# Selecting Strategies

Using the Hexagon Tool

This process can be used as a planning tool to evaluate strategies, programs, and practices prior to Implementation. It may also be used to determine revision or removal of an existing strategy, program, or practice.

Building/District: Click or tap here to enter text.

Strategy/Program/Practice: Click or tap here to enter text.

Purpose of Strategy: Click or tap here to enter text.

Brief Description of Strategy: Click or tap here to enter text.

Date: Click or tap to enter a date.

Target Population: Click or tap here to enter text.

Reviewers: Click or tap here to enter text.

Summarize the findings from the hexagon tool analysis:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Action steps to be taken as a result of the hexagon tool analysis:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Date for follow-up: Click or tap to enter a date.

## NEED Rating: Choose an item.

* Who is the identified focus population? Are there subpopulations? Were these data disaggregated by race, ethnicity, language, and other characteristics specific to the focus population and subpopulation(s)?
* What is/are the identified needs of these population(s) and/or subpopulations? What are the root causes of these needs? Is there evidence that the program or practice addresses the specific area(s) of need identified?
* How do members of the focus population perceive their need? What do they believe will be helpful? How were community members engaged to assess perception of need?
* If the program or practice is implemented, what could potentially change for these population(s)?

Notes: Click or tap here to enter text.

| RATING | DESCRIPTION |
| --- | --- |
| 5 - Strongly Meets Need | The implementing site has demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of how the program or practice meets the needs of the focus population. The implementing site has included three or more data sources when conducting the needs assessment including administrative data and perspectives of staff, community partners and children, youth and families; and has disaggregated data to identify needs of specific and relevant subpopulations. |
| 4 - Meets Need | The implementing site has demonstrated an understanding of how the program or practice meets the needs of the focus population. The implementing site has included two or more data sources when conducting the needs assessment including administrative data and perspectives of staff, community partners and children, youth and families; and has disaggregated data to identify needs of specific and relevant subpopulations. |
| 3 - Somewhat Meets Need | The implementing site has demonstrated some understanding of how the program or practice meets the needs of the focus population. The implementing site has included two or more data sources when conducting the needs assessment including administrative data and perspectives of staff, community partners and children, youth and families; but has not disaggregated these data. |
| 2 - Minimally Meets Need | The implementing site has demonstrated minimal understanding of how the program or practice meets the needs of the focus population. The implementing site has included only administrative data when conducting the needs assessment and has not disaggregated these data. |
| 1 - Does Not Meet Need | The implementing site has not demonstrated an understanding of how the program or practice meets the needs of the focus population. |

## FIT Rating: Choose an item.

* How does the program or practice fit with priorities of the implementing site?
* How does the program or practice fit with family and community values and assets in the impacted community, including the values of racially, ethnically, culturally, and linguistically specific populations? How does the program or practice fit with the community’s history relevant to the identified need or focus population?
* What other initiatives currently being implemented will intersect with the program or practice? How does the program or practice fit with other existing initiatives?

Notes: Click or tap here to enter text.

| RATING | DESCRIPTION |
| --- | --- |
| 5 – Strong Fit | The program or practice fits with all of the priorities of the implementing site; community values, including the values of racially, ethnically, culturally and linguistically specific populations; and other existing initiatives. |
| 4 - Fit | The program or practice fits with all of the priorities of the implementing site and community values; however, the values of racially, ethnically, culturally and linguistically specific populations and alignment with other initiatives have not been assessed for fit. |
| 3 – Some Fit | The program or practice fits with all of the priorities of the implementing site, but it is unclear whether it aligns with community values and other existing initiatives. |
| 2 – Minimal Fit | The program or practice fits with some of the priorities of the implementing site, but it is unclear whether it aligns with community values and other existing initiatives. |
| 1 - Does Not Fit | The program or practice does not fit with the priorities of the implementing site, community values or other existing initiatives. |

## CAPACITY TO IMPLEMENT Rating: Choose an item.

* Typically, how much does it cost to run the program or practice each year? For the entire length of the program or practice? Are there resources to support this cost?
* What are the staffing requirements for the program or practice (number and type of staff, e.g., education, credentials, content knowledge, cultural competency)? Does the implementing site currently employ or have access to staff that meet these requirements?
* Do staff have the capacity to collect and use data to inform ongoing monitoring and improvement of the program or practice? Will the program or practice require changes to the monitoring and reporting system?
* Is leadership knowledgeable about and in support of this program or practice? Do leaders have the diverse skills and perspectives representative of the focus population?
* What administrative policies, procedures, or practices must be developed or adjusted to support the work of practitioners and others to implement the program or practice?
* Will the program or practice require use of or changes to building facilities? New technology, including hardware or software?

