

The EXPLORATION STAGE for Scaling-Up

State Implementation and Scaling up of Evidence-based Practices

Co-Directors: Dean Fixsen, Karen Blase, Rob Horner, and George Sugai
University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill,
University of Oregon, University of Connecticut

www.scalingup.org

We know from the implementation research and practice literature that the Exploration Stage is critical (www.nirn.fpg.unc.edu). How an initiative begins has a lot to do with how successful it might eventually become and how well it might be sustained. We also know from complexity theory that the “first right steps” are important. Small changes early in a process can make big differences later on (output is not proportional to input). Thus, we knew we needed to invest considerable thought and energy into the State selection process.

A short time after the U.S. Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs awarded the scaling up contract, the work began on developing criteria for selecting States that could fully participate in and benefit from the process of creating a State infrastructure to support high fidelity implementation of evidence-based practices. By November 2007 this discussion led to the first drafts of selection criteria and strategies. The results of this process are described below.

Recruitment of States

A brief message was crafted describing the overall purpose of the State Implementation and Scaling up of Evidence-based Practices Center (the email message and description are provided in *Appendix A*). In mid-January 2008 OSEP leaders sent the message to its federal partners including all the TA& D Centers, and the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) organizations sent the brief message to its membership. The message invited State leaders to call in to find out more.

The call-in conference line used by SISEP provided a record of the telephone numbers that called in during the appointed time. The area codes of these numbers were used to identify the state associated with each telephone number. While this is imperfect (e.g. a state education director from Utah might have called in from a phone in California; or a technical assistance provider, rather than a state education official, might have called in from one of the identified states), these records do provide an indication of states initially interested in scaling up their capacity to make full use of evidence-based practices. A few calls could not be traced because of privacy restrictions on the call-in phone numbers.

Call #1 Goal: Brief Overview of SISEP/ scale up (an outline of the information provided in Call #1 can be found in *Appendix B*)

Three call-in opportunities in January 2008

For Call #1, calls were received from a total of 33 states and the District of Columbia (N = 34) to hear the introductory message. There were 12 states that called in on more than one occasion to hear the message in Call #1. The questions that arose during the telephone calls were quite varied but focused primarily on the selection process and selection criteria (*Appendix C*).

Call #2: Goal: More information on the strategies for scaling up and the need for continuing involvement of the State leadership in championing the process and actively solving problems that arise from the large scale change effort (an outline of the information provided in Call #2 can be found in *Appendix D*)

Two call-in opportunities in February 2008

For Call #2, calls were received from a total of 23 states and the District of Columbia (N = 24) to hear more detailed information about SISEP and scaling up strategies. There were 8 states that called in on more than one occasion to hear the message in Call #2.

A total of 22 States called in for both Call #1 and for Call #2. There were 11 States that called in for Call #1 and did not call in for Call #2. There was 1 State that called in for Call #2 but had not called in for Call #1. There were 2 States that eventually submitted a written application that did not show up on either call in list of area codes.

Overall, the initial telephone calls seemed to create enough interest so that about 2/3 of the initial callers called back to get more detailed information on Call #2.

Written Request for Participation

Those States that were interested were encouraged to visit the SISEP website (www.scalingup.org) for more information and to email/ contact the Co-Directors with any questions or concerns. After Call #2, States were asked to complete a 10-page (maximum) "Request for Participation" (RFP) if they were interested in the scaling up enterprise (*Appendix E*). The RFP form was put on the website and could be downloaded easily. A total of 16 States (N = 16) submitted an RFP by the deadline of March 5, 2008.

Beginning with 34 States on Call #1, 22 (65%) called in for Call #2, and 16 (47% of Call #1 participants; 73% of Call #2 participants) completed a written application.

State Selection: Review of Written Requests for Participation

The SISEP Co-Directors and other staff had participated fully in all phases of developing the concepts, strategies, call-in presentation outlines, and so on. They were well versed in the thinking and planning and were well-prepared to serve as reviewers of the written

applications submitted by the 16 States. Three or four SISEP staff independently read and rated each application using a 3-point scale to rate the application on each of the 5 criteria specified in the application (Evidence-based program, Leadership, Resources, Community of Practice, Data System; see *Appendix E*). The 3-point scale was 2 = Fully Meets Criteria, 1 = Partially Meets Criteria, 0 = Not currently meeting criteria.

In addition, we asked each reviewer to provide an overall rating on the following dimension:

How satisfied are you that this state would be a committed and effective partner with SISEP in implementation capacity building over the next five years?

- ___7 = Completely Satisfied
- ___6 = Satisfied
- ___5 = Somewhat Satisfied
- ___4 = Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- ___3 = Somewhat Dissatisfied
- ___2 = Dissatisfied
- ___1 = Completely Dissatisfied

Nearly all of scores were within one point of one another (e.g. a 3 and a 2 on the 3-point scale; a 5 and a 6 on a 7-point scale). One score deviated by more than one point (a 0, 2 split) on the 3-point scale and 5 scores deviated by more than one point (e.g. 2,4 split) on the 7-point scale. In these cases, an additional reviewer was asked to independently rate the application. It should be noted that all of the deviations in scoring occurred at the lower end of the scale (e.g. degrees of dissatisfaction). There were no deviations in scoring among the top-rated States.

