**North Carolina Tiered Model of Support**

**Discussion Guide**

**Purpose**:  Site Support Teams will work collaboratively with their NC Triple P Lead Implementing Agency (LIA) to make a mutual decision about the tier of support for July 2020-June 2021.

**Using this Guide:** Site Support Teams will choose which discussion strategies are appropriate for engaging their sites in the conversation, using what is minimally sufficient to arrive at an informed agreement.

**Prior to meeting with your site, both the Site Support Team and LIA should consider the following:**

* Review the **Tiered-Model of Support** one-pager
* Consider who needs to be involved in deciding which tier of support will work best for your team?
* Review relevant materials (e.g., GSEWs, Model Scale-Up Plan, Agreement Addenda, recent CCA)
* Reflect on guiding discussion questions (below)

**Guiding Discussion Questions:**

* What supports or needs do you have relative to this 5-year planning effort that you will be going through over the next year?
* What is it going to take to develop the 5-year scale-up plan (e.g. including leadership and implementation teams, co-creation partners, etc.?)
* What are your (quarterly, annual, bi-annual) goals and what is it going to take to reach your goals?
* What support do you need to create the 5-year plan while keeping the rest of your work moving?
* Which of the tiers of support feels like the right fit for you (time, ability, effort, and willingness)?
	+ Tell us more about how this tier is the best for your region?
	+ *If the site asks for intensive, broad-based support, ask:* If brief, narrow-focused support was all that was available, what needs do you think would go unmet? How would this affect your overall progress in the next year?
	+ *Remind site that we will do our best to honor their choice but will need to take into consideration all site requests and our team’s capacity to meet those.*

**Additional Discussion Strategies for Use as Needed:**

1. **Assessment of support needs based on degree change required**

The statements below can be used to help sites reflect on the extent of support needed based on change required. To help define “change required”, corresponding NC Triple P Model Scale-Up Plan strategies have been added. Implementation Specialist may consider having sites rate each of the NC Triple P Model Scale-Up strategies as “Fully in Place”, “Somewhat in Place”, or “Not in Place”.

* + **Practice change is required at multiple levels beyond practitioner level (e.g., supervisor, administrator), such as**:
		- Teaming structures are developed consisting of agency leaders, managers, and staff who are responsible for supporting Triple P delivery.
		- Workforce development systems have been developed and are being utilized.
		- Data is being collected and utilized to inform decision-making and quality improvement.
		- Stay Positive communications and other Triple P parent engagement strategies are being employed.
	+ **New thinking and acceptance of new ideas is required (e.g., inclusion, parent involvement, use of data), along with the letting go of current ways of work or adopting new values, such as:**
		- Co-creation partners are engaged, including but not limited to service agencies, the support system, and parents in the development of infrastructure needed to support the expansion and scale up of Triple P.
		- There is a shared community understanding of need, vision for change, and joint strategies for achieving desired change.
		- Systematic, bi-directional communication is occurring between teams and co-creation partners.
	+ **Changes in local infrastructure are required to support practice change and practitioner competency, such as:**
		- Selection procedures assessing alignment of Triple P with a service agency’s mission, vision, values, guiding principles, current target population needs, and resources and capacity to support competent and confident practitioners are utilized.
		- Development and provision of practitioner coaching and regional peer-to-peer practitioner supports.
		- Collection and use of data about practitioner delivery to inform learning and improvement efforts.
	+ **Changes in many parts of the system are required, such as:**
		- There is a Community Triple P coalition representative of the full array of cross-sector Triple P service agencies and input from co-creation partners.
		- Triple P is aligned with other existing parenting and family support programs and practices within the community.
		- Shared implementation barriers and system needs are reviewed, and solutions recommended.
		- Shared measurement system for improvement, accountability, and reporting, informed by Triple P requirements, is used.

|  |
| --- |
| * + **To achieve full community reach and population-level outcomes, engagement of broad systems change efforts is needed, such as:**
		- A needs assessment to inform the selection of Triple P target populations and program variants has been completed.
		- Triple P Levels 1-4 interventions have been scaled in all communities participating in North Carolina Triple P.
		- System-wide learning and continuous quality improvement of Triple P implementation, delivery, and outcomes is occurring.
		- There is a regional sustainability plan.
 |

1. **Readiness**

Readiness is the extent to which organizational members are psychologically and behaviorally prepared to implement organizational change. By assessing throughout the provision of support, we hope to more readily recognize the positive or negative influence of readiness on capacity building efforts and consider adjustments to implementation supports.

