Disseminating Innovative Strategies:
Finalizing and Packaging Your Curriculum

MS. STEPHANIE GUINOSSO: Today's webinar is a team event. We have pulled together several people, both from FYSB and ETR, who can speak to different aspects of the packaging and dissemination process. So we have with us today Itege Bailey who will be contributing with respect to FYSB's requirements for PREIS grantees for program packaging and dissemination. And I believe we also have Marc Clark on the line who can contribute with questions as well.

Karen Coyle is here. She is a Senior Researcher at ETR Associates. And she's developed and evaluated a number of different evidence based programs. So she will share her experience for disseminating research findings and translating research into an implementation-ready program.

And I'm Stephanie Guinosso. I'm also here with you today. I'm a Program Manager at ETR. I am part of the training and technical assistance team for many of the FYSB adolescent pregnancy prevention grantees. And I'll be talking about different dissemination models that you can consider when thinking about disseminating innovative programs.

So I'd like to start by first just acknowledging that this webinar was designed specifically for PREIS grantees, who are tasked with evaluating innovative adolescent pregnancy prevention strategies. However, we recognize that the information provided is valuable to others. So, to non-PREIS grantees. And therefore, we've extended the invitation so that anyone could attend. So if you're not a PREIS grantee, please just keep in mind that some of this information, and particularly FYSB's guidance around packaging and dissemination, really applies specifically to those grantees.

So that being said, let's review our learning objectives for today. So by the end of the webinar, we hope that participants will be able to describe broad steps for disseminating an innovative program, explain FYSB's guidance for finalizing, packaging and disseminating both the findings and program materials emerging from PREIS projects, discuss the prerequisites of scaling and the pros and cons of different scaling models, and share lessons and tools from the fields to consider when developing a dissemination plan.

So that being said, there's a lot we want to cover today. I'm going to jump right in. There will be periods where you will be able to ask questions, both in the middle and at the end.

So we'd like to start by conducting a series of polls, both so that we can get to know a little bit more about the work that you're doing and so that you and your colleagues can learn a little bit more about each other. So I will go ahead and launch the first poll here.

So, the first poll: What kind of programs are you implementing and evaluating? Is it a significant adaptation of an existing evidence-based program? Or is it an innovative or newly developed program? Or is it something else altogether?

All right. So we see many of the results are coming in. I'll give you just a few more seconds to select your answer. That looks like it's about most of you. I'll go ahead and close the poll. So you guys can see the poll results. It looks like most of you are making a significant adaptation to a current evidence-based program. A few of you are working with an innovative or newly developed program. And then there are some of you who fall into that other category. And I'm assuming most of those others would probably be the non-PREIS grantees who are probably working with an existing evidence-based program on the HHS list.

So I asked this question because when it comes to disseminating programs, the program that you're using, whether it's been developed by somebody else and available for adaptation, may have implications with respect to copyright concerns or intellectual property when you go to disseminate the program.

So let's move on to the second poll. So the second poll asks, Where are you in the evaluation process? So you haven't started collecting data. You're early in the data collection process. You're reviewing preliminary data, nearing the end of data collection, or all results are in--for those of you lucky enough to be that far along.

So almost there. Go ahead and give yourselves a few more seconds to select the answer here. So let me close that one, and I'll go ahead and share those results. It looks like most of you are still very early in the data collection process. A few of you are beginning to review your preliminary data. And about 17 percent of you are nearing the end of data collection. And two percent of you have all the results in. All right. So you're almost to that dissemination stage. Great.

Let’s do two more polls here. So this next poll asks, What kinds of evaluation outcomes are you looking at? Is it knowledge and behavioral intentions, self-reported behaviors, community data such as birthrates and STIs? Or all of the above? So again, most of the results are coming in. I’ll give you a few more seconds to enter it in. Okay, I’ll close that one. It looks like it’s kind of split into thirds here almost. About a third of you or a little more than that are looking at all of these outcomes. A third of you are looking just at the knowledge and behavioral intentions. And almost a third looking at some kind of self-reported behavior. And this will have implications when it comes to meeting certain levels of effectiveness for disseminating your program.

Let’s do one last poll here. So for those of you who’ve kind of reached that preliminary evaluation stage, what do your evaluation results suggest? Is it too early to tell? Does preliminary data suggest signs of effectiveness? Or does the preliminary data suggest no signs of effectiveness? Give yourself a few more seconds here just to enter in your polling answer. Okay, I’m going to close that one up.

So it looks like for most of you it is still too early to tell. So we don’t know if we’re showing signs of effectiveness just yet or not. But a good portion of you, almost half, with preliminary data suggesting that there are signs of effectiveness. So that's great news to see. And then a small percentage saying so far no signs of effectiveness just yet. So that's just to give yourself a sense of where you are in the process.

Before we move on, I just want to acknowledge many of us are in different places in the process. And even though you may not be at the dissemination stage just yet, it is very helpful to be thinking about these larger dissemination questions as you're collecting data and prior to the end of your evaluation, so that it can help you think about the best way you may want to go about disseminating your data.

Great. So, thank you for your participation there. So let’s move forward. So I’d like to start with just some definitions. And the first definition I’d like to talk about is just the term dissemination. So the dictionary defines dissemination as the act of spreading something, especially information, widely. And as we use this term today, I’d like you to think about it as getting the information out there about your research or getting the information out there about your program.

Another term that is commonly used is “scaling” or “bringing something to scale” is a phrase that we often hear. So this slide shows the definition of scaling from the World Health Organization as doing something in a big way to improve population health. And here, scaling refers to increasing the magnitude of your efforts or doing something on a larger scale.