Prior to doing the ratings, the Co-Directors had set 5.0 (Somewhat Satisfied) as the cut off point for deciding which States to consider, provided the reviewers agreed that the State scored at least 1 (Partially Meets Criteria) for each of the five selection criteria. The ratings resulted in an even split:

- 8 top-rated States (average 7-point satisfaction score = 5.8; range 5.1 – 6.7)
- 8 top-rated States (average 3-point scale rating = 1.60; range 1 - 2)
- 8 lower-rated States (average 7-point satisfaction score = 4.0; range 3.6 – 4.6)
- 8 lower-rated States (average 3-point scale rating = 1.06; range 0 – 2)

The Table below shows the largest differences in 3-point scale ratings occurred for EBP (“The State has documented implementation of an evidence-based curriculum/instruction initiative or a behavior support program”) and Leadership (“The State has demonstrated committed leadership at the State level”). See *Appendix E* for descriptions of the full Selection Criteria reflected in the Table below.

Selection Criterion	Top 8 States	Lower 8 States	Difference
EBP	1.77	1.15	0.63
Leadership	1.65	0.96	0.69
Resources	1.60	1.11	0.49
Community of Practice	1.38	0.88	0.50
Data System	1.58	1.19	0.40
<i>Average</i>	<i>1.60</i>	<i>1.06</i>	<i>0.54</i>

The calls were designed to provide sufficient information to allow States to make an informed choice to participate (or not) in the scaling up process as described by the State Implementation and Scaling up of Evidence-based Practices Center. As shown in the Table below, 100% of the top-rated States participated in both Call #1 and Call #2. For the 8 lower-rated States, 75% called in on Call #1 and 50% on Call #2, rates that are about the same as the remaining States that chose not to apply.

	Call #1		Call #2		Application
Top 8	8	100%	8	100%	8
Next 8	6	75%	4	50%	8
Other					
20	19	95%	11	55%	0

Only 4 of the 8 lower-rated States called in on both Calls (data not shown in the Table). There was no record that 2 of the lower-rated applicant States had ever called in, but using the area code to identify States calling in may only be a crude indicator of who is calling in.

Evidence-based practices

The application process asked each State to describe the evidence-based practices currently being implemented. The Table below summarizes the top two evidence-based practices named by the 16 States that applied. The top rated and lower rated States were about the same regarding which evidence-based practices they were using and would choose to scale up statewide. School-Wide Positive Behavior Support (PBS) and Response to Intervention (RtI) were most commonly in use in the States. Reading was the only academic subject that was being implemented by more than one State.

	Top 8	Lower 8
PBS	7	6
RtI	5	5
Reading	2	2
Math	1	
Drop Out	1	
Counseling		1
Leadership		1

State Selection: Mutual Selection Site Visits

On March 20, 2008 the top-rated States were congratulated and an on-site visit was scheduled (*Appendix F*). The purpose of the on-site visit was to allow the parties (State officials and stakeholders and SISEP) to meet each other and share information about the initiative and the State, engage in discussion to surface any key issues, and answer questions from any and all parties. At least two members of SISEP were present for each on-site visit (one person participated in all site visits) They compared notes and impressions immediately after each visit and communicated their findings to the overall SISEP staff group.

The primary criteria used to assess States during this process were the following:

- Assess the degree to which the State leadership team is knowledgeable about implementation of evidence-based practices in their State, engaged in solving implementation-related issues, and committed to change of the magnitude we envision. Cover each of the 5 selection criteria; get answers to any questions reviewers noted when doing ratings of the written application; gauge reactions to difficult scenarios we present. Spend time on the current state of the State data system to see where they are with respect to having a useful system for us to build upon.
- Assess the degree to which the major stakeholder groups are knowledgeable about implementation of evidence-based practices in their State, engaged in solving implementation-related issues, and committed to change of the magnitude we envision. Assess how engaged the stakeholders are with one another prior to the meeting and during breaks (are they accustomed to working together, or meeting for the first time). Cover each of the 5 selection criteria; get answers to any questions reviewers noted when doing ratings of the written application; gauge reactions to difficult scenarios we present.
- Assess how easy or difficult it might be to work with the State. How far along are they re: implementing evidence-based practices with fidelity; what is the depth of talent available in the State; how flexibly do they use funding now (examples); how have they tried to solve problems in the past; who are the natural leaders in the group; what problems are they trying to solve; etc.?

State Selection: Results

Of the 8 top-ranked States, one State withdrew (leadership issues were cited) and one State did not convene a stakeholder group, leaving 6 States. Each of the remaining 6 States met our criteria during the on-site visit. Consequently, those 6 States, representing a total of 14,984 schools, were selected to be part of the scaling up initiative.

During the selection process it became clear that two of the selected States already had initiatives underway that required considerable time and attention from the State leadership and it would be difficult to carry out the SISEP capacity building strategies at the same time. These initiatives were discussed during and after the on-site visits and SISEP selected the States knowing there might be a conflict. After the selection decision

was communicated, these two States independently asked to be “put on hold” for a while until they finished their work in progress. This led to a discussion about “degrees of participation” and timing which then led to thinking about possible categories.

Consequently, we developed three categories for State participation in SISEP scaling up activities:

- Active Scaling: States that are fully engaged in capacity building for scale up (Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, and Oregon; a total of 10,859 schools)
- Formative: States that are interested and will be actively working on “building the foundations” for scaling up implementation capacity (Missouri and Virginia; a total of 4,125 schools)
- Emerging: States that are interested in scaling up and will be given broad access to information from SISEP (the remaining applicant States and other States that may choose to participate in scaling up and system change communities of practice)

Once these categories of participation were formed, all 16 States that responded to the RFP were notified of their status on May 21, 2008.

Conclusion

The Exploration Stage required a very busy 7 months from conceptualization to selection of the States to be involved in scale up. The activities that occurred during the Exploration Stage seemed to provide enough information for States to make an informed choice (submit an application or not). The brief “Request for Participation” application format (10 pages maximum to respond to 5 criteria) did not place an undue burden on States. The emails and telephone calls leading up to the site visits and the site visits themselves provided opportunities for the SISEP staff to get to know the State leaders and stakeholders (and vice versa) and test the possibilities of a working relationship.

