CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY
SCIENCE AND PRACTICE

# User-Centered Design for Psychosocial Intervention Development and Implementation

Aaron R. Lyon, University of Washington
Kelly Koerner, Evidence-Based Practice Institute, LLC

**This article articulates how common difficulties encountered when attempting to implement or scale-up evidence-based treatments are exacerbated by fundamental design problems, which may be addressed by a set of principles and methods drawn from the contemporary field of user-centered design. User-centered design is an approach to product development that grounds the process in information collected about the individuals and settings where products will ultimately be used. To demonstrate the utility of this perspective, we present four design concepts and methods: (a) clear identification of end users and their needs, (b) prototyping/rapid iteration, (c) simplifying existing intervention parameters/procedures, and (d) exploiting natural constraints. We conclude with a brief design-focused research agenda for the developers and implementers of evidence-based treatments.**

***Key words:*** **design, evidence-based treatment, implementation, intervention development.** ***[Clin Psychol Sci Prac 23:180–200, 2016]***

Much attention has been paid to the "research–practice gap" in mental health care, wherein evidence-based treatments (EBTs)—typically established through decades of development and rigorous empirical testing—are not routinely employed in service delivery (Kazdin, 2008; McHugh & Barlow, 2010). Recently, the field of implementation science has emerged, explicitly tasked with improving the use of well-researched interventions in everyday service settings (Eccles & Mittman, 2006), and some have argued that new ways of connecting science and service may be necessary to close the research–practice gap and truly raise quality of care (e.g., Kazdin & Rabbitt, 2013). In line with this call for new approaches, we articulate in this article how many of the contemporary difficulties encountered during EBT implementation are exacerbated by fundamental design problems—embedded in both EBTs themselves and typical EBT implementation processes—and which may be effectively addressed by a set of principles and methods drawn from the field of user-centered design.

## GAPS IN EBT DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EFFECTIVENESS

EBTs are defined as interventions that have produced therapeutic change in controlled trials, while evidence-based practice refers to integration of research knowledge with clinical expertise and patient characteristics, culture, and preferences (American Psychological Association, 2006; Kazdin, 2008). Although there is recognition that mental health service quality should extend beyond EBT to the broader concept of evidence-based practice, and a number of recent research examples that suggest the field may be moving slowly toward complementary approaches (e.g., Garland et al., 2014; Schoenwald, Kelleher, & Weisz, 2008; Weisz & Chorpita, 2011), manualized EBT protocols remain the primary medium through which research evidence is

Address correspondence to Aaron R. Lyon, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, University of Washington, 6200 NE 74th St., Suite 100, Seattle, WA 98115. E-mail: lyona@uw.edu.

doi:10.1111/cpsp.12154

packaged and disseminated for use (Garland, Hawley, Brookman-Frazee, & Hurlburt, 2008). Despite their prevalence, numerous concerns about EBTs appear to contribute to their low level of use by community practitioners (Chambless & Ollendick, 2001; Kazdin, 2008). While some of these concerns represent important questions surrounding the methods through which EBTs are tested (e.g., research sample generalizability, relevance of psychiatric symptom outcome measures), many are exacerbated by the design or structure of EBTs, user responses to those designs, and the ways that elements of EBTs design interact with implementation processes. Although the implementation and widespread reach of EBT in service systems are known to be influenced by a range of factors operating across multiple system levels (Aarons, Hurlburt, & Horwitz, 2011)—and intervention characteristics are commonly included in leading implementation frameworks (e.g., Damschroder et al., 2009; Rogers, 2003)—specific characteristics of the programs implemented are typically given less attention than the individuals, systems, and processes involved. Further, despite acknowledgment that intervention characteristics are important, existing frameworks provide almost no guidance surrounding specific methods for ensuring that EBTs successfully meet user needs.

Key design issues that continue to impact EBT implementability include flexibility, complexity, and effectiveness, as well as the frequently one-directional relationship between program development and implementation. First, there is ongoing debate surrounding the extent to which EBTs are able to effectively balance structure and flexibility when introduced to service providers working in community contexts (Chambless & Ollendick, 2001; Hill & Owens, 2013; Lieb, Mayfield, Miller, & Pennucci, 2004). Flexibility (e.g., via allowable adaptations) is inherently appealing when working to deliver individualized or locally relevant services (Lyon, Lau, McCauley, Vander Stoep, & Chorpita, 2014b), but is accompanied by increased uncertainty (Chorpita & Daleiden, 2014) and may lead to lower clinician performance (e.g., Jewell, Handwerk, Almquist, & Lucas, 2004). Second, most psychosocial interventions are *complex* and carry numerous decision points during the course of their use (Chorpita, Bernstein, & Daleiden, 2008). High complexity can interfere with the extent to which EBTs are readily accessible to providers or organizations interested in adopting them to improve their practice. Further, trends suggest increasing complexity as EBT developers pursue applications to wider populations, but this added complexity often carries little additional benefit (e.g., Chaffin et al., 2004). As a partial function of their complexity, EBTs are exceedingly difficult to train and learn. Indeed, perhaps the best-established implementation truism is that even intensive "train and hope" approaches are unlikely to result in meaningful practitioner behavior change without ongoing consultation or coaching (Beidas & Kendall, 2010; Fixsen, Naoom, Blase, Friedman, & Wallace, 2005; Lyon, Stirman, Kerns, & Bruns, 2011). As a result of the effort required, high-quality EBT training is expensive and elusive for many practitioners.

Third, although widely cited articles originally documented the effectiveness of EBTs relative to usual care (e.g., Weisz, Jensen-Doss, & Hawley, 2006), some recent research has raised questions about their actual superiority (e.g., Spielmans, Gatlin, & McFall, 2010; Weisz et al., 2012, 2013). Findings such as these threaten to undermine the legitimacy of EBTs and the basic arguments on which their implementation is based. As discussed below, this is particularly problematic considering that EBTs are typically disseminated as static tools to be used only as directed by developers, rather than products to be improved over time (Chambers, Glasgow, & Stange, 2013). Although it is often a foregone conclusion that the transfer of an EBT to a community context will be accompanied by an inevitable "voltage drop" in which its effectiveness falters relative to the original efficacy trials, there is growing acknowledgment that ongoing adjustment and evaluation of EBT to ensure that a program is responsive to the local context provide an opportunity to increase intervention effectiveness over time (Aarons et al., 2012; Chambers et al., 2013). However, there are currently few clear principles or procedures available to guide this work effectively.

Finally, all of the concerns described above are perpetuated by existing divisions between intervention design (e.g., development and testing) and intervention implementation processes (e.g., training, scale-up, sustainment). Although interventions are not always

developed following a uniform or consistent process, a university-based research team most traditionally develops and tests an intervention extensively, articulating its key functions and structure, before it is disseminated more broadly as a fully formed, static intervention protocol. Chorpita and Daleiden (2014) recently distinguished this dominant emphasis on "design-time" control (i.e., determining features in advance) from "run-time" control, which they defined as configuration based on how a product interacts with its environment. This distinction is akin to the common breakdown of roles and responsibilities within the construction industry, in which architects design new buildings and contractors subsequently execute that design. Although there are advantages to this arrangement (e.g., development of a high degree of specialization), it can also produce blueprint designs that are ultimately too expensive, impractical, or even impossible to construct within real-world constraints. Seen this way, EBTs suffer from a disconnect between the design context and implementation context, which leads to (a) design decisions that are not necessarily applicable to the constraints of the contexts in which they will ultimately be used and (b) implementation processes that devote excessive resources to adhering to design-time specifications that may be inappropriate (e.g., strict emphases on intervention integrity). Despite recognition that EBT implementation involves substantial problem solving and frequent compromise (Aarons et al., 2011, 2014), emerging implementation strategies (Powell et al., 2015) have typically been used to implement relatively static EBTs in a unidirectional fashion, emphasizing design-time control. Because successful implementation occurs as a function of both the intervention itself and the destination context (Rogers, 2003), the failure of most implementation processes to incorporate ongoing, iterative intervention development increases the risk that local users will find new technologies to be low on key implementation outcomes such as acceptability, feasibility, and appropriateness (Proctor et al., 2011) and may limit effectiveness (Chambers et al., 2013).

A reconceptualization of how intervention technologies are initially developed, prepared for dissemination, and then ultimately implemented may help to capitalize on opportunities to increase intervention appropriateness and effectiveness over time. Just like other consumer products, EBT can be intentionally designed using methods that ensure the needs of target users are incorporated into the development process. Such processes are relevant to both the initial development of new interventions and the revision of existing interventions. We next discuss how user-centered design can be applied to satisfy user needs and improve EBT.

## USER-CENTERED DESIGN TO IMPROVE EBT DEVELOPMENT, PACKAGING, AND IMPLEMENTATION

### Usability and User-Centered Design

The need to create products that intended audiences find compelling and easy to use transcends any single discipline or industry. Over the past two decades, a field of user-centered design (UCD) has developed, largely rooted in human–computer interaction, industrial design, and cognitive psychology. UCD is an approach to product development that grounds the process in information about the people who will ultimately use the product (Courage & Baxter, 2005; Norman & Draper, 1986). Although UCD borrows concepts from other disciplines (e.g., participatory research), it bundles them uniquely in a comprehensive set of principles and procedures intended to make products more accessible and appealing and to improve their effectiveness over time. Colloquially, design is often distinguished from engineering: While engineering may build functional, yet inelegant, solutions to problems that meet technical specifications, design emphasizes parsimony, ease of use, aesthetics, fitness to purpose, and results in products that meet requirements in compelling ways. Because EBTs have historically focused primarily on the identification of robust, often complicated, solutions for highly specified problems (i.e., diagnosable clinical disorders), it could be said that they have overemphasized engineering to the detriment of design.

