# Contextual Fit Evaluation Tool (C-FET)

## Purpose of the C-FET

The Contextual Fit Evaluation Tool (C-FET) is designed to assess eight critical features of contextual fit essential for effective adoption and sustained implementation of interventions and practices. The C-FET results can be used to:

1. Assess setting features necessary for sustained implementation of practices or interventions,
2. Determine goals for improvement in contextual fit,
3. Improve intervention support plan design
4. Design and revise strategies to remove barriers to contextual fit as needed, and
5. Compare fit from year to year.

This form can be completed for one practice, intervention, or program in the school/agency/clinic. It can be completed by one or multiple representatives, whom individually assess the intervention's perceived fit in each of eight critical areas: need, precision, evidence-base, efficiency, skills/competencies, cultural relevance, resources, and administrative support.

Person Completing Document: _____ Position: _____

School/Agency: _____ Date of Completion: _____

| Initial Reference Questions: | |
|---|---|
| What Practice or Intervention is being evaluated? | |
| What are the expected outcomes of the intervention or practice? | |
| What other interventions or practices have been implemented previously to address the outcomes? | |

**Evaluation Scoring Instructions:** For the following items, score the practice or intervention for its perceived contextual fit with a 0, 1, or 2. Calculate a score for each area, then calculate an overall score by adding the percentages for each area, then dividing by the total number of areas (8).

| Contextual Fit Element | | Evaluation Item | Score: 0-2 | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A. Need** | Are the expected outcomes of the intervention or practice highly valued? | A1. Are the expected outcomes of the intervention perceived as important to those *providing support* (e.g., teachers, clinicians)? (0=no; 1= somewhat important; 2 = very important) | | |
| | | A2. Are the expected outcomes of the intervention perceived as important to those *responsible for managing support* (e.g., administrators, community, politicians)? (0=no; 1= somewhat important; 2 = very important) | | |
| | | A3. Are the expected outcomes of the intervention perceived as important to those *receiving support* (e.g., children, clients)? (0=no; 1= somewhat important; 2 = very important)? | | |
| **B. Precision** | Is the proposed intervention or practice defined with adequate clarity and detail? | B1. Are the essential core features of the intervention clearly defined? (0= no; 1 = somewhat defined; 2= clearly defined) | | |
| | | B2. Are the specific strategies for achieving the core features clearly defined for everyone involved (e.g., what is done, by whom, when, and why)? (0= no; 1 = somewhat defined; 2= clearly defined) | | |

| Contextual Fit Element | | Evaluation Item | Score: 0-2 | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **C. Evidence-base** | Does evidence support the practice or intervention? | C1. Does *empirical (research)* evidence demonstrate that implementation of the intervention's core features results in valued outcomes with similar target populations and setting conditions? (0= no evidence; 1= some evidence, 2= substantial evidence) | | |
| | | C2. Does *personal or anecdotal* evidence demonstrate that implementation results in valued outcomes with similar target populations and conditions (i.e., have you seen or heard of it working elsewhere)? (0= no evidence; 1= some evidence, 2= substantial evidence) | | |
| **D. Efficiency** | Are the time and effort needed for implementation reasonable? | D1. Are the time and effort needed for initial adoption reasonable? (0= no; 1= somewhat reasonable; 2 = yes) | | |
| | | D2. Are the time and effort needed for sustained implementation reasonable? (0= no; 1= somewhat reasonable; 2 = yes) | | |
| | | D3. Are the implementation strategies as efficient or more efficient than previous efforts (given the outcomes generated)? (0= less efficient; 1= similar efficiency; 2 = more efficient) | | |
| **E. Skills and Competencies** | What are the skills and competencies needed to implement the intervention or practice with fidelity? | E1. Are the skills needed for implementation clearly defined? (0=no; 1= somewhat defined; 2=clearly defined) | | |
| | | E2. Do procedures and materials for acquiring the skills needed to implement the intervention exist? (0=no; 1= some materials and procedures available; 2= yes) | | |
| | | E3. Does adequate technical assistance exist to support acquired skills (e.g., coaching)? (0=no; 1= some technical assistance available; 2= yes) | | |
| | | E4. Does the required skill development fit current professional standards and staffing structures? (0=no; 1= somewhat fits; 2= yes) | | |
| **F. Value Alignment** | Are the anticipated outcomes of the intervention consistent with personal values? | F1. Are the intervention strategies and procedures consistent with the values of those *who will perform them* (e.g., teachers, clinicians)? (0=no; 1= somewhat consistent; 2= yes) | | |
| | | F2. Are the intervention strategies and procedures consistent with the values of those *who will receive them*? (0=no; 1= somewhat consistent; 2= yes) | | |
| | | F3. Are the intervention strategies and procedures consistent with the values of the *community who supports them*? (0=no; 1= somewhat consistent; 2= yes) | | |
| **G. Resources** | Is the time, funding, and materials needed for implementation available? | G1. Is the *staff time* available for initial and sustained implementation? (0=no; 1= somewhat available; 2= yes) | | |
| | | G2. Are the necessary *materials* available for initial and sustained implementation? (0=no; 1= somewhat available; 2= yes) | | |
| | | G3. Is the *training* available for initial and sustained implementation? (0=no; 1= somewhat available; 2= yes) | | |
| | | G4. Is the *coaching and performance feedback* available for initial and sustained implementation? (0=no; 1= somewhat available; 2= yes) | | |
| **H. Administrative and Organizational Support** | Do key leaders (e.g., politicians, administration) support the intervention or practice? | H1. Is adoption of the intervention supported by key leaders? (0=no; 1= somewhat supported; 2= yes) | | |
| | | H2. Will key leaders monitor adoption, professional development, and technical assistance provided for the intervention? (0=no; 1= somewhat monitor; 2= yes) | | |
| | | H3. Will fidelity of implementation data and outcome data be monitored by key leaders? (0=no; 1= somewhat monitor; 2= yes) | | |
| | | H4. Does a documented commitment exist (e.g., policy) to make the intervention a standard operating procedure? (0=no; 1= some commitment; 2= yes) | | |

| Summary Scores: | A = ___/6 ___% | B = ___/4 ___% | C = ___/4 ___% | D = ___/6 ___% | E = ___/8 ___% | F = ___/6 ___% | G = ___/8 ___% | H = ___/8 ___% |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Overall Score: (A+B+C+D+E+F+G+H)/8 ____ % | | |

Ross & Horner, 2014