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“To gain a better insight into the facilitators and barriers to successful implementation and transfer of multi-component interventions and policies addressing diet, physical activity (PA) and/or sedentary behaviours (SB) across Europe”
Research question

“What do health promotion professionals and policy makers believe is important for adoption, implementation and transferability of multi-level interventions and policies promoting healthy eating, PA and/or SB in Belgium, Germany, Ireland, Norway, and Poland”? 
Work Package 3.1:

- Good practice policies and multi-component interventions for dietary, physical activity and sedentary behaviours including conditions for successful implementation across Europe
  Work Package Leader: Gun Roos (Norway)

- **Task 3.1.2** Qualitative research into the conditions for successful implementation and transfer of good practice interventions across Europe.
Task 3.2.1 subtasks

• 3.1.2.1 Rapid umbrella literature review of the critical conditions for successful implementation and transferability (Lead partner: Poland)

• Development of methodology on how these conditions can be studied based on rapid review (Lead partner: Ireland)

• 3.1.2.2 Case studies investigating implementation and transferability issues (BEL, DEU, IRL, POL, NOR) (Lead partner: Germany)
Rapid review

• **Aim**
  – To identify evidence-based conditions important for successful implementation of interventions and policies promoting a healthy diet, PA, and a reduction in (SB). In particular, whether the implementation conditions identified were intervention-specific or policy-specific

• **Method**
  – 1) systematic reviews analyzing original research on implementation conditions for policies/interventions (*Policies NOR, Interventions POL*)
  – 2) position papers that offered a comprehensive (but not systematic) review of research evidence (*Policies NOR, Interventions POL*), and
  – (3) documents issued by major national and international stakeholders (IRL)

  – At least two researchers were involved at all stages of data selection, data evaluation and coding.
Rapid Review - Results

• 312 potential conditions relevant for successful implementation
• 83 received sufficient support (identified in at least 4 documents)
• Classified by RE-AIM
  – **Reach** in target population - 8
  – **Effectiveness** of implementation process - 5
  – **Adoption** by staff, setting, institution – 24
  – **Implementation process** – fidelity, adaptations, costs - 43
  – **Maintenance** - 3

  – 88% referred to both interventions and polices
3.1.2.2 Case studies

• Aim
  – to explore what health promotion professionals, policy makers, and various other stakeholders think facilitates or impedes the adoption, implementation and maintenance of multi-component interventions/policies
Case Selection

- 5 countries
  - Brief scoping review of literature, professional networks (BEL, IRL, POL )
  - Literature search-national & international databases (GER)
  - Results from previous policy evaluation - DEDIPAC (NOR)

- Inclusion criteria
  - Completed in past decade or ongoing
  - Targeted diet and /or PA/SB
  - Description of all intervention components and levels, including results of an outcome evaluation or a description of the policy available

- Convenience Sample
Case Selection (2)

• Six multi-level interventions, Six policies

  – Multi-level interventions:
    • theory-based interventions, which use knowledge of the behavioral determinants at different levels (i.e. individual, social environmental) to improve dietary behavior, PA and/or SB

  – Policy:
    • A purposive and consistent course of action to stimulate a healthy diet and/or PA, formulated by a specific political process, and adopted, implemented, and enforced by a public agency, such as the EU, EU member states, or regional or local governments.
## Case Selection by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Project coordination</th>
<th>Implementer (e.g., school staff)</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Other stakeholder</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belgium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention: 10,000 steps</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention: Tutti Frutti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention: IDEFICS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy: Federal state offices coordinating networks for the provision of healthy food options in schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ireland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention: Food Dudes Healthy Eating Programme</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention: Green Schools Programme - Travel theme</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norway</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy: Keyhole labelling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy: Free school fruit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention: European Schools for Healthy Food - Slow Food in the Canteen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy: Fit Student</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy: Tasty, Healthy, Valuable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy: Fit City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One-to-one interviews

- Purposive sampling of key informants
- Semi-structured
- Topic guide* (guided by results of RR)
  - Factors facilitating implementation
  - Factors hindering implementation
  - Strategies to overcome barriers
  - Strategies to boost sustainability
- Audio-record (preferable) or extensive note taking in national language.
- Transcription in national language.
- Analysis in national language.
Analysis

• Individual cases analysed by partners.
• Content analysis (individual cases).
• Coding (NVIVO)-common categorisation matrix
• Individual summary reports (English)
• Collective data analysed (GER)
• Final report
Methods summary

- Identify cases
  - National published / grey lit review, professional networks
  - Policy / intervention – multilevel, nutrition, PA/SB or both

- Ethics approval
  - Apply for ethical approval (individual partners)

- Data collection
  - Interviews (Transcribe in national language)
  - Documentation / Observation
  - Database (individual)

- Individual Analysis
  - Descriptive (Content Analysis) NVIVO
  - Triangulation
  - Summary report (in English)

- Synthesis
  - Cross-case synthesis (German partner)
  - Database (collective)
  - Final Summary Report
Food Dudes: background

- **Aim**: Increase consumption of fruit and veg in school children
- **Theory**: Built around the concept of +ve peer modelling, repeated tasting & rewards.
- Funded by the Irish Dept. of Agriculture & European Commission
  - Managed by Bord Bia & implemented by Real Nation
- Rolled out to 97% of primary schools in Ireland (4-12 years)
- Well *evaluated* – *published* literature
- Within the school - programme is co-ordinated by a trained teacher
- Two distinct phases –
  - **Phase 1**: A 16 day intervention phase (fruit & veg delivered to the school + rewards for tasting food)
  - **Phase 2**: Maintenance, children bring fruit or veg from home, which is recorded and children may earn rewards (e.g certificates)
Stakeholders: Food Dudes Programme

- Bangor University
- Dept. of Agriculture
- Dept. of Edu
- Dept. of Health
- Dept. of Social Protection

- Bord Bia
- Real Nation
- Fruit and veg delivery company
- Teachers and Parents
- Reward contractors
Green schools (travel theme) - background

- Part of an international initiative - Eco Schools
- 7 themes (Active Travel)
  - Demonstrate / maintain improvement = “green flag”
- Travel theme funded by the Dept. of Transport
  - Managed through the National Transport Authority
- Organised / evaluated by An Taisce in Ireland in partnership with local authorities.
- Primary & Secondary Schools – 92% nationally
Stakeholders: Green Schools Programme [Travel Theme]

- Dept. of Transport
  - NTA
    - An Taisce
      - Teachers & Parents
Case study results (Facilitation)

• Adoption and Implementation
  – Active involvement of relevant stakeholders and good communication between coordinating organizations
  – Experience, engagement and motivation and training of staff
  – Tailoring of materials to match needs of target groups
  – Implementation protocols to ensure fidelity
  – Adaptations to setting (e.g. school holidays)
  – Incentives and Rewards important

• Maintenance
  – whether they were embedded in existing or newly created organizational structures of different settings
  – whether continued funding was secured
Case study results (Obstacles)

- Poor communication between stakeholders
- Too time consuming to integrate into curricula
- Too much documentation
- Accessibility of intervention
  - Apply for funding via e-portal
  - Need special equipment e.g. step counters, canteen equipment
- Adoption of policies based on political decisions – changes in government
- Lack of expertise or sufficient skills to act as liaisons e.g. for nutrition policy in schools
Conclusion

• Despite considerable heterogeneity of interventions and health policies in European countries, factors facilitating adoption, implementation, and maintenance appear to be similar for interventions and policies across Europe.
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