Usability—the extent to which a product can be used by specified users to achieve specified goals with effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction in a specified context of use (International Standards Organization, 1998)—is a principal outcome of a user-centered approach to design. Usability has been conceptualized as a combination of constructs, including (a) learnability, (b) efficiency, (c) memorability, (d) error frequency/

severity, and (e) satisfaction (Nielsen, 1994). Maguire (2001) has identified that usable systems result in increased productivity, enable a reduction of errors, require fewer resources for training and support, are more acceptable to users, and enjoy enhanced reputations within the user market. In contrast, problematic system design can easily undermine otherwise appealing and effective products (Karsh, 2004; Littlejohns, Wyatt, & Garvican, 2003). Other authors have included additional criteria for usable products, such as functional minimalism (i.e., too many features, functions, or components will reduce usability), low cognitive load (i.e., minimize the amount of thinking required to complete a task), clear feedback to users (e.g., about product status, success or failure), and exploitation of the natural constraints present in an environment (i.e., designing products in ways that incorporate unalterable characteristics of the intended context of use; Norman, 1988; Tognazzini, 2014).

Applied to psychosocial interventions, this list of design principles for ensuring usability suggests that well-designed EBTs should (a) provide clinicians, service recipients, and other users opportunities to rapidly build understanding of or facility in their use (learnability); (b) minimize the time, effort, and cost of using the EBT to resolve identified problems (efficiency); (c) remember and successfully apply important elements without many added supports (memorability); (d) prevent or allow rapid recovery from errors or misapplications (error avoidance/reduction); (e) be viewed as acceptable and valuable compared with other products available within the larger mental health marketplace (satisfaction/acceptability/reputation); (f) maintain simplicity (low cognitive load); and (g) be designed—first and foremost—to fit their context of use (exploit natural constraints). Table 1 displays these design goals.

UCD principles can be applied not only to the creation and improvement of software and physical products, but also to design of effective social phenomena, such as service design (Goldstein, Johnston, Duffy, & Rao, 2002; Zomerdijk & Voss, 2010) or instructional design (Gagne, Wager, Golas, Keller, & Russell, 2004; Van Merriënboer, Kirschner, & Kester, 2003).

In mental and behavioral health, some limited work has applied design principles to topics such as the instructional design of clinician training programs (Weingardt, 2004). Authors have also begun to explore the relevance of these ideas to mental and behavioral health interventions (most notably Chorpita & Daleiden, 2014), although not within an explicit UCD framework. Wu et al. (2015) have discussed the relevance of the related discipline of engineering to implementation and mental health services, and others have advocated for usability testing and iterative design in the context of health information technologies to support clinical decision making (e.g., Bickman, Kelley, & Athay, 2012; Lyon et al., 2016). Nevertheless, a UCD approach has not yet been applied to the development or implementation of EBTs themselves. To illustrate the utility of UCD, we briefly present a selection of concepts and methods below through which (a) initial psychosocial intervention design and (b) redesign of existing interventions (frequently in the context of implementation activities) can be brought into better alignment with the needs of the end users. These include careful identification of intervention end users and their needs, prototyping and rapid iteration, simplifying existing intervention parameters and procedures, and exploiting natural constraints. For each, we present a definition, example techniques from UCD, and potential applications to the design or redesign of psychosocial interventions in mental health.

**Table 1.** Design goals for evidence-based treatments (EBTs) in mental and behavioral health

| Principle | Description |
|---|---|
| Learnability | Well-designed EBTs should provide users with opportunities to rapidly build understanding of, or facility in, their use. |
| Efficiency | Minimize the time, effort, and cost of using the EBT to resolve identified problems. |
| Memorability | Users can remember and successfully apply important elements of the EBT protocol without many added supports. |
| Error reduction | Prevent or allow rapid recovery from errors or misapplications of EBT content. |
| Satisfaction/Reputation | Be viewed as acceptable and valuable, especially compared with alternative products available within the larger mental health marketplace. |
| Low cognitive load | Simplify task structure or the number of steps required in order to minimize the amount of thinking required to complete a task. |
| Exploit natural constraints | Successful designs should incorporate or explicitly address the static properties of an intended destination context that limit the ways a product can be used. |

#### Identifying Users and User Needs

***Definition.*** The UCD field places strong emphasis on explicitly identifying primary, secondary, and sometimes tertiary users in order to ensure that new products effectively meet their needs (Cooper, Reimann, & Cronin, 2007; Grudin & Pruitt, 2002). Primary users are the target group for a product whose needs are prioritized in the design or redesign process. Redesign of an existing innovation may sometimes be prompted by the identification of a new set of primary users. Secondary users are those who are likely to be generally satisfied with the design elements identified on the basis of the primary users, but who may have additional needs that can be accommodated without compromising a product's ability to meet the primary users' needs. Negative users are those the product is explicitly *not* intended to serve, and whose input should not be considered as design decisions are made (Cooper et al., 2007).

***Techniques.*** Product developers tend to underestimate user diversity in their design processes, but careful identification of representative user needs can correct this bias and enhance product quality (Kujala & Kauppinen, 2004). In the absence of this information, developers are likely to base designs on people similar to themselves (Cooper, 1999; Kujala & Mäntylä, 2000). Use of diverse user groups is important when designing products for organizations, which inevitably contain individuals representing different user types (Kujala & Kauppinen, 2004). In the domain of computer technologies, the increasing ubiquity of digital products has prompted suggestions that designers move beyond generic user models toward more nuanced understandings of their needs and desires (e.g., Dillon & Watson, 1996).

One parsimonious model for user identification is the lead user approach, wherein the experiences of particularly advanced users are collected to uncover system problems and solutions (which lead users often identify on their own; von Hippel, 1989). Although this method has been found to improve the efficiency of the product design process (Olson & Bakke, 2001), some lead user needs may be too advanced to be relevant to less experienced users (Kujala & Kauppinen, 2004). Hackos and Redish (1998) proposed a process for incorporating a broader variety of users into the design process that includes (a) brainstorming a preliminary list of users, (b) articulating user characteristics, (c) describing and prioritizing main user groups, (d) selecting typical and representative users from those groups, and (e) gathering information from users to inform the redesign of the user group descriptions. Some evidence exists to suggest the utility of this process in producing more usable systems (Kujala & Kauppinen, 2004).

***Applications.*** Similar to ineffective digital technology development, EBT development processes tend to emphasize the needs and perspectives of intervention developers over those of well-defined user groups. Indeed, substantial disconnects have been identified between developers, who are typically doctoral-level researchers or trainees working in academic settings, and public-sector mental health therapists, who are likely to be among the end users of the protocol (Weisz et al., 2006). Because master's-level therapists provide the bulk of mental health services in community settings (Hyde, 2013), this group is an important set of primary users. Nevertheless, available evidence suggests that EBTs are not particularly well aligned with the needs of this group (Addis, Wade, & Hatgis, 1999). As a result, many of these intended EBT users do not view EBTs as necessary or relevant to their work (Nakamura, Higa-McMillan, Okamura, & Shimabukuro, 2011) or, if they do, are struggling to use them routinely and successfully (Becker, Smith, & Jensen-Doss, 2013). Other studies have indicated that therapists sometimes question the relevance or effectiveness of EBTs for their specific populations or struggle to deliver them when presented with engagement difficulties, crises, or comorbidities (Chandler, Peters, Field, & Juliano-Bult, 2004; Kazdin, 2008; Whaley & Davis, 2007). Chorpita, Korathu-Larson, Knowles, and Guan (2014) have pointed out that these situations often require therapists to go "off protocol," changing their intervention plans in unexpected ways that are inconsistent with the intended treatment. Deviations such as these represent the EBT equivalent of software "workarounds," in which temporary fixes are used to bypass identified system usability problems. Although workarounds can often be effective problem solving strategies in the short term, they are likely to decrease usability and product functioning if unaddressed.

Well-designed systems reduce the need for such workarounds. A UCD perspective may also allow EBTs to be designed to address complex or changing client problems, and some existing interventions already reflect these principles. Examples of interventions designed to address these issues come from contemporary work on "transdiagnostic" and "modularized" approaches to intervention (Barlow, Allen, & Choate, 2004; Chorpita, Daleiden, & Weisz, 2005b; Roy-Byrne et al., 2010; Weisz et al., 2012), as well as more principle-driven (rather than traditionally manualized) interventions (Koerner, 2013). Both of these types of EBTs are intended to allow for more flexibility in addressing client problems identified across different stages of treatment.

