Scaling Up Evidence-Based Practices: Strategies from Investing in Innovation (i3)

i3
community.ed.gov

January 2017

INTRODUCTION

The Investing in Innovation (i3) program has awarded 172 grants since 2010 to support innovative and evidence-based education practices that improve student achievement and to bring these promising practices to a wide audience. This second goal—broadening the reach of evidence-based innovations, or scaling up—has been a challenge in education improvement efforts. While there are volumes of books and literature about how to scale up business practices, there is currently a small but growing literature base that identifies strategies to successfully scale up evidence-based programs within U.S. education (see Bradach & Grindle, 2014; Coburn, 2003; Levin, 2013; Sutton, 2014). The i3 program helps broaden this base by supporting organizations in expanding the information about effective, evidence-based practices, scaling up those practices, and disseminating lessons learned about how to effectively implement a practice at scale across diverse education settings in the United States.

What is scaling up? Scaling up is often simply seen as increasing the numbers of teachers, schools, or districts that are using a particular intervention. However, Coburn (2003) identified four dimensions of scaling up: depth, sustainability, spread, and a shift in reform ownership. Thus, she suggests that scaling up comprises not just increased users (spread), but also long-term changes in practice and belief (depth), continuation of intervention effects after initial implementation (sustainability), and strong ownership of the reform by districts and schools. i3 grantees' strategies to scale up their

What is i3?
The Investing in Innovation Program (i3) is a "tiered evidence" grant program in the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Innovation and Improvement (OII). It provides funding to support school districts, schools, and nonprofit organizations working with schools to improve student learning in K–12 public education, particularly for high-need students. Funded projects aim to: 1) develop innovative practices that can serve as models for others to learn from; 2) take to scale those practices that have been demonstrated to be effective, and 3) embed rigorous, school-based research to enable grantees and the educator sector more broadly to learn more about the effectiveness of various education practices.

i3 has a three-tiered funding model in which the amount of funding a grantee receives is linked to the quality of evidence demonstrating the prior effectiveness of the proposed practices. Those applicants without significant supporting evidence of a particular practice's effectiveness can apply to receive funding to develop and iterate new innovations; those applicants that want to take a practice(s) to scale regionally or nationally that can identify prior evidence of the practice's effectiveness qualify for larger amounts of funding.

In 2017, i3 will be replaced by its successor under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the Education Innovation and Research (EIR) program. EIR will retain i3's evidence-based funding model, its three-tiered structure, and its general goal, but will expand funding eligibility to include states, while also focusing more attention on rural students.

Visit http://www.i3community.ed.gov/ to learn more.

interventions focus on most or all of these dimensions.

What have we learned from i3? Nine i3 grant award recipients shared reflections on their experiences in scaling up interventions and provide advice to others trying to grow proven education practices. All have expanded the reach of their respective interventions and, with i3 grant funds, have collectively provided direct services to more than 1.5 million students. The grantees' experiences suggest the following strategies for scaling up evidence-based practices:

- Use multiple methods to establish buy-in;
- Build a regional and national infrastructure;
- Adapt practice based on evidence; and
- Plan for sustainability from day one.

These strategies, while not exhaustive, are useful for any organization that is interested in expanding the reach of an effective educational intervention. Below, we describe each strategy in more depth, with examples from grantees' experiences. To learn more about each organization and grant award, please visit http://www.i3community.ed.gov/i3-profiles and search by grantee name.

i3 Grantees Who Informed this Paper

Innovation	i3 Award (grantee, if different)	# of students served
Building Assets, Reducing Risks (BARR). The BARR model is a comprehensive approach to meeting students' academic, social, and emotional needs through the establishment of safe, strong, trusting relationships between teachers and students.	2010–Development (Search Institute) 2013–Validation (Spurwink) 2016–Scale-up (Spurwink)	3,100 17,000 146,000
Children's Literacy Initiative (CLI). CLI provides early literacy support to K–3 educators via high-quality materials, professional development, and job-embedded coaching.	2010–Validation 2015–Scale-up	58,144 49,500
Diplomas Now. Diplomas Now is a whole-school reform model (Talent Development Secondary) with integrated student supports provided by mentoring and tutoring of City Year Corps members and case management by Communities in Schools case managers. The partnership's integrated work focuses on increasing on-track graduation rates at secondary schools experiencing a disproportionate number of dropouts, and is informed and guided by an early warning indicator system.	2010–Validation (Johns Hopkins University)	30,000
Higher Achievement. Higher Achievement is a year-round expanded learning program whereby volunteer tutors provide 650+ hours of supplementary learning to students in grades 5–8.	2014–Validation	5,000