Notes: Click or tap here to enter text.

| RATING | DESCRIPTION |
| --- | --- |
| 5 – Strong Capacity | The implementing site adopting this program or practice has all of the capacity necessary, including all of the following: a qualified workforce, financial supports, technology supports and administrative supports required to implement and sustain the program or practice with integrity. |
| 4 – Adequate Capacity | The implementing site adopting this program or practice has most of the capacity necessary, including three of the following: a qualified workforce, financial supports, technology supports and administrative supports required to implement and sustain the program or practice with integrity. |
| 3 – Some Capacity | The implementing site adopting this program or practice has some of the capacity necessary, including two of the following: a qualified workforce, financial supports, technology supports and administrative supports required to implement and sustain the program or practice with integrity. |
| 2 – Minimal Capacity | The implementing site adopting the program or practice has minimal capacity necessary, including only one of the following: a qualified workforce, financial supports, technology supports or administrative supports required to implement and sustain the program or practice with integrity. |
| 1 – No Capacity | The implementing site adopting this program or practice does not have the capacity necessary, including any of the following: qualified workforce, financial supports, technology supports or administrative supports required to implement and sustain the program or practice with integrity. |

## EVIDENCE Rating: Choose an item.

* Are there research data available to demonstrate the effectiveness of the program or practice?
* Is there practice-based evidence or community-defined evidence to indicate effectiveness? What is the strength of the evidence? Under what conditions was the evidence developed? Was it similar to the setting in which it will be implemented?
* If research data are not available, are there evaluation data to indicate effectiveness (e.g., pre/post data, testing results, action research)?
* Do the studies (research and/or evaluation) provide data specific to effectiveness for racially, ethnically, culturally, and linguistically specific populations?
* What outcomes are expected when the program or practice is implemented as intended? How much of a change can be expected?

Notes: Click or tap here to enter text.

| RATING | DESCRIPTION |
| --- | --- |
| 5 – High Evidence | The program or practice has documented evidence of effectiveness based on at least two rigorous, external research studies with the focus population and control groups and has demonstrated sustained effects at least one year post treatment. |
| 4 – Evidence | The program or practice has demonstrated effectiveness with one rigorous, external research study with the focus population and a control group. |
| 3 – Some Evidence | The program or practice shows some evidence of effectiveness through less rigorous research studies with the focus population and comparison groups. |
| 2 – Minimal Evidence | The program or practice is guided by a well-developed theory of change or logic model for the focus population and has demonstrated a relationship between the program or practice and outcomes based on an evaluation or practice-based evidence. |
| 1 – No Evidence | The program or practice does not have a well-developed theory of change or logic model and has not demonstrated a relationship between the program or practice and outcomes based on an evaluation or practice-based evidence. |

## USABILITY Rating: Choose an item.

* Is the program or practice clearly defined (e.g., what it is, for whom it is intended)?
* Are core features of the program or practice identified, listed, named (e.g., key components of the program or practice that are required in order to be effective)? Is each core feature well operationalized (e.g., staff know what to do and say, how to prepare, how to assess progress)?
* Is there guidance on core features that can be modified or adapted to increase contextual fit, e.g., for specific populations, such as for racial/ethnic groups?
* Is there a fidelity assessment that measures practitioner behavior (i.e., assessment of whether staff use the practice as intended)?
* Has the program or practice been adapted for use within racially, ethnically, culturally, and linguistically specific populations and/or is there a recommended process for gathering input from the focus population and community on culturally specific enhancements?

Notes: Click or tap here to enter text.

| RATING | DESCRIPTION |
| --- | --- |
| 5 – Highly Usable | The program or practice has operationalized principles and core components that are measurable and observable and has a validated fidelity assessment; modifiable components are identified to support contextualization for new settings or populations. |
| 4 – Usable | The program or practice has operationalized principles and core components that are measurable and observable and has tools and resources to monitor fidelity, but does not have a validated fidelity measure; modifiable components are identified to support contextualization for new settings or focus populations. |
| 3 – Somewhat Usable | The program or practice has operationalized principles and core components that are measurable and observable and has tools and resources to monitor fidelity, but does not have a validated fidelity measure; modifiable components are identified to support contextualization for new settings or focus populations. |
| 2 – Minimally Usable | The program or practice has identified principles and core components; however, the principles and core components are not defined in measurable or observable terms; modifiable components are not identified. |
| 1 – Not Usable | The program or practice does not identify principles or core components. |

## SUPPORTS Rating: Choose an item.

* Is there a qualified “expert” (e.g., consultant, program developer, intermediary, technical assistance provider) who can help with implementation over time?
* Are there start-up costs for implementation of the program or practice? What does the implementing site receive for these costs?
* Are there curricula and/or other resources related to the program or practice readily available? Are the materials representative of the focus population who will be receiving and delivering the program or practice? What is the cost of these materials?
* Is training and professional development related to the program or practice readily available, and does it consider issues of race equity, cultural responsiveness, or implicit bias?

Notes: Click or tap here to enter text.

| RATING | DESCRIPTION |
| --- | --- |
| 5 – Well Supported | Comprehensive resources are available from an expert (a program developer or intermediary) to support implementation, including resources for building the competency of staff (staff selection, training, coaching, fidelity) and organizational practice (data system and data use support, policies and procedures, stakeholder and partner engagement). |
| 4 – Supported | Some resources are available to support implementation, including limited resources to support staff competency (e.g., training and coaching) and limited resources to support organizational changes (e.g., data systems). |
| 3 – Somewhat Supported | Some resources are available to support competency development or organizational development, but not both. |
| 2 – Minimally Supported | Limited resources are available beyond a curriculum or one time training. |
| 1 – Not Supported | Few to no resources are available to support implementation. |