Drawing from the UCD literature, a clearer conceptualization of users and user needs should involve more explicit articulation of user types and incorporation of user perspectives across intervention development phases. At a minimum, involving lead or expert users (e.g., clinicians with expertise using multiple EBTs in community settings) in early, formative information gathering to drive development processes represents a relatively cost-effective method of cataloging protocol problems and potentially innovative solutions, although this may result in limited scalability if it does not result in a product that is responsive to less experienced users. Developers may also leverage primary users' feedback to produce variations of EBT products for adoption by users at different levels of expertise, as is common in digital technologies (Kujala & Kauppinen, 2004). In this case, different classes of primary users may include line staff in juvenile justice mental health cottages, nurses and social workers in primary care settings, or PhD-level psychologists in specialty clinics—all of whom may desire or need different configurations of an EBT (e.g., versions that provide greater theoretical rationale or information about basic techniques, such as psychoeducation). Furthermore, findings indicating that incomplete penetration and sustainment are the norm (Stirman et al., 2012) suggest that it may be equally important for intervention developers to explicitly articulate the characteristics of negative users who are not intended targets for an intervention (e.g., those with low attitudes toward the use of research evidence in practice).

In addition, EBT design processes may be most effective if they incorporate a developmental perspective and attend to how individual service provider and service system needs change over time (Chorpita & Daleiden, 2014). In software design, competitive products must remain sufficiently adaptable to account for changing user expectations, previously unidentified bugs, evolving hardware, or a shifting marketplace. For these reasons, software updates are pushed out to users with astonishing regularity (e.g., every 6 weeks; Khomh, Dhaliwal, Zou, & Adams, 2012). Well-designed EBTs should be similarly responsive to changes in staff needs. These changes may include increases in individual staff expertise due to experience (e.g., new therapists becoming increasingly comfortable in clinical interactions) or development of specific new competencies, but may also include decreases in a system's collective expertise due to staff turnover. In either situation, mechanisms that allow service systems to update components of EBTs to meet these changing needs are vital. Possibilities include developing tools to "push out" regular intervention updates to practitioners along with just-in-time training (Dimeff, Paves, Skutch, & Woodcock, 2010).

Beyond clinicians, consumers of mental health services are a frequently ignored, but essential, primary EBT user type (Sanders & Kirby, 2015). When considered, consumer perspectives are most commonly captured in surveys of mental healthcare satisfaction (e.g., Solberg, Larsson, & Jozefiak, 2015), but their needs extend well beyond this construct. From a design perspective, satisfaction is only one of many indicators of a usable and effective product, and one that may be particularly subject to bias—and therefore less informative—when a user has no experience with a comparable product to which to compare a new innovation. Although service recipients generally report favorable experiences receiving EBT (Hodgetts & Wright, 2007), research has documented that EBT consumers may also experience a number of barriers to successfully engaging in, and benefiting from, those interventions. These include questions about their accessibility, perceived flexibility, and cultural relevance, among others (Becker, Spirito, & Vanmali, 2015; Hodgetts & Wright, 2007). UCD methods that evaluate (e.g., via contextual inquiry or other participatory approaches; Holtzblatt, Wendell, & Wood,

2004) and address these types of concerns directly have the potential to increase the "patient centeredness" of interventions by incorporating consumer preferences and ensuring responsivity to consumer needs (Methodology Committee of the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute, 2012). Indeed, one promising approach to better include consumer needs is through direct user participation in the initial development, redesign, or evaluation of interventions themselves (Boote, Baird, & Beecroft, 2010). For instance, Holmqvist, Vincent, and Walsh (2014) found that although web- and telehealth-based cognitive-behavioral therapy for insomnia were equally effective, service recipients favored web-based delivery. In that scenario, use of a web-based platform is likely to increase the user and patient centeredness of the intervention. Again, due to their built-in flexibility, newer transdiagnostic or modular approaches to service delivery (described above) may be more likely to be responsive in these ways.

Secondary EBT users may include system administrators, who make decisions about innovation adoption; paraprofessionals, who may use versions of EBT within traditional or reconceptualized service roles; as well as other key stakeholders. Although a large body of implementation-focused research has documented the impact of organizational processes on successful implementation—including leadership buy-in and administrative support (Beidas & Kendall, 2010)—outside of a few noteworthy exceptions (e.g., Schoenwald et al., 2008), little research has focused on ways to design EBTs to be responsive to the needs of these decision makers while keeping intervention effectiveness intact or to systematically plan evaluations of the modifications needed to better fit setting constraints. Additionally, given perpetual workforce shortages and rising populations of individuals in need of mental health services (U.S. DHHS, 2013; Kakuma et al., 2011), it may be the case that, in some situations, traditional mental health therapists are not the optimal "intervention pilots" or frontline service deliverers. Reconsideration of primary EBT users and service delivery models also opens the door to task-shifting strategies, which have quickly become popular in global health and, increasingly, domestically (Patel, 2009). Task shifting involves workforce reorganization and redistribution of some tasks that have traditionally been completed by highly trained service providers (e.g., clinical psychologists, psychiatrists) to other types of professionals. For example, in the Improving Access to Psychological Therapies project, cognitive-behavioral approaches were explicitly packaged as low intensity versus high intensity to efficiently expand workforce capability and ensure that people with less severe problems could receive care from psychological well-being practitioners with less intensive training (Clark et al., 2009; Glover, Webb, & Evison, 2010). Revising an existing EBT to be applicable to a new class of service providers (e.g., paraprofessionals) may be an appropriate impetus for system redesign. Redefined roles of this type may also help to make room for the development and use of simplified "disruptive innovations" within the EBT domain, which typically make products available to new sets of consumers or users who were not previously considered part of the target market (Hwang & Christensen, 2008; Rotheram-Borus, Swendeman, & Chorpita, 2012). Disruptive innovations are defined as "cheaper, simpler, more convenient products or services that start by meeting the needs of less demanding customers" (Christensen, Bohmer, & Kenagy, 2000, p. 2). Applied to health care, disruptive innovations often have the effect of increasing service capacity by either (a) reducing the need for clinician involvement by delivering services directly to consumers (e.g., client-facing apps that provide first-line interventions) or (b) shifting service delivery tasks to other types of professionals or paraprofessionals. The latter may include behavioral health service delivery in primary care or tertiary care settings that more typically emphasize physical health or the use of new service delivery innovations (e.g., via avatar-based interventions) to promote acceptability and accessibility. In both cases, increasing capacity may also have the effect of identifying and addressing problems in less severe populations of service users.

#### Prototyping and Rapid Iteration

***Definition.*** The concept of prototyping is ubiquitous within the field of UCD and related disciplines. Rapid prototyping is a process of making ideas tangible in order to quickly test and make improvements based on feedback (Wilson & Rosenberg, 1988). The mantra "Fail early and often" conveys the spirit of rapid

prototyping. Using this technique early in the design process allows for the inexpensive exploration of novel ideas and solutions prior to more costly production. It is especially helpful to mock up important interactions that will be crucial to success or workflow ease. Prototyping, and rapid iterations based on evaluation of each successive prototype, is an excellent example of the overarching design process of collecting data and feedback at all stages of a product development cycle (Maguire, 2001).

***Techniques.*** Prototyping is iterative and involves the sequence of developing a prototype, reviewing that prototype with users, and then refining it based on their feedback. At its essence, prototyping involves the creation of a "low-fidelity" version of a product that contains key functions of interest in order to test a concept, facilitate rapid evaluation and feedback, or answer a specific question (e.g., deciding between two design alternatives). Later, fully functional "high-fidelity" prototypes may be created that are more similar to the final product and typically offer real interactive content (Maguire, 2001).

Prototyping is frequently visual, and sketching may be an especially helpful tool to use in early rapid prototyping. With sketching, a design team represents a product in a quick and disposable manner, with just enough detail to learn how someone will use a product rather than evaluating that product or becoming distracted by how it looks. For example, to design a website or smart phone application, designers often begin with paper wireframes (i.e., quick drawings of user screen views) and schematic drawings of the content and interactions on and between pages. Testing with a paper prototype means the designer can rapidly redraw an interaction to better fit the flow to user needs and preferences. Robust evidence supports the use of prototyping to improve a product's match with users and overall "ease of use" (Gordon & Bieman, 1995).

***Applications.*** Applied to EBT development, rapid prototyping may hold opportunities to accelerate the glacial pace through which research innovations have historically been developed, tested, and translated into typical practice (Balas & Boren, 2000). Prototyping may be used either to facilitate more rapid and responsive initial EBT development processes or to redesign existing EBTs in the context of larger-scale implementation (e.g., successive, systematic testing of different intervention components or configurations). Prototyping may be distinguished from typical pilot testing by its speed, its repetition (many small tests are required), and the fact that it is largely exploratory (i.e., focused on challenging core assumptions and altering an intervention in meaningful ways) versus confirmatory (i.e., intended to establish feasibility).

