|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Code** | **Coding Criteria** |
| \*Coalition: A:Structural Characteristics | The social architecture, age, maturity, and size of an organization. Inclusion Criteria:Exclusion Criteria: |
| \*Coalition: B:Networks & Communications | The nature and quality of webs of social networks, and the nature and quality of formal and informal communications within an organization. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements about general networking, communication, and relationships in the organization, such as people connected and informed, and statements related to team formation, quality, and functioning. Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statements related to implementation leaders' and users' access to knowledge and information regarding using the program, i.e., training on the mechanics of the program and code to Access to Knowledge & Information Exclude statements related to engagement strategies and outcomes, e.g. how key stakeholders become engaged with the innovation and what their role is in implementation, and code to Engaging: Key Stakeholders Exclude descriptions of outside group membership and networking done outside the organization and code to Cosmopolitanism |
| \*Coalition: C:Culture | Norms, values, and basic assumptions of a given organization. Inclusion Criteria: Inclusion criteria and potential sub-codes, will depend on the framework or definition used for "culture". For example, if using the Competing Values Framework (CVF), you may include four sub-codes related to the four dimensions of the CVF and code statements regarding one or more of the four dimension in an organization. Exclusion Criteria: |
| \*Coalition: D.1:Implementation Climate: 1. Tension for Change | The degree to which stakeholders perceive the current situation as intolerable or needing change. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements that (do not) demonstrate a strong need for the innovation and/or that the current situation is untenable, e.g., statements that the innovation is absolutely necessary or that the innovation is redundant with other programs. Note: If a participant states that the intervention is redundant with a preferred existing program (double) code lack of Relative Advantage, see exclusion criteria below. Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statement regarding specific needs of individuals that demonstrate a need for the intervention, but do not necessarily represent a strong need or an untenable status quo, and code to Needs and Resources of Those Served by the OrganizationExclude statements that demonstrate the innovation is better (or worse) than existing programs and code to Relative Advantage |
| \*Coalition: D.2:Implementation Climate: 2. Compatibility | The degree of tangible fit between meaning and values attached to the intervention by involved individuals, how those align with individuals' own norms, values, and perceived risks and needs, and how the intervention fits with existing workflows and systems. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements that demonstrate the level of compatibility the intervention has with organizational values and work processes. Include statements that the intervention did of did not need to be adapted as evidence of compatibility of lack of compatibility Exclusion Criteria: Exclude or double code statements regarding the priority of the intervention based on compatibility with organizational values to Relative Priority, e.g. if an intervention is not prioritized because it is not compatible with organizational values. |
| \*Coalition: D.3:Implementation Climate: 3. Relative Priority | Individuals' shared perception of the importance of the implementation within the organization. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements that reflect the relative priority of the intervention, e.g., statements related to change fatigue in the organization due to implementation of many other programs. Exclusion Criteria: Exclude or double code statements regarding the priority of the intervention based on compatibility with organizational values of Compatibility, e.g., if an intervention is not prioritized because it is not compatible with the organizational values. |
| \*Coalition: D.4:Implementation Climate: 4. Organizational Incentives & Rewards | Extrinsic incentives such as goal-sharing, awards, performance reviews, promotions, and raises in salary, and less tangible incentives such as increased stature or respect. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements related to whether organizational incentive systems are in place to foster (or hinder) implementation, e.g., rewards or disincentives for staff engaging in the interventionExclusion Criteria: |
| \*Coalition: D.5:Implementation Climate: 5. Goals and Feedback | The degree to which goals are clearly communicated, acted upon, and fed back to staff, and alignment of that feedback with goals. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements related to the (lack of) alignment of implementation and intervention goals with larger organizational goals, as well as feedback to staff regarding those goals, e.g., regular audit and feedback showing any gaps between the current organizational status and the goal. Goals and Feedback include organization processes supporting structures independent of the implementation process. Evidence of the integration of evaluation components used as part of "Reflecting and Evaluating" into on-going or sustained organizational structures and processes may be (double) coded to Goals and Feedback. Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statements that refer to the implementation team's (lack of) assessment of the progress toward outcomes related to implementation, and code to Reflecting & Evaluating. Reflecting and Evaluating is part of the implementation process; it likely ends when implementation activities end. It does not requires goals to be explicitly articulated; it can focus on descriptions of the current state with real-time judgement, though there may be an implied goal (e.g. we need to implement the intervention) when the implementation team discusses feedback in terms of adjustment needed to complete interpretation. |