The Exploration Stage was labor intensive but provided sufficient information to States to allow them to make an informed choice, and secured enough information for SISEP to feel confident in making the selection decisions.

We wanted to have the “public” part of the selection process go as quickly as possible so States could participate in the process and have a decision in hand fairly quickly. We also wanted to use the process to generate interest and excitement about the possibilities and we did not want any time lapse that might diminish any momentum that was created. The first notices were sent out the middle of January and the final decision notifications were sent out May 21, 2008. Thus, from a State’s perspective the Exploration Stage required about four months.

Appendix A

The following email message was sent to State leaders via a variety of federal channels:

You are receiving this communication because you expressed interest in learning more about The Office of Special Education Program's Technical Assistance Center on State Implementation and Scaling up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP). Please see the attached announcement for information about the first round of conference calls between SISEP and Senior Officers in State Educational Agencies.

If you have questions, please contact Jennifer Doolittle (Jennifer.Doolittle@ed.gov, 202-245-6673) or Debra Price-Ellingstad (Debra.Price-Ellingstad@ed.gov, 202-245-7481).

Thank you,

(Attachment to the email)

Initial Conference Call: State Selection Process for Capacity Building Project

Too often, States invest in establishing effective demonstrations that never scale up to meet expectations or potential. The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has funded a center that is designed to provide the organizational and procedural supports to assist States in taking existing evidence-based practices to scale.

State Selection

The new OSEP Center for State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) is beginning the process of selecting six (6) States/ federal jurisdictions to participate in a process for increasing State capacity to make good use of innovations in education. More effective uses of evidence-based practices in education are intended to help States improve academic and other important outcomes for all students. SISEP would like to invite you to participate in an initial telephone conference call to hear about the purpose of SISEP and the benefits you might derive from participation as one of the selected States.

Initial Conference Call

SISEP is making three times available for the first call: January 18 at 4:00 PM EST, January 23 at 8:30 AM EST, and January 25 at 1:00 PM EST. The purpose of this first conference call is to provide you with the opportunity to hear about the goals and activities of the SISEP to enable you to determine if you will benefit from participation in future calls and activities related to selection of States for this project.

Purpose of the Center

Briefly, the purpose of SISEP is to promote students' academic achievement and behavioral health by supporting implementation and scaling up of evidence-based practices in education settings. SISEP will provide the critical content and foundation for establishing a technology of large-scale, sustainable, high-fidelity implementation of effective educational practices. SISEP will work with selected States to improve their capacity to carry out implementation, organizational change, and systems transformation strategies to maximize achievement outcomes for all students in each State.

Project Administrators

This effort is being organized by Dean Fixsen and Karen Blase at the University of South Florida, and Rob Horner and George Sugai at the Universities of Oregon and Connecticut. SISEP's project officers at OSEP are Debra Price-Ellingstad and Jennifer Doolittle. A Web site is under development to provide more information to you (www.scalingup.org) as you consider the benefits of your potential participation.

State Selection Criteria

The State selection criteria will be discussed on the call and include:

1. The State has documented implementation of an evidence-based curriculum/instruction initiative or a behavior support program.
2. The State has demonstrated committed leadership at the State level.
3. The state is willing to dedicate roughly \$2 million a year to scaling up evidence-based practices.
4. The State is willing to participate in and contribute to a community of practice.
5. The State has a data collection system in place that will allow them to collect and use data on the implementation, progress, and outcomes of the initiative or program chosen.

SISEP hopes to select the six States by April 2008. The selection process will involve an iterative exchange of information between interested States and SISEP. This will facilitate a mutual selection process with interested States that includes: a) evaluating the degree to which this capacity building initiative will further the State's goals, b) evaluating SISEP's capacity to assist the State, and c) evaluating the degree to which the State can effectively partner and provide resources for the initiative.

Please call in at ONE of the following times. The conference call-in number is 1-888-617-3400 and the access code is 685748.

January 18 at 4:00 PM EST

January 23 at 8:30 AM EST

January 25 at 1:00 PM EST

Appendix B

State Selection Phone Calls: An outline of the content (not all of it was covered, some information was included that might pertain to questions)

Call #1

January 18 at 4:00 PM EST, January 23 at 8:30 AM EST, January 25 at 1:00 PM EST

1. Thanks for your interest in scaling up evidence-based education practices and for making the time to be on this call
 - a. The purpose of this first call is to introduce you to our version of capacity development
 - b. For those of you who are still interested after this call, we will have one or two more phone calls to explore more of the details of this joint venture
 - i. The next calls will be February 4 at 4:00 PM EST with a repeat call February 6 at 1:00 PM EST (choose one).
 - c. For the finalists, we will have on-site visits to meet the key decision makers in your state. We believe in assessment FOR readiness, not assessment OF readiness. Thus, the site visits will be the first steps in the capacity development planning process
 - d. Out of this process, the 6 states that best meet our selection criteria will be selected and the intensive work will begin this summer.
 - e. Final selection decisions will be made jointly by SISEP and OSEP
2. In this call I will provide a brief overview of the need for and benefits of scaling up effective education practices
 - a. Discuss the role of states
 - b. Discuss the role of the new OSEP SISEP Center
 - c. We will have time for some questions at the end so jot them down along the way
3. OSEP partners
 - a. OSEP has been very supportive during the developmental stages of the SISEP Center
 - b. Especially appreciate the guidance from Patty Guard and Lou Danielson and our Project Officers, Debra Price-Ellingstad and Jennifer Doolittle
 - c. They have gone out of their way to be helpful at every step along the way and are terrific partners with us in this adventure
4. Before we begin, I should tell you a bit about ourselves
 - a. Karen Blase and I are Co-Principal Investigators on the OSEP contract
 - i. Since 1967 we have been involved in developing and doing research on evidence-based programs and working to establish the capacity to