* + *Talk through the following beliefs (adapted from National Center on Deaf/Blindness).*
	+ To what extent are the statements below true?:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Our community is open to making changes  | Our community does not see the need for change | Notes: |
| Our team is fully staffed, and leadership is active and engaged in scaling up Triple P | Our team is not fully staffed, and leadership is disconnected | Notes: |
| We believe that (**Intensive Broad-Focused Support/ Brief Narrow-Focused Support)** tier of support has value and benefits our project needs at this time | We believe that (**Intensive Broad-Focused Support/ Brief Narrow-Focused Support)** tier of support does not have the kinds of value or benefits we need for our project at this time | Notes: |
| We are willing and able to participate in a broad range of capacity building activities | We are only willing and able to participate in discrete capacity building activities (i.e., one or two clearly identified issues/areas) | Notes: |
| Our team’s strengths will allow us to make use of a more intensive tier of support | There are some factors that may preclude our ability to make use of a more intensive tier of support | Notes: |

1. **Use GSEW Goals to Identify Breadth and Depth of Priorities**
* Add the sites goals into the grid below. Place one goal in each row. Add rows if sites have multiple goals within one capacity area.
* Review the goals with the implementation team and any other relevant decision makers.
* As a team ask the group to decide if a goal is important, if so, place a check in the box headed important.
	+ Importance:
		- What goals/parts of the work will be a priority over the next year?
		- Can my community gain big from working on this goal (or lose big from not focusing our work in this area)?
* Repeat the process for feasible.
	+ Feasibility:
		- Is this something that can be done easily or conveniently?
		- How much time is this going to take?
		- Do I have the resources (people, other stuff) I need to do this (…or can I get them easily)?
		- Are leaders and teams “ready” for this (like the idea, want it, see the value, are bought-in)?
* Identify the number of goals that fit in each area of the grid as well as the amount of effort required to meet each goal. (For simplicity this does not include a Likert scale. Feel free to add one.)
* Consider both the number of goals, and the amount of support needed to accomplish one goal that is identified as important and feasible.
* If a site identifies no goals as important or feasible, they may need new goals and intensive supports.
* Sites can rate the goals prior to the meeting or take this strategy to their leaders and teams to work through together and then meet with Support System team to discuss.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Add rows if needed | **Goal:** | **Check boxes below for goals that are important/feasible** |
| Co-Creation Partners |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Important | Feasible |
|  |  |

 |
| Media & Networking Capacity |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Important | Feasible |
|  |  |

 |
| Workforce Development Infrastructure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Important | Feasible |
|  |  |

 |
| Quality & Outcome Monitoring System |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Important | Feasible |
|  |  |

 |
| Leadership & Implementation Teams |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Important | Feasible |
|  |  |

 |

Feasibility:

1. Is this something that can be done easily or conveniently?
2. How much time is this going to take?
3. Do I have the resources (people, other stuff) I need to do this (…or can I get them easily)?
4. Are leaders and teams “ready” for this (like the idea, want it, see the value, are bought-in)?

Importance:

What goals/parts of the work will be a priority over the next year?

Can my community gain big from working on this goal (or lose big from not doing it)?

High Feasibility,

Low Importance:

# of goals\_\_\_\_

Amount of effort needed

Low Feasibility, Low Importance:

# of goals\_\_\_\_

Amount of effort needed

High Importance, High Feasibility:

# of goals\_\_\_\_

Amount of effort needed

High Importance, Low Feasibility:

# of goals\_\_\_\_

Amount of effort needed