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abstract

• Wolf Wolfensberger, in chapter 6 of Advanced Issues in SRV, published posthumously in 2013, lamented that there had not been very much SRV implementation activity. It would seem that beyond training, various versions of person centered planning and the crafting of valued roles – one person at a time – there is no accepted SRV implementation methodology.

• The presenters, who have all worked in medium sized human service organizations will review their experiences in attempting to implement SRV in professional service organizations, and then review the current implementation and change management literature, in order to develop the outline of an SRV specific Implementation methodology.
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1- INTRODUCTION

“Who would promote an innovation
Must perdue much tribulation.
Change does not easy come to humans
Nor to the mans nor to the womans.
This is why many enterprises--
Especially those of major sizes--
Require that some clever actors
Become in them the changing factors.
Yes, to produce needed ferment,
One must recruit the change agent.”

“Cooperative Extension Service”

- Large scale change agenty - XIXth and XXth centuries
- revolutionized agriculture in the USA,
- “land grant”universities and “evidence-based” agricultural practices.
- a massive endeavour that started with a huge Federal Government initiative
- “…the US Department of Agriculture set up an army of local agricultural specialists all over the country, called “county agents,” under a scheme called the Cooperative Extension Service. As early as 1910, $15 million was already being spent on this system; in 1914, 12,000 professional agricultural innovators were set up by an act of Congress; and in 1917, 19,000 agricultural teachers were added.” (WW, 2012; p. 287).

Nebraska

- 1968:
  - few community services
  - 2300 people at Beatrice State Home
  - TV Exposé: “Out of the darkness into the light”
  - Nebraska Psychiatric Institute (NPI) : Wolfensberger, Clark and Menolascino
    - 1966: “Blueprint for action: the Nebraska Plan to Combat Mental Retardation”
  - Town Hall meetings held around the State
- 1970:
  - Eastern Nebraska Community Office of retardation (ENCOR) – regional community services agency
  - Pilot Parents Program in Omaha

Schalock, R. L. (2002). Out of the darkness and into the light
Why Nebraska?

- “The entire planning-implementation process sketched in this chapter sounds as if it had been largely rational, globally envisioned, and systematically executed. It was not! It evolved piecemeal, but with considerable consciousness. The systematization usually became apparent by hindsight rather than at each moment of action which often had a crisis atmosphere surrounding it. Nevertheless, future planners can apply with foresight what was only understood of the above in hindsight.”

  WW, Why Nebraska? p. 52

“Comprehensive soldier fitness”

- Martin Seligman – 1998 president of APA
- 2000 – Launch of positive psychology movement
- Impact has been international
- 125 million $ soldier comprehensive fitness project
  - Objective is to make US soldiers more psychologically resilient
  - Global Assessment Tool
  - Online Self Help Modules
  - Trained over 2,500 master resilience trainers

  Casey, 2001
Key components of SRV

- Devaluation
- Good Things of Life
- Valued Social Roles
- Positive role expectancies
- Personal Social Integration and Valued Social Participation (PSI-VSP)
- Imitation and Modeling
- Unconsciousness/consciousness raising
- Mind sets
- Model Coherency
- Image Enhancement
- Developmental model and competency enhancement
### Table 1: Social Role Valorization Action Implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Action</th>
<th>Primarily to Enhance Social Images</th>
<th>Primarily to Enhance Personal Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Person</td>
<td>Arranging Physical &amp; Social Conditions for a Specific Individual That are Likely to Enhance Positive Perceptions of That Individual by Others</td>
<td>Arranging Physical &amp; Social Conditions for a Specific Person That are Likely to Enhance the Competencies of That Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Social Systems</td>
<td>Arranging Physical &amp; Social Conditions in a Primary Social System That are Likely to Enhance Positive Perceptions of a Person in &amp; via This System</td>
<td>Arranging Physical &amp; Social Conditions in a Person's Social System That are Likely to Enhance That Person's Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Society of an Individual, Group, or Class of People</td>
<td>Arranging Physical &amp; Social Conditions Throughout Society That are Likely to Enhance Positive Perceptions of Classes</td>
<td>Arranging Physical &amp; Social Conditions Throughout Society That are Likely to Enhance the Competencies of Classes of People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 1. Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory
(in Berk & Roberts, 2009, p.28)
2- SMALL GROUP ACTIVITY: IMPLEMENTING SRV