Innovation	i3 Award (grantee, if different)	# of students served
Knowledge Is Power Program (KIPP). KIPP is a nonprofit network of college-preparatory, public charter schools serving elementary, middle, and high school students. With the support of i3, KIPP expanded its leadership training programs, provided sub-grants to KIPP regions and schools to enhance local leadership pipelines, supported adoption of performance evaluation tools, and disseminated leadership development practices beyond KIPP.	2010–Scale-up	70,000
National Writing Project (NWP). NWP's College-Ready Writers Program establishes partnerships with rural LEAs to provide professional development to middle and high school teachers in order to implement writing instruction aligned with the college- and career-ready standards.	2012–Validation 2016–Scale-up	25,000 40,000
National Math and Science Initiative (NMSI). NMSI partners with schools to implement the College Readiness Program in order to increase the number of students taking and earning qualifying scores on Advanced Placement math, science, and English exams, particularly among high-need students and students traditionally underrepresented in STEM.	2011–Validation 2015–Scale-up	24,400 60,000
Reading Recovery. Reading Recovery is a literacy intervention through which trained teachers provide one-on-one tutoring to first graders, including those in low-performing and rural schools, ELLs, and most recently, children with disabilities (HEROES intervention).	2010–Scale-up (Ohio State)	380,000
Success for All. Success for All is a whole-school improvement model that focuses on job-embedded professional development and coaching; cooperative learning; and school, community, and family engagement to enhance performance in early literacy and middle-school math.	2010–Scale-up	371,000

Strategies for Scaling Up

Strategy #1: Use Multiple Methods to Establish Buy-in

i3 grantees are generally nonprofit organizations and are unique in that they do not have a "captive audience" to expand their educational interventions the way a state or district might through its districts or schools. To scale up an intervention, organizations must first strategically recruit sites (e.g., districts, schools), focusing on those that will both benefit from the intervention and garner support from stakeholders, including those charged with implementation.

In conjunction with effective recruitment, adequate stakeholder buy-in is also essential for scaling up. Without sufficient buy-in, organizations will find it challenging to implement the intervention, let alone sustain the effects after the initial roll out. Organizations can develop buy-in in several ways, including demonstrating the program's effectiveness, building relationships, soliciting meaningful input with and from key stakeholders (e.g., district personnel, school leaders, and teachers), and assisting with funding or funding opportunities as part of the partnership.

Use Evidence of Effectiveness and Storytelling. Proving an intervention is effective is one of the first steps to gathering buy-in and often requires organizations to provide stakeholders with tangible evidence. When presenting evidence of intervention effectiveness and impact, organizations should highlight data that are important to districts or schools; for example,

> **Success for All, Using Evidence of Effectiveness and Storytelling**
>
> For 30 years, Success for All has worked directly with educators in thousands of schools in disadvantaged communities to help their students achieve reading levels at or above the norm. Success for All dedicates as much as six to nine months upfront to seek buy-in from teachers before implementing its intervention. Success for All does not have a large marketing budget, so it relies on word of mouth and previous relationships as a starting point for recruitment. Though formal research can be helpful in starting the conversation, Success for All has found that "speaking beyond academics," or formal research, and "connecting to the heart" by telling stories of the intervention's effects on students and educators is essential to establishing buy-in and commitment for implementation, according to Paul Miller, project manager at Success for All.

data that align with the district's/school's goals, plans, and areas of need. Accordingly, formal program evaluations or other research that provide evidence of intervention effectiveness are essential. For example:

- Higher Achievement launched a longitudinal study of out-of-school-time programming, the premise of its intervention, which had favorable outcomes and prompted additional investments in its expansion.

- During the first year of BARR's i3 development grant, schools participating in the intervention saw strong positive results. These positive findings resulted in a high demand for BARR's work. Angela Jerabek, founder of BARR, reported being "caught off guard by the number of schools that wanted the intervention!"

Additionally, communicating information in a way that is easy to understand and that clearly illustrates effectiveness and impact is paramount to achieving buy-in. Organizations should consider strategic ways to communicate their intervention's usefulness and how it addresses a pressing need in local communities. As an example:

- When NMSI initiates conversations with districts about its intervention to increase participation and performance in Advanced Placement courses, it analyzes the district's data

and compares them to NMSI's national results and the results of other NMSI partner districts in the region. NMSI then presents data-driven projections of the growth in Advanced Placement participation and performance that is possible in the district through partnership with NMSI.