So thinking about this today, scaling really involves the logistics and the infrastructure that’s needed to expand your programmatic reach. You’ll often hear dissemination and scaling used interchangeably. And even on this webinar, some of the ideas that are reflected are based on some nuanced definitions of particular authors in the field. And I don't want to get too caught up in the semantics. Just know that these ideas are interrelated, but the general ideas that dissemination refers to getting information out there about your evaluation research and your program. Whereas scaling really refers to what needs to be done to expand your programmatic reach.

So this slide shows some recent articles, for those of you who are interested in this kind of thing, that describe the different dissemination frameworks that are out there. And I've pulled concepts from each of these articles for the framework I'll show in the following slide. But for those of you who are interested, full citations are at the end of the slide set. I just wanted to make that information available.

So let's talk through a dissemination framework that's been adapted from Kreuter, Casey, & Bernhardt that describes steps for taking an innovative program from research to widespread use.

So starting at the far left of this framework, many interventions are often tested. So here we see all of the different interventions that are tested. But only a few will show evidence of effectiveness after expert review. So among those that do, even fewer will reach a level of demand for new users. So people in the field seeing these interventions and wanting to put them to use.

So even if a program is proven effective and there's demand--or if it's proven effective and there's demand, we ideally hope that the program goes through some process of design and marketing. And so this can make the product more user-friendly for a broader audience. It can also help to increase demand if you're designing something that makes the curriculum more user-friendly. It can increase whether or not people kind of see it and want to use it.

So we won't spend too much time on this particular topic today. But I do want to point out the importance of just knowing your target audience prior to packaging your materials.

So the final stage of this framework has to do with selecting a scaling approach. And so we will talk a lot more in-depth about scaling approaches during the second half of this webinar. And depending upon the approach that's selected, the final stage involves publishing, distributing, training and technical assistance, as well as any potential product support.

There are also two feedback loops in this process. First, we hope that demand will inform new research. And second, we hope that monitoring of those implementing the program can actually improve the programs themselves.

So this is the overall guidance framework for us to use today. That being said, there are a few assumptions I think that pop out at us when we look at this model.

First, few evidence-based programs really make it out of the research setting. So those of you who are evaluating innovative programs, we hope that your programs meet certain levels of effectiveness. But we all know that the reality is that this isn't always true.

The second assumption is that even fewer programs are widely used. And with that, that they're even used effectively. So if your program is effective and you go through the dissemination process, you'll need to consider what the demand is for your program and how you might increase the demand among users.

The third assumption is that there's generally a lack of infrastructure, and this is echoed throughout all of the research and any developer you talk to, about carrying out this marketing and dissemination. And so the fact that this infrastructure is lacking really explains why so few evidence-based programs make it out of the research setting.

So ETR was selected to deliver this webinar because our organizational model fulfills this marketing and dissemination gap. And I think we're unique in the sense that we have staff who literally operate at every single stage in this process.

But that being said, although Karin and I can speak to ETR's process today, there are others out there who have filled this gap in other ways. And so in preparation for this webinar, I actually spoke with many different developers who are currently on the HHS list just to ask them about the models that they chose and the process that they went through. So I'll try to weave as much of that information into this webinar today as possible.

So with that introduction and with this framework in mind, I'd like to turn it over to Itege Bailey who will review some of FYSB's expectations for the dissemination of PREIS research and programs. This information is also included in the OAH guidance document that was emailed with your webinar materials. So Itege, I'm going to turn it over to you.

MS. ITEGE BAILEY: Thank you, Stephanie. Outlined in the PREIS funding opportunity announcement, there are some broad goals related to packing and dissemination. By the end of the five-year cycle, PREIS grantees should have developed and packaged an implementation-ready program that can be replicated. Grantees are expected to document their programs with sufficient details.

Grantees should also be disseminating evaluation results. As PREIS grantees know, dissemination is one of the areas included in performance-measure reporting. So in addition to presentations and peer-review journal articles, grantees are also encouraged to explore additional methods of disseminating program information and findings. That could include things such as briefings or meetings with key stakeholders within the community.

Next slide, please. So this slide provides a list of the various components that make a program implementation-ready. The first one, evidence of effectiveness, you know, a number of grantees won't know the full impact of their program until the evaluations are completed. But some grantees have already seen favorable results in their preliminary evaluation findings.

So we encourage grantees to include some of these preliminary findings in their dissemination activities. So whether or not it's presentations at conferences or at meetings with key stakeholders or at briefings.

So core components. A list of core components is needed. And grantees in the past have already submitted a list of core components to their programs to their project officers. After this webinar, if there are any changes that grantees would like to make, then please update that list and submit that to your federal project officer.

But also to make the curriculum-implementation ready is a logic model, and a logic model for the program should link the program elements and the intended outcomes. Also to be included should be a description of the theory that the program is based upon.

PREIS grantees will be submitting information on how their program was implemented, guidance was distributed to grantees that is a template for an implementation report that grantees will be developing that will be due in the next coming months.

A facilitator's guide, the actual curriculum and training materials should also be available. Training materials include any materials necessary to deliver a training of educators or a training of trainers. Please note that we're not saying that these materials need to be included in the packaged curriculum, but they do need to be developed and available.

Grantees also need to have a guidance on the allowable adaptations, tools for monitoring fidelity, which PREIS grantees already have, and also evaluation instruments.

Although on today’s webinar, we won’t be able to talk through all of these components in depth, we will be giving some attention later on to evidence of effectiveness, core components, and underlying theory, and we will briefly discuss the guidance on allowable adaptations.

