* *an* *experiential learning activity—*to promote support participants’ habituation to typical discomforts or anxieties.  **9.2 (accountability):** 9.2 is typically used to hold support participants accountable to roles, responsibilities, and expectations (1.1); performance goals (4.2); strategies (4.4); action plans (6.1); experiential learning activities (7.1); and habituation processes (7.3) that were *previously* established. 7.3 is used to promote support participants’ habituation to typical discomforts or anxieties in *forthcoming* experiential learning activities as designed or identified in 7.1. |
|  |  |

Note. CPC = core practice component; KSA = knowledge, skills, and abilities; ISP = implementation support practitioner; PDSA = Plan-Do-Study-Act.

## CPC #8

## Provide Supportive Behavioral Coaching to Leaders and Teams

Practice Activity 8.1

Observe and/or debrief leaders’ and team members’ experiential learning activities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Observe and/or Debrief |
| Detailed Description | Directly observing or debriefing support participants’ experiential learning activities related to their application of implementation knowledge and skills. The purpose of 8.1 is for ISPs to have a clear understanding of how the experiential learning activity unfolded, what support participants perceived to be happening, and how they responded. Quantitative data collected during the experiential learning activity and/or qualitative feedback from others who participated in or observed the experiential learning activity may be reviewed as part of any debriefing process.  *Notes.* This practice activity may be used in relation to experiential learning activities that were identified through prior ISP facilitation (7.1) or that occurred naturally in support participants’ recent or past implementation practice activities.  Following an experiential learning activity, the ISP may not be completely aware of support participants’ efforts to fully experience or stay in the moment of typical discomforts and anxieties that may have arisen (see 7.3). Therefore, the ISP typically must engage in practice activity 8.1 to identify *whether* support participants fully moved through the habituation process and, if not, to identify reasons only partial engagement in the habituation process has taken place. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Allows the ISP to assess the need to develop new learning objectives or to monitor the progression of current learning objectives (5.1), pivot to other CPC 8 practice activities, and more appropriately and effectively determine the need for and nature of future experiential learning activities (7.1). |
| Common Situations for Use | During support participants’ engagement in an experiential learning activity (i.e., ISP observation).  Following support participants’ engagement in an experiential learning activity (7.1) that was co-developed through the support process (i.e., debrief between support participants and the ISP).  When support participants and the ISP debrief an experiential learning activity from support participants’ recent or past *independent* implementation practice activities. This may reveal the need to develop new or adjust current learning objectives. |
| Key Differentiations | **3.1 (qualitative assessment):** 3.1 involves assessing strengths, needs, and patterns related to the region/community’s Triple P implementation capacity, performance, and/or outcomes. *The focus of 3.1 is on the organizational/system level for assessment purposes.* 8.1 involves directly observing and/or debriefing specific episodes of support participants’ using or applying an implementation strategy or practice (e.g., “Tell me what happened when you did X” or “Tell me what that looked like when you did X”). *The focus of 8.1 is on the individual/team level.*  **4.1 (strengths, needs, and patterns):** 4.1 involves *reflecting on strengths, needs, and patterns related to implementation capacity and performance at organizational or system levels*. 8.1 involves *debriefing specific episodes in which support participants used or applied an implementation strategy or practice* (e.g., “Tell me what happened when you did X” or “Tell me what that looked like when you did X”).  **5.1 (learning objectives):** 5.1 is used for setting and monitoring *support participants’* *implementation practice learning objectives*. 8.1 is used when *observing or debriefing specific episodes of support participants’ using or applying an implementation strategy or practice* (e.g., “Tell me what happened when you did X” or “Tell me what that looked like when you did X”). To the extent that 8.1 involves qualitative or quantitative assessment of the degree to which support participants have achieved identified learning objectives, these practice activities may be dually recorded.  **8.2 (self-reflection: experiential learning activities):** 8.2 is used to facilitate support participants’ self-reflection into *their actions, experiences, and learning* during experiential learning activities. For example, the ISP may start with basic open-ended questions (e.g., “How did it go?” and “What did you learn?”); follow up with more specific open-ended questions (e.g., “How did it go when you did X?” “Why do you think Y happened?” “How did you feel about X or Y?” and “What did you think when Y happened when you did X?”); and encourage participants to respond with “When I \_\_\_\_\_ (behavior), I \_\_\_\_\_” statements *to explore, describe, and analyze their awareness, feelings, learning, and alternatives*. 8.1 is used when directly observing support participants’ experiential learning activities or debriefing their recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences. The purpose of 8.1 is for the ISP to have a clear understanding, *more generally*, of how the experiential learning activity unfolded, what support participants perceived to be happening, and how support participants responded.  **9.1 (root causes and lessons learned):** 9.1 is used when reflecting on experiential learning activities or past performance experiences *to* *analyze root causes of barriers and challenges and identify lessons learned at organizational or system levels*. 8.1 is used when directly observing support participants’ experiential learning activities or when debriefing their recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences *at the individual or team level*. |