| \*Coalition: D.6:Implementation Climate: 6. Learning Climate | A climate in which 1. Leaders express their own fallibility and need for team members' assistance and input; 2. Team members fell that they are essential, valued, and knowledgeable partners in the change process: 3. Individuals feel psychologically safe to try new methods; and 4. There is sufficient time and space for reflective thinking and evaluationInclusion Criteria: Include statements that support (or refute) the degree to which key components of an organization exhibit a "learning climate". Exclusion Criteria: |
| \*Coalition: E.1:Readiness for Implementation: 1. Leadership Engagement | Commitment, involvement, and accountability of leaders and managers with the implementation of the innovation Inclusion Criteria: Include statements regarding the level of engagement of organizational leadershipExclusion Criteria: Double Code statements regarding leadership engagement to "Engagement: Formally Appointed Internal Implementation Leaders" or "Champions" if an organizational leader is also an intervention leader, e.g., if a director of primary care takes the lead in implementing a new treatment guideline. Note that a key characteristic of this Intervention Leader/Champion is that s/he also an Organizational Leader |
| \*Coalition: E.2:Readiness for Implementation: 2. Available Resources | The level of resources organizational dedicated for implementation and on-going operations including physical space and timeInclusion Criteria: Include statements related to the presence or absence of resources specific to the intervention that is being implemented. Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statements related to training and education and code to "Access to Knowledge and Information"Exclude statements related to the quality of materials and code to "Design Quality & PackagingIn a research study, exclude statements related to resources needed for conducting the research components (E.G., time to complete research tasks, such as IRB applications, consenting patients). |
| \*Coalition: E.3:Readiness for Implementation: 3. Access to Knowledge & Information | Ease of access to digestible information and knowledge about the intervention and how to incorporate it into work tasks. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements related to implementation leaders' and users' access to knowledge and information regarding use of the program, i.e., training on the mechanics of the program. Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statements related to engagement strategies and outcomes, e.g., how key stakeholders became engaged with the intervention and what their role is in the implementation and code to "Engaging: Key Stakeholders"Exclude statements about general networking, communication, and relationships in the organization, such as descriptions of meeting, email groups, or other methods of keeping people connected and informed, and statements related to team formation, quality, and functioning, and code to "Networks & Communications". |
| \*Coalition: Peer Pressure | Mimetic or competitive pressure in the coalition to implement an intervention, typically because most or other key peer or competing organizations have already implemented or are in a bid for a competitive edge. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements about perceived pressure or motivation from other entities or organizations in the local geographic area or system to implement the innovationExclusion Criteria: |
| \*Coalition: Champions | Individuals in the coalition who dedicate themselves to supporting, marketing, and 'driving through' an [implementation]', overcoming indifference or resistance that the intervention may provoke in an organization. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements related to engagement strategies and outcomes e.g., how the champion became engaged with the intervention and what their role is in implementation. Note: Although both strategies and outcomes are coded here, the outcome of efforts to engage staff determines the rating, i.e., if there are repeated attempts to engage a champion that are unsuccessful, or if the champion leaves the organization and this role is vacant, the construct receives a negative rating. In addition, you may also want to code the "quality" of the champion here- their capabilities, motivation, and skills, i.e., how good they are at their job and this data affects the rating as well.Exclusion Criteria: Exclude or double code statements regarding leadership engagement to "Coalition Leadership Engagement" if a champion is also an organizational leader, e.g., if a director of primary care takes the lead in implementing a new treatment guideline. |
| \*Coalition: Individual Identification with Organization | Broad construct on how individuals perceive their organization, and their relationship and degree of commitment with that organization |
| \*Coalition: Knowledge and Beliefs about the Coalition | Individuals' attitudes toward and value placed on the coalition, as well as familiarity with facts, truths, and principles related to the coalitionInclusion Criteria: Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statements related to familiarity with evidence about the intervention and code to " Coalition: Evidence Strength & Quality" |
| \*Coalition: Reflecting and Evaluating | Quantitative and qualitative feedback about the progress and quality of implementation accompanied with regular personal and team debriefing about progress and experience. Reflecting and Evaluating is part of the implementation process; it likely ends when implementation activities end. It does not require goals by explicitly articulated; it can focus on descriptions of the current state with real-time judgement, though there may be an implied goals (e.g., we need to implement the intervention) when the implementation team discusses feedback in terms of adjustments needed to complete implementationInclusion Criteria: Include statements that refer to the coalitions (lack of) assessment of the progress toward and impact of implementation, as well as the interpretation of outcomes related to implementation. Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statements related to the (lack of) alignment of implementation and coalition goals with larger organizational goals, as well as feedback showing any gaps between the current organizational status and the goal, and code to "Goals & Feedback". Goals and Feedback include organizational processes and supporting structures independent of the implementation processes. Evidence of the integration of evaluation components used as part of "Reflecting and Evaluating" into on-going or sustained organizational structures and processes may be (double) coded to "Goals and Feedback".  |
