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Private and public funders often face the question of whether to support the replication or scale up of a promising program. Maybe they invested in the program’s initial development and now wonder about helping to fuel its expansion. Or perhaps the program, though new to them, seems like a good fit with their current priorities. On what grounds do they choose to invest in the program’s growth? The answer is not obvious, and until now little systematic guidance has existed to help funders decide.

Over the past five years, Replication & Program Strategies has had the opportunity to work with and study many organizations attempting to extend the reach of their programs. This experience has made clear that investing in social program growth doesn’t have to be the conundrum that it often is for public and philanthropic funders. Even though social investors lack a simple metric like profit to determine likely success and failure, they can still exercise business-like due diligence to evaluate the odds that a given program will expand successfully.

A Framework for Decision

The potential of a program to gain wider, successful application depends basically on three factors:

- whether the program is good enough;
- whether the organization that developed it is capable enough; and
- whether the program’s larger environment will support its expansion.

The qualities of the program are important for obvious reasons. To be replicable, the program must work, that is, it needs to show that it can produce the kind of results for which it has been designed. Also important is how it operates to get these results – how easy or hard it is to implement.

The capabilities of the organization that developed the program are important, because, in all probability, that organization (or another it has designated or created to lead replication) will have to teach those who want the program how to run it. No program is self-replicating, and the information that can be gleaned from written materials, web sites, and conference presentations usually isn’t enough to ensure effective replication.

The environment is important because it defines the overall conditions, for better or worse, under which the program will have to spread or not. It determines who’s interested in adopting the program, where the resources will come from to support the program’s operation, and how the program may have to change if it is to keep growing and benefiting more people in more
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Qualities of the Program

In the commercial sector, a number of overarching institutions regulate access to the marketplace. Such entities as Underwriters’ Laboratories, The Securities and Exchange Commission, and Consumers’ Union generate a rich and accessible pool of relatively valid and reliable information to aid investors and buyers in their decisions.

Needless to say, the social sector is not similarly equipped. Until it has its own institutions for assessing value, social investors will have to rely mostly on their own wits to evaluate program quality. While valuation can be complex because most social programs worth consideration are complex, RPS has found that certain qualities differentiate the more replicable from the less replicable designs.

Different Kinds of Effectiveness

A program needs to work – needs to meet some criterion of effectiveness – if it is going to be replicable. The judgment of effectiveness hinges on what a program purports to accomplish. Investing in the growth of a program should be based on whether it achieves its purpose and, equally important, whether that purpose is one investors understand and can support.

The point can perhaps be better understood by looking at two programs in the same general field but serving somewhat different purposes: Success for All, an elementary school reform program, and the Coalition of Essential Schools, a mostly high school reform model.

Success for All, developed by researchers at Johns Hopkins University, focuses mainly on changing classroom practice, to improve student reading and related performance measures. It employs specific curricular changes, embodied in detailed materials, to accomplish its aims. By contrast, the Coalition of Essential Schools, crafted by faculty at Brown University, attempts to change the overall school environment, with the hope that change will lead to higher levels of student performance. To get schools moving in this general direction, the Coalition prescribes several guiding principles, leaving it up to each school to turn these principles into operational details.

Evaluation using experimental methods has found Success for All to be measurably effective in fulfilling its aim to improve student reading performance. Because of its broader agenda, the Coalition has been harder to evaluate using experimental procedures, and so resort has been made to forms of assessment that do not depend as much on numbers. This more qualitative evaluation has yielded a mixed picture of the Coalition’s impact, which is not surprising given the broader goals of the program.

Is one of these models more effective than the other? That depends on what investors want. If investors want to see specific improvements in the reading levels and related performance of grade school students, then Success for All represents an attractive option. If, instead, they are more interested in developing the capacity of schools to change and strengthen themselves, then
the Coalition may be appealing. The judgment of effectiveness turns on which purpose an investor prefers or believes to be more important or necessary.

Questions to Ask about Effectiveness:

- Are the program and the purpose it serves worthy of support? Do they respond to a clear and significant need in society?
- Has the program shown that it can fulfill that purpose? What is the evidence that it can?
- How does this evidence compare with what’s known about the effectiveness of other programs serving the same purpose?

Explaining Effectiveness

It is one thing for a program to look effective on the basis of the evidence for it. It is another for that effectiveness to be explained as caused by the program and not something else. Causation is often difficult to ascertain in social action because people's behavior can be affected by so many different influences. Did a training program “cause” that person to get a job, or was it simply the fact that the job came open at the right time in the right place? For even the most rigorously designed and tested program, there is always some doubt that the program is responsible for the results attributed to it.

Be that as it may, if it is going to be a viable candidate for replication, a program needs to generate a convincing account of how it, and not something else, is the cause of its measured performance.

Consider, for example, the nurse home visitation program developed by David Olds of the University of Colorado and his colleagues. This program, the Nurse-Family Partnership, in which nurses visit low-income women in their homes during pregnancy and through the first two years of the child’s life, has been shown through high quality experimental research to lead to significant improvements in the health and social functioning of families. The evidence of its impact, however, would be less compelling than it is were it not for the fact that a comprehensive, coherent theoretical foundation underlies the design and operation of the program. The model is based on established theories about adult motivation (self-efficacy theory), parent-child relationships (attachment theory), and environmental influences on family life (community ecology theory). These theories supply a fairly convincing account of how the program produces the good outcomes associated with it.

Invoking theory is nothing more than being clear and persuasive about the assumptions on which a program is based. A well-articulated set of assumptions (or theories) explaining a program’s workings is not only important in being able to show that the program merits replication. It is also critical in making the program understandable to those who will implement it in new settings. People who do not understand why and how a program works the way it does are not apt to be very effective at operating it.
Questions to Ask about Explaining Effectiveness:

- Is there a convincing explanation that the program, and not other factors, has caused the performance being attributed to it?
- Is this explanation grounded in accepted theory?
- If not theory, is there a clearly stated and logical set of assumptions explaining how the working of the program produces the results associated with it?

Getting Results Sooner Rather Than Later

By and large, social problems are complicated and do not succumb to quick fixes. But we live in a society that thrives on speed, on getting things done sooner rather than later. Witness the short time horizons of elected officials, who want results achieved in two to four years, and foundations, which rarely grant funding for more than three years at a time. Thus, social programs face the challenge of lasting long enough to make a real difference and acting fast enough to accommodate the hurried culture in which we live.