Practice Activity 8.2

Facilitate leaders’ and team members’ self-reflection about what they have learned from their experiential learning activities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Self-Reflection: Experiential Learning Activities |
| Detailed Description | Based on what has been observed or reported in the course of 8.1 (observe and/or debrief), facilitating support participants’ self-reflection about their actions, experiences, and learning during their experiential learning activities, including areas of strength and development regarding their implementation practice knowledge and skills. This involves performance improvement reviews, journaling/behavior suggestion, and standards-based self-assessment. ISPs may start with basic open-ended questions (e.g., “How did it go?” and “What did you learn?”); follow up with more specific open-ended questions (e.g., “How did it go when you did X?” “Why do you think Y happened?” “How did you feel about X or Y?” and “What did you think when Y happened when you did X?”); and encourage participants to respond with “When I \_\_\_\_\_ (behavior), I \_\_\_\_\_” statements to explore, describe, and analyze their own awareness, feelings, learning, and alternatives.  *Note*. Using a self-regulatory framework for self-reflection provides a structure for 8.2 that is well aligned with the theoretical underpinnings of the practice model and the principle of local ownership of progress. Following general opening questions (e.g., “How did that go?”), ISPs may prompt support participants to continue their reflection starting with two things they believe they did well and then one thing they would do differently next time. Support participants may also be prompted to set specific practice goals to work on going forward, which can help with the identification of additional learning objectives (5.1) or action steps (6.1) in the support process. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Leads to *large* gains in achievement of adult outcomes [1] by deepening leaders’ and teams’ understanding from their experiential learning activities.  The more support participants can self-regulate their learning process, the greater their overall self-regulation will be.  Can generate engagement in continuous learning (5.1) and action planning for future support activities (6.1). |
| Common Situations for Use | When support participants and the ISP debrief an experiential learning activity (8.1) that was co-developed through the support process (7.1).  When support participants and the ISP debrief an experiential learning activity (8.1) from support participants’ recent or past *independent* implementation practice activities. |
| Key Differentiations | **CPC 2 activities:** CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants’ *self-regulation of* “X,” generally (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”). 8.2 typically *follows the occurrence of* “X” (an implementation practice behavior) and involves facilitating support participants’ self-reflection about their behavioral performance. Although self-reflection may be facilitated using a self-regulatory framework (see related note under “Description”), CPC 2 activities should only be recorded when the ISP *reinforces support participants’ own self-regulatory behaviors* (e.g., during 8.2, participants may engage in self-monitoring and self-determination of next steps, which the ISP may reinforce).  **3.1 (qualitative assessment):** 3.1 is used when assessing strengths, needs, and patterns related to the region/community’s Triple P implementation capacity, performance, and/or outcomes *at the organizational/system level.* 8.2 is used when providing supportive behavioral coaching to individuals and teams on their application of an implementation strategy or practice during an experiential learning activity (per 7.1)*. The focus of 8.2 is on the individual/team level.*  **8.1 (observe and/or debrief):** 8.1 is used when directly observing support participants’ experiential learning activities or debriefing their recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences. The purpose of 8.1 is for ISPs to have a clear understanding of how the experiential learning activity unfolded, what support participants perceived to be happening, and how support participants responded. 8.2 is used to facilitate support participants’ self-reflection into *their own actions, experiences, and learning*. For example, the ISP may start with basic open-ended questions (e.g., “How did it go?” and “What did you learn?”); follow up with more specific open-ended questions (e.g., “How did it go when you did X?” “Why do you think Y happened?” “How did you feel about X or Y?” and “What did you think when Y happened when you did X?”); and encourage participants to respond with “When I \_\_\_\_\_ (behavior), I \_\_\_\_\_” statements *to explore, describe, and analyze their own awareness, feelings, learning, and alternatives*.  **8.5 (structured learning: knowledge and skill refinement):** 8.2 is one example of a structured learning activity that promotes the refinement of knowledge and skill (8.5)*.* Because of this redundancy, 8.5 is always dually recorded with the occurrence of 8.2. However, because 8.2 is just one example of 8.5, 8.5 may also be recorded alone when other structured learning activities for knowledge and skill refinement are used by the ISP.  **9.1 (root causes and lessons learned):** 9.1 involves reflecting on experiential learning activities or past performance experiences to analyze root causes of barriers and challenges and identify lessons learned *at organizational or system levels*. 8.2 is used to facilitate support participants’ self-reflection into *their own actions, experiences, and learning* from an experiential learning activity*. The focus of 8.2 is at the individual/team level.*  **10.3 (support process reflection):** Although in both 10.3 and 8.2, the ISP facilitates support participants’ reflection, the focus of reflection is qualitatively different. In 10.3, support participants reflect on *the support processes and practices that best contribute to, that do not contribute to, or that may negatively influence their ongoing success and sustainability*. In 8.2, support participants self-reflect on *their actions, experiences, and learning during an experiential learning activity* with the purpose of *exploring, describing, and analyzing their own awareness, feelings, learning, and alternatives.* |

Practice Activity 8.3

Provide specific behavioral praise linked to leaders’ and teams’ behavioral performance during experiential learning activities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Specific Behavioral Feedback: Praise |
| Detailed Description | Providing positive statements to support participants to reinforce a specific, desired implementation practice behavior that has been observed or reported in the course of 8.1 (observe and/or debrief) or reflected upon in the course of 8.2 (self-reflection: experiential learning activities). Specific behavioral praise statements clearly identify the individual or team and the desired implementation behavior that was demonstrated (e.g., “[Name or Team], great job when you [desired implementation practice behavior]”).  *Note.* Statements should be authentic and are best delivered as soon as possible after observing or debriefing an implementation practice behavior. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Leads to *large* gains in achievement of adult outcomes [1] by deepening leaders’ and teams’ understanding from their experiential learning activities.  Specific behavioral feedback makes concepts real and credible and deepens support participants’ self-reflection (8.2) and ongoing learning. Specific behavioral *praise* increases the frequency of positive behaviors and may increase learners’ personal agency, self-efficacy, and self-sufficiency.  When provided before 8.4 (specific behavioral feedback: constructive), specific behavioral praise can also make it easier for support participants to hear constructive feedback. |
| Common Situations for Use | Following the occurrence of a desired implementation practice behavior, per observation or self-report. The behavior may have occurred naturally during support participants’ own practice activities or during ISP-facilitated application (7.1).  Before providing specific constructive feedback, to reinforce a supportive and balanced coaching environment. |
| Key Differentiations | **1.2 (provide emotional or practical support):** 1.2 is more *general or global* within the context of shared work or shared work environment. 8.3 typically follows *the occurrence of* X (an effective implementation practice behavior) and focuses on praising support participants’ specific behaviors during X, such as “I like when you did X,” “You did a good job doing X,” or “When you did X, did you notice that Y (favorable outcome) happened?” Moreover, the intent of 8.3 is not to provide emotional or practical support, *rather to provide supportive behavioral coaching to support participants* following an experiential learning activity.  **1.3 (readiness):** 1.3 specifically relates to *increasing support participants’* *willingness and abilities to take* *next action steps as identified in shared action plans (6.1) or as otherwise relevant to the course of support interactions*. 8.3 typically follows *the occurrence of* X (an effective implementation practice behavior) and focuses on praising support participants’ specific behaviors during X, such as “I like when you did X,” “You did a good job doing X,” or “When you did X, did you notice that Y (favorable outcome) happened?” Moreover, the intent of 8.3 is not to increase support participants’ readiness for next action steps, *rather to provide supportive behavioral coaching to support participants* following an experiential learning activity.  **CPC 2 activities:** CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants‘ *self-regulation of* “X,” generally (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”). 8.3 typically follows *the occurrence of* X (an effective implementation practice behavior) and focuses on praising support participants’ specific behaviors during X, such as “I like when you did X,” “You did a good job doing X,” or “When you did X, did you notice that Y (favorable outcome) happened?”  **8.5 (structured learning: knowledge and skill refinement):** 8.3 is one example of a structured learning activity that promotes the refinement of knowledge and skill (8.5)*.* Because of this redundancy, 8.5 is always dually recorded with the occurrence of 8.3. However, because 8.3 is just one example of 8.5, 8.5 may also be recorded alone when other structured learning activities for knowledge and skill refinement are used by the ISP. |

