FIDELITY VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS FOR PCCD GRANTEES

PROJECT TOWARDS NO DRUG ABUSE (PROJECT TND)

OVERVIEW OF THE PROCESS:

One of the requirements of the evidence-based grant funding through PCCD will be for your program's developer or their designee to conduct a Fidelity Verification Review of your site/agency, indicating whether or not the program is being implemented with sufficient quality and fidelity, and per your grant proposal.

The Fidelity Verification Review Process is an integral part of promoting model adherence, quality implementation, sustainability, and demonstrating program outcomes and impact. It also gives the developer or designee a means to provide necessary feedback should there be any notable areas of improvement needed.

The Fidelity Verification Review Process will look different for each evidence-based program, in terms of the delivery and/or components of the process. It is difficult to have a "blanket" process when each program is unique. Additional information for each program is available on the EPISCenter website.

The PCCD Fidelity Verification Review Process should not be confused with any certification processes established by the developer. The purpose of the Fidelity Verification Review Process is to fully assess a grantee's functioning, to assess programming fidelity and implementation, as well as their ability to demonstrate and communicate impact. PCCD is asking developers or their designees to assess these areas based on reasonable expectations for the length of time in which the grantee has been implementing their evidence-based program.

Program developers or their designees are asked to assess the grantees between Year 2, Quarter 1 and Year 2, Quarter 2 of their grant funding. Beginning in Year 1, Quarter 4, your Implementation Specialist will remind you to begin the Fidelity Verification Review Process. Depending on whether your program is school or community-based will determine when the process is able to occur. A subsequent letter is provided by the developer or their designee to the grantee. The grantee will then provide said letter to PCCD (via Egrants) and the EPISCenter. This letter will include a site rating, along with additional narrative information/ratings regarding strengths and areas in need of improvement. The letter must be submitted into Egrants and to EPISCenter no later than Year 2, Quarter 3, and should be done as soon as the review is completed and the letter is received from the developer or their designee.

The following are the grantee's ratings at the conclusion of the process:

Rating 1: Excellent implementation. This site is implementing with an excellent level of fidelity and exceeds expectations in multiple areas. The program adheres to the developer's model and this site can serve as a model site to others implementing this program. The program is achieving all required deliverables and it is expected that positive future outcomes will result from this implementation. (This rating is reserved for the truly exceptional and exemplar program implementations).

Rating 2: Strong/Sufficient implementation. The site is implementing with sufficient level of fidelity. The program is being implemented as designed, with no significant concerns or minimal recommendations for improvement. The program is achieving the expected outcomes and should continue to do so, if it continues implementing at the current level. At this time, the areas identified as needing improvement are limited and as to be expected for the length of implementation time. The program can reasonably expect positive future outcomes with current level of implementation

Rating 3: Improvement needed in implementation. The site needs to make significant changes and improvements to the current implementation. Currently, the program is not being implemented with the level of fidelity that is expected by the developer. If corrective action is taken in a timely manner to bring program implementation into compliance, it is reasonable to think that this implementation can still achieve the desired outcomes. (For programs in this category, it is PCCD's intention to work with the developer and grantee to articulate a plan of corrective action and timetable to bring the program into compliance with the developer's requirements).

Rating 4: Serious implementation concerns. There are serious concerns regarding implementation. The site is not implementing with fidelity and has not adhered to the program model as designed by the developer. The developer does not believe these concerns can be corrected in a reasonable amount of time, thus it is unlikely this site can make the necessary corrections prior to the conclusion of the funding cycle. It is recommended that the site continue to work closely with the EPISCenter to develop a corrective action plan and work closely with the EPISCenter staff to improve the quality of implementation to a mutually acceptable level in order to achieve the desired positive outcomes.

It is noted that all grantees are working towards, but are not expected to have achieved, full fidelity and/or capacity. It is not anticipated that many sites will receive the highest rating. Should the grantee receive a below average rating, they, the EPISCenter Implementation Specialist, and PCCD will work to formulate a corrective action plan for the remainder of the grant period.

Cost for Project TND:

Fidelity Verification Review cost for Project TND includes a phone or on-site consultation. Please contact your EPISCenter Implementation Specialist and USC Program Manager Leah Meza to schedule this process, and to assess the costs involved.

Leah Meza
USC Institute for Prevention Research
Soto Street Building, 3rd Floor
2001 N. Soto Street
Los Angeles, CA 90032
Phone: (800) 400-8461
Fax: (323) 442-7254
Email: leahmedi@usc.edu