| \*I.A: Int Characteristics: Intervention Source | Perception of key stakeholders about whether the intervention is externally or internally developed. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements about the source of the intervention and the extent to which interviewees view the change as internal to the organization, e.g., an internally developed program, or external to the organization, e.g., a program coming from the outside. Exclusion Criteria: Double code statements related to who participated in the decision process to implement the intervention to Engaging, as an indication of early (or late) engagement. Participation in decision-making is an effective engagement strategy to help people feel ownership of the innovation. |
| \*I.B:1: Int Characteristics: Evidence Strength and Quality: RCA | Root cause analysis data used for evidence and strength of the quality of evidence, as well as the absence of evidence or a desire for different types of evidence. Depending on how they discuss the RCA- RCA activity may also be coded as PROCESS:PLANNING |
| \*I.B:2: Int Characteristics: Evidence Strength and Quality: Literature Evidence | Use of journals, formulated studies, or research  |
| \*I.B:3: Int Characteristics: Evidence Strength and Quality: Success in another setting | Success in another community, setting, or QIO.  |
| \*I.C: Int Characteristics: Relative Advantage | Stakeholders’ perception of the advantage of implementing the intervention versus an alternative solution.Inclusion Criteria: Include statements that demonstrate the intervention is better (or worse) than existing programs.Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statements that demonstrate a strong need for the intervention and/or that the current situation is untenable and code to Tension for Change.  |
| \*I.D: Int Characteristics: Adaptability | The degree to which an intervention can be adapted, tailored, refined, or reinvented to meet local needs.Inclusion Criteria: Include statements regarding the (in)ability to adapt the intervention to their context, e.g., complaints about the rigidity of the protocol. Suggestions for improvement can be captured in this code but should not be included in the rating process, unless it is clear that the participant feels the change is needed but that the program cannot be adapted. However, it may be possible to infer that a large number of suggestions for improvement demonstrates lack of compatibility, see exclusion criteria below. Exclusion Criteria: Double code statements that the intervention did or did not need to be adapted to Compatibility.  |
| \*I.E: Int Characteristics: Trialability | The ability to test the intervention on a small scale in the organization, and to be able to reverse course (undo implementation) if warranted.Inclusion Criteria: Include statements related to whether the site piloted the intervention in the past or has plans to in the future, and comments about whether they believe it is (im)possible to conduct a pilot. Exclusion Criteria: Double code descriptions of use of results from local or regional pilots to Evidence Strength & Quality |
| \*I.F: Int Characteristics: Complexity | Perceived difficulty of the intervention, reflected by duration, scope, radicalness, disruptiveness, centrality, and intricacy and number of steps required to implement. Inclusion Criteria: Code statements regarding the complexity of the intervention itself.Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statements regarding the complexity of implementation and code to the appropriate CFIR code, e.g., difficulties related to space are coded to Available Resources and difficulties related to engaging participants in a new program are coded to Engaging: Innovation Participants.  |
| \*I.G: Int Characteristics: Design Quality & Packaging | Perceived excellence in how the intervention is bundled, presented, and assembled. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements regarding the quality of the materials and packaging.Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statements regarding the presence or absence of materials and code to Available Resources. Exclude statements regarding the receipt of materials as an engagement strategy and code to Engaging.  |
| \*I.H: Int Characteristics: Cost | Costs of the intervention and costs associated with implementing the innovation including investment, supply, and opportunity costs. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements related to the cost of the innovation and its implementation.Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statements related to physical space and time, and code to Available Resources. In a research study, exclude statements related to costs of conducting the research components (e.g., funding for research staff, participant incentives).  |
| \*II.A: Outer Setting: Needs & Resources of Those Served by the Organization | The extent to which the needs of those served by the organization (e.g., patients), as well as barriers and facilitators to meet those needs, are accurately known and prioritized by the organization.Inclusion Criteria: Include statements demonstrating (lack of) awareness of the needs and resources of those served by the organization. Analysts may be able to infer the level of awareness based on statements about: 1. Perceived need for the innovation based on the needs of those served by the organization and if the innovation will meet those needs; 2. Barriers and facilitators of those served by the organization to participating in the innovation; 3. Participant feedback on the intervention, i.e., satisfaction and success in a program. In addition, include statements that capture whether or not awareness of the needs and resources of those served by the organization influenced the implementation or adaptation of the intervention.Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statements that demonstrate a strong need for the intervention and/or that the current situation is untenable and code to Tension for Change. Exclude statements related to engagement strategies and outcomes, e.g., how intervention participants became engaged with the innovation, and code to Engaging: Innovation Participants.  |