Practice Activity 8.4

Provide specific constructive feedback linked to leaders’ and teams’ behavioral performance during experiential learning activities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Specific Behavioral Feedback: Constructive |
| Detailed Description | Providing specific behavioral feedback about the difference between what has been observed or reported during 8.1 (observe and/or debrief) or reflected upon in the course of 8.2 (self-reflection: experiential learning activities) and the intended or desired implementation practice behavior. Specific constructive behavioral feedback clearly identifies the individual or team and the developmental implementation practice behavior that was demonstrated (e.g., “[Name or Team], when I saw or heard \_\_\_\_\_, I noticed that \_\_\_\_\_ [connect to a consequence of a developmental implementation practice behavior]”). Statements should depict a clear difference between the actual (observed) behavior and the expected behavior (in other words, *teach*).  *Note.* Statements should be authentic and are best delivered as soon as possible after observing or debriefing an implementation practice behavior. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Leads to *large* gains in achievement of adult outcomes [1] by deepening leaders’ and teams’ understanding from their experiential learning activities.  Specific behavioral feedback makes concepts real and credible and deepens support participants’ self-reflection (8.2) and ongoing learning. Specific *constructive* behavioral feedback helps leaders and teams see how they are progressing in the application of their own implementation practice behaviors and then define (6.1, action plans) and apply next steps (7.1, planning experiential learning) that help them continue to progress. |
| Common Situations for Use | Following the occurrence of an implementation practice behavior that remains developmental—per observation or self-report—in support participants’ implementation practice skill set. The behavior may have occurred naturally during support participants’ own activities or during ISP-facilitated application (7.1). |
| Key Differentiations | **1.2 (provide emotional or practical support):** 1.2 is more *general or global* within the context of shared work or shared work environment. 8.4 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (a developmental implementation practice behavior) and focuses on constructive feedback related to support participants’ specific behaviors during X, such as “When you did X, did you notice that Y (unintended or partially intended outcome) happened?” Moreover, the intent of 8.4 is not to provide emotional or practical support, *rather to provide supportive behavioral coaching to support participants* following an experiential learning activity.  **1.3 (readiness):** 1.3 specifically relates to *increasing support participants’* *willingness and abilities to take* *next action steps as identified in shared action plans (6.1) or as otherwise relevant to the course of support interactions*. 8.4 typically follows *the occurrence of* “X” (a developmental implementation practice behavior) and focuses on constructive feedback regarding support participants’ specific behaviors during X, such as “When you did X, did you notice that Y (unintended or partially intended outcome) happened?” Moreover, the intent of 8.4 is not to increase support participants’ readiness for next action steps, *rather to provide supportive behavioral coaching to support participants* following an experiential learning activity.  **CPC 2 activities:** CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants‘ *self-regulation of* “X,” generally (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”). 8.4 typically follows *the occurrence of* X (a developmental implementation practice behavior) and focuses on providing *constructive feedback* regarding support participants’ specific behaviors during “X,” such as “When you did X, did you notice that Y (unintended or partially intended outcome) happened?”  **8.5 (structured learning: knowledge and skill refinement):** 8.4 is one example of a structured learning activity that promotes the refinement of knowledge and skill (8.5)*.* Because of this redundancy, 8.5 is always dually recorded with the occurrence of 8.4. However, because 8.4 is just one example of 8.5, 8.5 may also be recorded alone when other structured learning activities for knowledge and skill refinement are used by the ISP. |

Practice Activity 8.5

Provide structured learning activities that promote the refinement of knowledge and skill for their next application