How long a program should take to yield positive outcomes will depend on the complexity of the behavior the program seeks to instill or prevent. Big Brothers Big Sisters, the well-known mentoring program, has been shown to reduce at risk youth’s involvement in drugs, alcohol, and violence and to increase their commitment to school. Evidence suggests that, to produce these outcomes, the relationship between a mentor and a child needs to last nine months or longer. Less than that and the relationship may even be harmful to the child. By contrast, a program that does not target at risk kids and, say, focuses simply on improving children’s awareness of healthy behavior – the well-known DARE program might be an example – could probably afford to be less extensive.

The obvious trade-off, of course, is that simple programs of short duration do not hold as much potential as longer lasting, complex ones of affecting important outcomes. Occasionally, a program emerges that produces enduring change quickly. Habitat for Humanity would be a case in point. In a matter of months, Habitat erects a house which a low-income family then occupies as an owner, thereby gaining a surer foothold on economic security. But programs like Habitat are rare. Most social challenges won’t be successfully met so fast.

The best candidate for replication will be a program which takes some time to generate significant outcomes. It will not only be clear about its desired end-results, but will also have a well-defined set of interim performance targets. The latter will reveal whether progress is being made and will provide program staff with appropriate incentives. For example, the Nurse-Family Partnership noted above measures both outcomes and operational performance indicators that tell staff whether they are implementing the model with enough fidelity to have a good chance of eventually reaching those outcomes. The more replicable programs will be those that, like nurse home visiting, take the need for speed into account without completely surrendering to it.
Questions to Ask about Speed:

• Does the program last long enough to yield important outcomes?

• Does the program operate quickly enough to produce interim results (on the way to final outcomes) that will be persuasive to funders, policy makers, and others?

• Does the program generate interim performance measures to show program staff how they are doing?

Specificity and Coherence

Replicability depends not just on how effective and fast a program is, but also on how straightforward it is to implement. The simple rule here is that programs which are well-specified and coherent will be easier to implement than those which are not.

Consider, again, the Nurse-Family Partnership. The program’s effectiveness depends on the nurse establishing close rapport with the mothers she visits. This is easier to do when the mothers are having their first babies, and they are curious about their changing bodies and what it will be like to care for a small child. That’s why the program focuses on first-time moms, rather than women having subsequent children. The choice of target group thus aligns fairly precisely with the kind of relationship needed for the visitors to be effective. What should happen on the visits is then carefully spelled out in written visit-by-visit guidelines matched to the baby’s expected development from pregnancy through toddlerhood. Nurses report that the program’s intricate design, while initially a lot to absorb, puts them on a steep learning curve in their work with families.

Specificity makes a program easier to understand, adopt, and operate. People will learn a specific design, in which a program is defined in terms of its constituent processes, more readily than they will a general one. Concrete information is easier to assimilate than concepts. When a program has been well-specified and translated into practice, desired performance can be defined more accurately, and those involved in implementing the program are likely to be more aware of the ways in which it can go wrong. Make it a program which also coheres (i.e., the parts work together well), and implementers are better able to see how one part of it going wrong will affect other parts and how changes to the program may affect its overall functioning.

In studying education reform designs disseminated under the auspices of New American Schools, researchers at the Rand Corporation in California found early replication most successful for models that were spelled out more concretely and completely. The best explanation for this is that administrators and teachers were better able to grasp those models closest to their own operating experience. **Broader, more conceptual designs were perceived as more abstract and harder to get a handle on operationally.**

Specificity bears directly on the ability to preserve the quality of a program as it expands to more locations. Specificity aids codification, that is, the process of systematically laying out how the program is supposed to operate. Codification, in turn, provides the basis for setting the standards...
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against which quality can be assessed. Without, or with too little, codification, defensible standards are harder to set and, thus, quality is harder to assure.

Specificity also helps define the kinds of people needed to run a program locally. When a program has been pinned down fairly precisely, it is easier to identify the knowledge, skills, and personal attributes needed to do it well. The teen pregnancy prevention program of the National Adolescent Sexuality Training Center at the Children’s Aid Society in New York, developed by Dr. Michael Carrera, consists of five well-defined components. Each component is associated with a different job. When the program is established in a new setting, staff recruitment can proceed quickly because the positions to be filled are clear and specific.

Not everyone supports the idea of replication, and those who don’t usually base their opposition on the requirement of specificity. Proponents of replication believe that both the devil and God are in the details. Get the details right, and the program is replicable. Get them wrong, and adopters will be left implementing failure. Opponents, on the other hand, see the details as the devil’s province alone. They contend that social programs require too much adaptation across sites to be replicable in the strict sense of the term. From their perspective, about the best that can be done is to set forth general principles to guide local designs, which will, of necessity, vary significantly from place to place.

Although opponents make a valuable point – that differences among communities need to be respected, they frequently overstate the actual extent of these differences to make the case for local choice appear stronger. Theirs tends to be an argument less about the technical feasibility of replication and more about the desirability of letting communities solve their own problems. In this, they carry on an important political tradition in American life that helps to temper the hubris to which replication enthusiasts may be prone as they sometimes seek to make their way the only way.

Replication is not for all programs. Indeed, it’s probably not for most. For any given community at any given time, most of what they do to address social problems does and probably should have a strong local flavor. But where knowledge in a field has matured to the point where well-specified, coherent models have appeared, many communities will usually stand to gain from adopting those models rather than struggling to invent their own “wheels.” What they give up in terms of not being able to take credit for creating a program de novo, they may more than gain back in running a program that truly works and sharing experience with and learning from others operating the same model.

Questions to Ask about Specificity and Coherence:

• Is the program's design specific and coherent enough for an adopter to understand, implement, and operate it without significant difficulty?

• Is the design specific and coherent enough to support the development of standards by which to assess the quality of the program in the different sites adopting it?

• Are the program's staffing requirements spelled out and clearly related to its design?
Do the specificity and coherence of the program prevent it from being implemented anywhere?

Capabilities of the Developer

Studies conducted by the U.S. Agricultural Extension Service have found that the strategy used to disseminate an innovation significantly influences the extent to which that innovation is adopted. Providing prospective adopters with information about an innovation, say, in the form of a document, persuades a relatively small number of them. Having them attend workshops or conferences gets a few more to adopt. But the proportion climbs steeply when the method used to convey the innovation is a person who shows the adopter specifically how to implement it in her own setting.