| \*II.B: Outer Setting: Cosmopolitanism | The degree to which an organization is networked with other external organizations.Inclusion Criteria: Include descriptions of outside group memberships and networking done outside the organization.Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statements about general networking, communication, and relationships in the organization, such as descriptions of meetings, email groups, or other methods of keeping people connected and informed, and statements related to team formation, quality, and functioning, and code to Networks & Communications. |
| \*II.C: Outer Setting: Peer Pressure | Mimetic or competitive pressure to implement an intervention, typically because most or other key peer or competing organizations have already implemented or are in a bid for a competitive edge. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements about perceived pressure or motivation from other entities or organizations in the local geographic area or system to implement the innovationExclusion Criteria: |
| \*II.D: Outer Setting: External Policy & Incentives | A broad construct that includes external strategies to spread interventions including policy and regulations (governmental or other central entity), external mandates, recommendations and guidelines, pay-for-performance, collaboratives, and public or benchmark reporting. Inclusion Criteria: Includes descriptions of external performance measures from the system. Exclusion Criteria: |
| \*II.E: Outer Setting: Community Characteristics | Use this to capture characteristics of the community such as: geographic features, demographic composition, etc. This may also be double coded as Outer Setting: Needs and Resources.  |
| \*II.F: Outer Setting: Population Characteristics | The characteristics of a population or group in the outer setting. Inclusion criteria: Include statement about the general demographics or makeup of a community which may not be limited to the general needs of a population. Include statements about social determinants of health, SES, racial distribution, disease burden, average education attainment, and age of members in the community. Examples:• SDH (social determinants of health)• SES (socioeconomic status)• Racial distribution• Disease burden• Average educational attainment• Community age• Age distributionExclusion criteria: Exclude or double code statements related to the needs of the population to Outer Setting: Needs and Resources, or Outer Setting: General population culture  |
| \*II.G: Outer Setting: Healthcare Market Characteristics | The characteristics of the local healthcare market or larger healthcare market whose effects may transcend settings. Inclusion criteria: Include statements that refer to characteristics of the local or national healthcare market. This can include information such as baseline readmissions rates, penalties, medical utilization, presence or absence of various provider types, ownership/corporate influence, and cooperation (or a lack of) among health systems/providers. Examples:* Baseline readmission rates
* Presence of readmissions penalties
* Statements regarding medical utilization, unless they indicate cultural perspectives (e.g. ‘people around here have just always used the ED’ – would be population culture)
* Presence/absence of various provider types
	+ Provider shortages
	+ Closure of a provider that would have been a participant/helpful to the effort
	+ Presence/influence of IHS facilities, FQHCs, etc
	+ Access to medication
* Ownership/corporate influences on providers
	+ Owned by the same vs separate entities
	+ Local vs remote corporate control
	+ For profit vs non-profit status of important providers
* Cooperation/non-cooperation among health systems/providers
	+ Historical precedents for cooperation or experiences trying to cooperate in the past
	+ Ongoing/competing provider cooperation initiatives (e.g. presence of /prevalence of ACOs, or work towards ACO formation)
* Beneficiary and Family Advisory Councils (BFACs) – if a statement about a specific BFAC would be coded as inner setting or coalition setting (depending); if a statement about ‘they all have BFACs around here’ could be a market characteristic. BFAC in this context would be where they are fully integrated into how providers do business in general.

Exclusion criteria: Exclude or double code instances of medical utilization related to cultural perspectives to “Outer Setting: Population Culture” |
| \*II.H: Outer Setting: Physical features of the Community | Physical features of a city, community, region, or state.Inclusion criteria: Include statements relating to features of the community as well as potential impact (or lack thereof). This can include physical geographic features such as islands, mountains, dispersion of the population, or state boundaries. Examples:* Island/mountainous/etc.
* Dispersion of the population/how far people have to drive
* Crosses state lines
* Comments regarding physical composition of the community defined by the QIN for evaluation of RIR-relative improvement rate of readmissions (ie ‘really 2 separate communities that we lumped together’)

Exclusion criteria: Exclude or double code instance of this impact on policies or incentives to Outer Setting: External Policies and Incentives. Unless there is a competitive aspect to it (e.g. An island or peninsula would restrict access to providers across a border, influencing competition), then it may be coded to market characteristics. Exclude what would be coded to “big events”, such as a river flooding or mountain passes becoming unnavigable would be a result of a physical feature, but should be coded to “Outer Setting Big Events” not “Outer Setting Physical Features”. |
| \*II.I: Outer Setting: Community Resource Infrastructure | Physical infrastructure in a city, community, or region that may or may not be needed to support health. Inclusion criteria: Include statements regarding the outer setting’s infrastructure and their impact (or lack thereof). This can include transportation availability, housing adequacy, or presence of community agencies. Examples:* Transportation availability
* Housing adequacy
* Presence of community agencies (homecare aides, Area Agencies on Aging [AAAs], etc.)