3- WHAT SRV 10 TEACHES ABOUT SRV IMPLEMENTATION
FOUR DISTINCT LEVELS OF
SOCIAL ACTION

Level 1: The individual

Level 2: The primary group: family, communality, gang, any small close-knit group

Level 3: Secondary social systems: neighborhood, local community, service agency

Level 4: The society, either as a whole, or at least in broad cross section

“There are vast differences between efforts to change large social systems, or even entire societies, versus trying to improve conditions for specific individuals or relatively small groups, such as all the residents in one home, or all the clients of an agency.

We have touched on some SRV measures that would fall on the fourth level of societal organization, but cannot further elaborate this because it would be too vast an undertaking, and would require coverage of such things as strategies of public attitude change, and of lobbying important national organizations, and government for legislative and administrative changes.”

Also, few participants at introductory training events are in a position to work on fourth-level issues, and at any rate should seek out more advanced training before undertaking such a sophisticated task”

from Introductory SRV Training, Issues of Implementation of SRV
THE FOUR REQUIREMENTS OF SOCIAL ROLE VALORIZATION REGARDING THE USE OF THE DYNAMIC OF ROLE EXPECTANCY AND ROLE CIRCULARITY

1. Help people at risk of devaluation avoid becoming entrapped in negative role circularities
2. Embed persons at risk into positive role circularities
3. Help people who are entrapped in negative role feedback loops to break out of these
4. Help such people to enter positive role circularities

A STEP-WISE REGIMEN FOR APPLYING SOCIAL ROLE VALORIZING MEASURES TO A SPECIFIC PARTY

1. Becoming deeply familiar with a party and that party’s wounds and needs
2. Inventorying the party’s current roles
   - Positive roles
   - Negative roles
A STEP-WISE REGIMEN FOR APPLYING SOCIAL ROLE VALORIZING MEASURES TO A SPECIFIC PARTY

1. Becoming deeply familiar with a party and that party’s wounds and needs
2. Inventorying the party’s current roles
   - Positive roles
   - Negative roles
3. Knowing the party’s risk factors
4. Explicating the party’s current social standing and likely prospects
5. Reviewing practicalities about image and competency measures
6. Identifying the role goals
7. Reviewing miscellaneous other considerations and practices
6 DISTINCT POTENTIAL SRV GOALS

• Valorization of the positive roles already held by a person
• Averting a person’s entry into (additional) devalued roles
• Assisting a person’s entry into new valued roles or to regain previous valued roles
• Helping a person to escape devalued roles
• Reducing the negative roles already held by the person
• Exchanging devalued roles already held by the person for less devalued new roles

SOME POTENTIAL PITFALLS IN SRV IMPLEMENTATION

1. Failure to take role avidity into account
2. Pursuing social contacts without roles
3. Benefits come with certain devalued roles
4. All sorts of alternatives may have to be weighed against each other
5. Role complementarity complicates things
6. Physical and social discontinuities may be entailed
7. The easier attributive roles may drive out attention to harder competency-based ones
8. Roles must be communicated to others
9. Even some valued roles can be seen as unnecessary, ridiculous, inappropriate for some devalued people.
4- MODEL COHERENCY, “IMPLEMENTATION SCIENCE” AND CHANGE MANAGEMENT
Model Coherency Considerations

Non-programmatic considerations:

• Those elements of a service that are not derived from, or called for by, the needs of recipients, but are present to satisfy some other party (funders, regulators, law, the servers, the public, recipients’ advocates and family members, etc.).
  • WW – Model Coherency – unpublished manuscript
**Programmatic considerations**

- Those elements of a service that are actually called for by, and derived from, the needs of the recipients. ... Programmatic considerations should determine what service content is delivered, and what service processes are selected to deliver the content, to recipients. (See also “non-programmatic considerations.”)