Face-to-face communication between sources very knowledgeable about an innovative program and those who want to adopt it is a major determinant of the success of replication. Organizations interested in adopting a new program face substantial uncertainty. They can’t know in advance whether they’ll be able to operate the program effectively. They can’t be as sure as they’d like to be that the program will meet their needs. Further, regardless how well codified the program is, there’s always a large part of the know-how it entails that hasn’t been recorded, that remains tacit, and that can only be elicited through interaction between developer and adopter. Because adopters are, in these senses, “needy,” the capabilities of developers, or their agents, to provide training, materials, and support is of great importance.

Through work on several replication projects, RPS has found it convenient to think about the organizational capabilities that developers need as falling into four categories:

- Set-up capabilities,
- Support capabilities,
- Assessment capabilities, and
- Leadership capabilities.

These categories take traditional organizational functions (e.g., financial management, marketing) and give them the spin they need to make sense in the rather special context represented by replication.

Set-up Capabilities

Strategic Planning
Program developers who want their programs replicated need foresight. They need to be able to see ahead well and far enough to set a clear, tenable direction for their replication efforts. In
short, they need to be able to plan strategically.

The purpose of strategic planning is not to make an unchangeable commitment to some version of the future. The future is, by definition, unknowable. Things will always happen to throw the best laid plans off course. Rather, the purpose of replication planning is to train energy and attention on what it will take to enable the program to achieve increasingly greater reach. Measurable goals are set, but the main focus is on mapping out how the capabilities needed to support and sustain movement toward and beyond those goals will be created.

In other words, the chief aim of strategic planning is to get the developer to realize that replication is mainly about building an organization. The aim is not what many program developers and their funders normally assume: to get the program established as quickly as possible in as many new places as possible. It takes the former to make the latter happen. Put growth ahead of organizational development, and the growth that results is liable to be superficial and unsustainable.

The kind of planning necessitated by replication differs from what most program developers have done before. To be sure, it is hard to be a professional today and not have had some formal planning experience. But it is one thing to plan a project to test a particular program model – a form of planning with which program developers are very familiar – and quite another to plan the formation of an organization.

**Program Design**

While planning capability tends to be something most developers still need some of, they are usually further along in the other set-up capabilities replication involves. If they have crafted a successful program, developers should have adequate or better competence in program design. This is a useful talent to have, since, in all probability, the program will need to be redesigned over time to remain effective and relevant. Indeed, it is not uncommon at the very outset of replication to have to modify or augment the design of the program somewhat in response to what the environment is willing to accept.

Design capabilities will usually be evident in the care, methodicalness, and time developers have spent crafting their programs. For example, Girls Incorporated, a national youth development organization based in New York, receives high marks for the system it has devised to create the programs it delivers. Programs start out as pilots and then are taken through a series of steps to get finetuned, all along being carefully monitored to see how they perform. Every program Girls Inc offers goes through virtually the same rigorous development process that can last three or more years.

**Product Development**

Program developers are also often, although far from always, skilled in transforming their designs and experiences into concrete, usable forms, such as manuals, guidelines, descriptions, and the like. The Nurse-Family Partnership has a detailed set of visit-by-visit guidelines that have been continually refined through three successive clinical trials of the model. The Summer Training and Education Program developed and replicated by Public/Private Ventures in Philadelphia in the 1980s and 90s came with several well-crafted replication guides.
By the time a program is truly ready for replication, its developer should have worked out the vocabulary that will be used to describe the program in helping others understand how to run it. Programs that are well-codified (i.e., adequately specified and coherent) are generally the handiwork of developers who both know how to design and, as important, how to communicate that design to others.

**Questions to Ask about Set-up Capabilities:**

- Does the program's developer have strategic planning capability? Do they demonstrate sufficient awareness that their main task ahead is to create an organization capable of supporting the successful expansion of the program?
- Does the developer have advanced capabilities in program design?
- Has the developer demonstrated capability in translating the program into manuals, guidelines, examples, etc.?
- Is the developer able to talk in a coherent and easily understood way about the program?

**Support Capabilities**

If replication were pursued strictly through an information strategy (e.g., publishing materials on the program), set-up capabilities would be about all one would need. Since information, in and of itself, rarely leads to significant levels of program adoption, set-up capabilities, while necessary, are not sufficient to propel successful replication. Chief among the additional capabilities needed are the supports provided to help organizations adopt and implement the program.

**Site Cultivation**

Support begins, not, as typically assumed, with training and technical assistance, but with the cultivation of sites for the program. Developers err when, in the hope of generating broad appeal, they set no or minimal conditions for adoption of their models in new locations. It would be wonderful if what made a program replicable were its ability to work well everywhere or anywhere, but that's a standard almost no program can or will ever meet.

Most of the time, programs emerge from testing or small scale with limited understanding of the conditions needed for them to be effective under the less controlled circumstances that larger scale represents. Rarely, for example, are political factors (e.g., community support, party control of local decision making) explicitly and systematically addressed in program evaluations based on experimental designs. And programs that achieve success in one or a few communities, where each site's politics can be given careful attention, are unlikely to know what it will take to manage politics wholesale when the number of sites multiplies.

Other prerequisites, in addition to the political, that developers may underplay at the outset of replication include:

- the management and technical capabilities needed by the adopting organization,
• the specific qualifications of the staff who will operate the program,

• the adopting organization's relationships with other people and organizations holding resources the program may need, and

• the length of time the adopting organization needs to provide to get the program well established.

It is not that developers completely ignore these factors. Where they tend to come up short is not making good enough use of their initial replication experiences to obtain a deeper understanding of the local conditions necessary for their programs to be effective in new places.

Site cultivation is a support capability because its purpose is not just to establish sites for the program, but to help prospective locations learn what it will take for them to be successful. Their strengths and vulnerabilities from this perspective can be understood up-front, the best time to do something about them. Potential pitfalls can be identified and measures taken to avoid them, if possible. Organizations that are interested in adopting a program, RPS has found, usually need and want to know as much as they can about the conditions they need to have or create to be effective. Program developers who don't know enough about these conditions or who do but decide to pull their punches to make adoption seem easier do neither themselves nor sites a favor.

Training
Site cultivation helps sites understand the overall agenda they will have to manage to implement the program well. Training takes them more deeply into the program itself. The purpose of training is to impart to site staff what is explicitly known about how to operate the program.

Effective training for program replication meets a couple of key conditions. First and foremost, it describes the sequence of actions staff will need to perform to achieve intended results. Good training essentially walks people through what they will experience in implementing the program. It enables them to rehearse or simulate their roles, making the program more real to them both cognitively and emotionally than it would otherwise be. Second, replication training needs to explain how and why the program causes the results attributed to it. Adopters need to understand the theories, assumptions, and concepts that inform the design of the program.