Next slide please. So I am not going to present this slide because Stephanie just did a fabulous job of doing it. So I’m not going to do it again. But just going back to this framework that Stephanie presented earlier, FYSB does expect that PREIS grantees will disseminate research findings and develop an implementation-ready product. Grantees in the past have submitted dissemination plans. We are recommending that grantees revisit those plans and consider including the later steps of the scaling-up process in any revised plan. PREIS grantees will have the opportunity to submit revised dissemination plans with their continuation application.

MS. STEPHANIE GUINOSSO: Thank you, Itege. I’d like to pause here just for a second. So using your raising-hand tool that's on your webinar tools, raise your hand if your dissemination plan that you have right now currently addresses something beyond dissemination of just research findings. So of your actual program materials.

I see a couple of hands raised there. And from what I reviewed, it sounds like many of you have thought about how you'll disseminate your research findings. But thinking about how you can go beyond and disseminate the program itself, it might be adding onto what your current thinking is. So we’ll talk a little bit more about that today.

All right. So for this next portion of the webinar, I'm going to turn it over to Dr. Karin Coyle. And she'll be talking about some of her experience translating research into a final packaged program, with particular attention to documenting evidence of impact and identifying core components.

DR. KARIN COYLE: Great. Thank you. Good afternoon. I'm delighted to be part of today's webinar. As Stephanie noted earlier, I've worked on several school-based programs that have been packaged for dissemination through ETR's publications unit.

Prior to embarking on packaging and disseminating your program, there are several prerequisites which should be in place. Stephanie has alluded to these as has Itege.

First, there's the evidence of impact. We need good evidence of strong results because the resources simply don't exist to spend on interventions where we don't have evidence of impact. If you don't have evidence, the program may not be ready for scaling. You may have to do some revision and retesting before it's ready to be packaged and replicated widely.

That being said, and in concert with the emphasis on dissemination, it's super important to share your research findings regardless of impact of effectiveness because we learn as a field from programs that don't work or what's not working and what's working.

Along with evidence, there also needs to be both a need for your program as well as the demand, as Stephanie talked about earlier. We know there's still a need for adolescent pregnancy prevention programs. And often the available funding dictates demand or a particular need for a population or a community that's not being served.

Second, it's important to identify your program's core components to facilitate dissemination and scaling. As Stephanie noted earlier, you'll need the capacity to actually execute a scaling plan, including a fundamental level of financial stability, an infrastructure for doing so, and the capacity to disseminate and support broad-scale use.

Finally, you'll also need a little determination and passion to keep you going as you're navigating all the challenges from moving your program from a smaller to a much larger delivery.

So the data that you're collecting now can help with preparing your program for broader dissemination. In terms of documenting research carefully, you're already looking at behavioral impact and/or psychosocial impact. Some of you are looking at longer-term outcomes such as pregnancy and STI rates.

If your goal is to get your program on an evidence-based list, it's important to review the criteria now and determine whether you have the data and the research designed for disseminating via those lists. The existing lists, such as OAH's or Blueprint's typically require behavioral impact and they judge programs based on the strength of the evidence. If you don't have behavioral impact data, or if you don't have the data or you have no impact, then you're in a place where you'll need to revisit your program's component and possibly conduct more research before scaling it.

An important aspect of the dissemination process is supporting other users in navigating challenges they may face in adopting and implementing your program. And this is clearly an area where we get lots and lots of questions. So it’s critical to collect data now from current users, either your facilitators or at various sites, and start compiling the challenges, which you can use later for training and technical assistance and FAQ-type documents.

Observations are one very efficient and effective way for gathering information on challenges and understanding the adaptations or the need for them and gaining insights into your program impact. Other options for collecting data on challenges include your implementation logs or interviews. Basically what you want to do is experience your program in progress so that you can understand how to support other users down the road.

Considering and monitoring adaptations--this is probably the area where we get most questions about our program. What can and can’t be changed. So it’s critical to spend the time now while you have your full teams, you have your facilitators on board to really talk about what can happen, what can be changed, what can’t be changed, in terms of the content, the implementation logistics, and the pedagogy, or the teaching method you're using. ETR developed adaptation guidelines for our program using a green-, yellow-, red-light paradigm to code the adaptations. And that's something to think about as well, just to help users discern “What can I do? What can’t I do?” in an efficient manner.

Finally, the some other data that you're collecting now or may be collecting now that can be used for dissemination are qualitative data from participants or facilitators, to have them share how the program has impacted them or how they perceive the program is impacting participants.

These may not be able to serve as a definitive source of data on program effectiveness, but they can elucidate your outcome findings. They can be used to share insights with future users. You can also use the insights from participants to help you think about adaptations and what you want to allow or disallow.

As we talked about, just know that there are many different sources of evidence-based program lists. And these are an avenue for dissemination. Some of the key lists for sexual and reproductive health include OAH, which this is a screenshot of their list, CDC Effective Interventions, What Works, from the National Campaign. Blueprints has a list of promising and model youth development programs that cut across content areas. There are several other lists as well. Users of the list rely on them to highlight programs that have some set standard of evidence, and that typically varies by list. This is an important mechanism for getting information out about prevention programs now.

So we talked a lot about earlier--a key requisite for scaling is to have transferrable core components. Many of you have already thought about this. So before we jump into this slide, we want to start by asking how you've determined your program’s core components or are planning to or could determine them if you haven’t done so yet. We want you to type out your thoughts in the question box. So, how have you done this? Or what have you used to identify your core components? Or how might you?