---

Factoring in non-programmatic considerations

- $$$
  - Budget VS cost of implementation
- HR – collective agreement
- Time available
- Family (non)involvement, support/opposition
- Gov’t/funder contracts
- Laws, regulations
- Readiness (of HRs, of community, of organizations, etc)
- Community characteristics (rural, semi-urban, urban, prosperous, poor)
- Political (non)support
- Availability of supports
- Zeitgeist – cultural context and prevailing value systems
Common non-programmatic factors

1. Issues of funding, such as requirements that are attached to certain funds; whether funds are adequate; and the perceived need to control expenditures as by cutting costs.
2. Historical factors, such as how and why a service got located where it is—
3. Legal requirements and judicial rulings, such as what a law or court requires, forbids, or permits; fire, zoning, and health and safety code requirements in order to be licensed; court-imposed deadlines or instructions to accept and serve certain people.
4. Political concerns, such as pressure to please a powerful public figure or an influential friend of a public figure; the desire to appease a militant advocacy group; and concerns with an agency’s public profile.
5. Server and personnel issues, such as whether people with the desired qualifications are available and will work for the available monies; what servers like to do; the demands, requirements, and pressures of labor unions, and even the degree of control the service has over the servers.
6. Competing and perhaps overwhelming demands on, or engagements by, servers or serving entities.
7. There are also personality factors that can constrain or distort programmatic issues, such as the desire of people on the scene for recognition and even fame; a history of feuding among different involved parties; and other personal agendas that involved people may have.

WW - Model coherency – unpublished manuscript

How to respond to non-programmatic pressures

four key principles.
1. High consciousness must be preserved about the difference between programmatic and non-programmatic rationales.
2. Considerations of the design of a coherent service model must be resolutely separated from considerations of constraints, external requirements, good change agentry, etc.
3. Once the optimal program model has been defined and designed, then one may consider how much it may be necessary or defensible to retreat from the optimum in implementation, and what compromises or trade-offs can be justifiably made.
4. Where the very essence of the service would be perverted by such a retreat, and where there happen to be no other alternatives to the retreat, one can always choose not to implement, operate, or be associated with a specific service model.

WW Model coherency
“Bring on the constraints”

1. Is the service form one that oneself, as an individual, can provide?
2. Is the service form one that can only be implemented or used if a server or service body is willing and able to provide or mediate the service, and does any such exist at present that is willing to be the server, or even to mediate the service?
3. Are elements crucial to the service form available for the foreseeable future?

“Often—indeed, normatively—the truly best and needed model is not feasible, or at least not for oneself or one’s serving body” (WW – Model Coherency).
The “minimax” from Model Coherency

- a service form that has the *minimum* drawbacks with *maximum* advantages.
  - has a high-ranked culturally valued analogue, and
  - is still relevant enough to deserve being designed for implementation.
- The minimax service form may rank lower on relevance than on closeness to valued analogues, because overall and over the long run, image is more important to role-valorization than is competency.

*WW – Model Coherency*

“The best is the enemy of the good”

*(Voltaire)*

- Level 3 services (PASSING) are better than level 2 or level 1 services
- Sometimes level 4 and 5 services are not feasible in the short to medium term.
- Improvement is often incremental rather than a great leap
- The larger the system the more the inertia
Safeguarding: Murphy’s law and it’s derivatives

- What can go wrong will go wrong
  - Left to themselves, things tend to go from bad to worse.
  - It is impossible to make anything foolproof because fools are so ingenious.
- Everything goes wrong all at once.
- Matter will be damaged in direct proportion to its value.
- Smile... tomorrow will be worse.
- It almost always takes longer and costs more than planned.
- Never attribute to malice that which can be adequately explained by stupidity.

Training is not enough
Wherefore training?

- Training will not be enough (see Kirkpatrick)
  - SRV 10 is not an implementation training event
    - It was designed to train trainers of trainers
- Training will need to be ongoing
  - Training for families, managers, boards, and senior executives
  - Targeted training for specific implementation activities

Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick
“the 4 levels”

« The 4 levels (p. 21)

1. Level 1 – Reaction
2. Level 2 – Learning
3. Level 3 – Behavior
4. Level 4 – Results »
The 4 levels -a

1- Reaction

• The participant must react positively to the training
• “It is important not only to get a reaction but to get a positive reaction. As just described, the future of a program depends on positive reaction. In addition, if participants do not react favorably, they probably will not be motivated to learn. Positive reaction may not ensure learning, but negative reaction almost certainly reduces the possibility of its occurring” (p. 22).