The concept of microtrials (Howe, Beach, & Brody, 2010) represents a feasible approach to engaging in rapid, small-scale prototyping to develop and evaluate components of psychosocial interventions. Microtrials are short tests of the effects of circumscribed environmental or behavioral manipulations on proximal outcomes or mechanisms of change. Microtrials share some similarities with clinical analog trials, but rather than using analog conditions (e.g., vignettes [Wright, Weinman, & Marteau, 2003; ]; participants who approximate clinical populations [Barlow, Agras, Leitenberg, & Wincze, 1970; ]) to represent the phenomena of interest, microtrial studies are more likely to reflect real-world conditions (e.g., real service recipients and clinical interactions). Recently, microtrials have been identified as a feasible method for testing individual parenting techniques (e.g., praise) to determine their discrete merit and ultimately drive more individualized, tailored service delivery (Leijten et al., 2015). Early in an intervention development process, microtrials may have the potential to support the collection of "proof-of-concept" evidence for specific, previously untested techniques using a within-subjects, case study research design. These techniques can often be delivered across a single session, after which developers evaluate (a) the extent to which service recipients found the technique acceptable and appropriate and (b) any changes in proximal outcomes. Such an approach provides opportunities for multiple, simultaneous small-scale tests of variations within a case study research design or related framework.

Applied to the redesign of established EBTs, rapid prototyping allows changes to be made to existing content on an ongoing basis in the context of small- or even large-scale implementation. For example, systematic adaptation and iteration of evidence-based

progress monitoring, suicide risk detection/intervention, or group delivery of previously individualized interventions can be integrated with strong existing procedures for quality improvement to better fit the needs and constraints faced within a large health maintenance organization (Steinfeld et al., 2014). This stands in contrast to the dominant scientific model in which each incremental change to an existing EBT protocol must be subjected to a new randomized trial for testing (Chorpita, Daleiden, & Weisz, 2005a). In this way, rapid prototyping may systematize the processes through which practitioners tend to apply EBT in the real world, which commonly involve a series of nonsystematic adaptations (Stirman, Miller, Toder, & Calloway, 2013). Rapid prototyping may be distinguished from other models of EBT development and deployment (e.g., Rounsaville, Carroll, & Onken, 2001; Weisz, Jensen, & McLeod, 2005) in the extent to which it functions as a continuous, nonlinear quality improvement process and provides opportunities to quickly evaluate the viability of new concepts or variations. Because it opens the door to a greater number of variants and decreases the costs associated with testing new alternatives, rapid prototyping may be more likely to result in new EBT protocol innovations than current models.

#### Design Simplification

***Definition.*** With the goals of increasing learnability and decreasing the cognitive load required as users interact with a product, design simplification has long been a hallmark of UCD (Norman, 1988). Simplification is an overarching principle with specific applications to multiple design activities, such as the processes of scoping product functions and features (i.e., avoid unnecessary options) or determining the ways products present information to users (i.e., effective information visualization—see below). Simplicity is particularly important in the context of UCD because the common practice of collecting user input across phases of development has the potential to identify a nearly endless set of enhancements, which introduces considerable opportunities for "scope creep," or the creation of a product or product features that add complexity and extend well beyond original specifications. Vigilant application of the principle of simplification works to contain this complexity while enhancing user experiences and facilitating the scalability of products (Rogers, 2003; Yamey, 2011).

***Techniques.*** In the context of website usability, Nielsen and Loranger (2006) note that it is far more difficult to build simple yet sophisticated designs compared with cumbersome designs with multiple layers of navigation and features. Early in the emergence of the field of UCD, Norman (1988) articulated a series of principles for transforming difficult tasks into simple ones. Among them, he suggested simplifying the structure of tasks (e.g., by leveraging technology and reducing the load on attention, short-term memory, and long-term memory) through designs that show alternative courses of action, make visible information that would otherwise be invisible, and help users to readily evaluate the implications or outcomes of their actions. The goal of simplification can either be achieved by (a) keeping primary tasks unchanged, but incorporating new supportive infrastructure or external memory devices to supplement human perceptual abilities (e.g., dashboard instruments that communicate the state of the object in question [such as an automobile]), or (b) reducing the complexity of a task itself (e.g., introducing Velcro to replace shoelaces, or digital watches to replace analog). Frequently completed tasks are often most ripe for simplification, given the potential of even small changes to save substantial time and effort over each occurrence of a behavior.

A particularly important set of simplification tools relates to information visualization techniques, designed to communicate information simply and effectively. Although information visualization is frequently discussed surrounding the display of quantitative data (Tufte, 2001; Ware, 2013), clear presentation of visual information is essential to the functioning of any product to allow users to understand the state of a system, what actions are possible, and how they should be completed (Norman, 1988).

***Applications.*** When scaling up behavioral health interventions, Aarons and Chaffin (2013, p. 5) observed that "within an existing network, the less change required, the more implementation may occur." Considering the complexity of contemporary

EBTs, deliberate simplification may enhance the potential of effective programs to spread within service systems. Efforts to simplify EBT interventions and implementation processes may take several forms, including methods of simplifying EBTs themselves (i.e., reducing the complexity of the task itself) or improving EBT manuals and related materials (i.e., keeping the task unchanged, but incorporating new or different supports). These simplification activities may occur as new interventions are developed, or in service of reducing the complexity of existing protocols via EBT redesign.

Increasingly, mental health services researchers have begun to argue for the dissemination and implementation of key intervention competencies, principles, or practices rather than full EBT packages (e.g., Beidas, Koerner, Weingardt, & Kendall, 2011; Rotheram-Borus et al., 2012), an approach that may represent one compelling pathway to EBT simplification. For instance, increasing evidence has emerged that routinely monitoring psychotherapy client outcomes and providing data-driven feedback to therapists can reduce premature dropout and improve outcomes irrespective of the particular intervention approach used by the therapist (Bickman, Kelley, Breda, de Andrade, & Riemer, 2011; Lambert et al., 2003). Considered from this perspective, routine outcome monitoring may represent a potential minimum intervention necessary for change when working to enhance the quality of community-based services (Scott & Lewis, 2014).

Furthermore, recent advances in methods for distilling effective interventions to their "common elements" and processes have emerged (e.g., Chorpita et al., 2005a; Embry & Biglan, 2008), which parse the research literature at a finer level of detail than complete treatment packages. Recognizing that the identification of these specific elements of practice—which may be recombined in thousands of novel configurations—has the potential to increase the complexity of mental health intervention, Chorpita and colleagues have also developed a set of decision making frameworks and tools that help to simplify these processes (Chorpita et al., 2008; Daleiden & Chorpita, 2005). Although evidence for the effectiveness of interventions informed by these models is just emerging (e.g., modular interventions; Weisz et al., 2012), such approaches have facilitated the dismantling of complicated, existing intervention protocols to identify components that may, theoretically, be rearranged to produce simplified interventions. Lyon et al. (2014a, 2015) described the initial stages of such an effort, in which a small subset of elements from existing, evidence-based interventions were selected to construct a brief, simplified intervention for use by school-based mental health clinicians. Focusing on intervention-setting appropriateness (i.e., "fit"), the authors identified multiple constraints in the education sector, such as short windows for service delivery (approximately three to four sessions), which drove their simplified design.

Despite the potential for streamlined intervention content to improve intervention design, even traditionally structured EBT can benefit from redesign improvements that keep the intervention largely unchanged, but incorporate more useful supports to facilitate accessibility, usability, and scale-up. A particularly concrete application of the simplification principle may involve the redesign of EBT manuals using effective information visualization techniques. Driven by findings that users generally experience exhaustive documentation as burdensome, frustrating, and unhelpful (and, as a result, do not read manuals), the computer industry has moved to abandon comprehensive manuals in favor of quick, effective reference guides and other forms of minimalist documentation (Salvo, Zoetewey, & Agena, 2007; Smart, Madrigal, & Seawright, 1996). A similar problem exists within mental health, where concerns about traditionally structured, established EBT manuals abound (e.g., Addis & Krasnow, 2000;Borntrager, Chorpita, Higa-McMillan, & Weisz, 2009). Interestingly, some of the best examples of the innovative redesign of psychosocial intervention manuals and materials come from global health, where simplification of intervention content has been essential to allow for the translation of existing content into a form that is usable by paraprofessionals or local service recipients. Rahman (2007) described the simplification of cognitive-behavioral techniques for delivery to mothers demonstrating perinatal depression in rural Pakistan. The intervention was simplified using local imagery (e.g., depictions of culturally relevant mothers and children) to represent content that was normally written and to facilitate administration by existing "Lady

Health Workers" who lacked prior mental health experience. Other international researchers have had similar success (e.g., simplifying handouts for service recipients with low rates of literacy; Kaysen et al., 2013), but this type of manual simplification has rarely been applied domestically. Many of the design techniques described in previous sections (e.g., the construction of hassle maps) have the potential to facilitate this process, and more research is needed surrounding the ways to best streamline different components of EBT protocols via a redesign process. Although EBTs are situated within human interactions and reciprocal social processes, and some degree of complexity is unavoidable, emerging evidence indicates that it is possible to reduce complexity without deleterious consequences (e.g., Rahman, Malik, Sikander, Roberts, & Creed, 2008).

#### Exploit Natural Constraints

***Definition.*** Within the context of design, environmental constraints represent properties of an intended destination setting that limit the ways a product will be designed or used. Product design depends largely on this type of constraint, which may include limitations on or requirements for a product's form, function, budget, operating conditions, or time to completion, among others (Moggridge, 2007). Constraints of this type are unavoidable when working in the real world and must be considered during the design or redesign process if a new product is to function well in a destination context. For any given product, natural constraints restrict possibilities for action, but simultaneously make other pathways (those consistent with the constraints) more accessible.