MS. STEPHANIE GUINOSSO: So any thoughts on how you could determine what the core components of your innovative programs are or the adaptations are? Okay, no thoughts? I have one comment that says, “Look to the original developers,” from Molly.

DR. KARIN COYLE: Okay. So this is a challenging area and specifying the core components is critical for dissemination, but it’s not always straightforward, even though folks may think this should be absolutely easily known, it’s not. And so there are many thoughts to consider as you're shaping your core components. Certainly, you could turn to--if you've done an adaptation of an evidence-based program, you would be looking at some of those. But then you have to think about your adaptations and are those going to be a core component as well?

So you can focus on unique features or essential elements of your program. These may be dictated by theory or learning an implementation science, and they may include implementation factors, content or even teaching strategies.

Another way to think about it is, look at what can’t be changed without compromising the integrity of your program. And here are some examples of how that may play out. Some programs might have core implementation components that are deemed critical to their success such as group size has to be limited to no more than eight to ten participants. Or the number of characteristics of facilitators has to be two facilitators with these specific characteristics. There may be dyadic elements with participation. It has to be a participant and a parent or guardian or best friend.

In terms of content and pedagogical components, theory may dictate what content must be included and also how it must be taught. If you think about many programs, a condom-use demonstration as being critical and core. And individual practice. Because we know from theory and learning science that you need the practice to increase the capacity and the self-efficacy around that skill.

Other ways that you might be determining your core components: You could use the research to manipulate and actually randomly assign some participants to single or combination elements, and that may shed light on what component is core. You might use mediation analyses. You might look at those studies. So do secondary analyses looking at those studies. Things like that may inform core components.

You can also draw on other research to help inform what gets labeled as core. For example, texting research may support designating a texting component of a multi-component program as core.

Bottom line, it's going to be essential when you go to scale up and disseminate your program that you have identified what’s core. And doing so also frames several other critical dissemination tools, such as the allowable adaptations. It will also frame what you’ll train to, the types of technical assistance you'll need to offer.

MS. STEPHANIE GUINOSSO: There are a few comments that came in, Karin, just while you were talking. Leslie says some of the core components are specific for their target population, which is teen moms, and the different outcomes that they're looking at. So, contraception and repeat pregnancies. Another comment being that implementation core elements are dictated by the context of delivery differences. I think that reflects a lot of what you were just saying.

DR. KARIN COYLE: Great, thanks. Okay. Another consideration for dissemination and scaling is to think about transferability. And this is important because the hope is that we can get these programs out there. Others will adopt them and be able to use them more broadly. And transferability is certainly is going to impact others ability to scale or to use your program.

So if a program is both applicable in other contexts and easily adoptable, it can be considered highly transferable. If it's not very transferable, you could consider thinking about the form such as your curriculum manual or your facilitator's guide and the usability of that, how you can make it more transferable or adoptable just in terms of how you lay out your guide, the information you provide, etcetera. But you still need to preserve the core of your innovation.

It can get tricky if you have to make significant adaptations to enhance transferability, especially at this stage of your current project, and there are clearly tradeoffs. So that's something that you will wrestle with as you move through the next year and a half and think about packaging your program.

But it is, to the extent that you can, important to consider it now and do what you can to prepare for questions and support others about adaptation questions that will come up in other contexts, and provide that support to users to increase the transferability.

And I'll use an example of one of our more complex programs. It's a five-component program. And we designed the program that way initially because we wanted to see if you had all of these different components, could we have a lasting impact? We indeed had a lasting impact. But by having all five of the components, it's a very difficult program to adopt and many users want to adopt pieces of it.

We didn't research it that way. We don't have evidence of its component level. And so it makes it just much more difficult to scale because of that. And we certainly have thought about that and sought other funds to look at the most common components. What happens if we do that? Or the most intense components. So that's a way that we're looking to enhance the transferability of that initially complex intervention.

So the level of transferability will also help inform the dissemination model you ultimately select. For extremely complex interventions, those may benefit from more tightly controlled dissemination. Because without that type of support and control, some components are likely to get dropped. And we'll be talking about that more later in the webinar.

So, I think before moving forward, we wanted to pause for questions now and have participants enter questions into the question box on any of the material that's presented thus far.

MS. STEPHANIE GUINOSSO: Yes, I know that's a lot of information. And again, the goal of this webinar is to really think about many questions that you should be considering at this stage in the process, thinking about the research that you're collecting or the evaluation data you're collecting and how that may translate to dissemination. So are there any questions, either for Karin or for Itege that you have at this stage? And go ahead and just enter those into the question box if you have them.

There’s one question. It looks like it came in earlier and it says from Shawna: I’m curious to know if plans have been discussed with developers of programs that we are using as a portion of our overall program, how do we combine their program that we are using with fidelity and the portions of the program that we are developing ourselves?

So again, I think this gets to the question of making a significant adaptation of someone else’s work or someone else had a significant portion of that work. And so in the second half, I’m going to talk a little bit more about some of the kind of copyright concerns that you'll need to discuss when taking a program like that to scale. So hold onto that question for now. Unless there’s something else that you're interested in kind of based on what we’ve talked about so far with respect to that topic.

Any other questions at this point in the webinar? Things related to FYSB guidance, how to determine core components or identifying whether your program is transferrable to new audiences.

Okay. Well, I will go ahead and move forward then. Please feel free to enter questions into the question box. We'll have time more towards the end to answer some of these questions as well. You may just be marinating on all of this information.