2- Learning

• “… learning has taken place when one or more of the following occurs: Attitudes are changed. Knowledge is increased. Skill is improved. One or more of these changes must take place if a change in behavior is to occur” (p. 22).

The 4 levels -b

3- Behavior change

• At this point we are beyond the influence of the trainer. For behavior change to occur, participant motivation and organizational support become very important.
• “In order for change to occur, four conditions are necessary:
  • 1. The person must have a desire to change.
  • 2. The person must know what to do and how to do it.
  • 3. The person must work in the right climate.
  • 4. The person must be rewarded for changing.
• The training program can accomplish the first two requirements by creating a positive attitude toward the desired change and by teaching the necessary knowledge and skills. The third condition, right climate, refers to the participant’s immediate supervisor” (p. 23).
The 4 levels -c

4- Results (service recipient impact – outcomes)

- Employees are trained in order to improve cost benefit – effectiveness and efficiency. Secondary impacts can also be measured – ex: reduced sick leave.
- “Results can be defined as the final results that occurred because the participants attended the program. The final results can include increased production, improved quality, decreased costs, reduced frequency and/or severity of accidents, increased sales, reduced turnover, and higher profits. It is important to recognize that results like these are the reason for having some training programs. Therefore, the final objectives of the training program need to be stated in these terms” (p. 25).

“Implementation Science”

Six stages of implementation

- “There is substantial agreement that implementation is a recursive process with steps that are focused on achieving benefits for children, families, provider organizations, human service systems, and communities.

- It appears there are six functional stages of implementation:
  - exploration,
  - installation,
  - initial implementation,
  - full implementation,
  - innovation, and
  - sustainability.

- The stages are not linear as each appears to impact the others in a complex way”
  
  (Fixsen, et al. 2009, p. 533)

Implementation goals

- “The goal of implementation is to have practitioners (e.g., care managers, foster parents, nurses, teachers, therapists, physicians) use innovations effectively. To accomplish this, high-fidelity practitioner behavior is created and supported by core implementation components (also called “implementation drivers”)” (p. 533).

- “Desirable outcomes are achieved only once effective programs are implemented well”
  
  (Fixsen et al. 2009, p. 533).
Coaching and consulting

- "A coach provides 'craft' information along with advice, encouragement and opportunities to practice new skills specific to the innovation... Implementation of human service innovations requires behavior change of the practitioner, supervisory, and administrative support levels. Training and coaching of the principal ways in which behavior changes brought about for carefully selected staff in the beginning stages of implementation and throughout the life of evidence-based practices and programs"

(Fixsen et al., 2009, p. 534).
Ongoing training

• "preservice and in-service training are efficient ways to provide
  • knowledge and background information, theory, philosophy, and values;
  • introduce the components of rationales of key practices and
  • provide opportunities to practice new skills and
  • receive feedback in a safe training environment"

(Fixsen et al., 2009, p. 534).

Change management

Opening considerations

- Hope big the change and what kind of change
  - process and/or cultural?
- Readiness for change
  - Level of dissatisfaction with status quo
    - About service recipient outcomes
    - About service activities
  - Level of consensus on
    - need for change and
    - About what needs to change

7 steps to change

- “Step 1 – Mobilize energy and commitment through joint identification of business problems and their solutions.
- Step 2 – Develop a shared vision of how to organize and manage for competitiveness (effectiveness)
- Step 3 – Identify the leadership.
- Step 4 – Focus on results, not on activities
- Step 5 – Start change at the periphery, then let it spread to other units without pushing it from the top
- Step 6 – Institutionalize success through formal policies, systems, and structures.
- Step 7 – Monitor and adjust strategies in response to problems in the change process.”
7 implementation problems

A survey that identifies seven implementation problems “that occurred in at least 60 percent of the ninety-three firms polled:

1. Implementation took more time than originally allocated (76 percent).
2. Major problems surfaced during implementation that had not been identified beforehand (74 percent).
3. Coordination of implementation activities (for example, task forces or committees) was not effective enough (66 percent).
4. Competing activities and crises distracted attention from implementing this strategic decision (64 percent).
5. Capabilities (skill and abilities) of employees involved with the implementation were not sufficient (63 percent).
6. Training and instruction given to lower-level employees were not adequate (62 percent).
7. Uncontrollable factors in the external environment had an adverse impact on implementation (60 percent)” (p.p. 52-53).

Luecke, 2003

implementation

• Enlist the support and involvement of key people. It means people with power, expertise, credibility, proven leadership skills, and people with a fair amount of common interests on the team to manage the change.
• Craft an implementation plan. It needs to be a simple plan created by people affected at all levels and it needs to be structured in achievable chunks. It needs to specify roles and responsibilities and, finally, it needs to be flexible.
• There are three types of people who should not be on an implementation team. These include people with big egos, snakes and, finally, reluctant players.
• Support the plan with consistent behaviors and messages.
• Develop enabling structures to include pilot programs, training, and reward systems.
• Celebrate milestones in the change process. Thus, it’s important to symbolize change and success.
• And, communicate relentlessly. Here are some of the specifics that are really important.
• Using consultants is only good at the beginning of a process when an organization is diagnosing the need for change. Implementation on the other hand is something that belongs to the organization with little input from experts and consultants.
The high road

- it’s always important to appeal to people’s better motives in trying to engender change. Even the for-profit industry can have lofty goals that are to the benefit of the community rather than to just shareholders.
  - 3M has as its purpose to “solve unsolved problems innovatively,”
  - Cargill has as a mission “to improve the standard of living around the world,”
  - Hewlett-Packard wants “to make technical contributions for the advancement and welfare of humanity,” and
  - McKinsey & Company seeks “to help leading corporations and governments to be more successful.”

Conclusion – SRV implementation
An SRV change strategy in a nutshell

1. Dissemination to create interest
   • 1 day events
2. Capitalizing on dissatisfaction
3. Senior executive buy-in
   • Targeted initial training for decision makers
4. Identifying external “purveyors” (content experts) who will accompany the change process
5. Planning change
   • Identifying feasible early outcomes (indicators)
   • Identifying feasible early changes (indicators)
6. Piloting change
   • Small scale
   • Early adopters and champions
     • Identify potential leaders
   • Focused training
     • (principles but especially practices/behaviors)
     • Identify start and stop – behaviors/practices
7. Evaluating change

What must change with SRV implementation – examples

• Service recipient outcomes
• Frontline service practices (behaviour)
• Supervisory, managerial, administrative, communication, and governance practices
• Organizational culture
• Family and neighbour expectancies and behaviour
• The community’s behaviour
• Regulations, laws and policies (government’s behaviour)
• Society
Quality assurance

• How is implementation going?
  • Fidelity to approach
  • On time?
  • Are plans being implemented?
• How are people doing?
  • Are they involved?
  • Are they satisfied?
  • Are their lives changing for the better?
• Using a single person experimental design
  • Barlow

Evaluating the Implementation of SRV

• Is it SRV? (What constitutes SRV? And Fidelity to SRV)
• Does implementing SRV make a positive difference?
• Is it better than other approaches?
• Agreeing on a research design
  • Measures of implementation fidelity (is it SRV?)
  • Before and after measures of effectiveness
• Group comparisons
  • Matched pairs
  • Randomized clinical trial (RCT)
“... I have become painfully aware that ideologically oriented professionals and theoreticians - if they are to contribute effectively to much needed adaptive change - must concern themselves more with the way our society functions. Too long have we, as professionals, been remote from the seats of power, the democratic change process, and the societal involvement necessary to bring about such change. And such change we need, or die we must. We must sally forth from our ivory towers and join the fray in the moats and even sewers of our society in a battle for adaptive self-renewal that appears to be turning more bitter and desperate by the day.”

WW – Why Nebraska? p. 52