***Techniques.*** Addressing natural constraints in a setting involves both their identification and their incorporation into the product development cycle. Some constraints are ubiquitous, and while attention to them is essential to produce an effective design solution, nearly all solutions will attend to them implicitly (e.g., gravity). The most important natural constraints to articulate are therefore not necessarily those that are universal, but those which are likely to impact the usability and usefulness of a product. Discussion of natural constraints often involves the consideration of affordances, or properties of an environment (or objects in the environment) that pull for particular behaviors and, in doing so, exclude others. A doorknob, therefore, "affords" turning while a lakefront walking path "affords" walking, running, and standing to enjoy the view. Importantly, affordances rely heavily on human perception and have no existence independent of a joint consideration of the individual and environment (Zaff, 1995). Although affordances and constraints are traditionally conceptualized (within industrial design) as physical attributes of an environment, Norman (2004) has discussed cultural constraints, or learned conventions shared by a group, as a type of affordance that influences user expectations and perceptions and, in doing so, impacts design decisions.

***Applications.*** In the context of EBT, natural constraints are frequently conceptualized as barriers to implementation, represented as antagonistic to the internal validity of the EBT and as factors that must be overcome if program adoption and sustainment are to occur. Constraints may include practitioner caseload size, the regularity or duration with which clients attend sessions, practitioner time for training, and organizational or individual priorities (Lyon et al., 2014c; Southam-Gerow, Rodríguez, Chorpita, & Daleiden, 2012). When engaging in the redesign of an existing EBT, the identified core components of the intervention (Damschroder et al., 2009), if known, may be considered one particularly important set of design constraints.

Although discussion of ways to maximize intervention-setting fit is common in the field of EBT implementation, there has been little research focused explicitly on procedures for realizing this goal (Aarons et al., 2012; Lyon et al., 2014c). Countless studies have cataloged a litany of barriers (often post hoc) that interfere with successful program installation (e.g., Hasson, Andersson, & Bejerholm, 2011; Langley, Nadeem, Kataoka, Stein, & Jaycox, 2010; Lewis & Simons, 2011). In response, there is now growing consensus that the time has come to move implementation science beyond the identification of barriers toward the development of explicit strategies that facilitate EBT use and client improvement (Proctor, Powell, Baumann, Hamilton, & Santens, 2015). A reconceptualization of EBT implementation barriers as design constraints both

acknowledges the intimate relationship between those barriers and characteristics of the intervention model itself and simultaneously places responsibility for attending to those constraints on program designers and redesigners. Intervention redesign processes intended to address contextual constraints may be informed by work such as the Interagency Collaborative Team (ICT) model articulated by Aarons, Hurlburt, and colleagues (Aarons et al., 2014; Hurlburt et al., 2014). In this model, interagency seed teams consisting of stakeholders with varied and complementary expertise (e.g., EBT experts and individuals with knowledge of the local context) support the implementation and redesign of EBT in complex systems. Emerging evidence suggests that the ICT process can facilitate the alignment of the structure of evidence-based practices with local contextual variations (Hurlburt et al., 2014).

A UCD perspective conceptualizes program adaptations as less a nuisance to be minimized during the primary implementation phase of a project, and more an essential feature of intervention design to be considered from the first moments of its conceptualization. Explicit codesign processes—in which EBT developers specify major core components and an overarching structure, but allow service providers and recipients opportunities to determine more specific aspects of the intervention in real time—have been proposed as a method for the development of complex, contextually appropriate practices in fields such as education (Penuel, Roschelle, & Shechtman, 2007) and mental health (Chorpita, Bernstein, & Daleiden, 2011). Such approaches have considerable potential to account for natural constraints because local providers are given license to address them as they arise. Frazier, Chacko, Van Gessel, O'Boyle, and Pelham (2011) engaged in an elaborate process to redesign an existing EBT—the Summer Treatment Program (STP) for disruptive behavior problems (Pelham et al., 1997)—for use in a low-income, urban after-school environment that paid explicit attention to natural constraints. Their process involved a full year of discussion; resource mapping and needs assessment; participant observation; modeling, practice, and feedback; and ongoing problem solving to identify constraints and establish a final, flexible set of intervention principles and specific tools that emphasized the goals of the after-school environment (activity engagement and instruction, behavior management, and academic enrichment). Notably, the overarching goal of this project was not the implementation of the STP, but the identification of a set of practices that could best support the existing mission of the destination context (i.e., a design solution that highlighted environmental constraints). This orientation reflects a central tenet of UCD in that it places primary importance on the goals and needs of end users.

## DISCUSSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

This article has focused on the ways that principles and processes from the field of UCD can be leveraged to move EBT development and implementation into a new era of contextual appropriateness, scalability, and effectiveness. "Design thinking" holds promise in the extent to which it can drive a reconceptualization of EBT users, support more rapid innovation and testing of novel approaches, simplify standard EBT designs, and incorporate—rather than struggle to overcome—barriers and other natural constraints for new and existing interventions. From a UCD perspective, all human-made products are designed, and "the alternative to good design is bad design, not no design at all" (Martin, 1990, p. 12). Failure to explicitly consider a product's design is a guaranteed pathway to problematic design.

As noted earlier, the existing division between design-time and run-time control is akin to the common separation of architect and contractor responsibilities, where one professional completes his or her tasks before handing off a product to the next. Although this model has value, adopting a hybrid model for professionals interested in intervention development and implementation processes might prove to be better aligned with a UCD perspective (along with its built-in expectations for iteration, redesign, and continuous improvement) and, ultimately, more effective. Interestingly, the traditional distinction between architect and contractor has also begun to break down in favor of emerging design-build models that integrate both components (Reed Construction Data/RSMeans Market Intelligence, 2013). Design-build is a project delivery system used in the construction industry in which a single entity is responsible for both planning and executing a new building. In this system, design and

construction phases are overlapping rather than sequential, which saves time and allows for greater responsiveness to client needs or difficulties encountered during implementation of the design schematic. A comparable shift in the mental health field may be useful, in which developers begin to consider themselves designer-builders and take on the responsibility of contextually appropriate application of their EBT blueprints. Unfortunately, relative to the consolidation of the design and build components of the construction industry, there are fewer clear incentives for adopting some of the UCD approaches we have articulated. Nevertheless, given the current emphasis on accountability in health care and recent findings questioning the size of EBT effects (Driessen, Hollon, Bockting, Cuijpers, & Turner, 2015; Weisz et al., 2013), interest in design-oriented initiatives that can improve effects through locally relevant adaptations (Chambers et al., 2013) may become increasingly appealing.

#### A DESIGN-BASED RESEARCH AGENDA

The current article has begun to apply a UCD perspective to the development, redesign, and implementation of psychosocial mental health interventions, but remains largely theoretical. Research is needed to begin to test the applicability of these principles and evaluate the results of engaging in user-centered processes to improve key outcomes at the levels of the system (e.g., appropriateness, efficiency, penetration/reach), service provider (e.g., adoption, acceptability), and client (e.g., acceptability, improved functioning). Even as increasing research has focused on developing and testing implementation strategies to improve EBT uptake and sustainment (Powell et al., 2015), studies that have examined aspects of EBT design (e.g., simplicity, usability) and their connections to identified implementation outcomes (Proctor et al., 2011) are almost nonexistent. Pursuit of this research agenda could involve the construction of comprehensive usability assessment protocols to evaluate existing EBTs, test their applicability to different user types, identify avenues for redesign, and drive simplification. This might include developing test scenarios to assess how easily practitioners can use different components of the intervention (e.g., engaging in prolonged exposure in an anxiety protocol) following a training. This approach is similar to emerging methods for assessing practitioner skill acquisition following training (e.g., behavioral rehearsals; Beidas, Cross, & Dorsey, 2014) except that the intent would be to evaluate and revise the intervention or training protocol rather than assessing the practitioner's competence and determining the need for additional supports. A more economical option may be to adapt one of the many existing usability self-report measures. The 10-item System Usability Scale (SUS; Brooke, 1996), for instance, is generally considered to be among the most sensitive, robust, and widely used scales of its type (Sauro, 2011; Tullis & Stetson, 2004). The SUS yields a total score ranging from 0 to 100, with scores >70 indicating an acceptable level of usability when applied to digital technologies. New norms could be established across a range of EBT protocols, thus providing a benchmark against which adaptations of existing interventions or new protocols could be compared. Once established, a measure of EBT usability may also be used to explore the statistical relationship between usability and the growing number of measures evaluating implementation constructs (Lewis et al., 2015).

It may also be possible to glean design-relevant information from available data drawn from clinical trials or routine service delivery. For instance, EBT adherence data—frequently collected in the context of clinical trials, but often not feasible in typical service settings—could be leveraged to explore the nuances of usability problems. Within a UCD framework, adherence data may be conceptualized as an indicator of EBT task completion, a common metric in usability testing. Adherence checklist elements that are frequently omitted or delivered incorrectly may reflect EBT usability issues and suggest the need for redesign of those intervention elements or their related training procedures. In routine service delivery, settings that engage in routine outcome monitoring (e.g., using a measurement feedback system; Bickman et al., 2012) could facilitate a UCD approach by allowing for simultaneous "A/B" trials of different intervention configurations to determine what combination or sequencing of intervention components (e.g., preceding exposure procedures for anxiety with a brief motivational intervention) is most effective at a session and case level.