All right. So the next topic and the remainder of this webinar, we'll be overviewing these different approaches to scaling. And again, this is food for thought for you to begin thinking about the different options that are available, what you need to be thinking about before you select an option that works for you.

All right. So these ideas come from Dees & Anderson and they're with the Duke Center for the Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship. And they present three approaches to scaling, or ways of expanding your reach. So getting your program into the hands of new users. And these different approaches fall along a continuum.

So I think here is where our definitions of scaling and dissemination get a little bit more nuanced. So they call these scaling approaches. You can see one of their approaches is also called dissemination. So bear with me as I talk through this.

So at the far left of the continuum is what they call branching. And this is when there’s one central organization and they branch out to implement their program into other local organizations.

So this is kind of the do-it-yourself model. Your organization is currently implementing in certain sites. And so to reach more people, you go and implement in other local sites. So you're just expanding your reach that way.

The second is affiliation. This is a slightly more flexible approach where you're not necessarily doing all of the work yourself. And typically in this situation, there’s some type of agreement between two or more parties, and that makes an implementation network.

So examples of this are--I don't know if any of you are familiar with “It’s Your Game: Keep It Real” or the Carrera program. They really operate on this affiliation model.

And then at the far right side of the continuum is what they call dissemination. And this is the process of really providing the information, the instructions and a model for communities to follow and replicate. And so, I think many of us are familiar with it. This is the approach that many of the programs that are currently on the HHS evidence-based programs list follow.

So in these cases, developers have partners with various entities to handle certain aspects of dissemination. So, for example, companies like ETR or Select Media or

Sociometrics, we do a lot of the packaging, the marketing and the actual distribution. Like the logistics of getting the program into the hands of new people. There are also several agencies to partner with for things like training and technical assistance. So those are ETR, the National Campaign, Healthy Teen Network. And many other organizations offer that kind of service. And so I think this dissemination model is the one that we tend to be most familiar with, although it's not the only option that exists.

So then even along this continuum, there are different intricacies or different ways to think about these different scaling approaches. And I'm not going to talk to each of these, but I do want to highlight a couple.

So here, as I mentioned on the previous slide, the Carrera Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Program follows a dissemination model. And so I kind of put them into this box. When they form a network of implementers, those new users go through a pretty in-depth process for how they become vetted. And so they have to demonstrate that they have the values and the organizational capacity and the staffing--many criteria in order for them to be selected as an implementer.

Even when that's done, the Carrera program goes through a process of posting the job description. They'll actually be a part of hiring educators who go to implement. They hire a fidelity monitor for each site who can collect all of the data. So it's a pretty intense process of vetting new people to become a part of that network.

Then in this dissemination approach, there are some differences here. Many of us again are familiar with getting the curriculum packaged so that it’s implementation-ready, and then just making it widely available to folks.

And so there are different levels of training and technical assistance that you may draw upon. Some of this maybe partnering with an organization who does this work. You may want to be involved as a developer or someone who’s done the adaptations in how to train for this work. Or there may be no training at all. There’s very different guidelines here in terms of what works.

Another option is – and we see this with some of the interventions that are provided on CDC’s effective intervention lists--is just to post the information, open source, on the Web for people to download either for free or for a price. So we also see this form of advanced dissemination. And I think this really fits with our definition of dissemination we’ve been using which is really just to get the materials out there.

All right. So just given what you've heard so far about different scaling approaches, I’d like to pose a question to the group. And please enter your thoughts into the question box. So thinking about these different approaches, when do you think it would be best to lean more towards a more centralized-control model such as branching or affiliation? Go ahead and enter your comments in. When do you think that these models might be best for you?

So I see Mary says, “After we have results and only if we have capacity.” So again, we want to make sure that you meet the prerequisites. And then if you have the capacity for that higher level of control, this might be the best approach for you. Any other thoughts on this one? When might you lean towards branching or affiliation?

All right. Let’s hold onto that then. We’ll move to the next question. Oh, I see one comment from Trisha which says, “Branching could be an immediate sustainability strategy.”

Okay. So thinking about sustainability and how you might continue the implementation effort. So you take that responsibility on to continue what you're doing. I’m assuming that's what you mean by that, Trisha. But please correct me if I’m wrong.

So the next question that we would ask is when might you lean more towards a dissemination approach? Like we see with so many of the interventions on the HHS list? What are some ideas there? Any thoughts?

And I’ll say too there are absolutely no right or wrong answers to either of these. We’ll talk about some questions to ask yourself in terms of determining what’s best for you. And it really is evaluating all of these different questions together. So Marie says, “When you're not sure who would take financial responsibility for moving the work forward?” Okay. So maybe you don’t have the organizational capacity or that financial responsibility. And so you can maybe pass it off onto somebody else.

Trisha also says, “Where the results are strong enough to qualify for OAH lists.” So you just put the program on the list and being on that list is its own level of marketing and it helps with the dissemination.

Marie also says, “When your developer doesn’t care if they make a lot of money when others use the program.” Absolutely, Marie. That’s definitely something that we see. And Carmen says, “Once evaluation is completed for the curriculum designer.” Okay, good. And Courtney says, “When we’re better sure of an audience.”

So thinking about who your audience is and knowing that it’s in good hands if you disseminate broadly. So these are all excellent suggestions.

So in general when we think of the pros and cons of the different approaches, we see that models on the left--so the branching and affiliation--they tend to have more control over the programs and the implementation partners. And as a result, this leads to increased fidelity.

Except this level of control, as you guys mentioned, also comes with more organizational capacity and the resources that go along with that. So these approaches have less expansion. So maybe their reach isn’t quite as broad. But you will have more control over the fidelity and how the programs are actually implemented.

