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Social Interaction Learning Model

- Adverse Contexts
- Coercive
  - Aversive Behavior
  - Negative Reciprocity
  - Escalation
  - Negative Reinforcement
- Positive
  - Skill Encouragement
  - Limit Setting
  - Monitoring
  - Problem solving
  - Positive Involvement
- Disrupted parenting
- Child Adjustment
OSLC RCTs

SAMPLES
- Divorced Mothers (PTC)
- Step-families (MAPS)
- School in High Crime Neighborhoods (LIFT)
- Maltreated Children
- Adjudicated Youth
- Treatment Foster Care: Delinquents - Boys
- Treatment Foster Care: Delinquents - Girls
- Foster Care: Mentally Ill (Hospitalized)
- Early Intervention Treatment Care (2-4)

POSITIVE PARENTING PRACTICES
- Skill Encouragement
- Positive Involvement
- Effective Discipline
- Problem-solving
- Monitoring / Supervision

COERCIVE PARENTING
- Negative Reciprocity
- Escalation
- Negative Reinforcement

CHILD OUTCOMES
- Arrest Rates / Severity of Crime
- Substance Use
- Noncompliance
- Delinquent Behaviors
- Academic Function
- Out of Home Placement
- Deviant Peer Associations
- Depression

PARENT OUTCOMES
- Depression
- Standard of living
- Arrest rates
- Marital adjustment
- Marital satisfaction

Forgatch & Patterson, 2010
Implementation through Full Transfer

- EBP is fully transferred from purveyor to adopting community
- Wide-scale Implementation
- Requires oversight by governing authority that can & will sustain
  - Model Fidelity
  - Effective Treatment Outcomes
- Starts with visionary leader(s) committed to effecting lasting change
  - Social Political Capital
  - Resources
  - Longevity
- Sustained by satisfied families & practitioners
- Fidelity Measure: *Fidelity of Implementation (FIMP)*
  - Observations based on intervention sessions
  - Ratings of practitioner adherence and competence
Host Community
- Identify Needs
- Engage Leadership
- Establish Program Goals
- Recruit Effective Program
- Administer Training
- Evaluate Program Efficacy

Program Provider
- Articulate Intervention
- Engage Leadership
- Develop Training Program
- Train Professionals
- Evaluate Fidelity
- Certify Competency

Collaboration
- Logistics
- Mentorship
- Adapt for Context
- Adapt for Culture
- Provide Support
- Troubleshoot
- Evaluate Implementation
- Make Sustainable
# Large-Scale PMTO Implementations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Date Initiated</th>
<th>System of Care*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Nationwide</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>CMH &amp; CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Nationwide</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>CMH &amp; CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>2004-2006</td>
<td>CMH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denmark</strong></td>
<td>Nationwide</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>CMH &amp; CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Nationwide</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>CMH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>City/Countywide</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>CMH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>CW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trained by Norway**
*Child Mental Health (CMH)*
*Child Welfare (CW)*
Evaluations of PMTO Implementations

- Norway: many RCTs showing positive effects
- Iceland: a nationwide RCT showing positive effects
- Netherlands: a nationwide RCT in progress
- Denmark: an RCT in progress
- Mexico city: an RCT soon to be published
- Minnesota: tailored for military families; an RCT underway

- Michigan: statewide, qualitative study and preference study
- Spanish-speaking Latinos in Detroit; high retention rate & satisfaction; RCT and more research in progress
- Kansas: earlier reunification & greater retention in treatment; RCT and more research in progress
Implementation Feedback Process

1. Develop a Collaborative Partnership
2. Adapt for Contexts & Culture
3. Train & Support Professionals
4. Evaluate Outcomes
5. Evaluate Fidelity
6. Make Sustainable
The FIMP Central Website: How ISI2 Keeps the Orchestra in Tune

An orchestra conductor can use a Tuning Fork to ensure that each instrument is in tune with all the others. Similarly, ISI2 can use the secure online environment of the FIMP Central website to ensure fidelity to the original PMTO model. As FIMP team leaders from around the world upload, view and rate FIMP spots with their own team members, ISI2 is able to compare each team’s ratings to ISI2 “True Scores,” ensuring fidelity to the original PMTO model.

In addition to providing a means for FIMP teams to calibrate themselves to the standards set by ISI2, the FIMP Central website provides a means for FIMP teams around the world to monitor their own team, store their ratings and reliability scores in a centralized online archive, and have their reliability recertified annually through ISI2.
Fidelity of Implementation Rating System (FIMP): The manual for PMTO®
(Knutson, Forgatch, Rains, & Sigmarsdóttir, 2009, rev.)

9-Point Likert Scale
Good work = 7-9; Acceptable = 4-6; Needs Work = 1-3

Knowledge: Proficiency in understanding & application core components
Structure: Session management, pacing/timing, responsiveness
Teaching: Promotes mastery, use of role play, problem solving
Process: Clinical & strategic skills, supportive context for learning
Overall: Growth, satisfaction, likely return, adjust context, difficulty

Sessions scored for Certification: Encouragement and Limit Setting
Uses of FIMP

Teaching tool for training and coaching

Evaluation of training & certification

Evaluation of drift across generations

Evaluation of drift within a generation

Assess mechanisms
  Does fidelity predict improved parenting?
  Does fidelity predict improved child outcomes?
Predictive Validity of Fidelity

Fidelity → Change Parenting → Change Child Behavior
FIMP Predictive Validity in Two Samples: Effects of FIMP on Pre/Post Change in Observed Parenting

S = Efficacy Trial: Stepfamily Prevention Sample – N = 4 Therapists; N = 20 Families
N = Effectiveness Trial: Norwegian Clinical Sample – N = 114 Therapists; N = 238 Families

Stepfamily Sample: chi-square = 9.113, df = 12, P = .693, CFI = 1.000, cmindf = .759, rmsea = .000; tp < .10; *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001; Forgatch, Patterson, & DeGarmo (2005)
Norwegian Sample: chi-square = 9.113, df = 12, P = .693, CFI = 1.000, cmindf = .759, rmsea = .000; tp < .10; *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001; Forgatch & DeGarmo (2011)
Predictive Validity of FIMP in Norwegian Sample: FIMP and Alliance Effects on Change in Child Outcome

Figure 3. Structural model for fidelity, alliance, and parent-reported externalizing problem behaviors ($N = 328$). Coefficients are completely standardized estimates. Significant paths are in whole lines ($^* p \leq .05$; $^{**} p \leq .01$), whereas nonsignificant paths are presented by stippled lines ($p > .05$). All paths between same construct were at $p \leq .001$. The error variance for PDR_T4 was constrained to zero because of a nonsignificant, negative residual variance. PDR = Parent Daily Report; CBCL = Child Behavior Checklist; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker Lewis index; T = time; beh = behavior.
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