Finally, although we presented only a subset of UCD concepts in the current article, additional direction may be gleaned from the worlds of effective design and technology development, especially as it relates to large-scale rollout of new projects. For instance, the mental health field may want to take notice of the increasing need for interoperable systems within health information technology, where there is now widespread acknowledgment that nearly ubiquitous digital tools need to be able to work together and share information in a way that enhances convenience and value for the user (Fontaine, Ross, Zink, & Schilling, 2010). As EBTs are increasingly scaled up across large service systems, alignment of multiple interventions within organizations is quickly becoming a priority (Chorpita et al., 2011). Designing and testing EBTs with interoperability in mind (e.g., mechanisms for information sharing, elimination of redundancies) may be one way to facilitate this task.

## CONCLUSION

It is our perspective that a UCD approach represents a promising collection of methods and a way forward for researchers and practitioners interested in supporting the dissemination and implementation of psychosocial interventions. EBT researchers who adopt a design-informed approach will be well advised to embrace the mentality of rapid trial and error and nonlinear progress that can be observed in the design and technology communities. Calls to "fail early and often" are useful reminders to take chances, try new approaches, hedge bets by exploring multiple innovations simultaneously, and reconceptualize success as the exploration of new possibilities rather than the confirmation and solidification of the status quo. A similar perspective has emerged within the National Institute of Mental Health in their "Fast-Fail" drug trials (http://www.nimh.nih.gov/research-priorities/research-initiatives/fast-fast-fail-trials.shtml), but no specific funding mechanisms currently exist to support comparable, rapid work in behavioral health.

The transition to more rapid approaches may be uncomfortable for some researchers accustomed to the traditionally slow scientific slog down a single investigative pathway, but is likely to pay important dividends related to scientific discovery and the widespread use of well-designed, contextually appropriate, and empirically based interventions. Just as the first computers were complicated machines, accessible to and understood by only expert users, so too EBT protocols have historically only been available to highly trained (and often highly motivated) mental health providers. It is our hope that redesigning EBT protocols and implementation processes can make them as accessible and ubiquitous as computing has become for large segments of the general population.


## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This publication was made possible in part by funding from grant number K08 MH095939, awarded to the first author from the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). Dr. Lyon is an investigator with the Implementation Research Institute (IRI), at the George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University in St. Louis, through an award from the National Institute of Mental Health (R25 MH080916) and the Department of Veterans Affairs, Health Services Research & Development Service, Quality Enhancement Research Initiative (QUERI).


## REFERENCES


Aarons, G. A., & Chaffin, M. (2013). Scaling-up evidence-based practices in child welfare services systems. *CYF News*. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/pi/families/resources/newsletter/2013/04/child-welfare.aspx

Aarons, G. A., Fettes, D. L., Hurlburt, M. S., Palinkas, L. A., Gunderson, L., Willging, C. E., & Chaffin, M. J. (2014). Collaboration, negotiation, and coalescence for interagency-collaborative teams to scale-up evidence-based practice. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, *43*, 915–928. doi:10.1080/15374416.2013.876642

Aarons, G., Green, A., Palinkas, L., Self-Brown, S., Whitaker, D., Lutzker, J., & Chaffin, M. (2012). Dynamic adaptation process to implement an evidence-based child maltreatment intervention. *Implementation Science*, 7(1), 32. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-7-32

Aarons, G., Hurlburt, M., & Horwitz, S. (2011). Advancing a conceptual model of evidence-based practice implementation in child welfare. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health*, *38*, 4–23. doi:10.1007/s10488-010-0327-7

Addis, M. E., & Krasnow, A. D. (2000). A national survey of practicing psychologists' attitudes toward psychotherapy treatment manuals. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *68*, 331–339. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.68.2.331

Addis, M. E., Wade, W. A., & Hatgis, C. (1999). Barriers to dissemination of evidence-based practices: Addressing practitioners' concerns about manual-based psychotherapies. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, *6*, 430–441. doi:10.1093/clipsy.6.4.430

American Psychological Association. (2006). Evidence-based practice in psychology. *American Psychologist*, *61*, 271–285. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.61.4.271

Balas, E. A., & Boren, S. A. (2000). Managing clinical knowledge for health care improvement. In J. Bemmel, & A. T. McCray (Eds.), *Yearbook of medical informatics 2000: Patient-centered systems* (pp. 65–70). Stuttgart, Germany: Schattauer Verlagsgesellschaft mbH.

Barlow, D. H., Agras, W. S., Leitenberg, H., & Wincze, J. P. (1970). An experimental analysis of the effectiveness of "shaping" in reducing maladaptive avoidance behavior: An analogue study. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *8*, 165–173. doi:10.1016/0005-7967(70)90086-0

Barlow, D. H., Allen, L. B., & Choate, M. L. (2004). Toward a unified treatment for emotional disorders. *Behavior Therapy*, *35*, 205–230. doi:10.1016/S0005-7894(04)80036-4

Becker, E. M., Smith, A. M., & Jensen-Doss, A. (2013). Who's using treatment manuals? A national survey of practicing therapists. *Behaviour Research & Therapy*, *51*, 706–710. doi:10.1016/j.brat.2013.07.008

Becker, S. J., Spirito, A., & Vanmali, R. (2015). Perceptions of 'evidence-based practice' among the consumers of adolescent substance use treatment. *Health Education Journal*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/0017896915581061

Beidas, R. S., Cross, W., & Dorsey, S. (2014). Show me, don't tell me: Behavioral rehearsal as a training and analogue fidelity tool. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, *21*, 1–11. doi:10.1016/j.cbpra.2013.04.002

Beidas, R. S., & Kendall, P. C. (2010). Training therapists in evidence-based practice: A critical review of studies from a systems-contextual perspective. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, *17*, 1–30.

Beidas, R. S., Koerner, K., Weingardt, K. R., & Kendall, P. C. (2011). Training research: Practical recommendations for maximum impact. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, *38*, 223–237. doi:10.1007/s10488-011-0338-z

Bickman, L., Kelley, S. D., & Athay, M. (2012). The technology of measurement feedback systems. *Couple and Family Psychology: Review and Practice*, *1*, 274–284. doi:10.1037/a0031022

Bickman, L., Kelley, S. D., Breda, C., de Andrade, A. R., & Riemer, M. (2011). Effects of routine feedback to clinicians on mental health outcomes of youths: Results of a randomized trial. *Psychiatric Services*, *62*, 1423–1429. doi:10.1176/appi.ps.002052011

Boote, J., Baird, W., & Beecroft, C. (2010). Public involvement at the design stage of primary health research: A narrative review of case examples. *Health Policy*, *95*(1), 10–23. doi:10.1016/j.healthpol.2009.11.007

Borntrager, C., Chorpita, B., Higa-McMillan, C., & Weisz, J. (2009). Provider attitudes toward evidence-based practices: Are the concerns with the evidence or with the manuals? *Psychiatric Services*, *60*, 677–681. doi:10.1176/ps.2009.60.5.677

Brooke, J. (1996). SUS: A "quick and dirty" usability scale. In P. W. Jordan, B. Thomas, B. A. Weerdmeester, & A. L. McClelland (Eds.), *Usability evaluation in industry*. London, UK: Taylor and Francis.

Chaffin, M., Silovsky, J. F., Funderburk, B., Valle, L. A., Brestan, E. V., Balachova, T., ... Bonner, B. L. (2004). Parent-child interaction therapy with physically abusive parents: Efficacy for reducing future abuse reports. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *72*, 500–510. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.72.3.500

Chambers, D., Glasgow, R., & Stange, K. (2013). The dynamic sustainability framework: Addressing the paradox of sustainment amid ongoing change. *Implementation Science*, *8*(1), 117. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-8-117

Chambless, D. L., & Ollendick, T. H. (2001). Empirically supported psychological interventions: Controversies and evidence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *52*, 685–716. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.685

Chandler, R. K., Peters, R. H., Field, G., & Juliano-Bult, D. (2004). Challenges in implementing evidence-based treatment practices for co-occurring disorders in the criminal justice system. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *22*, 431–448. doi:10.1002/bsl.598

Chorpita, B. F., Bernstein, A., & Daleiden, E. L. (2011). Empirically guided coordination of multiple evidence-based treatments: An illustration of relevance mapping in children's mental health services. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *79*, 470–480. doi:10.1037/a0023982

Chorpita, B. F., Bernstein, A., Daleiden, E. L., & Research Network on Youth Mental Health. (2008). Driving with roadmaps and dashboards: Using information resources to structure the decision models in service organizations. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, *35*, 114–123. doi:10.1007/s10488-007-0151-x

Chorpita, B. F., & Daleiden, E. L. (2014). Structuring the collaboration of science and service in pursuit of a shared vision. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, *43*, 323–338. doi:10.1080/15374416.2013.828297

Chorpita, B. F., Daleiden, E. L., & Weisz, J. R. (2005a). Modularity in the design and application of therapeutic interventions. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, *11*, 141–156. doi:10.1016/j.appsy.2005.05.002

Chorpita, B. F., Daleiden, E. L., & Weisz, J. R. (2005b). Identifying and selecting the common elements of evidence based interventions: A distillation and matching model. *Mental Health Services Research*, 7(1), 5–20. doi:10.1007/s11020-005-1962-6

Chorpita, B. F., Korathu-Larson, P., Knowles, L. M., & Guan, K. (2014). Emergent life events and their impact on service delivery: Should we expect the unexpected? *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *45*, 387–393. doi:10.1037/a0037746

Christensen, C. M., Bohmer, R., & Kenagy, J. (2000). Will disruptive innovations cure health care? *Harvard Business Review*, *78*(5), 102–112.