So then at the opposite end of the spectrum when we might lean towards dissemination, we see that those that follow this type of model tend to have increasing expansions. So they get into the hands of more people. And to do this, they need to be highly transferrable or adaptable because so many different users will have access to them. We need to make sure that it can fall into someone else’s hands and they can work with it.

And then also thinking about dissemination, on this level of the spectrum, you tend to require less organizational control and capacity and resources for those of you out there who are doing this kind of evaluation.

All right. So then the next question naturally becomes which approach do you think would be best for you? And to do this, I’d like to conduct an initial poll here. Just based on what we’ve discussed so far, which approach do you think would be best for your organization or the program that you're working with now? Go ahead and enter your results into the poll.

All right. We have about almost half of you have responded. I’ll give you a few more seconds to enter your thoughts into the poll. So let me go ahead and close the poll here, and I will share the results. So it looks like it was pretty evenly spread across the board, and many of you want some combination of the above. And I think that's great because you don’t need to fall into one specific category.

In talking with developers, there were developers who continued to branch out and implement the program in new sites, as well as working with trainers and distributors who got the program out there, as well as posting the information online for anyone to download. So there are definitely different approaches that you can take. Each one of those will have slightly different results. So right now we're thinking some combination of above.

Okay. So the next part of this webinar, this again comes from Dees & Anderson. And they say that in order to kind of really determine which approach works best for you, they suggest thinking about these five R's: Readiness, Receptivity, Resources, Risks and Returns. So we'll talk through each of these with questions. So we'll talk through what each of these mean. And again, posing questions for you to consider at this stage to think about which scaling model is right for you.

So the first is Readiness. And I think Karin already spoke to this already. Like the perquisites of scaling are that you have to have some level of evidence and readiness. So again, questions to ask yourself. Do you have evidence of impact? Are the core components transferrable to others? Can they easily pick it up and use the program? Does your organization have the investment of time, energy and resources to actually scale the program? It's a very important question to ask.

So with this in mind, if you're not ready to scale your intervention, you may have to reassess whether, number one, the program's worth scaling. If you don't have a certain standard of evidence, right? Or you may need to refine the program to some level. Or take steps to position your organization better for scaling, whether that's securing new resources or potential partners who can help step in with some of this process.

So the second R they say to think about is Receptivity. So how well will the program be received in target communities? And again, questions to ask yourselves are is the program easily understood? Does it align with local values? Is it adaptable for local control? And are users willing to invest the time and energy and resources into making it happen?

So again, as Karin touched upon earlier, I imagine that many of you are collecting a lot of really valuable data through your evaluations right now that answer some of these questions. So pay attention to how people are receiving the program in different areas. What might you do to make the program more receptive? And I'm sure you've already begun to figure some of this out.

So the third question has to do with the resources that are available. And so again, thinking about what resources you have available now, either through your current grant funding or through other funding that you may have or partnerships that you have in place, thinking about what resources might be needed. And so this includes staffing costs for different scaling and dissemination approaches, as well as the infrastructure that's needed.

And you may also need to think about what resources can you generate through a scaling model. And so this includes things like selling the product. Network memberships, so oftentimes to be a part of the membership, there's a fee involved with that process or a licensing fee. People often make money--ETR is one of these--on the training and technical assistance that comes with dissemination of new programs.

The next question to consider is, What are the risks of incorrect implementation? So when thinking about which scaling approach is right for you, the risks associated can help you make that decision. So here we think about what are the risks of incorrect implementation for your clients or for the youth that you serve?

So, for example, will this reduce the impact or may it potentially damage community relations in some way? Or will it be a waste of limited resources? Again, if it’s not implemented correctly, what are the risks that can go on?

You also want to think about if things are not implemented correctly, what might be the risk to your organization or to your brand? And again, I bring in the Carrera example here because they feel so strongly about having a brand that is associated with really effective implementation. And that's important to them because that brand of strong effectiveness and positive results is what they use to solicit resources from new funders. So it’s really important to them that whoever is implementing their curriculum is implementing it exactly as they want them to because it reflects on their organization.

So the final R to think about is Returns. And here this is not just about the number of potential people that can be served, but how well they can be served. And so the goal is to find the best balance for your organization and your philosophy about how you can reach the most people most effectively and most cost-effectively.

So thinking about these five R's and then putting all of this information together, let's turn back to those questions that we asked before we started talking about them. And in general, tighter models of control such as branching or affiliation are favored when there tends to be low receptivity despite a high need in the community.

So this allows for kind of more intensive efforts to work with communities to build their receptivity of the program. Tighter models of control are also favored when the risk of incorrect implementation, either to the clients or to the organization, are high. If the risks are high, you need more intensive efforts to make sure that the program is being implemented with fidelity.

This is also favored when the potential return from central coordination is high. And so again, I bring in that Carrera example. Where this is having that central coordination and ensuring that the program is done well serves them in the sense that it helps them to solicit more funds.

And finally, of course, you need to have the resources available for these tighter models of control.

Great. So then looking at the flip side, looser models of dissemination tend to be more favored when there's a really high receptivity and a desire for local ownership for programs. So people out there are really ready to use the program that's available.

The risks of incorrect implementation, either to the client or to the brand, is fairly low. So if you get it into the hands of as many people as possible, if for some reason they don't implement it exactly as it's said, it's not going to be that big of a deal. Clients are still going to be receiving good product. Maybe it's written so well that it's fairly easy to pick up and use. So the risks are fairly low.

