

## ***Bridges/Getting Ahead Model Fidelity Scale***

### ***Instructions***

#### *Who Is to Conduct Fidelity Scale*

- aha! Process consultant
- Information to be provided by implementing organization

#### *Data Collection*

- Implementing organization responsible for data on who is trained

#### *When/Frequency*

- Semi-annually

#### *Reports*

- Formative: at six months
- Summative: at 12 months

#### *Who Is to Be Assessed*

- Bridges Overview: board and managers
- Bridges Day One: front-line staff
- Applying the Concepts: front-line staff
- Design/Redesign: administration and managers
- Getting Ahead Facilitator Training: Getting Ahead facilitators
- Getting Ahead Workgroups: Getting Ahead investigators/participants

Different parts of the form apply to different departments and individuals, so some parts of the form will be filled out, while others will be blank. The “Critical Indicators Section Under Review” line will identify which section(s) of the form will be filled out.

#### *Instructions for Header*

- Filled out by aha! Process consultant
- Used for gathering information from various sources

#### *Instructions for “Provided: Yes/No” Section*

These columns are to identify whether or not (yes/no) the training was provided to the individual [source: attendance rosters].

#### *Instructions for “Meeting Standards” Section*

Reviewer must observe or see documentation of the critical indicators and note the degree to which the standard is being met: minimal action, initiated and mostly achieved (51%+), achieved (90%+), maintained over time. The first column (minimal action) indicates that the standard has not been met.

***Instructions for Bridges Overview***  
*Critical Indicators Descriptions*

Applies Bridges concepts to agency mission: Does the board or manager use Bridges constructs or language when discussing the agency mission and in producing promotional materials, press releases, or reports? [sources: observations by reviewer, evidence in written documents].

Recognizes policy implications: Has the board or manager used Bridges constructs or language to change policies and/or procedures? [source: evidence in written documents].

Recognizes community implications: Has the board or manager used Bridges constructs or language to change relationships and structures within the community? Has the board worked in the community to develop strategies across all four areas of research on the causes of poverty? [sources: evidence in minutes, memoranda of agreements, contracts, program development, press releases, reports].

***Instructions for Bridges Day One***  
*Critical Indicators Descriptions*

Analyzes mental models of economic class: Does the staff member identify, document, and apply information about the environment of participants in terms of stability, vulnerability, driving forces, strengths and weaknesses, and interlocking elements? [sources: observations by reviewer, evidence in case notes, illustrations/examples provided by person(s) being observed].

Analyzes causes of poverty: Does the staff member identify, document, and apply the client situation regarding the causes of poverty that apply to individuals in terms of individual behaviors, equity of access in the community, exploitation, and political/economic policy? [sources: observations by reviewer, evidence in case notes, illustrations/examples].

Uses hidden rules skillfully: Does the staff member demonstrate knowledge of hidden rules in interactions with individuals in poverty, co-workers, and community partners? [sources: observations by reviewer, evidence in case notes, illustrations/examples].

Evaluates resources: Does the staff member assess the resources of participants? [sources: observations by reviewer, evidence in case notes, illustrations/examples].

Uses language registers appropriately: Does the staff member use language registers to build relationships, collect data, plan, teach, and support program participants? [sources: observations by reviewer, evidence in case notes, illustrations/examples].

Uses discourse patterns appropriately: Does the staff member use discourse patterns to build relationships, collect data, plan, teach, and support program participants? [sources: observations by reviewer, evidence in case notes, illustrations/examples].

Identifies family structures: Does the staff member document the family structures of program participants? [sources: observations by reviewer, evidence in case notes, illustrations/examples].

### ***Instructions for Applying the Concepts***

#### *Critical Indicators Descriptions*

Creates positive relationships with clients: Are there relationships of mutual respect between the staff member and clients as evidenced by body language, expressions of affection and concern, and humor? [source: observations by reviewer].

Makes “deposits” (vs. “withdrawals”; see Covey): Does the staff member seek first to understand, keep promises, express kindnesses/courtesies, clarify expectations, show loyalty to the absent, apologize, and accept feedback? [sources: observations by reviewer, evidence in case notes, illustrations/examples].

Uses mediation: Does the staff member use the “what/why/how” teaching/learning strategies in informal and formal settings? [sources: observations by reviewer, evidence in case notes, illustrations/examples].

Uses mental models: Does the staff member use stories, analogies, metaphors, graphs, charts, and two-dimensional drawings with clients? [sources: observations by reviewer, evidence in case notes, illustrations/examples].

Uses adult voice: Does the staff member speak with clients as equals, ask questions, use reflective-listening skills, and have a win/win approach? [sources: observations by reviewer, evidence in case notes, illustrations/examples].