- implement those programs nationally. We started out in residential care for children with serious problems, then branched out into homebased treatment, treatment foster care, and community-based prevention programs.
- ii. Karen and I currently are Co-Directors of the National Implementation Research Network and are dedicated to advancing the science and practice of implementation. In this capacity we have had the opportunity to work with a variety of state systems in education, substance abuse treatment, mental health, child welfare, and aging, among others. It is interesting to us to see how similar the implementation, organization change, and system transformation issues are across these diverse human service systems.
- b. Rob Horner (U Oregon) and George Sugai (U Connecticut) are Co-Directors of the SISEP Center
 - i. Rob and George have been involved in advancing research and best practices in education throughout their illustrious careers. They currently are Co-Directors of the PBIS Center that supports the national implementation of the School-Wide Positive Behavior Support program. Currently, there are over 7,000 schools in more than 40 states using PBS to improve the behavior and academic achievement of students.
 - ii. SW-PBS is probably the best and most widely implemented program model in education or other human services.
 - c. The four of us bring over 100 years of collective knowledge and experience to the capacity development efforts in the 6 selected states. We and our colleagues will be heavily involved with each state from the outset. We will be highly accountable for success in each of the 6 states.
5. Now, on to capacity development – what is it and how can we approach developing it
- a. As state leaders you have responsibility for improving graduation rates, academic achievement, and parental involvement in education while reducing suspension, drop outs, and disproportionality (among many other things)
 - i. Adequate Yearly Progress indicators
 - ii. Out there for the world to see (Google: “Adequate Yearly Progress” resulted in 23,500 hits)
 - b. Scientists have produced programs and practices that can help achieve these and other goals you have for students, communities, and education systems
 - i. What Works Clearinghouse (<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>)
 - ii. NREPP (<http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov/>)
 - iii. Colorado Blueprints (<http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/index.html>)
 - iv. Education research journals/ American Education Research Association (<http://www.aera.net/>) / J. of Evidence-Based Practices in Schools
 - c. Most states already have attempted to implement a variety of these science-based practices: Some attempts achieve their purposes but others fall short
 - d. Three big issues have emerged

- i. How to implement new education practices so they actually produce the intended benefits to students
 - ii. How to scale up effective practices so they are available to all students who could benefit from them
 - iii. How to align system structures and functions to fully support scale up efforts as a part of “education as usual” (sustainable)
- 6. State leaders and SISEP will focus on all three issues simultaneously as capacity is developed in a state
 - a. A State Management Group will be formed to work on changes at the policy level and to enable implementation of effective education practices (policy-enabled-practice)
 - b. A Regional Implementation Team will be formed to work on implementing new education practices so they actually produce intended benefits to students
 - i. The RIT will do the real work of implementation with teachers, staff, and administrators in schools and districts
 - ii. Results of this experience will be fed back to the State Management Group (practice-informed-policy)
 - c. After the first RIT has acquired the knowledge, skills, and abilities to be successful, a State Transformation Team will be formed. The job of the STT is to create more RITs to work with more schools until saturation is reached in the state (median = 7 teams per state)
 - d. The SISEP Center will work with members of all three groups to guide the capacity development process. SISEP Center staff will help select team members, provide training and intensive on-site coaching for team members, and conduct regular assessments of team members’ performance as they acquire and use the complex sets of skills involved in implementation and scale up
- 7. After 5 years, this infrastructure will allow states to have the capacity to fully implement effective education practices for all students who need them in a state
 - a. Once the infrastructure is in place, it will become more effective and efficient over time and will incorporate a broad range of initiatives in its mandate
 - b. It is designed to be self-sustaining, self-correcting, and adaptable to the inevitable changes in state education systems
- 8. The State selection process is designed to give you a lot of information so you can decide if you want to pursue capacity development in your state. The selection criteria are:
 - a. **The State has documented implementation of an evidence-based curriculum/instruction initiative or a behavior support program.**

Rationale: The State needs to have had the experience of implementing a specific initiative or program before they choose to scale up the initiative or program. This is critical because the State needs to know: (a) that they can

achieve their desired outcomes with the initiative or program, (b) the types of resources they need for implementation, (c) that there is support across the State for widespread implementation of the initiative or program, and (d) how to successfully take into account the context in which implementation takes place. Also, States will be expected to scale up their initiative or program in less than five years. It is very unlikely that scale up would be possible if the States have not yet entered the full implementation stage in multiple sites across the State.

b. The State has demonstrated committed leadership at the State level.

Rationale: Top leadership support is critical to making necessary system changes and accessing funding to achieve scale up. The formation of a State Management Group that includes general education and special education leaders is an essential ingredient of the scale up endeavor because the initiatives or programs chosen by the State are expected to assist general and special education students.

c. The State is willing to dedicate roughly \$2 million a year to scaling up evidence-based practices.

Rationale: Scaling up of implementation efforts will require dedicated funds to support SEA staff time, as well as the time and training of Regional Implementation Team (RIT) members. The dollar amount of allocated funds may include current funding already allocated for EBP implementation and scale-up as well as new funding.

Initially, this funding allocation must include funds to hire or redirect two State-level FTEs to work exclusively with SISEP. In addition, funds must be made available to support the time, training and activities of the initial RIT. In later years, additional funding will be needed for the State Transformation Team (STT) and growth of the RIT structure. This year's successes can pay for next year's expansion.

