**Chis study is supported by the Centers for Disease Control and** Prevention of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), cooperative agreement numbers: U48 DP006400, U48 DP006398, U48 DP006396. The contents are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of, nor an endorsement, by CDC/HHS, or the U.S. Government.

> Sarah Birken\*, Linda K. Ko, Jennifer Leeman, Mary Wangen, Mimi Choy-Brown, Matthew Lee, Terry T-K Huang, Prajakta Adsul, Miram Bender, Per Nilsen, Lauren Richardson, Barabara Baquero BACKGROUND

Frameworks at the collective level exist (e.g., CFIR) but are not based exclusively on theory. Theoretical frameworks are needed at organizational levels to identify *strategies* that target organization-level implementation determinants.

Frameworks comprised of theories exist at the individual level (e.g. Theoretical Domains Framework.)

1. To elicit implementation strategies from organization theories' propositions



	Overview		
	Complexity science focuses	on understanding how	
	that are made up of many in	terdependent, hetero	
Ð	system may be conceptualized as a unit within an		
	organizational system of which the organization is		
	<b>Example Application to Implementation Science</b>		
	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29116022/		
	Construct	Definition	
	Self-organization	A process whereby lo	
		(dependent variable)	

Uncertainty

A system's behavior

## METHOD

- and their germinal articles

•Team members extrapolated from propositions to implementationrelated constructs (e.g., adoption) to identify strategies.



Synthesize

across theories

PURPOSE

# The Organization Theory for Implementation Science (OTIS) Project





Iodel for Physical Activity - Adapted from Heise, L., Ellsberg, M., & Gottemoeller, M.



2. To synthesize organization theory constructs into a domains framework

• Surveyed 18 organization science scholars re: implementation-relevant organization theories

•From germinal articles, two OTIS team members abstracted key constructs and propositions and met to reconcile discrepancies.









### **Examples of theories, propositions, and implementation strategies**

-		
eory	Proposition	S
nplexity	Small changes may lead to large differences in outcomes (the "butterfly effect"), and vice versa. Interdependencies contribute to sense-making.	C ir ir ir
ntingency	Higher levels of interdependence require greater investment in coordination.	P (e C fa
itutional	Normative processes are greater in organizations with higher levels of professionalization.	P e s a fa

### **Implications for D&I**

Our work describes theory-derived strategies to target organization-level implementation determinants, advancing understanding of implementation strategies' mechanisms of influence and improving implementation strategies' potential *effectiveness*. Next steps include concept mapping to organize organization theory constructs into a domains framework.

> \*Sarah A. Birken, PhD; Department of Implementation Science, Wake Forest School of Medicine; <a href="mailto:sbirken@wakehealth.ek">sbirken@wakehealth.ek</a>, @birkensarah



Across the 9 expert- vetted organization theories, we identified:
103 propositions
79 implementation strategies

#### Strategy

Continuously monitor and iteratively test implementation strategies. Fortify existing relationships and foster new interdependencies to facilitate implementation.

Promote coordination and communication (e.g., audit and provide feedback; build a coalition; create new clinical teams) to facilitate implementation.

Partner with professional associations to establish norms of implementation and sustainment. Partner with professional associations to promote normative processes with the organization to facilitate implementation and sustainment.