Training that meets these conditions usually is provided by trainers who have experience running the program. While how the program causes the results associated with it can be successfully conveyed by those who are just well-informed, it is much more difficult for trainers who have not actually operated the program to teach others about how the program functions on a day-to-day basis. Trainers who are able to invoke their own experience operating the program appear to those being trained as more knowledgeable and authentic.

However, just being experienced in the program does not necessarily make someone a skilled trainer. Conveying information so that it can be easily understood and establishing rapport with trainees are not abilities that every experienced practitioner will possess. When scaling up, program developers are wise to build their training capacity by recruiting talent from existing sites, focusing on those practitioners who appear to have the right combination of skills to be competent trainers.
Technical Assistance
Training provides formal instruction in the operation of the program. Technical assistance reinforces and amplifies what is taught during training, and it helps adopters adapt the program to their own circumstances.

Alone, training is not apt to lead to successful replication. Training, by definition, only deals with the formalized knowledge embodied in the program. But there is almost always more, sometimes much more, about the program that cannot be or hasn’t been articulated. The only way to elicit this “buried” know-how is for developers and adopters to enter into a close enough relationship that will create opportunities to bring out what the developers know but haven’t codified. This is what good technical assistance supplies.

More than any other replication activity, technical assistance defines the relationship between the developer of the program and those adopting it. Through technical assistance, the developer demonstrates that it’s capable of helping a particular site with its particular needs. It keeps the developer engaged with the site, ready to help site personnel deal with the uncertainties and difficulties that inevitably arise when complex programs are being implemented.

Developers who approach this task with both a high level of program expertise and a commitment to listening to and learning from adopting sites will cultivate more successful relationships than those who do only one or the other of these things or, in the worst case, neither. In the early stages of program implementation, when a site’s uncertainty is the greatest, developers normally must be willing to maintain fairly intensive contact through technical assistance. Frequent interaction builds the trust on which an effective working relationship between developer and site depends.

Questions to Ask about Support Capabilities:

• Has the developer designed a disciplined approach to cultivating sites for the program? Does this approach help prospective sites make an informed decision about whether to pursue the program or not?

• Has the developer designed training that will enable adopters to envision clearly how the program works as a sequence of interrelated activities? Does the training enable adopters to understand why the program is supposed to work the way it does?

• Are plans for technical assistance to adopters well thought out? Do those who will provide technical assistance have the necessary expertise to customize their help to meet the particular needs of particular sites?

Assessment Capabilities
Set-up and support capabilities anchor most replication efforts. Indeed, they are often the limit of how program developers and their funders think about replication. Design an effective program, translate that design into a learnable form, and then, using that form, train and support others in
adopting the program. This simple method of replication would be appropriate if the only goal were maximizing the number of places that take up the program. But that's shortsighted. Merely getting the program adopted won't be worth the effort if the program doesn't reproduce the positive outcomes that make it a candidate for replication in the first place. **Replication is about reproducing results, not just programs.**

To get results, performance has to be tracked. Adopters of the program need to be able to monitor what and how well they are doing compared to the expectations built into the model. It is a rare program that simply by being implemented will generate favorable outcomes. In the complex world of social problem solving, the threats to program integrity and performance are constant. Vigilance through taking regular, systematic readings of operational quality and results is essential if the program is to fulfill its potential.

**Indicators**
Program developers need three kinds of capabilities to support the assessment of performance as their programs spread. The first kind is the ability to convert their knowledge of the program into trackable indicators. These indicators tell whether the program is operating as designed and producing the results expected. For example, Big Brothers Big Sisters agencies regularly track both operational measures, such as the length of time it takes an adult to get matched with a youth and the length of the match relationship, and outcome measures, such as impressions from mentors, teachers, and parents of changes in youth behavior and school performance.

It normally takes extensive experience with a program to arrive at a valid and reliable set of indicators. Initially, program designers may focus exclusively on outcome measures, since these constitute the main test of the program's value. But over time experience reveals to developers that they also have to pay attention to indicators of productivity (i.e., the effort that it takes to produce those outcomes) and to how the program is perceived by those it serves. Measures of productivity and consumer perceptions, for obvious reasons, grow in importance as a program seeks wider adoption.

**Interpreting Data**
A second assessment capability is teaching program adopters how to collect and interpret performance data. Developers need to be able to show adopters what data they ought to track routinely, how to obtain it efficiently, and, most important, how to understand what the data are telling them about their performance. Since the acquisition and use of data are not costless, developers must also be able to forecast for adopters how much time and effort they should expect to invest in data collection and analysis activities.

**Sharing Data**
Many developers make some attempt to muster these first two assessment capabilities. But they tend to stop short of trying to develop what might be called a common data regime between themselves and those adopting their programs. So, data may get collected and used locally by adopters, and developers may monitor their own replication work (e.g., hours spent providing training), but there is no information system to speak of connecting the two. To be sure, it is complex and costly to design useful management information systems that link developer and adopters. Moreover, **funders often do not appreciate the importance of having systematic data to guide performance, and thus, won't pay for it. But the neglect comes at a high**
Deprived of periodic performance data, developers have little to go on in helping adopters solve the inevitable riddles of implementation. This is one of the principal reasons why replicated programs often veer off course and get watered down as they expand. In the absence of frequent, objective performance checks, adopters and funding sources have an easier time assuming that diluting the program won't hurt much. A commitment to performance measurement is one capability gap, it seems, that will have to be closed if replicating effectiveness, and not just programs, is to become more commonplace.

**Questions to Ask about Assessment Capabilities:**

- As the program is replicated, will it be possible to determine whether it is reproducing in new sites the outcomes that made it a candidate for replication to begin with?
- Does the design of the program include regular performance indicators which adopters can track to see how they're doing?
- Is the developer ready and able to show adopters how to use effectively the data they collect from the program?
- Are there serious plans, for an information system linking the developer and the network of sites that adopt the program?

**Leadership Capabilities**

Set-up, support, and assessment capabilities together represent the technical side of replication. Conceivably, they would be all the capability a developer would need to replicate a program in a stable environment with ample, easy-to-access resources. But, since stable environments and plentiful funding are rare in the social sector, developers usually need one very important, additional capability to be successful in extending the reach of their programs: leadership. **Because most programs, in order to grow, have to push their way into their environments, leadership is needed to overcome the obstacles that inevitably stand in the way.**

**Charismatic Leadership**

Leadership can and does take two forms in replication. One is charismatic leadership. Program founders with strong, compelling visions for their programs and the personality to convince others of their rightness are often viewed as charismatic leaders.