\$45,000 a year from SISEP to the State to support travel and communication expenses – some flexible funds to support State efforts re: capacity building.

d. **The State is willing to participate in and contribute to a community of practice.**

Rationale: SISEP intends to have interested State leaders, STT members, RIT members, and local implementers participate in a community of practice to share information. The focus will be on the lessons learned about implementing evidence-based practices and scaling up in the six selected States, coupled with relevant information gleaned from related activities of any of the States participating in the community of practice.

e. **The State has a data collection system in place.**

Rationale: The data collection system should allow the State to collect and use data on the implementation, progress, and outcomes of the initiative or program chosen. A key feature of implementation, sustainability, and scaling up is an active, effective and dynamic evaluation structure for gathering and using data. This takes time to build and it is important that States already have a system in process.

9. By April we hope to have the field narrowed down to the 6 states that will participate in the first round of capacity development
10. For the 6 selected states and for any other interested state, we will develop a community of practice to share developments, successes, failures, and lessons learned
11. The next telephone call will occur February 4 at 4:00 PM EST with a repeat call February 6 at 1:00 PM EST (choose one). We will get into the next level of detail so you can decide if capacity development is for you. Same call in number and access code. Go to the website for continuing updates for the next five years.
12. Questions?
13. Thanks for taking the time to participate in the call today. We look forward to working with each of you as the capacity development process unfolds.
 - a. Contact us directly with any questions or comments you may have.
 - b. Contact information on the Center's website www.scalingup.org – click on Karen Blase or Dean Fixsen under the “People” tab
 - c. We are very interested in hearing from you.

Appendix C

The notes Jennifer Doolittle took on the States' questions and our answers during the call on 1-23-08 (fairly typical of the other calls as well):

1. Q: When will the next round of states be chosen?
A: Maybe yr 4.
2. Q: How will the State visits look?
A: A combination of Project Directors will visit and will work with the beginnings of the State management group. Get a feel for how quickly can get things up and running. Look, in more detail, at how doing on the selection criteria.
3. Q: What are the due dates on Request for Participation?
A: Will have more info on Web site very soon. Due sometime in February.
4. Q: Will SISEP be working directly with the RTI Center?
A: Yes, if the State is scaling up RTI.
5. Q: What is the State Transformation Team's (STT) role?
A: The STT will be the last piece that comes into play. We first have to build the capacity to have the Regional Implementation Teams (RIT). Will have to make sure they have the independent ability to do the work. Eventually, the STT will be the creator of new RITs and the go between for the RIT and the State Management Group.
6. Q: Will the State need to implement in every district?
A: No. Eventually would like to be and that is what we will work toward. Need to start small and learn lessons and skills quickly then start the expansion. Each State will be different and so the scale up effort will take on different character.
7. Q: Are there plans to include IHE's (teacher and admin training programs)?
A: The State Management Group would build those types of partnerships. SISEP will help direct attention to the work that needs to be done.
8. Q: Money is not necessarily available. Could the money come from federal sources?
A: The goal is to have the newly developed capacity be business as usual in the State, therefore it is better if funded by State funds. Could start off using federal funds, but work toward having it in the State budget.

Appendix D

State Selection Phone Call #2

February 4 @ 4:00 PM EST; February 6 @ 1:00 PM EST

Call #2

1. Thanks for your interest in scaling up evidence-based education practices and for making the time to be on this call
 - a. This is the second call to help inform your decision about pursuing scale up in your state
 - b. The purpose of the first call in January was to introduce you to our version of capacity development
 - c. The purpose of this call is to give you more information about how the first two years might look in terms of activities in your state
 - i. Call #2 = February 4 at 4:00 PM EST with a repeat call February 6 at 1:00 PM EST (choose one).
 - d. For those of you still interested in scale up after this call, you may go to the State Implementation and Scaling up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) website to download an RFP (Request for Participation).
 - i. www.scalingup.org under the “Just for States” tab
 - ii. 10-page response due no later than March 5.
 - iii. We will review the responses and select up to 12 states as “finalists”
 - e. For the finalists, we will have on-site visits to meet the key decision makers in your state.
 - i. We believe in assessment FOR readiness, not assessment OF readiness. Thus, the site visits will be the first steps in the capacity development planning process
 - f. Out of this process, the 6 states that best meet our selection criteria will be selected in April and the intensive work will begin this summer.
 - g. Final selection decisions will be made jointly by SISEP and OSEP

2. In this call I will provide a brief overview of the activities and changes involved in scaling up effective education practices
 - a. Discuss the changes in state operations
 - b. Discuss the role of the new OSEP SISEP Center
 - c. We will have time for some questions at the end so jot them down along the way

3. OSEP has been very supportive during the developmental stages of the SISEP Center
 - a. Especially appreciate the guidance from Patty Guard and Lou Danielson and our Project Officers, Debra Price-Ellingstad and Jennifer Doolittle
 - b. They have gone out of their way to be helpful at every step along the way and are terrific partners with us in this adventure

4. As a reminder, Karen Blase and I are Co-Principal Investigators on the OSEP contract
 - a. Karen and I are Co-Directors of the National Implementation Research Network and are dedicated to advancing the science and practice of implementation. In this capacity we have had the opportunity to work with a variety of state systems in education, substance abuse treatment, mental health, child welfare, and aging, among others. It is interesting to us to see how similar the implementation, organization change, and system transformation issues are across these diverse human service systems.
 - b. Rob Horner (U Oregon) and George Sugai (U Connecticut) are Co-Directors of the SISEP Center. They are Co-Directors of the PBIS Center that supports the national implementation of the School-Wide Positive Behavior Support program across the nation.
 - c. We and our colleagues will be heavily involved with each state from the outset. We will be highly accountable for success in each of the 6 states.