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Structured Learning: Knowledge and Skill Refinement |
| Detailed Description | Providing performance-based learning support using resources or activities operated by the ISP and explicitly or implicitly focused on achieving support participants’ learning objectives (5.1). These structured learning methods are used following a recent experiential learning activity or past performance experience and typically involve evaluation, reflection, and mastery activities within the context of supportive behavioral coaching. Re-illustration or demonstration of knowledge and skills, role plays, and problem-solving tasks may also be used to refine learning for future experiential learning activities or applications.  Note. Learning activities may occur in person, virtually, or by setting up leaders’ and teams’ independent learning. Learning objectives on which practice activity 8.5 focuses may or may not have been formally identified through practice activity 5.1 but should be considered if they reasonably relate to support participants’ implementation performance goals. Blended learning occurs (1) when practice activity 5.2 or 8.5 is used for the same or similar sets of learning objectives in both virtual and in-person formats, or (2) when 5.2 or 8.5 is used in person along with past, current, or future use of online learning resources (5.4) for the same or similar sets of learning objectives. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Leads to gains in the achievement of adult outcomes ranging from moderate (re-illustrating or demonstrating knowledge and skills; problem-solving tasks; reviewing experience and making changes) to large (practicing through role plays; assessment of strengths and weaknesses; performance improvement reviews; journaling/behavior suggestion; standards-based self-assessment) [1].  The use of in-person learning activities in addition to virtual instruction creates the context for blended learning. Blended learning has demonstrated significantly larger impacts on learning compared to face-to-face and online-only learning [2]. These advantages were attributed to the differences in content, pedagogy, and learning time afforded in blended learning conditions and not to the use of the online delivery medium itself. |
| Common Situations for Use | When attempting to strengthen learning outcomes following the observation or debriefing of support participants’ performance of specific implementation behaviors (8.1).  When attempting to better tailor the application of implementation knowledge and skills that have been the focus of a recent experiential learning activity or past performance experiences to the same or a similar situation. |
| Key Differentiations | 5.2 (structured learning: new knowledge and skills): 5.2 represents the acquisition of new or expanded learning through structured learning activities. 8.5 represents structured learning activities that promote knowledge and skill refinement, typically in the context of supportive behavioral coaching following a recent experiential learning activity or past performance experience.  5.3 (just-in-time learning): 5.3 represents the opportunistic acquisition of new learning, often by making connections between real-time discussions or activities and effective implementation practice. 8.5 represents structured learning activities that promote knowledge and skill refinement, typically in the context of supportive behavioral coaching following a recent experiential learning activity or past performance experience. 5.3 may occur during the context of 8.5 if new learning is introduced opportunistically (not formally). In such cases, both practice activities should be recorded.  5.4 (online learning resources): 5.4 represents the acquisition of new learning through the independent use of online learning resources. 8.5 represents structured learning activities that promote knowledge and skill refinement, typically in the context of supportive behavioral coaching following a recent experiential learning activity or past performance experience.  5.5 (broker learning): 5.5 involves brokering external partnerships or learning resources or events operated by third parties to support participants for new learning. 8.5 involves structured learning activities that promote knowledge and skill refinement, typically in the context of supportive behavioral coaching following a recent experiential learning activity or past performance experience.  7.1 (experiential learning): In. 7.1, the ISP facilitates experiential learning through support participants’ application of new or previously acquired implementation knowledge and skills in the context of their own organizational or system environment. In 8.5, the ISP provides structured learning activities that promote knowledge and skill refinement, typically in the context of supportive behavioral coaching following an experiential learning activity.  8.2 (self-reflection: experiential learning activities), 8.3 (specific behavioral feedback: praise), & 8.4 (specific behavioral feedback: constructive): 8.2 is one example of a structured learning activity that promotes the refinement of knowledge and skill (8.5). 8.3 and 8.4 (specific behavioral feedback) may integrate with or follow naturally from 8.2 and are also examples of learning activities that promote the refinement of knowledge and skill (8.5). Because of these redundancies, 8.5 is always dually recorded with the occurrence of 8.2, 8.3, and 8.4. However, because 8.2, 8.3., and 8.4 are just a few examples of 8.5, 8.5 may also be recorded alone when other structured learning activities for knowledge and skill refinement are used by the ISP.  8.7 (self-reflection: generalization): 8.7 relates to the generalization of support participants’ skills and professional judgments, as demonstrated in one or more experiential learning activities, to a variety of other applied contexts. 8.5 represents structured learning activities conducted after a specific experiential learning activity to refine support participants’ knowledge and skills for future related experiential learning activities or applications.  CPC 9 activities: CPC 9 activities involve the facilitation of organization/system learning and problem-solving activities. 8.5 involves structured individual/team learning activities after a specific experiential learning activity to refine support participants’ knowledge and skills for future related experiential learning activities or applications. |

Practice Activity 8.6

Normalize or temper thoughts and/or feelings related to the application of new or prior knowledge or skills within the local context

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Normalize |
| Detailed Description | In the course of 8.1 (observe and/or debrief), 8.2 (self-reflection: experiential learning activities), or other supportive behavioral coaching activities, normalizing or tempering support participants’ thoughts and/or feelings that have emerged during recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences.  Normalization, as appropriate, helps support participants learn that their thoughts and/or feelings are not uncommon or wrong and may be shared by others who have gone through similar performance experiences. Tempering strong, rigid, or extreme thoughts and/or feelings, as appropriate, may soften support participants’ undue bias (positive or negative) toward recent or past practice-based learning experiences, thereby increasing the clarity of learning and its impact on future performance.  Note. When support participants have disclosed emotional experiences that are not reflective of typical emotions in implementation practice, ISPs might explore the thoughts underlying these emotional experiences. If maladaptive or distorted thought patterns or clinical symptoms become apparent, ISPs should take caution to not intervene beyond expressing empathy unless they have specific training and relevant licensure to engage in applicable services and supports (e.g., cognitive behavioral or other therapeutic strategies). Consultation with supervisors, colleagues, or peers who have training in such techniques or backgrounds in counseling or clinical work may be appropriate. ISPs should never cross into areas of behavioral intervention they do not have training, experience, or appropriate credentialing in. Knowingly doing so would be unethical and may cause harm. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | May help support participants expand on or clarify the learning that has occurred during recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences.  May increase support participants’ abilities to self-regulate future implementation practice activities through self-management of learning experiences. |
| Common Situations for Use | When the ISP observes that support participants attribute commonly shared experiences (positive or negative) from implementation practice activities primarily or uniquely to themselves or their own performance (e.g., internal attribution bias).  When the ISP observes support participants having an undue positive or negative bias toward their learning experiences from recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences. |
| Key Differentiations | 1.2 (provide emotional or practical support): In 1.2, the ISP provides more general or global support within the context of shared work or shared work environment. In 8.6, the ISP normalizes or tempers thoughts and/or feelings that emerged during prior experiential learning activities. Moreover, the intent of 8.6 is not to provide emotional or practical support, rather to provide supportive behavioral coaching to support participants following an experiential learning activity or past performance experience.  1.3 (readiness): 1.3 specifically relates to increasing support participants’ willingness and abilities to take next action steps as identified in shared action plans (6.1) or as otherwise relevant to the course of support interactions. In 8.6, the ISP normalizes or tempers thoughts and/or feelings that emerged during prior experiential learning activities. Moreover, the intent of 8.6 is not to increase support participants’ readiness for next action steps, rather to provide supportive behavioral coaching to support participants following an experiential learning activity or past performance experience.  7.2 (anticipatory guidance: performance success): In 7.2, the ISP uses anticipatory guidance to promote support participants’ success, ensure their safety, and facilitate their anticipatory problem solving related to perceived or potential threats/challenges before engaging in an experiential learning activity. In 8.6, the ISP normalizes or tempers thoughts and/or feelings that emerged during recent or past experiential learning activities. |

Practice Activity 8.7

Facilitate leaders’ and team members’ self-reflection about the potential generalization of their demonstrated skills and professional judgments to varied practice contexts