Exclusion criteria:  |
| \*II.J: Outer Setting: Medical and Health Support Payment Environment in the Community | Definition: Medical and health payment environment in the outer setting (community, city, region, state, or nation).Inclusion Criteria: Include statements relating to the support (or lack thereof) for payment structures that occur in the outer setting and their potential impact. This can include funding to support improvement work such as various CMMI initiatives, HIIN presence, Medicaid policies or ACO requirements, ongoing statewide initiatives, grant funding. Examples:* Reference to Medicaid coverage/change in Medicaid coverage
* Funding likely to contribute to the support of readmissions reduction/care coordination
	+ Various CMMI initiatives
	+ HIIN presence
	+ Medicaid policies impacting care coordination (ie ACO requirements)
	+ Other grand funding
* Statewide ongoing initiatives (Medicaid Expansion, etc.)
* Influence of bundled payments/ACO or Clinically Integrated Network presence

Exclusion Criteria: |
| \*II.K: Outer Setting: General Population Culture | Culture of the general population (not providers) in the outer setting (community, city, region, or state).Inclusion Criteria: Include statements relating to culture of the population in the outer setting and the impact (or potential impact) of this on other activities. Include a culture of collective action of the general population, a sense of place identity in the outer setting (community, city, region, or state), or any general biases or attitude held by key groups of the general population. Examples:* Reference to influence of native cultures
* Culture of collective action/previous collective action initiatives
* Statements coded to place identity (i.e. ‘here in Middle Earth’ etc)
* Statements indicating general biases or attitudes ‘around here’

Exclusion Criteria: Exclude references to the provider culture and code to “Outer Setting: Healthcare Market Characteristics” when applicable. If the information describes impact of peer pressure in the context of the community culture, code to “Outer Settings: Peer Pressure” |
| \*III.A: Inner Setting: Structural Characteristics | The social architecture, age, maturity, and size of an organization. Inclusion Criteria:Exclusion Criteria: |
| \*III.B: Inner Setting: Networks & Communications | The nature and quality of webs of social networks, and the nature and quality of formal and informal communications within an organization. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements about general networking, communication, and relationships in the organization, such as people connected and informed, and statements related to team formation, quality, and functioning. Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statements related to implementation leaders' and users' access to knowledge and information regarding using the program, i.e., training on the mechanics of the program and code to Access to Knowledge & Information Exclude statements related to engagement strategies and outcomes, e.g. how key stakeholders become engaged with the innovation and what their role is in implementation, and code to Engaging: Key Stakeholders Exclude descriptions of outside group membership and networking done outside the organization and code to Cosmopolitanism |
| \*III.C: Inner Setting: Culture | Norms, values, and basic assumptions of a given organization. Inclusion Criteria: Inclusion criteria and potential sub-codes, will depend on the framework or definition used for "culture". For example, if using the Competing Values Framework (CVF), you may include four sub-codes related to the four dimensions of the CVF and code statements regarding one or more of the four dimension in an organization. Exclusion Criteria: |
| \*III.D.1: Inner Setting: Implementation Climate: 1. Tension for Change | The degree to which stakeholders perceive the current situation as intolerable or needing change. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements that (do not) demonstrate a strong need for the innovation and/or that the current situation is untenable, e.g., statements that the innovation is absolutely necessary or that the innovation is redundant with other programs. Note: If a participant states that the intervention is redundant with a preferred existing program (double) code lack of Relative Advantage, see exclusion criteria below. Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statement regarding specific needs of individuals that demonstrate a need for the intervention, but do not necessarily represent a strong need or an untenable status quo, and code to Needs and Resources of Those Served by the OrganizationExclude statements that demonstrate the innovation is better (or worse) than existing programs and code to Relative Advantage |
| \*III.D.2: Inner Setting: Implementation Climate: 2. Compatibility | The degree of tangible fit between meaning and values attached to the intervention by involved individuals, how those align with individuals' own norms, values, and perceived risks and needs, and how the intervention fits with existing workflows and systems. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements that demonstrate the level of compatibility the intervention has with organizational values and work processes. Include statements that the intervention did of did not need to be adapted as evidence of compatibility of lack of compatibility Exclusion Criteria: Exclude or double code statements regarding the priority of the intervention based on compatibility with organizational values to Relative Priority, e.g. if an intervention is not prioritized because it is not compatible with organizational values. |
| \*III.D.3: Inner Setting: Implementation Climate: 3. Relative Priority | Individuals' shared perception of the importance of the implementation within the organization. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements that reflect the relative priority of the intervention, e.g., statements related to change fatigue in the organization due to implementation of many other programs. Exclusion Criteria: Exclude or double code statements regarding the priority of the intervention based on compatibility with organizational values of Compatibility, e.g., if an intervention is not prioritized because it is not compatible with the organizational values. |