5. Now, on to capacity development and how we can approach scale up in your state
 - a. As state leaders, you are in a difficult position
 - i. On the one hand you see the need for change and are very aware of the multiple pressures to “improve education”
 - ii. On the other hand you know that nearly all of your resources are tied up in “education as usual” with little room for innovation
 - b. The big question is, “how can we make the best use of limited resources to bring about lasting improvements in education.”
 - iii. Using evidence-based practices in education is not the problem – you are doing this already or you would not be on this call
 - iv. The problem resides with lack of implementation capacity – the ability to implement a whole range of evidence-based practices over many years to improve all aspects of education
 - v. Thus, the focus of the State Implementation and Scaling up of Evidence-based Practices Center is on helping states establish and expand their implementation capacity
 - c. Is scale up a “certain science” like building an airplane or a nuclear reactor?

NO. Scale up is more emergent and the pathway is not well defined.

 - vi. There is a thin science base but a more mature experience base for implementation, organization change, and system transformation, the key components of scaling up
 - vii. After 50 years (since the Great Society programs in the 1960s), the science and practice of scale up are sufficiently developed to make the outcomes more predictable (but still not certain)

6. Scale up activities
 - a. Scaling up implementation capacity will require change. Science and practice are pretty clear on this: New practices do not fare well in “systems as usual” because current systems support current practices. New practices usually

require new skills, abilities, and supports that are not part of current system functioning.

- i. In his review of education systems, Fritz Oser calls this the “tyranny of the status quo”
 - ii. Patrick McCarthy at the Annie E. Casey Foundation says, “Systems trump programs”
 - iii. Howard Adelman and Linda Taylor caution that sustainability requires innovations and their supports to be integrated into the fabric of education systems
 - iv. Need the “second order changes” described by Lauren Rhim and colleagues in their review of the school turnaround literature (changes in roles, functions, and structures)
 - v. Change is a part of the scale up process and needs to be embraced and welcomed, even when the going gets rough.
- b. In the previous phone call we described the three big issues
- i. How to implement new education practices so they actually produce the intended benefits to students
 - ii. How to scale up effective practices so they are available to all students who could benefit from them
 - iii. How to align system structures and functions to fully support scale up efforts as a part of “education as usual” (sustainable)
- c. We also outlined the key components of a scaled up education system:
- i. A State Management Group to work on changes at the policy level and to enable implementation of effective education practices (policy-enabled-practice)
 - ii. A number of Regional Implementation Teams to work on implementing new education practices so they actually produce intended benefits to students
 1. The RITs will do the real work of implementation with teachers, staff, and administrators in schools and districts
 2. Results of this experience will be fed back to the State Management Group (practice-informed-policy)
 - iii. A State Transformation Team
 3. One important job of the STT is to create more RITs to work with more schools until saturation is reached in the state (median = 7 teams per state)
 4. Another important job of the STT is to help assure a steady flow of information between the State Management Group and the RITs (practice-informed-policy) to keep the focus on functional outcomes for students and the education system
 - iv. The SISEP Center will work with members of all three groups to guide the capacity development process, teach the complex sets of skills involved in implementation and scale up, and be accountable for the success of the overall effort

- d. Once the infrastructure is in place, it will become more effective and efficient over time and will incorporate a broad range of initiatives in its mandate
 - i. There is no need to have a new implementation effort for each new innovation that comes along – the capacity to implement new evidence-based practices and scale them up effectively and efficiently will be in place – a huge advantage for each participating state
 - e. It is designed to be self-sustaining, self-correcting, and adaptable to the inevitable changes in state education systems
 - i. “An everlasting vision of the everchanging view.” Carole King (1971). *Tapestry*. Screen Gems – Columbia Music, Inc., New York.
7. The first year
- a. SISEP will meet with the State Management Group monthly
 - i. Plan the first steps
 - ii. Identify the best leverage points for that state
 - iii. Establish the first RIT as soon as practicable
 - b. SISEP and the State Management Group will continue meeting monthly
 - i. Begin the implementation process in 5 – 10 schools
 - 5. Important: This creates the opportunity for us to teach the members of the RIT the key skills and abilities associated with implementation of evidence-based practices and organizational change at the school and district levels.
 - ii. Incorporate the RIT/ school groups in the monthly State Management Group meetings
 - 6. Important: This is the start of the practice-informed-policy communication links
 - 7. Important: This is the start of aligning state policies and regulations more precisely with achieving functional outcomes for students
 - 8. SISEP will be there to help guide the process and to help assure the most constructive uses of the information flow
 - iii. Expand the implementation process to a new set of 5 – 10 schools
 - 9. More opportunities for teaching/ learning for the RIT members and the State Management Group
 - 10. Remember: The focus is on capacity development, not numbers of students or schools impacted
 - c. In year 2, the State Transformation Team will be formed with experienced and skilled members of the RIT and State Management Group as the core.
 - i. The STT has a complex job to do and the members need to gain functional experience at the ground level before the STT can be formed.
8. The State selection process is designed to give you a lot of information so you can decide if you want to pursue capacity development in your state.

9. After this call, if you are still interested, go to the website www.scalingup.org to download the Request for Participation.
 - a. The RFP asks a few questions about your state and asks you to respond to the five (5) selection criteria we outlined during the previous call (also on the website and in the RFP).
 - b. We ask that the 10-page response to the RFP be submitted to us no later than March 5
 - c. We will schedule on-site visits with up to 12 “finalists” in March and early April
10. By the end of April we hope that SISEP and OSEP will have the field narrowed down to the 6 states that will participate in the first round of capacity development
11. For the 6 selected states and for any other interested state, we will develop a community of practice to share developments, successes, failures, and lessons learned
12. Questions?
13. Thanks for taking the time to participate in the call today. We look forward to working with each of you as the capacity development process unfolds.
 - a. Contact us directly with any questions or comments you may have.
 - b. Contact information on the Center’s website www.scalingup.org – click on Karen Blase or Dean Fixsen under the “People” tab
 - c. We are very interested in hearing from you.