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Self-Reflection: Generalization |
| Detailed Description | Facilitating support participants’ self-reflection aimed at generalizing effective implementation practice skills, abilities, and acumen beyond the experiential learning activitiesor performance experiences in which they were demonstrated to varied implementation contexts or practice situations. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Broadens support participants’ application of knowledge, skills, and abilities to future practice situations and varied implementation contexts.  May increase support participants’ abilities to self-regulate future implementation practice activities by increasing personal agency, self-efficacy, self-management, and self-sufficiency of implementation practice skills and abilities. |
| Common Situations for Use | As a culminating coaching activity before transitioning the focus of supportive behavioral coaching away from well-demonstrated implementation practice skills and abilities to still-developmental implementation practice skills and abilities (e.g., “Before we move on, in what other contexts or situations might these implementation skills and abilities be useful?”).  When learning activities (CPC 5), capacity development (6.2), anticipatory guidance on performance success (7.2), or supportive behavioral coaching activities (CPC 8) focus on implementation contexts or situations like those in which support participants have previously demonstrated effective implementation practice skills and abilities (e.g., “What have you done before in similar situations that led to some degree of success?”). |
| Key Differentiations | **CPC 2 activities:** CPC 2 activities reinforce support participants‘ *self-regulation of* “X,” generally (“You can do X,” “You have ownership of/are responsible for doing X,” “You have the resources to do X,” “You can do X without dependence on the ISP,” “You can problem solve around challenges that came up when you did X”). 8.7 typically follows *the occurrence of* X (an implementation practice behavior) and focuses on facilitating self-reflection aimed at *generalizing* *participants’ specific behaviors during X* to implementation contexts or practice situations beyond X.  **6.1 (action plans):** 6.1 involves developing or adapting *shared action plans to advance collective efforts* *to achieve prioritized implementation performance goals*. 8.7 involves facilitating self-reflection aimed at *generalizing* *support participants’ specific skills and professional judgments* *from* *prior experiential learning activities to diverse future applied contexts*.  **7.2 (anticipatory guidance: performance success):** In 7.2, the ISP uses anticipatory guidance to promote support participants’ success, ensure their safety, and facilitate their anticipatory problem solving related to perceived or potential threats/challenges *before engaging in* *an* *experiential learning activity*. In 8.7, the ISP helps support participants, through self-reflection, to generalize specific skills and professional judgments *from* *prior experiential learning activities* to diverse future applied contexts. When 8.7 occurs within the context of 7.2 (e.g., “What have you done before in similar situations that led to some degree of success?”), the activities may be recorded together.  **8.5 (structured learning: knowledge and skill refinement):** 8.5 involves structured learning activities conducted after a specific experiential learning activity *to refine support participants’ knowledge and skills for future related experiential learning activities or applications*. 8.7 involves facilitating support participants’ self-reflection with the purpose of *generalizing their skills and professional judgments*,as demonstrated in one or more experiential learning activities, *to a variety of other applied contexts.*  **9.5 (document collective learning and problem solving):** 9.5 involves the documentation of collective learning and problem solving that has taken place *related to organizational/system performance*. This may be useful for curating organizational/system knowledge and abilities that translate to future organizational/system situations or contexts. 8.7 involves facilitating support participants’ self-reflection with the purpose of *generalizing their skills and professional judgments*,as demonstrated in one or more experiential learning activities, to a variety of other *individual/team* applied contexts. |

Note. CPC = core practice component; KSA = knowledge, skills, and abilities; ISP = implementation support practitioner.

## CPC #9

## Facilitate Organizational and System Learning and Adaptive Problem Solving

Practice Activity 9.1

Facilitate leaders’ and teams’ use of data, feedback, and knowledge of effective implementation practices to analyze root causes of barriers and challenges and identify lessons learned at organizational/ system levels

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Root Causes and Lessons Learned |
| Detailed Description | Facilitating support participants’ use of data, feedback, and knowledge of effective implementation practices to analyze root causes of barriers and challenges and identify lessons learned at organizational or system levels. This generally occurs while reflecting on recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences to develop, test, or put to use organizational/ system structures, resources, policies, or practices (7.1). The focus of this practice activity is on organizational/system learning to enhance change management processes during implementation and scale-up (see 6.4, PDSA). |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Increases opportunities for organizational/ system learning and course correction during capacity development and performance improvement efforts. This increases the likelihood that efforts will ultimately be successful and sustainable.  The secondary gains in support participants’ collective contextual knowledge and their participation in collective adaptive problem solving at the organizational/system level may increase their collective agency, collective efficacy, collective management, collective sufficiency, and collective problem solving for ongoing capacity development and performance improvement efforts. This reflects increases in collective abilities for self-regulation. |
| Common Situations for Use | Following support participants’ engagement in an ISP-facilitated experiential learning activity (7.1) to develop, test, or put to use organizational/ system structures, resources, policies, or practices (whether old or new).  When support participants, the ISP, and perhaps other key organizational/system partners (as in 9.4) debrief recent or past *independent* implementation practice activities at organizational or system levels. |
| Key Differentiations | **6.2 (capacity development)**: The purpose of 6.2 is to *develop or refine* organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices. The purpose of 9.1 is to *analyze root causes of barriers and challenges and lessons learned* at organizational or system levels following efforts to develop, test, or put to use organizational/ system structures, resources, policies, or practices*.* *9.1 should be recorded alongside 6.2* when the development or refinement of organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices *results in the ISP’s facilitating concurrent collective activities* to identify and analyze root causes of barriers or challenges and identify lessons learned at organizational/system levels.  **6.4 (PDSA)**: The use of 9.1 may be designed within planned PDSA cycles (6.4), and thus should be reflected in shared action plans (6.1). However, *the use of 9.1 itself is recorded separately when it occurs, unrelated to the PDSA planning that may occur within 6.4.*  **8.1 (observe and/or debrief):** 8.1 involves directly observing support participants’ experiential learning activities or debriefing their recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences *for supportive behavioral coaching purposes at the individual or team level*. 9.1 involves reflecting on recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences *to* *analyze root causes of barriers and challenges and identify lessons learned while developing, testing, or putting to use organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices*.  **8.2 (self-reflection: experiential learning activities):** 8.2 involves supportive behavioral coaching for individuals and teams on their application of an implementation strategy or practice during an experiential learning activity*. The focus of 8.2 is on the individual/team level.* 9.1 involves analyzing root causes of barriers and challenges and identifying lessons learned following experiential learning activities or past performance experiences to develop, test, or put to use organizational/ system structures, resources, policies, or practices. *The focus of 9.1 is* *at organizational or system levels*.  **9.3 (technical and adaptive elements):** In 9.3, the ISP helps support participants identify technical and adaptive elements of challenges and effective strategies to address them. In 9.1, the ISP facilitates support participants’ reflection on recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences to analyze root causes of barriers and challenges and identify lessons learned while developing, testing, or putting to use organizational/ system structures, resources, policies, or practices. 9.3 should be recorded alongside 9.1 *when 9.1* *incorporates the identification of technical and adaptive elements of challenges and the use of appropriate strategies to address them (9.3).*  **9.4 (engage partners for shared learning and problem solving):** In 9.4, the ISP facilitates *support participants’ engagement with key regional or system partners for shared learning or problem solving* at organizational or system levels. In 9.1, the ISP facilitates *support participants’ own reflection* on recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences to analyze root causes of barriers and challenges and identify lessons learned at organizational or system levels. If 9.1 occurs during an interaction *with support participants and key regional or system partners* with whom the ISP has facilitated support participants’ engagement for shared learning and problem solving, *both 9.1 and 9.4 should be recorded.* |