Clark, D. M., Layard, R., Smithies, R., Richards, D. A., Suckling, R., & Wright, B. (2009). Improving access to psychological therapy: Initial evaluation of two UK demonstration sites. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *47*, 910–920. doi:10.1016/j.brat.2009.07.010

Cooper, A. (1999). *The inmates are running the asylum: Why high-tech products drive us crazy and how to restore the sanity*. Indianapolis, IN: Macmillan.

Cooper, A., Reimann, R., & Cronin, D. (2007). *About face 3: The essentials of interaction design*. Indianapolis, IN: John Wiley & Sons.

Courage, C., & Baxter, K. (2005). *Understanding your users: A practical guide to user requirements methods, tools, and techniques*. San Francisco, CA: Elsevier.

Daleiden, E. L., & Chorpita, B. F. (2005). From data to wisdom: Quality improvement strategies supporting large-scale implementation of evidence-based services. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, *14*, 329–349. doi:10.1016/j.chc.2004.11.002

Damschroder, L. J., Aron, D. C., Keith, R. E., Kirsh, S. R., Alexander, J. A., & Lowery, J. C. (2009). Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: A consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. *Implementation Science*, *4*(1), 50. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-4-50

Dillon, A., & Watson, C. (1996). User analysis in HCI—The historical lessons from individual differences research. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, *45*, 619–637. doi:10.1006/ijhc.1996.0071

Dimeff, L. A., Paves, A. P., Skutch, J. M., & Woodcock, E. A. (2010). Shifting paradigms in clinical psychology: How innovative technologies are shaping treatment delivery. In D. H. Barlow (Ed.), *Handbook of clinical psychology* (pp. 618–648). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Driessen, E., Hollon, S. D., Bockting, C. L., Cuijpers, P., & Turner, E. H. (2015). Does publication bias inflate the apparent efficacy of psychological treatment for major depressive disorder? A systematic review and meta-analysis of U.S. National Institutes of Health-funded trials. *PLoS ONE*, *10*(9), e0137864. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0137864

Eccles, M. P., & Mittman, B. S. (2006). Welcome to implementation science. *Implementation Science*, *1*(1), 1. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-1-1

Embry, D. D., & Biglan, A. (2008). Evidence-based kernels: Fundamental units of behavioral influence. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, *11*(3), 75–113. doi:10.1007/s10567-008-0036-x

Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M., & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature*. FMHI Publication #231. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, The National Implementation Research Network.

Fontaine, P., Ross, S. E., Zink, T., & Schilling, L. M. (2010). Systematic review of health information exchange in primary care practices. *Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*, *23*, 655–670. doi:10.3122/jabfm.2010.05.090192

Frazier, S. L., Chacko, A., Van Gessel, C., O'Boyle, C., & Pelham, W. E. (2011). The summer treatment program meets the south side of Chicago: Bridging science and service in urban after-school programs. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, *17*(2), 86–92. doi:10.1111/j.1475-3588.2011.00614.x

Gagne, R. M., Wager, W. W., Golas, K. C., Keller, J. M., & Russell, J. D. (2004). *Principles of instructional design* (5th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Garland, A. F., Accurso, E. C., Haine-Schlagel, R., Brookman-Frazee, L., Roesch, S., & Zhang, J. J. (2014). Searching for elements of evidence-based practices in children's usual care and examining their impact. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, *43*, 201–215. doi:10.1080/15374416.2013.869750

Garland, A. F., Hawley, K. M., Brookman-Frazee, L., & Hurlburt, M. S. (2008). Identifying common elements of

evidence-based psychosocial treatments for children's disruptive behavior problems. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, *47*, 505–514. doi:10.1097/CHI.0b013e31816765c2

Glover, G., Webb, M., & Evison, F. (2010). Improving access to psychological therapies: A review of the progress made by sites in the first roll-out year. *North East Public Health Observatory*. Retrieved from www.iapt.nhs.uk/silo/files/iapt-a-review-of-the-progress-made-by-sites-in-the-first-roll8208-out-year.pdf

Goldstein, S. M., Johnston, R., Duffy, J., & Rao, J. (2002). The service concept: The missing link in service design research? *Journal of Operations Management*, *20*(2), 121–134. doi:10.1016/S0272-6963(01)00090-0

Gordon, V. S., & Bieman, J. M. (1995). Rapid prototyping: Lessons learned. *IEEE Software*, *12*(1), 85–95. doi:10.1109/52.363162

Grudin, J., & Pruitt, J. (2002). Personas, participatory design and product development: An infrastructure for engagement. In T. Binder, J. Gregory, & I. Wagner (Eds.), *PDC 2002 Proceedings of the Participatory Design Conference, Sweden* (pp. 144–161). Palo Alto, CA: Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility.

Hackos, J. T., & Redish, J. (1998). *User & task analysis for interface design*. New York, NY: Wiley. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1097-4571(1998) 49:14 < 1334:AID-ASI14 > 3.0.CO;2-0

Hasson, H., Andersson, M., & Bejerholm, U. (2011). Barriers in implementation of evidence-based practice: Supported employment in Swedish context. *Journal of Health, Organisation and Management*, *25*, 332–345. doi:10.1108/14777261111143563

Hill, L. G., & Owens, R. W. (2013). Component analysis of adherence in a family intervention. *Health Education*, *113*, 264–280. doi:10.1108/09654281311329222

von Hippel, E. (1989). New product ideas from lead users. *Research Technology Management*, *32*(3), 24–27.

Hodgetts, A., & Wright, J. (2007). Researching clients' experiences: A review of qualitative studies. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, *14*, 157–163. doi:10.1002/cpp.527

Holmqvist, M., Vincent, N., & Walsh, K. (2014). Web- vs telehealth-based delivery of cognitive behavioral therapy for insomnia: A randomized controlled trial. *Sleep Medicine*, *15*, 187–195.

Holtzblatt, K., Wendell, J. B., & Wood, S. (2004). *Rapid contextual design: A how-to guide to key techniques for user-centered design*. San Francisco, CA: Elsevier.

Howe, G. W., Beach, S. R., & Brody, G. H. (2010). Microtrial methods for translating gene–environment dynamics into preventive interventions. *Prevention Science*, *11*, 343–354. doi:10.1007/s11121-010-0177-2

Hurlburt, M., Aarons, G. A., Fettes, D., Willging, C., Gunderson, L., & Chaffin, M. J. (2014). Interagency collaborative team model for capacity building to scale-up evidence-based practice. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *39*, 160–168. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2013.10.005

Hwang, J., & Christensen, C. M. (2008). Disruptive innovation in health care delivery: A framework for business-model innovation. *Health Affairs*, *27*, 1329–1335. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.27.5.1329

Hyde, P. S. (2013). *Report to Congress on the nation's substance abuse and mental health workforce issues*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department for Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services.

International Standards Organization. (1998). *Ergonomic requirements for office work with visual display terminals (VDTs) – Part 11: Guidance on usability*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Organization for Standardization, 9241.

Jewell, J., Handwerk, M., Almquist, J., & Lucas, C. (2004). Comparing the validity of clinician-generated diagnosis of conduct disorder to the Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, *33*, 536–546. doi:10.1207/s15374424jccp3303_11

Kakuma, R., Minas, H., van Ginneken, N., Dal Poz, M. R., Desiraju, K., Morris, J. E., … Scheffler, R. M. (2011). Human resources for mental health care: Current situation and strategies for action. *The Lancet*, *378*(9803), 1654–1663. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)61093-3

Karsh, B. T. (2004). Beyond usability: Designing effective technology implementation systems to promote patient safety. *Quality and Safety in Health Care*, *13*, 388–394. doi:10.1136/qshc.2004.010322

Kaysen, D., Lindgren, K., Zangana, G. A. S., Murray, L., Bass, J., & Bolton, P. (2013). Adaptation of cognitive processing therapy for treatment of torture victims: Experience in Kurdistan, Iraq. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, & Policy*, *5*(2), 184–192. doi:10.1037/a0026053

Kazdin, A. (2008). Evidence-based treatment and practice: New opportunities to bridge clinical research and practice, enhance the knowledge base, and improve patient care. *American Psychologist*, *63*, 146–159. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.63.3.146

Kazdin, A. E., & Rabbitt, S. M. (2013). Novel models for delivering mental health services and reducing the burdens of mental illness. *Clinical Psychological Science*, *1*, 170–191. doi:10.1177/2167702612463566

Khomh, F., Dhaliwal, T., Zou, Y., & Adams, B. (2012). Do faster releases improve software quality? An empirical case

study of Mozilla Firefox. In *Mining Software Repositories (MSR), 2012 9th IEEE Working Conference* (pp. 179–188). Piscataway, NJ: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. doi:10.1109/MSR.2012.6224279

Koerner, K. (2013). What must you know and do to get good outcomes with DBT? *Behavior Therapy*, *44*, 568–579. doi:10.1016/j.beth.2013.03.005

Kujala, S., & Kauppinen, M. (2004, October). Identifying and selecting users for user-centered design. In *Proceedings of the Third Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction* (pp. 297–303). ACM.