Appendix E

State Implementation and Scaling up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP Center)

Request for Participation

State leaders have responsibility for improving academic achievement for all students in reading, math, and science while increasing graduation rates (among other state education goals and Adequate Yearly Progress indicators). Scientists have produced programs and practices that can help achieve these and other goals that society, educators, and parents have for students, communities, and education systems (e.g. What Works Clearinghouse [<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>]; education research journals/ American Education Research Association [<http://www.aera.net/>]).

Most states already have attempted to implement a variety of scientifically-based practices. Some attempts have achieved their purposes but most attempts do not reach fidelity, do not provide the intended benefits to students, and are not sustained (e.g. Rhim, Kowal, Hassel, & Hassel, 2007; Aladjem & Borman, 2006).

The purpose of the State Implementation and Scaling up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) Center is to help States address the major issues that have emerged from the experiences of those who have attempted to revise/ reform current practices:

1. How to implement new education practices so they actually produce the intended benefits to students.
2. How to scale up effective practices so they are available to all students who could benefit from them.
3. How to align system structures and functions to fully support scale up efforts as a part of “education as usual” (sustainable).

To implement and scale up effective practices and align system components, State leaders and SISEP will focus on three areas simultaneously as capacity is developed in a state:

1. A State Management Group will be formed to work on changes at the policy level and to enable implementation of effective education practices (policy-enabled-practice)
2. A number of Regional Implementation Teams will be formed to work on implementing new education practices to reliably produce intended benefits to students
 - h. The RITs will do the real work of implementation in productive partnerships with teachers, staff, and administrators in schools and districts

- i. Results of this experience will be fed back to the State Management Group (practice-informed-policy) so that.....
3. After the first RIT has acquired the knowledge, skills, and abilities to be successful, a State Transformation Team will be formed. The job of the STT is to create and support more RITs to work with more schools until saturation is reached in the state (median = 7 RIT teams per state)
4. The SISEP Center will work with members of all three groups to guide the capacity development process. SISEP Center staff will help select team members, provide training and intensive on-site coaching for team members, and conduct regular assessments of team members' performance as they acquire and use the complex sets of skills involved in implementation and scale up

After 5 years, the creation of this infrastructure will allow states to have the capacity to fully implement effective education practices for all students who need them in a state. Once the infrastructure is in place, it will become more effective and efficient over time and will incorporate a broad range of initiatives in its mandate. The infrastructure is designed to be self-sustaining, self-correcting, and adaptable to the inevitable changes in state education systems.

The telephone calls in January and February were intended to provide information to States leaders about the scaling up process and how the process might play out in a state. The purpose of the telephone calls was to inform the decision of State leaders to participate (or not) in the SISEP Center scaling up activities over the next 5 years.

The next step in the State Selection Process is to have interested states:

- ***Complete the Information Page and***
- ***Respond to the five (5) criteria listed below.***

The State leaders' response to the four questions is limited to 10 pages (MS Word document, 8 ½ X 11 inches, 12 point font, 1.5 line spacing, one-inch margins).

The SISEP staff will review the written responses and telephone the contact person for clarification/ further information as needed. The finalists will be notified and site visits will be scheduled to meet with state leaders. After the site visits have been completed, the six states will be selected by SISEP and OSEP.

Send the information as an email attachment, to:
 Dean Fixsen and Karen Blase at
dfixsen@fmhi.usf.edu

Questions concerning this process or any other issue related to the SISEP Center may be directed to Dean Fixsen and Karen Blase at the same email address.

**State Implementation and Scaling up of Evidence-based Practices
(SISEP Center)**

Request for Participation (RFP)

State Information Page

1. Contact person (name, position title, mailing address, telephone numbers, email address):
2. Number of School Districts in the State:
3. Number of public schools in the State:
4. Number of private/ charter schools in the State:
5. Key evidence-based practices currently being implemented in the state
6. Contact person (name, telephone numbers, email address) for each evidence-based practice effort named above:
7. The State leaders' intended outcomes for each evidence-based practice named above:

Request for Participation (RFP)

State Selection Criteria

Please respond to each of these criteria (10 page maximum for all 6 responses combined)

1. The State has documented implementation of an evidence-based curriculum/instruction initiative or a behavior support program.

Rationale: The State needs to have the experience of implementing a specific evidence-based practice before they choose to scale up that practice. As part of their work with the SISEP Center, States will be expected to scale up one or more selected evidence-based practices in less than five years. It is very unlikely that scale up would be possible if the States have not yet entered the full implementation stage in multiple sites across the State.

Be sure to state how many schools currently are using the identified evidence-based practice. Information about how fidelity/ adherence is measured and reported also would be useful but not required.

2. The State has demonstrated committed leadership at the State level.

Rationale: Top leadership support is critical to making necessary system changes and accessing funding to achieve scale up. The formation of a State Management Group that includes general education and special education leaders is an essential ingredient of the scale up endeavor. The initiatives or programs chosen by the State are expected to assist general and special education students and policy alignment efforts will impact the education system.

3. The State is willing to dedicate roughly \$2 million a year to scaling up evidence-based practices.

Rationale: Scaling up implementation efforts will require dedicated funds to support SEA staff time and Regional Implementation Teams (RIT). The dollar amount of allocated funds may include current funding already allocated for EBP implementation and scale-up as well as new funding.

Initially, this funding allocation must include funds to hire or redirect two State-level FTEs to work exclusively with SISEP. Initial funds also must be made available to support the time, professional development, and activities of the initial RIT members. In later years, additional funding will be needed for the State Transformation Team (STT) and growth of the RIT structure. As scale up progresses, this year's successes will help to pay for next year's expansion.