Practice Activity 9.2

Hold leaders and teams accountable for key elements of the support process that have been previously agreed upon

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Accountability |
| Detailed Description | Holding support participants accountable for roles, responsibilities, and expectations (1.1); performance goals (4.2); strategies (4.4); action plans (6.1); experiential learning activities (7.1); and habituation processes (7.3) that were *previously* established. This practice activity closely aligns with adaptive leadership principles “regulate distress” and “maintain disciplined attention.” Accountability should be relationship driven and compassionate (possibly occurring alongside, for example, 1.2 and 1.3), *not directive or compliance oriented*. When holding support participants accountable in such ways, it can be useful to discuss *why staying accountable for these elements is important* to support partners’ achieving their established implementation performance goals and the overall success of the support process. Importantly, ISPs should never shy away from revising roles, responsibilities, and expectations (1.1); performance goals (4.2); strategies (4.4); action plans (6.1); experiential learning activities (7.1); and habituation processes (7.3) when doing so *would increase benefits within the support process*.  *Note*. ISPs, as a third party, cannot hold support participants accountable for their agreements or expectations with other partners (e.g., funders, community partners). *Reinforcing bi-directional accountability* in those relationships is a desirable alternative behavior that fits with the ICTP practice model values and principles. However, *reinforcing accountability with others is not recorded under this practice activity*. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Ensures that support participants stay fully engaged to maximize their implementation capacity and performance improvement efforts and their development of self-regulatory abilities (especially personal agency).  *Note.* When support partners are not held accountable, they may be forfeiting key elements or opportunities to maximize their efforts, goals, and development of self-regulation. |
| Common Situations for Use | When ISPs and support participants are monitoring or debriefing events related to agreed-upon partnership roles, responsibilities, and expectations (1.1); performance goals (4.2); strategies (4.4); action plans (6.1); experiential learning activities (7.1); or habituation processes during experiential learning activities (7.3).  When support participants are not meeting prior agreements or expectations related to roles, responsibilities, and expectations (1.1); performance goals (4.2); strategies (4.4); action plans (6.1); experiential learning activities (7.1); or habituation processes for experiential learning activities (7.3). |
| Key Differentiations | **1.1 (roles and responsibilities):** 1.1 is typically used proactively to set roles, responsibilities, and expectations *going forward*. 9.2 is typically used to hold support participants accountable for what was *previously* established.  **7.3 (anticipatory guidance: habituation):** 7.3 is used to help support participants *anticipate* and fully lean into the process of habituating to the typical discomforts and anxieties of creating change in their own and their organizational/system environments during *upcoming* experiential learning activities. 9.2 is used to hold support participants accountable for fully leaning into habituation processes (7.3) that were *previously* anticipated. |

Practice Activity 9.3

Facilitate leaders’ and teams’ identification of technical and adaptive elements of challenges and the use of appropriate strategies to address them

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Technical and Adaptive Elements |
| Detailed Description | Facilitating support participants’ identification of, and strategic response to, the technical and adaptive elements of organizational/system challenges that may have emerged in recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences, or that might emerge in anticipated performance activities to come. Technical challenges, whether simple or complicated, have a clear definition, solution, and party primarily responsible for addressing them. Adaptive challenges are complex, have unclear definitions and solutions, involve legitimate but competing perspectives, and require the involvement of many people using a learning process to address them. Most challenges have both technical and adaptive elements, all of which require appropriate strategies to address [3]. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Contributes to addressing organizational/system barriers and challenges that have arisen during efforts to improve implementation capacity and performance. In the context of PDSA methods being utilized within action plans (6.4), this practice activity informs subsequent PDSA cycles, which may increase the likelihood of support participants’ achieving and sustaining their implementation capacity and performance goals.  The secondary gains in support participants’ collective contextual knowledge, and their participation in collective adaptive problem solving at the organizational/system level, may increase their collective agency and collective problem solving for ongoing capacity development and performance improvement efforts. This reflects increases in collective abilities for self-regulation. |
| Common Situations for Use | When support participants are addressing implementation barriers or challenges that have at least some adaptive elements and they are not yet able to self-regulate problem solving (2.4).  When support participants experience and/or ISPs observe unresolved organizational/system challenges that keep recurring despite the use of technical solutions.  When providing implementation support in organizational/system settings not typically designed to respond to adaptive challenges.  Support participants’ failure to appropriately identify and respond to the technical and adaptive elements of challenges can delay progress, lead to decreased buy-in and readiness for implementation/scaling activities among organizational/system partners, and engender support participants’ exhaustion or burnout. Identifying these process outcomes may also signal the need for this practice activity. |
| Key Differentiations | 2.4 (problem solving): 2.4 involves the ISP’s reinforcement of support participants’ own identification of, and response to, technical and adaptive elements of challenges. 9.3 involves the ISP’s facilitation of support participants’ identification of technical and adaptive elements of challenges and the use of appropriate strategies to address them.  4.1 (strengths, needs, and patterns): 4.1 involves facilitating ISPs’ and support participants’ shared understanding of higher-level implementation strengths, needs, and patterns at organizational or system levels. 9.3 involves facilitating support participants’ identification of technical and adaptive elements of organizational/system challenges that may have emerged in recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences, or that may emerge in anticipated performance activities to come. To the extent that the organizational/system learning that results from 9.3 shifts ISPs’ and support participants’ shared understanding of higher-level implementation strengths, needs, and patterns, 4.1 might be recorded alongside 9.3.  6.2 (capacity development): In 6.2, the ISP facilitates support participants’ development or refinement of organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices. In 9.3, the ISP facilitates support participants’ identification of technical and adaptive elements of challenges and the use of appropriate strategies to address them.  9.3 and 6.2 should be dually recorded when the development or refinement of organizational/system structures, resources, policies, or practices results in the ISP’s facilitating concurrent collective activities to identify the technical and adaptive elements of challenges and the use of appropriate strategies to address them (9.3).  7.2 (anticipatory guidance: performance success): 7.2 may involve working with support participants to anticipate challenges to success and how to respond to them. Therefore, 9.3 may occur—and be recorded—alongside 7.2 when (1) support participants perceive or anticipate organizational/system challenges in upcoming experiential learning activities and (2) the ISP facilitates support participants’ identification of the technical and adaptive elements of challenges and the use of appropriate strategies to address them.  9.1 (root causes and lessons learned): In 9.1, the ISP facilitates support participants’ reflection on recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences to analyze root causes of barriers and challenges and identify lessons learned at organizational or system levels. 9.3 may occur—and be recorded—alongside 9.1 when, in the course of 9.1, support participants identify technical and adaptive elements of challenges and appropriate strategies to address them (9.3). |