The return from a more centralized model is also low. So if you're not going to get a lot of return from that tighter level of control, then you may want to lean more towards dissemination.

And them, of course, finally if you have limited resources available for that tighter control, a dissemination approach might be more favorable.

All right. So now that we've gone through that information, I'd like to go back to our poll one more time just to see if you changed your thoughts at all looking at those five R's. This is the same question that you were asked the last time. Having heard some of this information, does it change your stance on which approach might be best for you?

All right. So there does seem to be some change. I'll give you guys a few more seconds here to get your votes in. I like that I can see the votes coming in, but you guys can't see it yet. So I see where you guys are all leaning before you do. And it looks like we're slowing down a little bit. So I'll give you three more seconds to get your votes in.

So let me share this here. So last time, I think about half of you were thinking some combination of the above. And then you're fairly evenly distributed throughout the other three. This time it looks like we might be leaning a little bit more towards the dissemination, as well as some combination.

So, for those of you who put some combination, I'd love to hear your thoughts about that. So what kind of combination might you be thinking about that would work for you? You can enter those into the question box. For those of you who said some combination, any thoughts there on what type of combination you're thinking about?

So branching and affiliation. So combining those two together. That came from Donna. All right. So maybe that's branching and affiliation, branching and dissemination. So many of you are putting the branching and affiliation together. I think that's natural because they both speak to a tighter level of control.

Great. All right. So thank you. I'm hoping this is helpful for you guys in thinking about questions to consider. I'm going to go into the final stage here of this webinar. And then we'll open it up again for more questions.

The goal here is that I just wanted to share some of the insights and the gems that I received in talking to other developers in the field. As I mentioned, I talked to about fifteen different developers and just asked them why did they choose the method that they did to disseminate their programs? What were some of the pros and cons? And what would they want to share with others who are about to embark on this process?

And fortunately, what they shared really reflects what we've talked about so far. We haven't quite talked about intellectual property and ownership rights. And I'll turn to that on the next slide. So hold onto that thought for a second. But these other ideas really reflect everything that we've talked about so far.

So for some folks, branding and program quality was really important and they lean more towards tighter controlled models. Those that lean towards dissemination tended to acknowledge that the fidelity monitoring was a pretty significant gap. So that was missing in the broader dissemination models.

People took really different stances on training and technical assistance. Some folks really felt that they were not skilled trainers. That was not their job. And they really wanted to bring in someone who could do that training and technical assistance. Others wanted to be involved at every step in the process. So like putting together, designing the actual training and delivering the training.

There are also different philosophies with respect to just what should be trained to? So some felt that it is absolutely critical for every component of this program to be trained to and people need to implement it as is.

Some people felt like that's not the case and that they really needed to convey, What are the core components? What's the core essence of the program? And as long as people understood that, they were good to go.

So this is a topic I think we could do a whole new training on. So I'm going to just put those ideas out there for now in terms of thinking about the training and technical assistance that's necessary for your program.

Fidelity monitoring, we already talked about. Tighter models of control really lend themselves more towards fidelity monitoring, as well as organizational capacity. So more organizational capacity, again, lends itself towards tighter models of control.

And then many folks had very different thoughts on their levels of involvement. And as I said with training, some people wanted to be involved at every step of the way. Others recognized that their strength and their skill was really doing the research, getting that research out there. Once that was complete, they were ready to hand it off to everyone else who's going to get the program into the hands of more people. So it's something to consider. What's the level of involvement that you want when it comes to sharing your program with others?

All right. So I want to spend just a moment here because I know this is a question many of you will probably have around intellectual property and ownership rights with respect to dissemination, and particularly for those of you who are working with another developer's materials or adapting materials in some way.

So there are no clear answers here. I'll just preface it with that. And I've talked to a lot of people to gather some insights here. And basically what I walked away with is that there's no clear answers, but many things to consider.

The first of them is consider what's the ownership rights of FYSB? So what's considered publicly available information? What do you technically have ownership rights over?

You'll also want to consider the intellectual property rights of the program's original developer. So if you're evaluating a significant adaptation of an existing program. And I think the best advice to give here from everyone that I've spoken with about this is that if you're making significant adaptations to another developer's work, it's really important to initiate a discussion with that developer as soon as possible to come up with an agreement. And I think some of you mentioned in the comments that some developers just want to get the information out there. And they'll be willing for you to adapt it and share it. And some are really going to feel strongly about the ownership over their materials. And so the only way to know is to really have those conversations, bring in the necessary legal support that can provide the right amount of information about what the copyright laws even are. Those are things that you just want to address as soon as possible.

So in addition to that, there are also different rights to consider should you choose to partner with a publisher or a distributor like ETR or Select Media or Sociometrics. And in these cases, developers will likely always maintain the intellectual property rights. So it's like it's their content and their science that they have created. But the publisher or the distributor will own the right to sell and distribute the material. So different things to consider there. Some distributors may offer royalties on the distribution of the program as well. But this is going to depend upon the state of the work, the demand for your program, how profitable it is. All kinds of things. So again, important to just address these potential questions and partnerships and the agreements that may take place with them as early as possible in the process before moving towards dissemination.

Just to add to that, I think that as an organization, ETR has really participated in these types of different ownership agreements at every single one of these levels, both for our own programs that we've developed as well as the work of other people that we have distributed. And there really is no clear answer to any of them. So in each one of those cases, it really was unique and kind of dependent upon the different people involved.

All right. So I'm not going to read through this slide. But I did ask--you guys have this in your notes--I did ask these developers if there was one tip that they would give folks kind of embarking on this process, what would it be? So I'll let you read through these on your own. But just know that that is what is going on here with this slide. And I do want to allow a lot of time for questions.