\$45,000 a year will be provided by SISEP to the State to support travel and communication expenses – flexible funds to support State efforts re: capacity building.

4. The State is willing to participate in and contribute to a community of practice.

Rationale: SISEP intends to have interested State leaders, STT members, RIT members, and local implementers participate in a community of practice to share information. The focus will be on the lessons learned about implementing evidence-based practices and scaling up in the six selected States. This will require the participation of members of the State Management Group and RIT in bi-monthly telephone conferences, email exchanges, and web postings.

5. The State has a relevant data collection system in place.

Rationale: The State will need a data collection system to collect and use data on the implementation, progress, and outcomes directly relevant to the chosen evidence-based practice. A key feature of implementation, sustainability, and scaling up is an active, effective, and dynamic evaluation structure for gathering and using data. This takes time to build and it is important that States already have a system in place or in process.

If not already covered, briefly describe the facilitating factors that position the state to take advantage of this effort as well as the most significant challenges at this point in time.

Appendix F

Email Notice to Top-Rated States/ Initiating the On-Site Visit

Dear _____

CONGRATULATIONS to you and your colleagues in _____. After careful review of the RFPs that were submitted, the State Implementation and Scaling up of Evidence-based Practices Center has selected _____ as one of eight finalists. This is high praise for what you already have accomplished in your state!

As we move to identify the six States with which we will work, the next step in the process is a site visit by two or more SISEP staff members. We need to schedule this visit to your State sometime between March 31 and May 9. I would like to set up a time for a telephone call to talk with you about this on Monday or Tuesday, March 24 or 25. Let me know what time would be convenient to you.

The following is a possible sequence of events and a possible list of participants. It is offered as a guide for our discussion next week.

Our hope for the site visit is to begin with a 3.5-hour group meeting with the top education officials in the State (Chief State School Officer, Special Education Chief Officer, Title I Director, NCLB Director, and their associated Finance Officers, Curriculum and Instruction Directors, Technical Assistance Directors). In the first hour we will provide a presentation of the State Implementation and Scaling up of Evidence-based Practice goals, change methods, and intended outcomes. We also will review the Year 1 and Year 2 activities with an emphasis on the role of the State Management Group in the scale-up process. In the second hour we will discuss the funding (the \$2 million or so outlined in the RFP) and develop more specific plans for how the identified funds can be used as the initial investment in capacity building. More of the specific activities/functions of capacity building will be discussed during this time as well. The remaining time will be devoted to questions, discussion, and initial planning of potential start up activities.

Next, we would like to have a 2.0-hour group meeting with Directors/ top officials of major stakeholder groups such as the State Superintendents' Association, State Teachers' Association, State Principals' Association, State Parent Advocacy Associations (these people may or may not have a relationship with the State or with each other). We view these groups as key stakeholders in the scale up process and they need to be informed and feel involved right from the start. At this meeting we will present the SISEP goals, change methods, and intended outcomes. We will briefly review the Year 1 and Year 2 activities with an emphasis on the role of the activities and people at the practice level in the scale up process. The remaining time will be for questions and discussion to invite their support and targeted participation in this complex and important effort for the children in their state.

We will conclude with a meeting with you and any others you would like to invite for a quick de-briefing prior to our departure.

We know this is short notice but we need to conclude this process so we can get to the real work of scaling up implementation capacity to benefit children in your State and others.

Thanks again for doing such excellent work over the past several years and for submitting an RFP so that we might join in your future efforts.

Dean Fixsen, Ph.D., Karen Blase, Ph.D., Rob Horner, Ph.D., and George Sugai, Ph.D.
Co-Directors, State Implementation and Scaling up of Evidence-based Practices Center

Appendix G

Notice to Applicants

Thank you again for submitting an application to participate in the scaling up process. As we have reviewed the applications we have determined three ways in which SISEP can engage with States interested in scaling up implementation capacity to make full use of evidence-based practices statewide. The three categories of engagement are:

1. Emerging

States that are interested in scaling up and will be given broad access to information from SISEP

- * SISEP website
- * SISEP State Community of Practice (quarterly)
- * Annual national forum
- * Organizational self-assessment tool (blueprint)

2. Formative

States that are interested and will be actively working on "building the foundations" for scaling up implementation capacity

- * SISEP website
- * SISEP State Community of Practice (quarterly)
- * Annual national forum
- * Organizational self-assessment tool (blueprint)
- * Quarterly State Management Group meetings with SISEP
- * Action Planning at State Management Group and Major Stakeholder level around SISEP foundations annually

3. Active Scaling

States that are fully engaged in capacity building for scale up

- * SISEP website
- * SISEP State Community of Practice (quarterly)
- * Annual national forum
- * Monthly State Management Group Meetings with SISEP
- * Professional development for capacity building (e.g. Regional Implementation Team members)
- * Capacity Development in core functions (e.g. System Improvement Cycles, Evaluation)
- * Annual SISEP presentation and training at larger state events (Legislature, State

Meetings)

I can assure you the decisions were made very difficult by the quality of applications that were submitted and the limited resources we have to help up to six States develop their capacity to implement evidence-based practices to benefit students. We want to thank you for participating in this initial round of applications and thank you for the wonderful work you are doing on behalf of students and stakeholders in your State. .

Thanks again for your application and for your patience as this inaugural process played out. It was a pleasure working with you.

Dean Fixsen, Ph.D., Karen Blase, Ph.D., Rob Horner, Ph.D., and George Sugai, Ph.D.
Co-Directors, State Implementation and Scaling up of Evidence-based Practices Center