

## # Paper Summary

<!--META\_START-->

Title: Identifying actionable strategies: using Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR)

Authors: Helen Lam, Michael Quinn, Toni Cipriano-Steffens, Manasi Jayaprakash, Emily Koebnick, Forne

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43058-021-00150-9>

Year: 2021

Publication Type: Journal

Discipline/Domain: Implementation Science / Public Health

Subdomain/Topic: Colorectal cancer screening, evidence-based intervention implementation

Eligibility: Eligible

Overall Relevance Score: 85

Operationalization Score: 90

Contains Definition of Actionability: Yes (implicit, operational focus)

Contains Systematic Features/Dimensions: Yes

Contains Explainability: Partial

Contains Interpretability: No

Contains Framework/Model: Yes (CFIR)

Operationalization Present: Yes

Primary Methodology: Qualitative

Study Context: Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs) implementing 3 EBIs for CRC screening

Geographic/Institutional Context: Large urban FQHC in Chicago, Illinois, USA

Target Users/Stakeholders: Primary care providers, integrated care specialists (CRC stewards), administ

Primary Contribution Type: Empirical study with implementation strategy recommendations

CL: Yes

CR: Yes

FE: Yes

TI: No

EX: Partial

GA: Yes

Reason if Not Eligible: N/A

<!--META\_END-->

**\*\*Title.\*\***

Identifying actionable strategies: using CFIR-informed interviews to evaluate the implementation of a mul

**\*\*Authors:\*\***

Helen Lam, Michael Quinn, Toni Cipriano-Steffens, Manasi Jayaprakash, Emily Koebnick, Fornessa Ran

**\*\*DOI:\*\***

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s43058-021-00150-9>

**\*\*Year:\*\***

2021

**\*\*Publication Type:\*\***

Journal

**\*\*Discipline/Domain:\*\***

Implementation Science / Public Health

**\*\*Subdomain/Topic:\*\***

Colorectal cancer screening, evidence-based intervention (EBI) implementation

**\*\*Contextual Background:\*\***

The study examines how three EBIs—EHR provider reminders, quarterly provider assessment/feedback,

**\*\*Geographic/Institutional Context:\*\***

Large urban FQHC in Chicago, Illinois, USA

**\*\*Target Users/Stakeholders:\*\***

Primary care providers, CRC stewards (integrated care specialists), administrators, implementation team

**\*\*Primary Methodology:\*\***

Qualitative (semi-structured CFIR-guided interviews, template analysis)

**\*\*Primary Contribution Type:\*\***

Empirical study + operational recommendations

---

**## General Summary of the Paper**

The paper uses the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) to analyze the implem

---

**## Eligibility**

Eligible for inclusion: **\*\*Yes\*\***

---

**## How Actionability is Understood**

Actionability is understood implicitly as the ability to **\*\*translate findings about barriers/facilitators into con**

> “By identifying the contextual determinants, we can then determine implementation strategies to facilitate

> “The ultimate goal... was to identify possible implementation strategies... to promote CRC screening...

---

## ## What Makes Something Actionable

- Based on clearly identified barriers/facilitators from stakeholders
- Integrates with existing workflows to minimize disruption
- Distributes responsibility (team-based rather than provider-centric)
- Supported by clear goals and performance feedback
- Supported by culturally and linguistically appropriate resources
- Tied to measurable indicators (e.g., screening rates, completion rates)
- Supported by leadership engagement and organizational incentives

---

## ## How Actionability is Achieved / Operationalized

- **Framework/Approach Name(s):** CFIR-guided post-implementation formative evaluation
- **Methods/Levers:** Qualitative interviews; barrier/facilitator mapping; context-specific strategy design
- **Operational Steps / Workflow:**
  - Conduct CFIR-based stakeholder interviews
  - Code responses into CFIR constructs
  - Identify contextual barriers/facilitators
  - Develop targeted strategies (e.g., morning huddles, standing orders, dashboards)
- **Data & Measures:** EHR-based screening rates, provider order rates, completion rates, qualitative feedback
- **Implementation Context:** Large urban FQHC with diverse patient populations and resource constraints

> “We will tackle the two barriers related to the EHR provider reminder... using a teamwork-based approach

> “Goals direct attention and action... Specific and challenging goals can lead to better task performance

---

## ## Dimensions and Attributes of Actionability (Authors' Perspective)

- **CL (Clarity):** Yes — Strategies emphasize clarity in communication, goals, and feedback reports.
  - > “Include the target CRC screening rates in the quarterly... report.” (p. 12)
- **CR (Contextual Relevance):** Yes — Strategies tailored to FQHC realities (diverse patients, resource constraints)
- **FE (Feasibility):** Yes — Solutions integrate into workflow (e.g., huddles, MA screening updates).
- **TI (Timeliness):** No explicit link to timeliness as a requirement.
- **EX (Explainability):** Partial — Strategies are explained, but not framed in terms of “explainability.”

- **GA (Goal Alignment):** Yes — Emphasis on setting clear organizational and clinic-level goals.
- **Other Dimensions Named by Authors:** Team-based care; cultural/linguistic appropriateness.

---

## ## Theoretical or Conceptual Foundations

- Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR)
- Goal-setting theory (Locke, Latham)

---

## ## Indicators or Metrics for Actionability

- CRC screening order and completion rates
- Provider- and clinic-level performance comparisons
- Achievement of target goals in quarterly feedback

---

## ## Barriers and Enablers to Actionability

- **Barriers:** EHR reminder fatigue; unreliable data; cultural/linguistic challenges; lack of goals; poor communication
- **Enablers:** HRSA reporting incentives; peer pressure; quarterly feedback reports; leadership engagement

---

## ## Relation to Existing Literature

Positions CFIR as a pragmatic framework for evaluating and improving EBI implementation in resource-constrained settings

---

## ## Summary

This study operationalizes “actionability” as turning contextual analysis of implementation barriers and facilitators into actionable strategies

---

## ## Scores

- **Overall Relevance Score:** 85 — Strong implicit conceptualization of actionability with concrete features
- **Operationalization Score:** 90 — Detailed, context-specific strategies directly linked to identified barriers

---

## ## Supporting Quotes from the Paper

- “By identifying the contextual determinants, we can then determine implementation strategies to facilitate change.”
- “Use teamwork approach and share the burden... Conduct morning huddles... Implement standing orders.”
- “Include the target CRC screening rates in the quarterly... report... Disseminate... to all members of the team.”
- “Identify and collect culturally and linguistically specific CRC education material.” (p. 12)

---

## ## Actionability References to Other Papers

- CFIR framework: Damschroder et al. (2009)
- Goal-setting theory: Locke et al. (1981), Lunenburg (2011)
- Implementation strategies literature: Proctor et al. (2013), Keith et al. (2017)