

Meta-Analysis of Critical Implementation Components

Louise Rowling, University of Sydney, Australia
louise.rowling@sydney.edu.au

Acknowledge

Oddrun Samdal, University of Bergen, Norway

Montreal November 2011



THE UNIVERSITY OF
SYDNEY



Introduction

- Previous focus of health promoting school (HPS) approach
 - Developing a Rationale
 - Production of guidelines articulating principles
 - Providing indicators for evaluation

THE GAP

- Focus of presentation – articulate a science base of implementation of HPS to fill current gap



Develop a theoretical understanding of implementation components and their mechanisms



THE UNIVERSITY OF
SYDNEY

Why?

- **Delineating a theoretical and empirical base for implementation components of health promoting schools** (we have called this the **what** of implementation) **will allow practitioners to understand the function of each component -> fidelity.**
- ***Educational*, implementation and organizational change theories are used to identify the functionality, i.e. the mechanisms at work for each component (we have called this the **how** of implementation)**



Acknowledging core implementation perspectives

- ✓ ***School values and context* for organisational development and learning**
- ✓ **Multidisciplinary science base for implementation**
- ✓ **Capacity and need**
- ✓ **A systems approach**



Methodology

- **Narrative synthesis of available English-language literature, 1995-2010, delineating implementation of HPS**
- **Key words: health promoting schools, implementation, comprehensive approach, whole school improvement/change, school health promotion.**
- **Implementation of pre-packaged programmes were excluded**
- **7 sources were identified that described components of HPS implementation**



The components

- 1) **Preparing and planning for school development**
- 2) **Policy and institutional anchoring**
- 3) **Professional development and learning**
- 4) **Leadership and management practices**
- 5) ***Relational and organisational support context***
- 6) ***Student participation***
- 7) **Partnership and networking**
- 8) **Sustainability**



5. Relational and organisational support context – what and why

- **What**

- Relational support: climate and culture
- Organisational support: structures (including timetabling), physical environment and fiscal resources



Stimulates motivation and change processes

- **Why: Theoretical base**

- Social learning theory, social climate (Bandura, 1998)
- Organisational capacity (Elias et al., 2003; Flaspohler et al., 2008; Hopkins and Jackson, 2003)



Relational and organisational support context – how and why

- **How**

- Establish practices for interaction for all school community members (including external 'project staff')
- Nurture reflective behaviours
- Pedagogic leadership to create caring environments in classrooms
- Emphasis should be given to relational pedagogy
- Scaffolding beneficial teaching schedules, class meetings, and grouping structures to allow time and opportunities for collaboration
- Modify and create appropriate physical spaces/buildings
- Supportive ongoing conditions for professional development and learning to build capacity

- **Why: Theoretical and empirical base** Boyd, *et al.*, 2006; Cole, 2008; Durlak & Dupre, 2008; Hall & Hord, 2006; Heward *et al.*, 2007; Hoyle, 2007; MacNeil & Silcox, 2003



6. Student participation – what and why

- **What**
 - Involvement of target group is basic principle of health promotion (empowerment)
 - Means and goal to maximize motivation for health and learning
- **Why: Theoretical base**
 - Self-determination theory, agency, initiative (Ryan and Deci, 2000)
 - School connectedness and civic engagement (Simovska and Bruun Jensen, 2009)
 - Relational pedagogy (Boyd,, MacNeil, and Sullivan, 2006)



Student participation – how and why

- **How**
 - Facilitate student active decision-making in school life
 - Develop teachers' skills to facilitate this action, putting aside their views and trusting in young person's perspectives and advice
 - Help young people learn they can make a difference to self and others
 - Create varying structures to facilitate student's influence and participation and invite them to be represented in core team
 - Ask and listen to students' perceptions of school needs for change and enable them to act on their ideas to address them in an inclusive and non judgemental manner
- **Why: Theoretical and empirical base**
 - AICAFMHA, 2008; Holdsworth and Blanchard, 2006; Jensen and Simovska, 2005



- **The HOW links a rationale to the elements of each component eg core team development,**
- **The rationale for the actions to be undertaken indicates the **SCOPE** of implementation flexibility within which practitioners can operate, so being able to fulfil the rationale using a similar or other action.**
- **The rationale will constitute an important basis for identifying implementation success or weaknesses by evaluating if the described outcomes were achieved, eg whether involving a core team did impact on whole school commitment.**



Conclusion

- **The implementation components are firmly based in Educational and Health Research**
- **They are interdependent and provide a balance of specificity and flexibility for whole school change**
- **They need to be tested within school specific context and culture by practitioners and researchers**
- **They will also give greater understanding of what is needed for sustainability of hps.**



***Mark Twain's
Advice***

**Even when we
are on the
right track,
If not moving,
We will be run
over.**



Further Reading

Samdal, O. & Rowling, L. (2011) Theoretical and empirical base for implementation components of health promoting schools.

Health Education, Vol 111, No. 5 pp. 367-390

Rowling, L. & Samdal, O. (2011) Filling the black box of implementation for health promoting schools. *Health Education, Vol 111, No. 5 pp. 347-366.*