| \*III.D.4: Inner Setting: Implementation Climate: 4. Organizational Incentives & Rewards | Extrinsic incentives such as goal-sharing, awards, performance reviews, promotions, and raises in salary, and less tangible incentives such as increased stature or respect. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements related to whether organizational incentive systems are in place to foster (or hinder) implementation, e.g., rewards or disincentives for staff engaging in the interventionExclusion Criteria: |
| \*III.D.5: Inner Setting: Implementation Climate: 5. Goals and Feedback | The degree to which goals are clearly communicated, acted upon, and fed back to staff, and alignment of that feedback with goals. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements related to the (lack of) alignment of implementation and intervention goals with larger organizational goals, as well as feedback to staff regarding those goals, e.g., regular audit and feedback showing any gaps between the current organizational status and the goal. Goals and Feedback include organization processes supporting structures independent of the implementation process. Evidence of the integration of evaluation components used as part of "Reflecting and Evaluating" into on-going or sustained organizational structures and processes may be (double) coded to Goals and Feedback. Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statements that refer to the implementation team's (lack of) assessment of the progress toward outcomes related to implementation, and code to Reflecting & Evaluating. Reflecting and Evaluating is part of the implementation process; it likely ends when implementation activities end. It does not requires goals to be explicitly articulated; it can focus on descriptions of the current state with real-time judgement, though there may be an implied goal (e.g. we need to implement the intervention) when the implementation team discusses feedback in terms of adjustment needed to complete interpretation. |
| \*III.D.6: Inner Setting: Implementation Climate: 6. Learning Climate | A climate in which 1. Leaders express their own fallibility and need for team members' assistance and input; 2. Team members fell that they are essential, valued, and knowledgeable partners in the change process: 3. Individuals feel psychologically safe to try new methods; and 4. There is sufficient time and space for reflective thinking and evaluationInclusion Criteria: Include statements that support (or refute) the degree to which key components of an organization exhibit a "learning climate". Exclusion Criteria: |
| \*III.E.1: Inner Setting: Readiness for Implementation: 1. Leadership Engagement | Commitment, involvement, and accountability of leaders and managers with the implementation of the innovation Inclusion Criteria: Include statements regarding the level of engagement of organizational leadershipExclusion Criteria: Double Code statements regarding leadership engagement to "Engagement: Formally Appointed Internal Implementation Leaders" or "Champions" if an organizational leader is also an intervention leader, e.g., if a director of primary care takes the lead in implementing a new treatment guideline. Note that a key characteristic of this Intervention Leader/Champion is that s/he also an Organizational Leader |
| \*III.E.2: Inner Setting: Readiness for Implementation: 2. Available Resources | The level of resources organizational dedicated for implementation and on-going operations including physical space and timeInclusion Criteria: Include statements related to the presence or absence of resources specific to the intervention that is being implemented. Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statements related to training and education and code to "Access to Knowledge and Information"Exclude statements related to the quality of materials and code to "Design Quality & PackagingIn a research study, exclude statements related to resources needed for conducting the research components (E.G., time to complete research tasks, such as IRB applications, consenting patients). |
| \*III.E.3: Inner Setting: Readiness for Implementation: 3. Access to Knowledge & Information | Ease of access to digestible information and knowledge about the intervention and how to incorporate it into work tasks. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements related to implementation leaders' and users' **access to knowledge and information regarding use of the program, i.e., training on the mechanics of the program.** Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statements related to engagement strategies and outcomes, e.g., how key stakeholders became engaged with the intervention and what their role is in the implementation and code to "Engaging: Key Stakeholders"Exclude statements about general networking, communication, and relationships in the organization, such as descriptions of meeting, email groups, or other methods of keeping people connected and informed, and statements related to team formation, quality, and functioning, and code to "Networks & Communications". |
| \*IV.A: Char of Individuals: Knowledge & Beliefs about the Intervention | Individuals' attitudes toward and value placed on the intervention, as well as familiarity with facts, truths, and principles related to the intervention Inclusion Criteria: Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statements related to familiarity with evidence about the intervention and code to "Evidence Strength & Quality" |
| \*IV:B: Char of Individuals: Self-Efficacy | Individual belief in their own capabilities to execute courses of action to achieve implementation goals Inclusion Criteria: Exclusion Criteria:  |