- Reading Recovery, when recruiting, illustrates its effect on students both by sharing its research findings and what reading texts look like for a student before and after one year of intervention. The difference is dramatic.

- When recruiting a district in California, BARR completed an analysis that showed how much money the district was paying for ninth-grade students who had to re-take a class, considering failure rates and teacher salaries. The argument was clear: to save money, invest in BARR. Since implementation that started in 2013, the California district has already recouped the expenditures and is investing in advanced coursework, the arts, and other offerings that were not available to students before BARR implementation.

- Success for All (see above text box) reminds us, though, that organizations sometimes need to "speak beyond academics," or formal research, and learn to tell stories that move stakeholders emotionally. Relatedly, Reading Recovery taps teachers who are passionate about the intervention to share stories of impact, thereby serving as an informal sales team to garner buy-in and support for their intervention. BARR also structures its convenings with partner districts to focus heavily on stories of impact on students' lives. These stories are the anchor for the intervention and have proven effective at engaging educators at both the district and school levels.

Beyond evidence and storytelling, it is important for sites to see implementation in practice. BARR and CLI both recently began to scale up outside of their founding region and are establishing exemplar sites in each new region to demonstrate excellence in intervention implementation and to provide an opportunity for others to see the model in practice.

Build Relationships at All Levels. Establishing relationships is another key way to garner and maintain buy-in. Although organizations use various methods to build relationships, focusing efforts at the school level appeared most popular. To illustrate:

- CLI seeks adequate teacher buy-in (i.e., two-thirds of staff) before it will implement, but focuses its attention on school leaders. CLI connects with the school leader to get support for the program, and once the school leader is onboard, CLI tasks him/her with communicating the intervention to school staff and ensuring buy-in. As a result, CLI's application process yielded four times the implementation sites than needed for its i3 Scale-up grant. CLI also takes a few key actions to make a good first impression, including providing quality materials, stocked classrooms when teachers return from the summer, professional training sessions that deliver high value to teachers, and, of course, nice accommodations.

- Diplomas Now builds relationships by treating its school sites as partners in the work and collaborating with administrators and teachers to set goals, develop strategic plans, identify struggling students, and regularly review data.

- Higher Achievement has identified four criteria to guide site selection, including alignment with school leadership, financial commitment of $25,000 per year, demonstrated student need, and data sharing on student progress. Higher Achievement focuses on the relationship component to ensure that each principal wants the organization to be a part of his/her school.

Though relationship building at the school level is a popular approach, organizations also seek to build relationships or leverage existing relationships at the district and regional levels.

- NMSI created an i3 program manager role specifically to oversee program implementation, build relationships with districts, and gain knowledge about the new areas in which NMSI is working. NMSI also leveraged existing relationships with district personnel to scale up its intervention.

- NWP, in contrast, has established ongoing relationships with regional site leaders, "establishing local relationships from the beginning and building those throughout [the process]," according to Linda Friedrich, co-project director of the NWP i3 grant.

Help Sites Identify Funding. Adding new line items to the budget can deter schools and districts from engaging in the intervention. Helping them find solutions to this problem as part of the recruitment process can encourage buy-in by mitigating fears of how new programs will receive funding.

- Diplomas Now found that districts needed help identifying funds to support turnaround of their lowest-performing schools. As a result, Diplomas Now contracts with a funding specialist to help district leaders find financial resources to support the intervention.

- Success for All has focused on using its i3 grant funds to provide technical assistance services at no cost to its i3 implementation sites and is using technology to make ongoing technical assistance a low-cost option for sites.

Strategy #2: Build a Regional and National Infrastructure

Establishing a regional and national infrastructure (e.g., regional training centers, offices, and staff) emerged as a key component of scaling-up efforts. Organizations noted that concentrating resources allowed for focus and efficiency in all aspects of implementation (relationship building, staffing, technical assistance, cost, funding). Key to realizing these benefits is clarifying the roles of the national and regional staff.

Concentrate Resources Regionally. All of the organizations either leveraged or established regional infrastructures to support scale up. Regional centers and locally recruited staff allow organizations to deliver service within the local context, achieve efficiencies by concentrating resources and expertise, and provide face-to-face technical assistance and support to intervention sites. Many of the organizations rely on their regional teams to build school- and district-level capacity to implement interventions with fidelity and leverage the talent of local practitioners and partners to provide support and professional development to schools and educators.