Some believe that programs cannot achieve significant scale without charismatic leadership from their developers. There is no question that a charismatic leader can be a plus when it comes to trying to move a program to greater scale. But there are downsides to this form of leadership that need to be taken into account, as well.

Among the most obvious and important is that with increasing scale, the charismatic leader becomes less available to any one site operating or considering adoption of the program. While this problem can be managed some by having effective surrogates for the leader, the leader remains the central figure, even if in disembodied form much of the time. When the leader dies or
becomes too ill or simply moves onto something else, the possibility of decline becomes very real. The systems that have been created by the charismatic founder to support replication may not be able to function nearly as well, or at all, without him or her.

**Relational Leadership**

Because of these liabilities and because charismatic founders are fairly rare, little replication would occur if it depended on the existence of this form of leadership alone. There is, however, another type of leadership that is essential to replication in just about all circumstances.

As we've already emphasized, the success of replication depends on relationships. These include relationships between staff and the people served by a program, between the developer and adopters, within the developer's organization among the staff, between the developer, adopters, and funders, and between all of these and the larger audience of interested or aware parties. Managing this complex array of relationships is at the heart of replication as a process. While each kind of relationship involves certain technical skills, the skills are brought to life and made effective by leadership – by the ability of the developer to motivate people, set direction, and inspire confidence and competence.

There are four relationship-driven functions in the typical replication effort where the developer's leadership is most critical: raising money, managing staff, managing the network of sites, and marketing the program.

**Fund Development and Management**

Replication, of course, doesn't happen without money. By the time they consider replication, developers of effective programs often have spent many years raising funds for their work. But usually the amounts raised pale in comparison with the financial requirements of scale-up. Tired of having spent so much time pleading for funds in the past, they may be inclined to delegate part or all of the fund development work to subordinates or outside fundraising firms. This is usually a mistake. While subordinates and fundraising counsel may be adept at handling the mechanics of development, they are normally far less effective than the program's creator in persuading potential investors. The reality is that funders invest based as much, if not more, on their confidence in the leadership of the developer as on the program or organization. Developers who are willing and able to take the lead in raising money for growth are likely to be more successful than those who won't or aren't.

As important as getting the funding needed for replication is managing it once in hand. All formal organizations have to account for their use of funds, but the importance of sound financial management grows with the scale of the operation. The experience of the Centers for Employment Training shows what can happen when accounting practices fail to keep up with the increased complexity of managing a larger enterprise.

CET, based in San Jose, California, emerged in the late 1980s as one of the few shining examples of success in helping the unemployed gain access to decent jobs. It caught the attention of major foundations and, more significantly, the federal government. Substantial funding became available to CET to take its effective model to more and more communities. But as it grew, not enough attention was paid to building the capability needed to manage a rapidly increasing volume of financial transactions. Inadequate handling of federal funds led to investigations by the US Department of Education, which in turn coincided with the departure of CET's founder and
the closing or dramatic scaling back of many replication sites. CET is still around, and may some
day regain its high profile. But it paid a high price for under-appreciating its accounting needs as
it grew.

**Staff Development**
Providing leadership to the people who staff the replication effort is one of the developer’s greatest
challenges. These relationships tend to be close and because of their closeness more complex
than other kinds of relationships. Often, the developer and key replication staff were involved
together in developing and testing the program. Now, they are attempting to make the significant
transition from the more flexible, exploratory mindset of program development to the more
systematic orientation needed to foster and manage growth. It is not a transition that everyone
can make successfully (including, sometimes, the developer), and yet historical ties may make it
difficult to recognize this problem and act to solve it.

The Family Matters program of the Points of Light Foundation offers a case in point. The program,
which mobilizes families for volunteer community service, began as a research and development
project. During its R&D stage staff were hired who were skilled in the creative work needed to
fashion a viable program. But, when the foundation decided to begin replicating Family Matters
on a larger scale, these staff resisted the more heavily managed approach replication entails. They
wanted to preserve their former, more informal way of operating. Only gradually did they come to
terms with the reality that the situation was evolving away from them. Over a period of a couple
of years they left, making room for new staff better suited to the new work.

**Most replication efforts do not begin with a thoughtful human resource strategy.** Because
they just about always start with staff who helped the developer create the program, there is a
tendency to avoid tampering with relationships that already exist. Only after problems begin to
emerge in these relationships, does it become apparent that a different way of operating may be
necessary. Some of the common problems we have observed include:

- Staff who are mismatched with their new responsibilities under replication.
- Staff who resist the more intense, formal coordination of activities that scale-up requires.
- A general reluctance to measure individual or team performance.
- Lack of competence in managing time under the different circumstances that replication
  creates.
- Continuation in new roles of historical conflicts between staff.

Developers need to be sensitive to the likelihood of these and similar problems when they first
start thinking about replication and to make the development of human resource strategies to
prevent or combat them a high priority from the outset.

**Network Leadership**
While providing the right leadership to their staff may be personally challenging for developers,
the most novel leadership they must exercise usually pertains to the overall network of sites they
help to create. In all of the replication efforts we’ve observed, not once have we encountered a
developer who has done replication before. They are embarking on expansion for the first time, and from the vantage point of experiences that may be of limited applicability to the leadership they will be expected to provide in a growing, more far-flung enterprise.

For example, we worked on expansion of a program that had begun as a grassroots operation in a single community. Its founder had managed to extend the program to an assortment of other communities but struggled with being responsible for what happened to the program in those communities. In his grassroots days, he was intimately involved in every detail. But in an expanding number of new communities, he couldn't be so deeply engaged, and yet, he was at something of a loss for how to relate to this network of new sites otherwise.

**Leading a network requires competence in managing relationships at a greater distance, both geographically and psychologically.** Communication skills obviously are key. Openness to what sites want or believe is also critical, and sometimes difficult for headstrong developers to accommodate. The greater systematization of work that comes with expansion needs to be balanced with a human touch that accords significance and voice to all who are involved. Creating and sustaining this balance must be guided by the leadership of the developer.

**Marketing and Communications**

The leadership involved in managing a network dovetails, to a degree, with the leadership needed to market the program. Both depend on the ability of the developer to communicate effectively with a large and often diverse audience. Marketing social programs is generally tough business. Most programs are never in high demand, because the resources to invest in them are scare and investors don't have an easy way to judge program value. Developers will enjoy the most replication success who appreciate these natural constraints on demand and take strategic action to surmount them.