Practice Activity 9.4

Facilitate leaders’ and teams’ engagement of key partners for shared learning and help with problem solving

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Engage Partners for Shared Learning and Problem Solving |
| Detailed Description | Facilitating support participants’ engagement with key regional or system partners for shared learning or problem solving related to organizational or system performance. This may be particularly important when engaging in problem-solving activities to address adaptive challenges, which benefit from the involvement of several voices and perspectives, or learning activities that require perspectives from multiple system levels (e.g., community members, service providers, funders, policymakers, program developers). This practice activity closely aligns with co-creation processes and the adaptive leadership principles “give the work back to people” and “protect voices of leadership from below.” |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Expands opportunities and perspectives for organizational/ system learning and course correction during capacity development and performance improvement efforts. This greatly increases the likelihood that efforts will ultimately be successful and sustainable by enlarging the number and types of partners who are involved and invested in success.  The secondary gains in support participants’ collective contextual knowledge and their participation in collective adaptive problem solving at the organizational/system level may increase their collective agency, collective efficacy, collective management, collective sufficiency, and collective problem solving for ongoing capacity development and performance improvement efforts. This reflects increases in collective abilities for self-regulation. |
| Common Situations for Use | In anticipation of, during, or as a follow-up to practice activity 9.1.  As needed or beneficial to organizational/ system learning and adaptive problem-solving efforts. |
| Key Differentiations | **9.1 (root causes and lessons learned):** In 9.1, the ISP facilitates *support participants’ reflection* on recent experiential learning activities or past performance experiences to analyze root causes of barriers and challenges and identify lessons learned while developing, testing, or putting to use organizational/ system structures, resources, policies, or practices. In 9.4, the ISP facilitates *support participants’ engagement with key regional or system partners for shared learning or problem solving*. Should the ISP facilitate an interaction *with support participants and key regional or system partners* for shared learning and problem solving developed through analysis of root causes and lessons learned, *both 9.1 and 9.4 may be recorded.* |

Practice Activity 9.5

Facilitate leaders’ and teams’ documentation of organizational/ system learning and problem solving

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Document Organizational Learning and Problem Solving |
| Detailed Description | Facilitating support participants’ documentation of organizational/system learning and problem solving developed through 9.1 (root causes and lessons learned) or otherwise. Documenting learning and problem solving helps support participants to procure, retain, and transfer organizational/system knowledge and abilities. Support participants and their successors may utilize this documentation to translate prior learning and problem solving into future organizational/system implementation practice situations, activities, and improvements. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Maintains and sustains organizational/system capacity and performance improvements beyond individuals and teams.  May increase support participants’—and their successors’— collective agency, collective efficacy, collective management, collective sufficiency, and collective problem solving for ongoing capacity development and performance improvement efforts. This reflects increases in collective abilities for self-regulation. |
| Common Situations for Use | During or following practice activity 9.1 (root causes and lessons learned) or as organizational/system learning is otherwise developed. |
| Key Differentiations | **8.7 (self-reflection: generalize):** 8.7 involves the *generalization of support participants’ skills and professional judgments,* as demonstrated in one or more experiential learning activities, to a variety of other *individual/team* applied contexts. 9.5 involves the documentation of *organizational/system learning and problem solving* for use in future organizational/system implementation practice situations, activities, and improvements. |

## CPC #10

## Transition Out of Intensive Implementation Support

Practice Activity 10.1

Establish a shared rationale for transitioning out of intensive implementation support

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Shared Rationale |
| Detailed Description | Ensuring that support participants have a shared understanding—with ISPs—about the conditions for support participants’ transition out of intensive implementation support focused on the improvement of one or more aspects of implementation capacity and performance (i.e., support activities within the “intensive, broad-based” and “brief, narrow-focused” tiers of support).  Such transitions may relate to  an individual goal or goals on which support has been focused,  a transition in membership on the regional support team, or  a change in the overall nature of the support relationship (e.g., shifting to another form of support or ending support altogether).  Acknowledging the full context around the transition can be beneficial for establishing a shared rationale. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | Ending intensive support with a shared rationale affords support participants a clear understanding of how and why implementation performance must be sustained through their ongoing self-regulation of efforts. This may better prepare and motivate support participants to sustain effective implementation performance.  *Note.* When the ISP has developed (through CPCs 5–9) and reinforced (through CPC 2) support participants’ self-regulation abilities, support participants may be more prepared to navigate such transitions, no matter the cause or rationale. |
| Common Situations for Use | Typically, transitioning out of intensive support occurs in any of the following situations:  The focus of intensive support is shifting to another implementation performance goal because the organization, community, or system has sufficiently developed and is consistently self-regulating its own implementation capacity and performance related to the current goal.  A member or entire team of regional support specialists is transitioning out of that region and being replaced by a new member or team.  Intensive, broad-focused or brief, narrow-focused support is ending in favor of an alternative support relationship—such as universal supports or design and consultation support—or no support relationship at all.  All CPC 10 practice activities may be useful in any of these transition situations, though 10.1 and 10.2 are considered essential activities for any transition event. |
| Key Differentiations | **1.1 (roles and responsibilities):** 1.1 focuses on *establishing or redefining roles, responsibilities, and expectations* for each partner within the course of the support engagement. When shared rationales for transitioning out of intensive implementation support (10.1)necessitate a shift in ISP roles and responsibilities (1.1; e.g., due to changes in regional support team membership or a change in the overall nature of the support relationship), ISPs may need to engage in practice activity 1.1 *alongside or in close sequence with 10.1.* |