Organizations that have regional operations may have an advantage in scaling up—they can identify opportunities for scale in regions in which they already have a footprint, an established infrastructure, and a pool of talented practitioners to serve as trainers and coaches. For example:

> **National Math and Science Initiative (NMSI),**
> **Building a Regional and National Infrastructure**
>
> NMSI supports states, districts, and schools to improve student access and success in advanced coursework in math and science. NMSI used a local partnership model to scale up in 40 districts across two states with its first i3 Validation grant. By partnering with local nonprofits and universities to lead implementation, NMSI was able to concentrate and leverage local infrastructure quickly. When NMSI received a Scale-up grant for further expansion, it decided to directly establish staff in local communities across nine districts to support 60,000 students. NMSI made this adjustment to have more direct control over program implementation and support—including hiring of staff, coordination of student and teacher training and mentoring, collection and analysis of participant feedback, partnerships, and fundraising efforts.

- Reading Recovery and NWP have university-based regional sites (22 and 185, respectively) that provide technical assistance and professional development to schools and educators within a designated region.

- KIPP has 31 regionally based teams across the country where it is focusing efforts to open new schools.

For other organizations, the development of regional hubs, local offices, and region-based staff was, or is, a newer approach that stems from efforts to scale up. The organizations achieve this development either by partnering with organizations that have existing footprints in communities (and consequently relationships) or by establishing their own infrastructure.

- Diplomas Now scaled up its intervention from 7 schools in 1 city to 30 schools in 13 cities. The primary grantee for Diplomas Now is Johns Hopkins University; however, the grantee partnered with two nationally established organizations, City Year and Communities in Schools. As a result of this partnership, Diplomas Now focused its scaling up efforts in communities where both organizations had existing infrastructure. This accelerated the scaling up process, leveraging the long-standing relationships that both organizations had built in local communities.

Clarify Roles of Regional and National Offices. As interventions scale up and organizations adjust back-end systems and human capacity to support expansion, both the integrity of model implementation and decision making within an organization may need to adjust to clarify the roles of the regional and national offices.

- KIPP has established autonomous regions across the country as separate 501(c)(3) organizations. The regional sites operate the schools, and as such, are responsible for site quality, student recruitment, working with the local authorizer, and fundraising. The national organization focuses on three primary roles: (1) healthy growth; (2) program integrity and quality; and (3) innovation, research, and learning. With the i3 grant, the national office provided regional sub-grants to foster implementation of the innovations tested under i3. KIPP takes a deliberate approach to testing and scaling what works within its network—careful to get it right on a small scale before sharing practices with all its sites. KIPP developed and refined a set of six questions, with corresponding key performance indicators, that guide its sense of quality across the network. KIPP also has a specific goal to decrease the cost per student of its national office operations as its footprint expands—keeping resources closest to students. This also puts pressure on the national team to prioritize and deliver high value on its work to regions and schools.

- Higher Achievement expanded its sites in the 2015–16 school year and, by the end of its i3 grant, will double implementation sites. With that growth across four regions, Higher Achievement needed to adjust the back-end infrastructure, decision-making structures, supervision roles, communications systems, and meeting routines—all facilitated by the national office. Building a strong leadership team that blends the national and regional offices to communicate and work through these challenging questions and adjustments has been critical to the organization's success thus far.

- CLI established its back-end infrastructure at the national office during the Validation grant. As part of the Scale-up grant, CLI's national team is creating an online knowledge management platform with "best of" resources, videos, and guides to support high-quality training, coaching, and implementation integrity across its five geographic hubs.

Strategy #3: Adapt Practice Based on Evidence

To successfully implement, expand, and sustain an education intervention, organizations have to be adaptable to change and responsive to lessons learned. Fortunately for i3 grantees, the program supports a rigorous and independent program evaluation for each grantee, which allows organizations not only to track intervention effects, but also to identify ways they may need to adjust to improve both organizationally and/or programmatically. Organizations pursuing scale must continually assess successes and areas for improvement. Below we discuss approaches organizations have used, including consulting the research, conducting formative assessments, collecting stakeholder feedback, and experimenting with components of their interventions.

Stay on Top of the Latest Research. Consulting research that is relevant to the field, intervention model, or population served helps organizations incorporate the most recent findings. For example:

- KIPP is committed to being a "learning organization", underlining the need to evolve over time and adapt to new research and lessons learned. KIPP takes lessons from research to understand the practices most essential to student achievement and then encourages those practices across schools.

