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Scale Up: Scaling In and Scaling Out
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Research Questions

- How has the process for continuous improvement shaped the scaling of the innovation?
- To what extent was the innovation taken to scale?
Defining Scale

• Scaling Up = Scaling In and Scaling Out

• Coburn’s conception of scale
  – Depth
  – Spread
  – Shift in ownership
  – Sustainability
A Framework for Scale

Facilitating Conditions
• Beliefs (Depth)
• Will (Ownership)
• Capacity (Sustainability)
• Alignment (Sustainability)

Implementation Supports
• Implementation team (Sustainability)
• Implementation plan (Ownership)
• Allocation of resources (Sustainability)
• Ongoing technical support (Sustainability)
• Continuous improvement process (Ownership)

Implementation Quality
• Integrity (Depth)
• Frequency (Spread)
• Program reach (Spread)
• Participant responsiveness (Depth)
Where we are now

• Second year of full implementation (scale in just beginning)
• Scale out just beginning
What can we say about scale up now?

• How are the core principles of our improvement process setting the stage for scale in (depth, spread, sustainability, shift in ownership)?
  – Built on locally effective practices
  – Rapid-cycle testing
  – Research-practice partnership

• What is the initial evidence for scale out?
Data

• Draw from both school-based fieldwork data in 6 innovation schools, and
• Data on the process of improvement with DIDT and SIDTs
Depth

• Building on locally effective practices
  – Co-construction process with DIDT and SIDTs struggled to achieve necessary specificity while maintaining consensus and transparency
  – SIDT members demonstrated depth of understanding around practices, but teachers less so
  – SIDT engaged in difference minimizing to build ownership, yet also resulted in fewer changes to teacher practice

• Rapid-cycle testing
  – PDSA helped each school develop deeper understanding of the innovation (but it was unique to the school)
  – In both districts, schools valued a “loose” PDSA as a mechanism for structuring refinement in practices and structural supports
  – Yet schools varied in how much they actually enacted changes as a result of PDSA
  – It took substantial time for SIDTs to have capacity to use PDSA to achieve depth of change
Spread

• Building on locally effective practices
  – Discussions of including new schools raised questions of how much they are implementing what the innovation schools have done, or starting the development process over?
  – Given the variation in practices in innovation schools, what practices do scale out schools begin with?

• Rapid-cycle testing
  – As PDSA facilitated school-based adaptations and necessary specificity, there was reduced commonality between schools
  – With different specific practices in schools, there was less interest in cross-school learning
    • SIDTs became more reception to cross-school learning the deeper they went into implementation

• Partnership
  – 4 or 5 schools in each district have now begun
  – District leadership varied in recruiting scale out schools
Sustainability

• Rapid-cycle testing
  – Concerns around whether PDSA will continue as part of the process of improvement without strong facilitation by NCSU
  – Language matters!
    • “Continuous improvement” consistent with district priorities, “testing practices” raised concerns about making effective practices available to all

• Partnership
  – SIDTs demonstrated strong knowledge of local context to facilitate implementation
  – Most SIDTs were perceived to have sufficient capacity to lead implementation
  – SIDTs and principals in innovation schools committed to sustaining, but concerns around district support as external support from NCSU faded
Shift in Ownership

• Build on locally effective practices
  – Co-construction process built strong ownership by SIDT members

• Rapid-cycle testing
  – PDSA facilitated the co-construction process in schools
  – Schools resisted PDSA or engaged for compliance
  – Yet, most SIDTs were committed to gathering stakeholder feedback as a way to build buy-in among faculty
Conclusion

• Process matters
  – Co-construction and rapid-cycle testing facilitated ownership and precursors to sustainability
  – At best, PDSA helped deepen change in beliefs and behaviors in schools, even as pre-existing conditions in schools shaped the PDSA process

• But the practice matters too!
  – Co-construction around local practices struggled to achieve specificity to guide behavioral change
  – Emphasis on alignment to local practices minimized differences to existing practices
Scaling Out – Next Steps

• Continue gradual transfer of leadership of activities from NCSU to district

• Study the scaling in and scaling out
  – Sustaining implementation in original innovation schools
  – Initial implementation in scale out schools
  – District processes to achieve depth, spread, ownership, and sustainability