Builds future story: Does the staff member assist clients to visualize, articulate, and plan for the future, both informally and formally? [sources: observations by reviewer, evidence in case notes, illustrations/examples].

Encourages the practice of choice making: Does the staff member assist clients to develop and practice choice-making skills, both informally and formally? [sources: observations by reviewer, evidence in case notes, illustrations/examples].

Teaches planning strategies: Does the staff member embed planning strategies in most interactions with clients—both one to one and in classroom settings? [sources: observations by reviewer, evidence in case notes, illustrations/examples].

Teaches procedural self-talk: Does the staff member encourage clients to develop their own internal voice for supporting positive attitudes, choices, future orientation, and celebration? [sources: observations by reviewer, evidence in case notes, illustrations/examples].

Assists clients in negotiating change: Does the staff member create a problem-solving partnership, assess resistance and motivation, and assist the individual through the stages of change? [sources: observations by reviewer, evidence in case notes, illustrations/examples].

Provides follow-up and support for change: Does the staff member create a long-term plan for support with clients and assist them in developing support systems during their transition? [sources: observations by reviewer, evidence in case notes, illustrations/examples].

### ***Instructions for Design/Redesign***

#### ***Critical Indicators Descriptions***

Staff training changed to include Bridges: Are all staff members trained in Bridges constructs and are follow-up reviews, case studies, and client applications part of staff meetings and supervision? [sources: rosters, minutes from staff meetings, illustrations/examples].

Client orientation changed: Are clients informed of new theories of change and changes in process and programming? [sources: written policies and procedures, orientation materials].

Increased time for staff/client relationships: Have policies and procedures been implemented that give staff and clients more time for relationship building, both in daily contacts and in the length of time for ongoing support during transition? [sources: written policies and procedures, program design documents].

Discipline system focused on learning: Do accountability systems explain expectations clearly? Are choices and future ramifications described in meaningful ways? Is choice making and accountability designed to give people practice? Is assistance given in planning? [sources: written policies and procedures, program-design documents].

Mental models used: Has the organization adopted mental models for orientation, education, data gathering, and planning? [source: mental models].

Long-term support provided for people in transition: Have the organization and community created equity in access to opportunities to transportation, childcare, healthcare, credit, education, and wages? [sources: planning documents, minutes from meetings, reports].

Mentoring provided: Has the organization developed informal or formal mentoring programs for people in transition? [sources: planning documents, minutes from meetings, reports].

Social capital built: Have people in poverty been brought into decision-making and problem-solving roles in the organization and community? Have people from different

economic backgrounds been brought together in settings of mutual respect? [sources: planning documents, minutes of meetings, reports].

### ***Instructions for Getting Ahead Facilitator Training***

#### ***Critical Indicators Descriptions***

Demonstrates Bridges knowledge: Does the facilitator have command of core concepts, such as mental models of poverty, research continuum, key points, hidden rules, resources, family issues, and language issues? [sources: observations by reviewer, evidence in case notes, illustrations/examples].

Adheres to model: Does the facilitator use the workbook in sequence and cover the content of each module—and do so in at least 15 sessions? [sources: observations by reviewer, schedules, attendance records, documents from Getting Ahead class].

Uses registers appropriately (including translation of abstract concepts using casual register): Does the facilitator translate from the formal to the casual effectively—and use casual register to make and maintain relationships? [source: observations by reviewer].

Facilitates another person's self-discovery: Does the facilitator encourage an individual's exploration of issues and analysis rather than "give the answers"? Does the facilitator "allow" the participants to do and decide what they can do and decide, not stepping in? Is the facilitator non-judgmental? [source: observations by reviewer].

Works well with a co-facilitator who was a former group participant: Does the facilitator include and value the input of the co-facilitator? [source: observations by reviewer].

Empathetic but not easily manipulated, challenges thinking: Does the facilitator demonstrate empathy with a healthy degree of detachment? Does the facilitator avoid "enabling" behavior and help participants be accountable for their own behavior? [source: observations by reviewer].

Uses mental models to illustrate abstract concepts: [source: review of representative mental models].

### ***Instructions for Getting Ahead Workgroups***

#### ***Critical Indicators Descriptions***

The participant created a plan for at least one resource: Did the participant create a plan to raise resources? [source: notes by facilitator].

Staff provided bridging social capital: examples of interactions between staff and participant [source: concrete, observable examples].

Attended at least 90% of group sessions: Did the participant attend at least 90% of the sessions? [source: attendance roster].

Long-term support provided by agency: Did the agency develop a plan to provide long-term support for participants? Did the participants receive long-term support? [sources: planning documents, minutes of meetings, reports].

Long-term support provided by community: Did the agency develop a plan with the community to provide long-term support? Did the participants receive long-term support? [sources: planning documents, minutes of meetings, reports].