This requires, most of all, having a comprehensive understanding of marketing. Many developers start out thinking that marketing is chiefly advertising. But running public service ads is only one option, and not necessarily always valuable. **Good marketing involves identifying the different audiences who need to be informed about the program because they can either enhance or hinder its expansion, and devising the education strategy best suited to each.** It is also worth noting that the skills which go into marketing are virtually identical to the skills involved in trying to influence public policy. Developers will do well to regard all external forms of communication as the general marketing work of replication and to nurture the necessary capabilities.

**Questions to Ask about Leadership Capabilities:**

- Is the program dependent on the leadership of a charismatic founder? Whether charismatic or not, is the leadership capable of actively managing the variety of relationships on which the program’s successful expansion will depend?

- Is the leadership willing and able to invest the personal energy needed to raise the funds for expansion, especially early on when the challenges are greatest?

- Is the leadership savvy about the staffing challenges associated with scaling up and willing and able to take the steps necessary to build a strong organization?
• Is the leadership willing and able to manage a growing network of sites? Is the leadership willing and able to be influenced by sites' experiences and views?

• Is the leadership willing and able to market the program to the variety of audiences whose support or acquiescence is necessary for the program to expand?

Attributes of the Environment

Today, it is generally recognized that spreading a program requires negotiating a complex environment. Public policy is usually implicated, though not always. From a replication standpoint, the contemporary environment is best thought of as a diverse and fluid set of relationships between sellers (those with programs to offer) and buyers (those wanting programs) than as an intergovernmental hierarchy. Because there is less dependence on government, developers bear more of the burden themselves for figuring out how to get their programs operating well on a larger scale. Several aspects of the environment bear on how developers may fare in this more demanding role. Funders need to take into account each of them.

Demand

To spread, a good program needs to be in demand. It must be wanted by other communities, states, or organizations. DARE, the Drug Abuse Resistance Education program, offers a compelling, if controversial, example of this.

Tested on a modest scale in Los Angeles and without strong research evidence in its favor, DARE spread almost like wildfire as police departments all over the country lined up to get trained in the model, which involves cops visiting school classrooms to talk about avoiding drugs. The timing couldn’t have been better for the program. It gave police departments a “kinder and gentler” complement to their harsher, traditional methods of fighting the rising drug problem. Though debate continues about whether DARE is effective enough to warrant such widespread use, it is one of the few classic examples we have in the social sector of demand literally pulling a program into the marketplace.

Most programs never are in demand to DARE’s extent and so easily adopted. Certainly, if they have demonstrated positive results, they are usually more complex, and thus harder for potential adopters to evaluate. Interestingly, the basic mechanism for this evaluation is the same in the social and commercial sectors. Social programs, as well as commercial products and services, are assessed, essentially, along two basic dimensions by potential users: How well does the program resonate with the consumer’s values? And how well does it work?

Values

Congruent values often play a large role in determining the take-up of social programs. Unlike many, if not most, commercial products and services, every social program exudes certain political or moral values, making them potential fodder for ideological debate. Even programs developed through the crucible of the hardest kind of social science cannot escape this condition.
For example, the Nurse-Family Partnership has been as rigorously designed and tested as any program ever has, and yet, when nurses begin talking with mothers, say, about contraception, they are touching on values that may not be universally shared.

Some developers, perhaps recognizing the inevitability of all social action being perceived in terms of its values, forgo the science altogether and promote their programs mainly, if not exclusively, on value grounds. The social sector itself plays a unique role in society as an arena for the expression of different value positions. The problem this poses for replication, however, is that, at least in a culturally and politically diverse society like the United States, the chances of a program diffusing far and wide solely on the basis of its values appear rather small. The more complex programs that are the norm in replication express more complex values, which mean more ways for people to find fault with them.

**Evidence**

This suggests that the greater advantage in replication may lie with programs that have more explicitly scientific origins or a stronger evidentiary foundation, so that their underlying values form a less obvious part of their public identity. Such programs are perceived in more practical terms as working or being effective.

**It is important to keep in mind, however, that most programs with evidence showing they work never approach the kind of reliability we tend to associate with products and services in the commercial economy.** Because if this inherent weakness, potential adopters often find additional ways to decide whether a program is likely to supply their needs. They may be attracted because the program seems innovative or different, or attracted not to the program but to its well-known developer. Some may simply follow the lead of those who have already adopted the program. The lure of easy solutions to complex problems tempts many. Unfortunately, reliance on such other measures of presumed “quality” can at times trump the importance of effectiveness, leading to the spread of programs that don’t work particularly well.

This, of course, happens in the business world, too. But inferior commercial products or services are more likely to be changed or taken off the shelves. In the social sector, a mediocre program can normally endure much longer. So long as it satisfies other needs that adopters have and count as meaningful, the program will not be driven out or forced to change by the usual working of market forces.

Before leaving the topic of demand, mention needs to be made of the important role that funding plays in guiding the behavior of potential adopters. Often, potential adopters want a program available for replication mainly because money exists to support its operation. While no careful studies have been done on the issue, there’s good reason to believe that if the funding is relatively accessible, adopters may pay less attention to how well the program meets their needs. Many states and communities, for example, can, without too much trouble, come up with the money to adopt a replicable program on a pilot basis. Yet, such pilots all too infrequently evolve into full-fledged programs. Easily started, they are just as easily stopped when the pilot money ends. In other words, the chances of a program being sustained may be greater when the adopter has had to work hard to fund it. Their commitment runs deeper and, in all likelihood, they’ve had to cast a broader net to elicit support.

**Questions to Ask about Demand:**
• Are the values embodied in the program an explicit part of its apparent appeal? With which audiences are these values apt to be congruent?

• Which appears more important to the program's replicability: its values or the evidence for its effectiveness?

• Are there features other than values and effectiveness that might spur demand for the program?

• Is the developer willing and able to modify the design of the program in response to demand? If such modifications were made, what effect would this likely have on the ability of the program to realize the outcomes at which it is aimed?

• Are likely adopters in a position to obtain, on their own, most or all of the funds needed to operate the program?

Interdependence

Just as no person is an island, no program works alone. Every program relies not only on the people charged with operating it, but also on other organizations and people in its environment. A home visiting program for low-income mothers depends on the availability of other health and social services that these mothers and their young children may need. A training program for welfare recipients depends on connections to employers who can provide jobs to its graduates. A program being adopted in a new setting not only needs a host organization, it needs a host context.