- Success for All continuously modifies its approach based on research in the field; in fact, "every practice has multiple research studies behind it" before the organization incorporates it into the model and shares it with practitioners, according to Paul Miller, project manager for Success for All.

- NMSI is constantly consulting research to identify key drivers of success to develop leading indicators of program success and failure to drive implementation and support.

> **Building Assets, Reducing Risks (BARR), Adapting Practice Based on Evidence**
>
> BARR is a comprehensive approach to meeting students' academic, social, and emotional needs. The model helps educators build safe, strong, trusting relationships with their students—paving the way for every student to engage in learning. During the Development grant, BARR realized it took three years—not one as originally designed—to maximize implementation effects. After routinely assessing implementation progress and outcomes using the three-year model in its subsequent i3 Validation grant, BARR learned that implementation of some components could begin in the second or third year based on local context. It found that four of the eight components of the intervention are most important to get in place early—creating cohorts of students in ninth grade, conducting team and risk review meetings, and using the I-Time curriculum to build relationships among teachers and students. BARR will expand these learnings to 116 more schools with its 2016 i3 Scale-up grant. BARR is the only innovation to receive all three levels of i3 funding.

Conduct Regular Formative Assessments. Organizations reported that formative, or routine, assessments of implementation were critical to determining progress and areas of need. Such assessments drive learning and problem solving on a continual basis. Often, as was the case for some in i3, organizations learn while doing and have to be flexible enough to deviate from the original plan to make changes in the midst of implementation.

- When NWP realized that its partner districts and local affiliates needed to build more knowledge about teaching argument writing, it created a suite of curricular and formative assessment tools. These resources not only provided guidance on implementation, but also served as a measure of implementation integrity that informed NWP support to its partners.

- Higher Achievement initially planned to expand to 10 cities but later learned it was better to "concentrate the scale and go deeper" in the 4 cities in which it already operated, according to Higher Achievement CEO Lynsey Jeffries. The organization thought it could take a "cookie

cutter approach" to replicating its model, but soon learned that it must adjust to account for local contexts and needs. Formative evaluation also is leading the organization to consider how it can influence educators beyond those it directly serves.

Collect Stakeholder Feedback. Organizations also captured feedback from those directly involved in or affected by the intervention to adapt practices.

- NMSI collected feedback from teachers (e.g., via surveys and focus groups) to identify successes and areas for refinement. In fact, feedback from teachers prompted NMSI to assign consultants to each region to routinely interact with districts and schools to ensure project success.

- Success for All relies on school-based coaches to gather feedback so the organization can modify or adapt its approach.

Experiment With Components of the Intervention. Organizations used their i3 grant to test individual components of their interventions to determine which aspects are most important and how they might alter the program if necessary and/or focus on scaling only specific components (e.g., for cost effectiveness).

- Reading Recovery tested a virtual support and coaching model to deploy in rural areas where it can be more expensive to provide in-person coaching.

- NMSI is currently testing its blended learning model to examine what elements have the greatest effect, so it can then deliver these components more efficiently.

- NWP is planning to test a one-year version of its program to determine if it will have the same effect as its current two-year program. NWP is implementing this as part of its SEED-funded work and is also testing the idea as part of its recent 2016 i3 Scale-up grant award.

Strategy #4: Plan for Sustainability from Day One

When planning to implement an innovation, it is essential, from the start, to plan for sustainability, especially if the innovation is proving to be effective. It is just as important (if not more so) to plan for sustainability as it is to plan to recruit, garner buy-in, and implement the innovation. Organizations should be proactive, early on, about identifying how they will fund the scale up of the intervention (if that is the goal), leverage relationships and partnerships to sustain implementation, and maintain the effect on student achievement. This proactive approach is a challenge for many organizations and thus requires consideration before and during implementation.

Integrate Predictable and Significant Sources of Funding. Organizations recognize that a predictable funding source is necessary to scale and sustain interventions. Successful organizations have sustained practices over time to be in a strong position for rapid scaling opportunities.

- Over the past 30 years, Reading Recovery has maintained about 20 university training centers across the country and weathered periods of contraction and expansion, serving more than 2 million students. Before the i3 grant, Reading Recovery was scaling up in waves, with the first national expansion happening in the 1980s through the national diffusion network. With i3, Ohio State and partners established a collective goal of expansion and impact to part of the Reading Recovery network, expanding services to 380,000 more students within existing and new schools.

