Implementation and maintenance of a school-based multicomponent physical activity intervention

- The ‘Move for Well-being in School’ study
Project design

- **Design phase**
  - February 2014 - June 2015

- **Pilot phase**
  - August 2015 - June 2016

- **RCT phase**
  - August 2016 - December 2017

- **Evaluation phase**
  - April-May 2017

**Process evaluation & Knowledge Translation (KT)**

- 3 years & 10 months
Flow chart

12 schools intervention
1449 pupils – 4.-6 grade
140 educators involved

12 schools control
1675 pupils – 4.-6 grade

6 best implementing schools invited
5 schools consent to participate

18 teachers part of focus group
interviews 3-4/school

Based on
- ‘Degree of implementation’ (Smedegaard et al, 2017)
- ‘Room for improvement’ (Smedegaard et al, 2018)

Semistructured interviewguide inspired by:
- ‘Transform-Us!’ (Salmon et al, 2011)
- ‘RE-AIM framework’ (Glasgow, Vogt, & Boles, 1999)
- ‘Implementation Matters’ (Durlak & DuPre, 2008)

12 women – 6 men
50/50 experienced/new teachers
10 PE teachers
6 part of project coordination group
Theoretical framework

• Durlak and Dupre’s implementation categories constituted the analytical frame, and the results are related to the characteristics of the teachers (provider), the intervention (innovation) and the school system (organization).

• As part of the community factors, the Move for Well-being School project was influenced by the 2014 Danish school reform which promotes an average of 45 minutes of physical activity per day aiming to improve learning, motivation and health.
Results

- The interviews revealed differences in implementation and maintenance across components and between schools.
- Interviews identified factors on all levels of the framework, that were consistent with higher implementation and maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Provider Characteristics</th>
<th>Innovation Characteristics</th>
<th>Prevention Delivery system - organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>• Self-efficacy</td>
<td>• Compatibility</td>
<td>• Shared decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Motivation</td>
<td>• Adaptations</td>
<td>• Prioritising e.g. through allocated time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>PE teacher or not &amp; importance of local champions</td>
<td>Possibility to fit in and become integrated part of the school-culture</td>
<td>School management prioritising the project and both management and educators part of decision-making to participate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors that influenced implementation and maintenance of Move for Well-being in School – inspired by Durlak & DuPre (2008)

...I’m not a PE-teacher, but my motivation for participating is boosted by our local champions

...Yes, this project was really up our alley - the underlying principles i mean. That definately motivated us!

... We are fortunate because the whole school is in on it – school management want’s it just at much as we do, and that’s a good thing!
Conclusion

• The *Move for Well-being in School* project has been implemented and maintained to different degrees among the five schools involved in this study.

• All schools have continued with the intervention elements – brain breaks, PE programs, recess activities and theme days – 10 months after cessation of the official project period.

• Factors on all levels of the theoretical framework has been identified in the study as essential for successful implementation and maintenance.

• This study points the attention to a number of practical factors, which future school-based interventions should attend to. Most importantly precautions should be taken to secure that interventions are compatible with the schools and teachers and that the intervention can be adapted without losing effect.
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