Not all replicated programs take root. The reasons may appear obvious: funding ran out, leadership changed, priorities shifted. But the failure to embed might be based on something more fundamental. Maybe local commitment just wasn’t secure enough from the get-go. This is often seen, for example, when schools are used as settings for the implementation of social programs. Such programs are dropped when startup funding ends or initial enthusiasm dissipates. The apparent explanation is that faculty have a hard time committing to anything outside the core curriculum. But that’s only part of the story. What happens in schools is a product of a complex set of relationships, including teachers, students, administrators, parents, state policy makers, professional associations, and others. If change is to occur, this network either needs to go along or at least acquiesce to it.

Any new program, especially one being imported from outside, rocks the boat. It disrupts existing practice, conflicts with some current interests, and threatens some relationships. Sometimes, it can’t withstand the sources of resistance both within and outside the organization operating it. Successfully replicated programs, however, learn how to overcome or at least “wait out” this resistance. They are clear and specific about dealing with the traps that will be set, the conflicts likely to arise, and the types of people and organizations who must be assuaged.

In the course of working with many growing programs, we have noticed that programs seem better able to manage this “waiting out” period when their own, built-in timeframes are long.
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enough. For example, the nurse visiting program takes two and a half to three years to serve a family; Big Brothers Big Sisters asks mentors to make a minimum commitment of one year; and most of the major school reform models are multi-year in design. As a rule, adopters initially agree to take on a program for one complete cycle – whatever that happens to be – at the end of which they'll decide whether to continue or not. A program that takes longer to complete this cycle will have longer to become known in the local environment, and this greater knowledge is likely to generate a more lasting trust. Of course, a program might last too long and thus cost more than potential adopters want to or can spend up front. But the risks to sustainability seem higher for programs that are designed to be brief.

Because program duration can be important, evidence that the program is working well as it unfolds in a new location can be critical to widening and deepening its acceptance there. The performance indicators discussed above become the means to identify and troubleshoot implementation problems when they happen, rather than later when they are harder to resolve. As implementation thereby gains strength, program staff and onlookers become more convinced of the program’s value.

While a program is being developed and tested, attention needs to be paid to the kinds of environmental connections on which its successful performance is apt to depend. In our work, we have come to think of this as “elaborating the program model.” Rather than regard external context as a “black box,” developers and their funders should view it as an opportunity to make negotiating the larger environment part of the program’s evolving design. The key questions for this continuing design work will be: what relationships have to be actively managed for the program to succeed in any local setting where it might be adopted? what strategies work best in managing these relationships?

Questions to Ask about Interdependence:

- What other organizations and people will the program depend on for its effective operation in new settings?
- What strategies does the developer have for managing these interdependencies to assure that the program embeds successfully where it is adopted?
- Is the program designed to last long enough to have a good chance of being accepted in a new setting?

Resources

We have saved for last what many program developers often put first: the availability of resources to support their growth plans. This has been done deliberately to emphasize that access to resources should be, although it frequently isn’t, contingent. The willingness of funders to invest should hinge on the quality of the program and the capabilities of the developer’s organization relative to the requirements of the environment.

It almost goes without saying that resources for social investment are relatively scarce. While there are large amounts of money spent on social endeavors, much of the funding fuels the
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standard operation of public institutions and is not available as flexible investment capital. Charitable dollars are more flexible, but not nearly as plentiful as the public sources.

Further, in neither case is there usually an explicit purpose to support the growth of effective programs and organizations. Contrast this with the commercial sector where investment institutions of all kinds exist to underwrite expansion. The net result is that the social sector, overall, does not provide an especially generous, or munificent, environment for enabling the cream—the best programs and organizations—to rise to the top.

Having said that, though, it's important to understand that the environment is not uniform. Some markets within it are more accommodating than others.

More institutionalized markets, such as public education and health care, have more dedicated sources of funding to support the scale up of improvements. Title I of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act, targeted at schools in low-income areas, has been a major source of support for a number of education reform programs. Medicaid has funded a variety of innovative approaches in delivering health care to the needy, often through federal and state policy changes. In both cases, fairly elaborate public rules must be followed in order to obtain funding. Thus, these markets tend to be munificent only for those able and willing to abide by their institutional requirements.

The less institutionalized environments in the social sector tend to be less generous in terms of the sheer availability of resources but somewhat more open concerning access to the resources that do exist. The early childhood and youth work fields offer good illustrations.

Early childhood has been a formal field really ever since Head Start got underway in the early 1960s. But aside from the federal investment in Head Start, there have been no sizeable and sustainable funding sources established for early childhood initiatives nationwide. This has left both developers and potential adopters of innovative early childhood programs with the complex task of scrambling to find funding. For example, home visiting programs, such as the Nurse-Family Partnership and Healthy Families America, are being supported by Medicaid, Targeted Assistance for Needy Families (the welfare reform successor to Aid to Families with Dependent Children), federal Maternal and Child Health block grant funds, and other sources around the country.

A variety of funding sources finance the youth work field, but they tend each to serve fairly narrow purposes and for short periods of time. Programs that cut across those purposes—an increasingly common occurrence—typically have to pursue funding in more than one venue and satisfy the conditions of multiple sources. Further, funders' preferences in the youth field change often in response to the shifting tides of public opinion about America's adolescent population.

Developers of programs for under-institutionalized markets normally have to spend large amounts of time, on a continuing basis, raising money from diverse sources. What's more, they do so in the face of stiff competition for the limited pools of funds available. This creates a dilemma for many funders, too, who, lacking a reliable basis for judging the value of different programs and organizations, would rather not have to choose among them when allocating scarce dollars. Competition also exists in the more institutionalized arenas. But there, where resources are more ample and standards for making decisions clearer and more precise, competition tends
to be a more accepted feature of the landscape.

Money, of course, is not the only resource of value in replication. What it can buy in the form of staffing, office space, equipment, and the like is of equal importance. The limited availability of the types of people needed to staff a program locally constrains many replicable programs in their growth efforts. The nationwide shortage of nurses has limited the expansion of the Nurse-Family Partnership. The Carrera teen pregnancy prevention program mentioned in our discussion of specificity faces particular challenges in finding youth workers with the sophisticated skills and deep devotion to teens that the model calls for. Programs that depend on volunteers confront similar challenges. In recent years, Big Brothers Big Sisters has begun developing new forms of mentoring because of the limited number of volunteers willing to give the time required by the organization's core program.