| \*IV:C: Char of Individuals: Individual Stage of Change | Characterization of the phase an individual is in, as s/he progresses toward skilled, enthusiastic, and sustained use of the interventionInclusion Criteria: Exclusion Criteria: |
| \*IV:D: Char of Individuals: Individual Identification with Organization | A broad construct related to how individuals perceive the organization, and their relationship and degree of commitment with that organizationInclusion Criteria: Exclusion Criteria: |
| \*IV:E: Char of Individuals: Other Personal Attributes | A broad construct to include other personal traits such as tolerance of ambiguity, intellectual ability, motivation, values, competence, capacity, and learning styleInclusion Criteria: Exclusion Criteria: |
| \*V:A: Process: Planning | The degree to which a scheme or method of behavior and tasks for implementing an intervention are developed in advance, and the quality of those schemes or methodsInclusion Criteria: Include evidence of pre-implementation diagnostic assessments and planning, as well as refinements to the plan Exclusion Criteria: |
| \*V:B.1: Process: Engaging: 1. Opinion Leaders | Individuals in an organization that have formal or informal influence on the attitudes and beliefs of their colleagues with respect to implementing the intervention Inclusion Criteria: Include statements related to engagement strategies and outcomes, e.g. how the opinion leader became engaged in the intervention. Note: Although both strategies and outcomes are coded here, the outcome of efforts to engage staff determines the rating, i.e., if there are repeated attempts to engage an opinion leader that are unsuccessful, or if the opinion leader leaves the organization addition, you may also want to code the "quality" of the opinion leader here- their capabilities, motivation, and skills, i.e., how good they are at their job, and this data affects the rating as well. Exclusion Criteria: |
| \*V:B.2: Process: Engaging: 2. Formally Appointed Internal Implementation Leaders | Individuals from within the organization who have been formally appointed with responsibility for implementing an intervention as coordinator, project manager, team leader, or other similar role. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements related to engagement strategies and outcome, e.g., how the formally appointed internal implementation leader became engaged with the intervention and what their role is in implementation. Note: Although both strategies and outcomes are coded here, the outcome of efforts to engage staff determines the rating, i.e., if there are repeated attempts to engage an implementation leader leaves the organization and this role is vacant, the construct receives a negative rating. In addition, you may also want to code the "quality" of the implementation leader here- their capabilities, motivation, and skills, i.e., how good they are at their job, and this data affects the rating as well. Exclusion criteria: Exclude or double code statements regarding leadership engagement to Leadership Engagement if an implementation leader is also an organizational leader, e.g., if a director of primary care takes the lead in implementing a new treatment guideline. |
| \*V:B.3: Process: Engaging: 3. Champions | Individuals who dedicate themselves to supporting, marketing, and 'driving through' an [implementation]', overcoming indifference or resistance that the intervention may provoke in an organization. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements related to engagement strategies and outcomes e.g., how the champion became engaged with the intervention and what their role is in implementation. Note: Although both strategies and outcomes are coded here, the outcome of efforts to engage staff determines the rating, i.e., if there are repeated attempts to engage a champion that are unsuccessful, or if the champion leaves the organization and this role is vacant, the construct receives a negative rating. In addition, you may also want to code the "quality" of the champion here- their capabilities, motivation, and skills, i.e., how good they are at their job and this data affects the rating as well.Exclusion Criteria: Exclude or double code statements regarding leadership engagement to "Leadership Engagement" if a champion is also an organizational leader, e.g., if a director of primary care takes the lead in implementing a new treatment guideline. |
| \*V:B.4: Process: Engaging: 4. External Change Agents | Individuals who are affiliated with an outside entity who formally influence or facilitate intervention decisions in a desirable directionInclusion Criteria: Include statements related to engagement strategies and outcomes, e.g., how the external change agent (entities outside the organization that facilitate change) became engaged with the intervention and what their role is in implementation, e.g., how they supported implementation efforts. Note: Although both strategies and outcomes are coded here, the outcome of efforts to engage the staff determines the rating, i.e., if there are repeated attempts to engage an external change agent that are unsuccessful, or if the external change agent leaves their organization and this role is vacant, the construct receives a negative rating. In addition, you may also want to code the "quality" of the external change agent here- their capabilities, motivation, and skills, i.e., how good they are at their job, and this data affects the rating as well. Exclusion Criteria: Note: It is important to clearly define what roles are external and internal to the organization. Exclude statements regarding facilitating activities, such as training in the mechanics of the program, and code to "Access to Knowledge & Information" if the change agent is considered internal to the study , e.g., a staff member at the national office. If the study considers this staff member internal to the organization, it should be coded to "Access to Knowledge & Information" even though their support may overlap with what would be expected from an External Change Agent. |