So at this point, I'd like to open it up. Any questions for any folks at FYSB, Karin or myself, anything regarding this process. Go ahead and enter those into the question box. I see no questions yet. But I know sometimes it takes a moment to think about all the information that we've covered, how it applies to your program, and to type up that question in the question box. So I'll give you guys a few more moments here. So we have a question from Donna and it says, “Can you speak a bit more to the infrastructure of an organization as it relates to being ready to scale?”

So I think this kind of goes back to all of those five R’s that we talked to. And so like do you have the capacity to--let’s break it down. So it’s like to do the design and marketing of the program, to get it out to as many people, to monitor what people are doing, to set up a process for either those dissemination channels, for the training, for how you might do some continuous quality improvement.

So all of those different questions to consider will be important for you to think about. And what do you as an organization have the capacity for, both in terms of staffing and the resources and the finances and the skills? Do you have the skills for all of those things? Or might you need to partner with someone to make all of those things happen? Anything to add there?

DR. KARIN COYLE: I think you also, again, going back to the five R’s, but thinking about how you're going to package it. Is it going to be available online? Do you have the internal capacity to create a hard copy product, ship it out, train people, support, develop the adaptation guidelines, meet demands in terms of questions about what can and can’t I change? Those kinds of things. And each organization needs to assess what do we have in place? Do we have the infrastructure to handle all of that or not?

ETR, one thing that’s unique to ETR, I can speak from that experience, is we’re in the science unit. So we develop the programs. But then we have this whole other dissemination unit that allows the programs to be disseminated. If that capacity wasn't available, we would have had to partner. Because within the research department itself, we don't have all the capabilities to put the manual together in a user-friendly fashion, to train, all of those. We like to be part of the training, but we're not trainers. So those are things I think that you need to think about as an organization. Do you have it internally? Can you get it? Or is it better for you to partner?

MS. STEPHANIE GUINOSSO: Great. So, Tasha asked, "Will the audio be available?" Yes, it will. All of these webinars offered to FYSB grantees are always available on FYSB's website. Nicole says, "Piggybacking on the first question, is there information on the average cost for this process?"

So that's a great question. I don't know what that would be. I'm sure it would really vary depending upon what you chose to do. There's the Cadillac model. I think if you were to just take your materials, post them on the Web, open source, that's a pretty low-cost avenue that you can take. Whereas, the more tightly controlled process or models, the costs could add up exponentially depending on what you're trying to do.

So what I would suggest, Nicole, is to reach out to some different developers who've maybe kind of gone through this process. Or reach out to some different partners to see what they charge for certain things. And start to put some of that information together. I'm happy for you to contact me, and I can direct you to some people who I think would be good for answering those type of questions.

All right. And then we have a question, it says, "Can FYSB give an example of a program or product that would represent intellectual property of FYSB." So I'll turn that one over to Itege or Marc or someone from FYSB for that question.

MS. ITEGE BAILEY: Marc, maybe you can speak to that question.

MR. MARC CLARK: One example that comes to mind is it really wouldn't be from the teen pregnancy prevention arena since we're such a new division within FYSB. So I could try and find out greater detail on that. I think probably we're more likely to find some ownership with regard to products and actual disseminated products in our older division which would be the runaway and homeless youth. But even there, nothing occurs to me as a product that is really a FYSB product in the sense that it's marketed in some form or fashion. But I'll try and find out more detail about that and share that with the audience as I learn more.

MS. STEPHANIE GUINOSSO: Thank you, Marc. So it looks like those are the only questions we have for now. As we close up the webinar, I just want to point you in the direction of some useful tools and support on this topic. So as you know, you can always request technical assistance through your FYSB project officer. The communities of practice website will also post the slides and handouts associated with this webinar. As well a recording and I believe a full transcript will be posted on FYSB's website.

I also suggest that you visit OAH's website. I'm not sure if many of you go to this website frequently, but they have a lot of resources on there similar to what we offer for the FYSB grantees. But they've done kind of parallel work in some ways. And so they've recently done a two-day training for their tier-two grantees who are embarking on a similar process that the PREIS grantees are on. And so they have some great resources that they've recently shared on that website as well.

And I also wanted to refer you to the dissemination planning template that was sent out with your webinar materials for this webinar. And this is just a list of all the questions that we've posed on this webinar. I've kind of organized them in just a two-page document for you. So as you go through to think about your dissemination plan, those questions are spelled out for you in that document.

So as we close up the webinar, I'd like for you guys to share one important point. Hopefully, there is at least one important point from today's webinar that you want to remember or one key learning. And just to solidify some of that learning, go ahead and enter that into the question box. Any key learning from today. Not seeing anything coming yet. But I know it takes a moment to type it up and put it in there. All right. So we have the five R's wiwas a key learning. "I need to have a conversation with our curriculum developer regarding our method for packaging and dissemination."

Also, "A lot of these pieces we've already done and given to our project officer." "We keep the focus on the five R's in front of us." "The project officer is a great resource." "The importance of scaling." "Having infrastructure is very important to dissemination." All right. So great learnings from today.

Here are a list of some of the citations that were mentioned as well as other resources that you might find useful. I'll type that really small in this one slide for you.

And with that, I would like to thank you very much for your participation today. I know that there was a lot of information covered. And I really appreciate the wonderful questions that were asked and the comments that were given, as well as our other speakers, Karen and Itege and Marc for chipping in with the questions. So thank you all very, very much.

(END OF TRANSCRIPT)