Put simply, all the types of resources needed for replication, with the exception of the knowledge residing in the program, have to come from an environment in which scarcity, to a greater or lesser degree, is the norm. Figuring out how to access these resources is the sine qua non of replication success.

**Questions to Ask about Resources:**

- **Is the program addressed to a more institutionalized market? Are there dedicated funding sources in that market to support the program's expansion? Will institutional rules help or hinder the program's efforts to grow?**

- **If the program is for a less institutionalized market, what mix of funding sources appears most likely to be appropriate in supporting the program's expansion? Is the developer prepared to undertake the effort necessary to access successfully these diverse sources?**

- **Does the program face competition from other programs? Is its market accepting of such competition? Is the program's developer willing and able to adapt to the market's relative tolerance or intolerance of competition?**

- **Can the kinds of settings and organizations likely to adopt the program acquire the staffing and other resources necessary to operate the program well?**

---

**Conclusion**

Replication is a complex matter. It cannot be reduced to a simple function of leadership or funding or any other narrow set of factors. It involves innovative programs, their developers and adopters, and a host of local and broader environmental factors in intricate combinations. And yet, it is possible amidst this complexity to see "a method to the madness" – to mark out a pathway that, if followed, increases the chances of replication success. To be sure, this is not a pathway without its share of detours and divots. But the dedicated and capable can negotiate it with effort and a willingness to learn and adapt along the way. The reward to those who persist is the opportunity to improve lives and communities on a greater scale.

This guide has been written mainly for funders. Whether promising programs and organizations
spread in our society hinge on the decisions that philanthropies and public agencies make about what to invest in. It does not happen by magic or the operation of Adam Smith's "invisible hand." It happens, when it does, because social investors have decided that replicating and expanding programs that have proved effective is an appropriate and feasible way to work for a better society and world. At bottom, replication, while as a word technical and mundane, as a practice has profound implications for human well-being.
Appendix

Questions to Ask....

About the Program

Effectiveness
• Are the program and the purpose it serves worthy of support? Do they respond to a clear and significant need in society?
• Has the program fulfilled that purpose? What is the evidence that it has?
• How does this evidence compare with what's known about the effectiveness of other programs serving the same purpose?

Explaining Effectiveness
• Is there a convincing explanation that the program, and not other factors, has caused the performance being attributed to it?
• Is this explanation grounded in accepted theory?
• If not theory, is there a clearly stated and logical set of assumptions explaining how the working of the program produces the results associated with it?

Speed
• Does the program last long enough to yield important outcomes?
• Does the program operate quickly enough to produce interim results (on the way to final outcomes) that will be persuasive to funders, policy makers, and others?
• Does the program generate interim performance measures to show program staff how they are doing?

Specificity and Coherence
• Is the program's design specific and coherent enough for an adopter to understand, implement, and operate it without significant difficulty?
• Is the design specific and coherent enough to support the development of standards by which to assess the quality of the program in the different sites adopting it?
• Are the program's staffing requirements spelled out and clearly related to its design?
• Do the specificity and coherence of the program prevent it from being implemented anywhere?

About the Program's Developer

Set-Up Capabilities
• Does the program's developer have strategic planning capability? Do they demonstrate sufficient awareness that their main task ahead is to create an organization capable of supporting the successful expansion of the program?
• Does the developer have advanced capabilities in program design?
• Has the developer demonstrated capability in translating the program into manuals,
guidelines, examples, etc.?

• Is the developer able to talk in a coherent and easily understood way about the program?

**Support Capabilities**

• Has the developer designed a disciplined approach to selecting sites for the program? Does this approach help prospective sites make an informed decision about whether to pursue the program or not?
• Has the developer designed training that will enable adopters to envision clearly how the program works as a sequence of interrelated activities? Does the training enable adopters to understand why the program is supposed to work the way it does?
• Are plans for technical assistance to adopters well thought out? Do those who will provide technical assistance have the necessary expertise to customize their help to meet the particular needs of particular sites?

**Assessment Capabilities**

• As the program is replicated, will it be possible to determine whether it is reproducing in new sites the outcomes that made it a candidate for replication to begin with?
• Does the design of the program include regular indicators of performance which adopters can track to see how they’re doing?
• Is the developer ready and able to show adopters how to use effectively the data they collect from the program?
• Is there, or are there serious plans, for an information system linking the developer and the network of sites that adopt the program?

**Leadership Capabilities**

• Is the program dependent on the leadership of a charismatic founder? Whether charismatic or not, is the leadership capable of managing the variety of relationships on which the program’s successful expansion will depend?
• Is the leadership willing and able to invest the personal energy needed to raise the funds for expansion, especially early on when the challenges are greatest?
• Is the leadership savvy about the staffing challenges associated with scaling up and willing and able to take the steps necessary to build a strong organization?
• Is the leadership willing and able to manage a growing network of sites? Is the leadership willing and able to be influenced by sites’ experiences and views?
• Is the leadership willing and able to market the program to the variety of audiences whose support or acquiescence is necessary for the program to expand?

**About the Environment**

**Demand**

• Are the values embodied in the program an explicit part of its apparent appeal? With which audiences are these values apt to be congruent?
• Which appears more important to the program’s replicability: its values or the evidence for its effectiveness?
• Are there features other than values and effectiveness that might spur demand for the program?
• Is the developer willing and able to modify the design of the program in response to demand? If such modifications were made, what effect would this likely have on the ability of the program to realize the outcomes at which it is aimed?
• Are likely adopters in a position to obtain, on their own, most or all of the funds needed to operate the program?

**Interdependence**
• What other organizations will the program depend on for its effective operation in new settings?
• What strategies does the developer have for managing these interdependencies to assure that the program embeds successfully where it is adopted?
• Is the program designed to last long enough to have a good chance of being accepted in a new setting?

**Resources**
• Is the program addressed to a more institutionalized market? Are there dedicated funding sources in that market to support the program’s expansion? Will institutional rules help or hinder the program’s efforts to grow?
• Is the program is for a less institutionalized market, what mix of funding sources appears most likely to be appropriate in supporting the program’s expansion? Is the developer prepared to undertake the effort necessary to access successfully these diverse sources?
• Does the program face competition from other programs? Is its market accepting of such competition? Is the program’s developer willing and able to adapt to the market’s relative tolerance or intolerance of competition?
• Can the kinds of settings and organizations likely to adopt the program acquire the staffing and other resources necessary to operate the program well?