- Success for All scaled up dramatically as part of the federally funded National Demonstration Project in the 1980s, from about 60 sites to over 1,000 in a few years. Since then, Success for All has maintained its footprint in about 1,000 schools and was scaling at 20 sites per year before the i3 grant. However, it has more than tripled this pace during i3 grant implementation.

- NMSI maintains a diverse funding portfolio that includes support from public, private, and philanthropic partners. It works with schools and districts to encourage the use of Title I and II funds, as well as local funding partners.

> ### Children's Literacy Initiative (CLI), Planning for Sustainability from Day One
>
> CLI works with teachers to improve instruction so that children can become powerful readers, writers, and thinkers. CLI requires each i3 intervention school to pay an annual buy-in fee "to build a habit of mind that things cost," according to CLI CEO Joel Zarrow. Each school must invest $10,000 per year for the three years of implementation. CLI structured the per-school costs in its 2015 i3 Scale-up grant to taper significantly after Year 1 to aid in sustainability. Additionally, CLI is building the capacity of its partner districts to support schools after the grant, but CLI also plans to maintain its capacity in regional hubs by expanding to new schools and providing fee-for-service supports to existing schools in the network. CLI also provides literacy coaching services to districts and schools, unbundled from its full intervention model.

After Scaling Up, Adjust Implementation Support. Several organizations note that they have built sustainability planning into their implementation design. Some organizations are focused on building district capacity to provide supports to schools after initial implementation, while some plan to use their regional infrastructure (e.g., coaches, training centers) to provide fee-for-service implementation support and technical assistance after the i3 grant ends. To sustain sites after a supportive grant or cash infusion ends, organizations need to proactively seek other sources of funding (e.g., local, philanthropic, corporate) and work closely with sites to access multiple funding sources (e.g., Title I, Title II).

- Higher Achievement realized how difficult it is to procure national philanthropic funding and took a different approach to diversifying funds. It requires new sites to bring in private dollars (e.g., corporate sponsorship, school-based funding, local foundation funding) that are elastic enough to grow each year.

- Success for All has created individual services that sites can purchase based on school needs once initial implementation is complete. Doing so creates ongoing implementation and financial relationships and is quite popular among schools and districts.

- Diplomas Now is working to place sites on sustaining contracts, whereby the school pays an annual fee for support in tracking and analyzing data, maintaining key staff, and attending principal sessions twice a year and trainings for school transformation facilitators.

- Reading Recovery gets a substantial portion of its financial sustainability through university training center partnerships with school districts. Districts form a "site" where one district trains a teacher leader (one year of graduate study), and the teacher leader then provides training and ongoing professional development to other school districts. The school districts pay a training fee to the district with the teacher leader.

- NWP also attributes its sustainability to partnerships with universities, yet notes that the variability in goals and entrepreneurial capacity across the network of universities can create scaling challenges. NWP comprises 185 university-based partners in all 50 states, DC, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

CONCLUSION

Scaling up is not only about increasing the number of users implementing a program, but also about the depth of the reform, sustainability of practices after initial implementation, and strong ownership of the intervention at the district and school levels (Coburn, 2013). Increasing access and use, while also addressing the dimensions of scaling up Coburn identifies, is challenging; programs—even those highlighted in this paper—are often not able to address all dimensions. The i3 grant program has allowed multiple organizations the opportunity to test their scale-up strategies, while also affording those in the field of education the unique opportunity to learn from their experiences. This is especially important given the scarcity of information concerning scale up in the education sector. The strategies identified and stories of implementation shared in this paper contribute to the emerging knowledge base related to scaling up innovative programs in the field of education. Public education entities and their partners should continue to invest in building the evidence base for education practices, translating research into policy and practice, and sharing and implementing what works at the district and school levels.

To learn more and explore the lessons and evaluation findings from all 172 i3 grantees, visit http://www.i3community.ed.gov/.

Contributors

References

Bradach, J., & Grindle, A. (2014). *Transformative scale: The future of growing what works*. Boston, MA: The Bridgespan Group.

Coburn, C. E. (2003). Rethinking scale: Moving beyond numbers to deep and lasting change. *Educational Researcher, 32*(6), 4.

Levin, B. (2013). *What does it take to scale up innovations*? Washington, DC: National Education Policy Center.

Sutton, R. I. (2014). *Eight essentials for scaling up without screwing up*. Harvard Business Review. Retrieved November 11, 2016, from https://hbr.org/2014/02/eight-essentials-for-scaling-up-without-screwing-up.