| \*V:B.5: Process: Engaging: 5. Key Stakeholders | Individuals from within the organization that are directly impacted by the intervention, e.g., staff responsible for making referrals to a new program or using a new work process. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements related to engagement strategies and outcomes, e.g., how key stakeholders became engaged with the intervention and what their role is in implementation. Note: Although both strategies and outcomes are coded here, the outcome of efforts to engage staff determines the rating, i.e., if there are repeated attempts to engage key stakeholders that are unsuccessful, the construct received a negative rating. Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statements related to implementation leaders' and users access to knowledge and information regarding using the program, i.e. training on the mechanics of the program, and code to "Access to Knowledge & Information" Exclude statements about general networking, communication, and relationships in the organization, such as descriptions of meetings, email groups, or other methods of keeping people connected and informed, and statements related to team formation, quality, and functioning, and code to "Networks and Communications" |
| \*V:B.6: Process: Engaging: 6. Intervention Participants | Individuals served by the organization that participate in the intervention, e.g. patients in a prevention program in a hospitalInclusion Criteria: Include statements related to engagement strategies and outcomes, e.g., how intervention participants became engaged with the intervention. Note: Although both strategies and outcomes are coded here, the outcome of efforts to engage participants determines the rating., if there are repeated attempts to engage participants that are unsuccessful, the construct receives a negative rating. Exclusion Criteria: Exclude statements demonstrating (lack of) awareness of the needs and resources of those served by the organization and whether or not that awareness influence the implementation or adaptation of the intervention and code to "Needs & Resources of Those Served by the Organization" |
| \*V:C: Process: Executing | Carrying out or accomplishing the implementation according to plan. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements that demonstrate how implementation occurred with respect to the implementation plan. Note: Executing is coded very infrequently due to a lack of planning. However, some studies have used fidelity measures to assess executing, as an indication of the degree to which implementation was accomplished according to planExclusion Criteria:  |
| \*V:D: Process: Reflecting & Evaluating | Quantitative and qualitative feedback about the progress and quality of implementation accompanied with regular personal and team debriefing about progress and experience. Inclusion Criteria: Include statements that refer to the implementation team's (lack of) assessment of the progress toward and impact of implementation, as well as the interpretation of outcomes related to implementation. Reflecting and Evaluating is part of the implementation process; it likely ends when implementation activities end. It does not require goals by explicitly articulated; it can focus on descriptions of the current state with real-time judgement, though there may be an implied goals (e.g., we need to implement the intervention) when the implementation team discusses feedback in terms of adjustments needed to complete implementationExclusion Criteria: Exclude statements related to the (lack of) alignment of implementation and intervention goals with larger organizational goals, as well as feedback showing any gaps between the current organizational status and the goal, and code to "Goals & Feedback". Goals and Feedback include organizational processes and supporting structures independent of the implementation processes. Evidence of the integration of evaluation components used as part of "Reflecting and Evaluating" into on-going or sustained organizational structures and processes may be (double) coded to "Goals and Feedback". Exclude statements that capture reflecting and evaluating that participants may do during the interview, for example, related to the success of the implementation and code to "Knowledge & Beliefs about the Intervention". |
| Benefits of CFIR to QIOs | Code any time the QIO states they found a benefit to the interview and "thinking through the process". This information will likely be mentioned at the end of the interview.  |
| Concurrent Intervention | Code any other intervention the QIO discusses as occurring in the community Do not code other interventions occurring in the community to CFIR domains. Instead code these as "concurrent interventions" so we can note the other interventions occurring but do not need to analyze them in the depth of CFIR that we would the intervention identified in the survey/interview guide.  |
| Explanation of RIR performance | Use this code for the QIO response to how they explain the RIR performance in the community |
| Intervention Description | Use this code when the QIO (or interviewer) discussed fundamental components of the intervention or what the intervention is. Exclusion Criteria: This code does not need to be used when the QIO is discussing components of the intervention where they fall into CFIR.  |
| LOA | Code when QIO discusses the specific utilization of concepts the QIO learned from Leadership and Organizing in Action/community organizing.  |
| Reach | Use this code when the QIO discusses the reach of the intervention (beneficiaries reached, or potential spread of implementing providers).  |
| Spread of intervention | Code this when discussing the spread of the intervention either across communities or providers |
| Background QIO Setting | Use this when the QIO talks about the QIO organization, turnover in the QIO, staff, etc. This captures anything outside typical contractual activities. |