



## The Hexagon Tool: Exploring Context

Adapted with permission by  
The State Implementation & Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices Center (SISEP)

Based on the work of  
The National Implementation Research Network (NIRN)

Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute





The Hexagon Tool helps states, districts, and schools systematically evaluate new and existing interventions via six broad factors: needs, fit, resource availability, evidence, readiness for replication and capacity to implement.

Broad factors to consider when doing early stage exploration of Evidence-Based Practices (EBP)/Evidence Informed Innovations (EII) include:

- **Needs** of students; how well the program or practice might meet identified needs.
- **Fit** with current initiatives, priorities, structures and supports, and parent/community values.
- **Resource Availability** for training, staffing, technology supports, curricula, data systems and administration.
- **Evidence** indicating the outcomes that might be expected if the program or practices are implemented well.
- **Readiness for Replication** of the program, including expert assistance available, number of replications accomplished, exemplars available for observation, and how well the program is operationalized
- **Capacity to Implement** as intended and to sustain and improve implementation over time.

A thorough exploration process focused on the proposed program or practice will help your Implementation Team(s) have a productive discussion related to the six areas listed above, and to arrive at a decision to move forward (or not) grounded in solid information from multiple sources. That information will assist you in communicating with stakeholders and in developing an Implementation Plan.

There are a number of discussion prompts listed under each area of the hexagon. These prompts are not exhaustive, and you may decide that additional prompts need to be added. The prompts direct you to relevant dimensions that your team may want to discuss before rating the factor.

For example, under the area labeled **Fit**, you are reminded to consider:

- How the proposed intervention or framework ‘fits’ with other existing initiatives and whether implementation and outcomes are likely to be enhanced or diminished as a result of interactions with other relevant interventions
- How does it fit with the priorities of your state, district, or school?
- How does it fit with current state, district, or regional organizational structures?
- How does it fit with community values, including the values of diverse cultural groups?

---

## Recommendations for Using the Hexagon Tool

The following are SISEP recommendations for using the tool:

1. Assign team members to gather information related to the six factors and to present the information to the decision-making group or relevant Implementation Team. Following report-outs related to each area and/or review of written documents, team members can individually rate each area on a 1 to 5 scale, where 1 indicates a low level of acceptability or feasibility, 3 a moderate level and 5 indicates a high level for the factor. Midpoints can be used and scored as 2 or 4.
2. You can average scores for each area across individuals and arrive at an overall average score, with a higher score indicating more favorable conditions for implementation and impact. However, cut-off scores should not be used to make the decision.
3. The scoring process is primarily designed to generate discussion and to help arrive at consensus for each factor as well as overall consensus related to moving forward or not. The numbers do not make the decision, the team does. Team discussions and consensus decision-making are required because different factors may be more or less important for a given program or practice and the context in which it is to be implemented. There also will be trade-offs among the factors. For example, a program or practice may have a high level of evidence with rigorous research and strong effect size (Evidence), but may not yet have been implemented widely outside of the research trials<sup>1</sup>. This should lead to a team discussion of how ready you are to be the “first” to implement in typical educational settings in your area. Or the team may discover that excellent help is available from a developer, purveyor, or expert Training or Technical Assistance, but that ongoing costs (Resource Availability) may be a concern.
4. We recommend that after reviewing information related to each factor, individually scoring each factor, summarizing ratings, and discussing the strengths and challenges related to each factor of the proposed intervention, that the team members decide on a process for arriving at consensus (for instance, private voting or round-robin opinions followed by public voting).

---

<sup>1</sup> Usable Interventions - To be usable, it's necessary to have sufficient detail about an intervention. With detail, you can train educators to implement it with fidelity, replicate it across multiple settings and measure the use of the intervention. So, an intervention needs to be teachable, learnable, doable, and be readily assessed in practice.


# The Hexagon Tool

## Exploring Context

The Hexagon Tool can be used as a planning tool to evaluate evidence-based programs and practices during the Exploration Stage of Implementation.

See the AI Modules Resource Library <http://implementation.fpg.unc.edu>

<b>EBP:</b>			
5 Point Rating Scale: High = 5; Medium = 3; Low = 1. Midpoints can be used and scored as a 2 or 4.			
	High	Med	Low
Need			
Fit			
Resource Availability			
Evidence			
Readiness for Replication			
Capacity to Implement			
<b>Total Score</b>			



© Dean Fixsen and Karen Blase 2013

Adapted from work by Laurel J. Kiser, Michelle Zabel, Albert A. Zachik, and Joan Smith at the University of Maryland



# Citation

## Citation and Copyright

This document is based on the work of the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN).

© 2013 Karen Blase and Dean Fixsen



This content is licensed under Creative Commons license CC BY-NC-ND, Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives . You are free to share, copy, distribute and transmit the work under the following conditions: Attribution — You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work); Noncommercial — You may not use this work for commercial purposes; No Derivative Works — You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work. Any of the above conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.

# About

## About

The mission of the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) is to contribute to the best practices and science of implementation, organization change, and system reinvention to improve outcomes across the spectrum of human services.

email: [nirn@unc.edu](mailto:nirn@unc.edu)

web: <http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu>

Effective implementation capacity is essential to improving education. The State Implementation & Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices Center supports education systems in creating implementation capacity for evidence-based practices benefitting students, especially those with disabilities.

email: [sisep@unc.edu](mailto:sisep@unc.edu)

web: <http://www.scalingup.org>



State Implementation & Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices Center  
National Implementation Research Network, CB 8185, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-8185