Practice Activity 10.2

Facilitate leaders’ and teams’ understanding of when and to whom they might need to reach out for support in the future

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Future Support Outreach |
| Detailed Description | Ensuring that support participants have identified when and to whom they might reach out for support in the future related to one or more implementation practice challenges or goals. Helping support participants to identify such partners in their natural support system can be beneficial anytime when engaging in this practice activity, but it is particularly important if the relationship between an ISP and support participants is ending altogether.  Notes. Sustained, self-regulated implementation performance is not meant to imply that support participants operate independently or without seeking support, rather that they practice implementation autonomously and are able to self-determine when, why, and to whom they might need to reach out for different types of support.  If the ISP will remain available to support participants even after their transition out of intensive support (e.g., for universal or design and consultation supports), the ISP should also engage in practice activity 1.1 (roles and responsibilities) to ensure that partnership roles, responsibilities, and expectations are clearly redefined. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | When support participants have clearly identified partners in their natural support system that can provide support, they may be more likely to access those partners when needed in the future. This may increase sustainment of effective implementation performance even when challenges arise. |
| Common Situations for Use | Typically, transitioning out of intensive support occurs in any of the following situations:  The focus of intensive support is shifting to another implementation performance goal because the organization, community, or system has sufficiently developed and is consistently self-regulating its own implementation capacity and performance related to the current goal.  A member or entire team of regional support specialists is transitioning out of that region and being replaced by a new member or team.  Intensive, broad-focused or brief, narrow-focused support is ending in favor of an alternative support relationship—such as universal supports or design and consultation support—or no support relationship at all.  All CPC 10 practice activities may be useful in any of these transition situations, though 10.1 and 10.2 are considered essential activities for any transition event. |
| Key Differentiations | **1.1 (roles and responsibilities):** 1.1 focuses on *establishing or redefining roles, responsibilities, and expectations* for each partner within the course of the support engagement. To the extent that the facilitation of support participants’ understanding of when and to whom they might need to reach out for support in the future (10.2) is due to a shift in ISP roles and responsibilities (1.1; e.g., an end to their intensive engagement with a region due to transitions in regional support assignments, support participants’ achievement of all their implementation performance goals, or the end of funding), *1.1 may occur alongside or in close sequence with 10.2.*  **8.2 (self-reflection: experiential learning activities):** Although in both 8.2 and 10.2 the ISP facilitates support participants’ reflection, the focus of reflection is qualitatively different. In 8.2, support participants’ self-reflection focuses on *their own actions, experiences, and learning during an experiential learning activity* with the purpose of *exploring, describing, and analyzing their own awareness, feelings, learning, and alternatives.* In 10.2, the focus of support participants’ reflection is on *when and to whom they might reach out for support in the future related to one or more implementation practice challenges or goals*.  **8.7 (self-reflection: generalization):** Although in both 8.7 and 10.2 the ISP facilitates support participants’ reflection, the focus of reflection is qualitatively different. In 8.7, support participants’ reflection involves *generalizing* *their skills and professional judgments* *from* *prior experiential learning activities to diverse future applied contexts.* In 10.2, the focus of support participants’ reflection is on *when and to whom they might reach out for support in the future related to one or more implementation practice challenges or goals*. |

Practice Activity 10.3

Facilitate leaders’ and teams’ identification of the support processes that best contribute to their ongoing success and sustainability

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Short Name | Support Process Reflection |
| Detailed Description | Ensuring that support participants have identified the implementation support processes and practices that best contribute to their own success and sustainability. It may also be helpful for support participants to identify the support processes and practices *that do not contribute to or may negatively influence* their success and sustainability. This practice activity enables support participants to become more informed consumers of external implementation support and better communicate their support needs and preferences while working on different implementation performance goals or with future ISPs. |
| Contribution of Working Alliance | When support participants have clearly identified the implementation support processes and practices that best contribute to their own success and sustainability, they may be more likely to access those supports in the future from other support providers. This may increase sustainment of effective implementation performance even when challenges arise. |
| Common Situations for Use | Typically, transitioning out of intensive support occurs in any of the following situations:  The focus of intensive support is shifting to another implementation performance goal because the organization, community, or system has sufficiently developed and is consistently self-regulating its own implementation capacity and performance related to the current goal.  A member or entire team of regional support specialists is transitioning out of that region and being replaced by a new member or team.  Intensive, broad-focused or brief, narrow-focused support is ending in favor of an alternative support relationship—such as universal supports or design and consultation support—or no support relationship at all.  All CPC 10 practice activities may be useful in any of these transition situations, though 10.1 and 10.2 are considered essential activities for any transition event. |
| Key Differentiations | **8.2 (self-reflection: experiential learning activities):** Although in both 8.2 and 10.3 the ISP facilitates support participants’ reflection, the focus of reflection is qualitatively different. In 8.2, support participants’ self-reflection focuses on *their own actions, experiences, and learning during an experiential learning activity* with the purpose of *exploring, describing, and analyzing their own awareness, feelings, learning, and alternatives.* In 10.3, the focus of support participants’ reflection is on *the support processes and practices that best contribute to, or that do not contribute to or may negatively influence, their ongoing success and sustainability*.  **8.7 (self-reflection: generalization):** Although in both 8.7 and 10.2 the ISP facilitates support participants’ reflection, the focus of reflection is qualitatively different. In 8.7, support participants’ reflection involves *generalizing* *their skills and professional judgments* *from* *prior experiential learning activities to diverse future applied contexts.* In 10.3, the focus of support participants’ reflection is on *the support processes and practices that best contribute to, or that do not contribute to or may negatively influence, their ongoing success and sustainability*. |

*Note.* CPC = core practice component; ISP = implementation support practitioner; ICTP = Implementation Capacity for Triple P.