Kujala, S., & Mäntylä, M. (2000). How effective are user studies? In S. McDonald, Y. Waern, & G. Cockton (Eds.), *People and computers XIV—Usability or else!: Proceedings of Human-Computer Interaction 2000* (pp. 61–71). London, UK: Springer-Verlag. doi:10.1007/978-1-4471-0515-2_5

Lambert, M. J., Whipple, J. L., Hawkins, E. J., Vermeersch, D. A., Nielsen, S. L., & Smart, D. W. (2003). Is it time for clinicians to routinely track patient outcome? A meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, *10*, 288–301. doi:10.1093/clipsy.bpg025

Langley, A. K., Nadeem, E., Kataoka, S. H., Stein, B. D., & Jaycox, L. H. (2010). Evidence-based mental health programs in schools: Barriers and facilitators of successful implementation. *School Mental Health*, *2*(3), 105–113. doi:10.1007/s12310-010-9038-1

Leijten, P., Dishion, T. J., Thomaes, S., Raaijmakers, M. A. J., Orobio de Castro, B., & Matthys, W. (2015). Bringing parenting interventions back to the future: How randomized controlled microtrials may benefit parenting intervention efficacy. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, *22*, 47–57. doi:10.1111/cpsp.12087

Lewis, C. C., & Simons, A. D. (2011). A pilot study disseminating cognitive behavioral therapy for depression: Therapist factors and perceptions of barriers to implementation. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, *38*, 324–334. doi:10.1007/s10488-011-0348-x

Lewis, C. C., Stanick, C. F., Martinez, R. G., Weiner, B. J., Kim, M., Barwick, M., & Comtois, K. A. (2015). The Society for Implementation Research Collaboration Instrument Review Project: A methodology to promote rigorous evaluation. *Implementation Science*, *10*(1), 2. doi:10.1186/s13012-014-0193-x

Lieb, R., Mayfield, J., Miller, M., & Pennucci, A. (2004). *Benefits and costs of prevention and early intervention programs for youth* (Document No. 04-07-3901). Retrieved from Washington State Institute for Public Policy website: http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/Reports/04-07-3901

Littlejohns, P., Wyatt, J. C., & Garvican, L. (2003). Evaluating computerised health information systems: Hard lessons still to be learnt. *British Medical Journal*, *326*, 860–863. doi:10.1136/bmj.326.7394.860

Lyon, A. R., Bruns, E. J., Ludwig, K., Vander Stoep, A., Pullmann, M. D., Dorsey, S., … McCauley, E. (2015). The Brief Intervention for School Clinicians (BRISC): A mixed-methods evaluation of feasibility, acceptability, and contextual appropriateness. *School Mental Health*, *7*, 273–286.

Lyon, A. R., Bruns, E. J., Weathers, E., Canavas, N., Ludwig, K., Vander Stoep, A., … McCauley, E. (2014a). Taking EBPs to school: Developing and testing a framework for applying common elements of evidence based practice to school mental health. *Advances in School Mental Health Promotion*, *7*, 42–61. doi:10.1080/1754730X.2013.857903

Lyon, A. R., Lau, A. S., McCauley, E., Vander Stoep, A., & Chorpita, B. F. (2014b). A case for modular design: Implications for implementing evidence-based interventions with culturally diverse youth. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *45*(1), 57–66. doi:10.1037/a0035301

Lyon, A. R., Ludwig, K., Romano, E., Koltracht, J., Vander Stoep, A., & McCauley, E. (2014c). Using modular psychotherapy in school mental health: Provider perspectives on intervention-setting fit. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, *43*, 890–901. doi:10.1080/15374416.2013.843460

Lyon, A. R., Stirman, S. W., Kerns, S. E., & Bruns, E. J. (2011). Developing the mental health workforce: Review and application of training approaches from multiple disciplines. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, *38*, 238–253. doi:10.1007/s10488-010-0331-y

Lyon, A. R., Wasse, J. K., Ludwig, K., Zachry, M., Bruns, E. J., Unützer, J., & McCauley, E. (2016). The Contextualized Technology Adaptation Process (CTAP): Optimizing health information technology to improve mental health systems. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, *43*, 394–409. doi:10.1007/s10488-015-0637-x

Maguire, M. (2001). Methods to support human-centred design. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, *55*, 587–634. doi:10.1006/ijhc.2001.0503

Martin, D. (1990). *Book design: A practical introduction*. New York, NY: Van Nostrand-Reinhold.

McHugh, R. K., & Barlow, D. H. (2010). The dissemination and implementation of evidence-based psychological

treatments: A review of current efforts. *American Psychologist*, *65*(2), 73. doi:10.1037/a0018121

Methodology Committee of the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute. (2012). Methodological standards and patient-centeredness in comparative effectiveness research: The PCORI perspective. *JAMA*, *307*, 1636. doi:10.1001/jama.2012.466

Moggridge, B. (2007). *Designing interactions*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Nakamura, B. J., Higa-McMillan, C. K., Okamura, K. H., & Shimabukuro, S. (2011). Knowledge of and attitudes towards evidence-based practices in community child mental health practitioners. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, *38*, 287–300. doi:10.1007/s10488-011-0351-2

Nielsen, J. (1994). *Usability engineering*. San Diego, CA: Elsevier.

Nielsen, J., & Loranger, H. (2006). *Prioritizing web usability*. Berkley, CA: Pearson Education.

Norman, D. A. (1988). *The design of everyday things*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Norman, D. (2004). *Affordances and design*. Retrieved from http://www.jnd.org/dn.mss/affordances_and_desi.html

Norman, D. A., & Draper, S. W. (Eds.). (1986). *User centered system design: New perspectives on human-computer interaction*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Olson, E. L., & Bakke, G. (2001). Implementing the lead user method in a high technology firm: A longitudinal study of intentions versus actions. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *18*, 388–395. doi:10.1111/1540-5885.1860388

Patel, V. (2009). The future of psychiatry in low- and middle-income countries. *Psychological Medicine*, *39*, 1759–1762. doi:10.1017/S0033291709005224

Pelham, W. E., Lang, A. R., Atkeson, B., Murphy, D. A., Gnagy, E. M., Greiner, A. R., … Greenslade, K. E. (1997). Effects of deviant child behavior on parental distress and alcohol consumption in laboratory interactions. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *25*, 413–424. doi:10.1023/A:1025789108958

Penuel, W. R., Roschelle, J., & Shechtman, N. (2007). Designing formative assessment software with teachers: An analysis of the co-design process. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, *2*(1), 51–74. doi:10.1142/S1793206807000300

Powell, B. J., Waltz, T. J., Chinman, M. J., Damschroder, L. J., Smith, J. L., Matthieu, M. M., … Kirchner, J. E. (2015). A refined compilation of implementation strategies: Results from the Expert Recommendations for Implementing Change (ERIC) project. *Implement Science*, *10*(1), 21. doi:10.1186/s13012-015-0209-1

Proctor, E. K., Powell, B. J., Baumann, A. A., Hamilton, A. M., & Santens, R. L. (2015). Writing implementation research grant proposals: Ten key ingredients. *Implementation Science*, *7*(1), 96. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-7-96

Proctor, E., Silmere, H., Raghavan, R., Hovmand, P., Aarons, G., Bunger, A., & Hensley, M. (2011). Outcomes for implementation research: Conceptual distinctions, measurement challenges, and research agenda. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, *38*, 65–76. doi:10.1007/s10488-010-0319-7

Rahman, A. (2007). Challenges and opportunities in developing a psychological intervention for perinatal depression in rural Pakistan–A multi-method study. *Archives of Women's Mental Health*, *10*(5), 211–219. doi:10.1007/s00737-007-0193-9

Rahman, A., Malik, A., Sikander, S., Roberts, C., & Creed, F. (2008). Cognitive behaviour therapy-based intervention by community health workers for mothers with depression and their infants in rural Pakistan: A cluster-randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet*, *372*(9642), 902–909. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(08)61400-2

Reed Construction Data/RSMeans Market Intelligence. (2013). *Design-build project delivery market share and market size report*. Retrieved from http://www.dbia.org/resource-center/Documents/rsmeansreport_2013rev.pdf

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusions of innovations* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.

Rotheram-Borus, M. J., Swendeman, D., & Chorpita, B. F. (2012). Disruptive innovations for designing and diffusing evidence-based interventions. *American Psychologist*, *67*, 463. doi:10.1037/a0028180

Rounsaville, B. J., Carroll, K. M., & Onken, L. S. (2001). A stage model of behavioral therapies research: Getting started and moving on from stage I. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, *8*, 133–142. doi:10.1093/clipsy.8.2.133

Roy-Byrne, P., Craske, M. G., Sullivan, G., Rose, R. D., Edlund, M. J., Lang, A. J., … Stein, M. B. (2010). Delivery of evidence-based treatment for multiple anxiety disorders in primary care: A randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*, *303*, 1921–1928. doi:10.1001/jama.2010.608

Salvo, M., Zoetewey, M. W., & Agena, K. (2007). A case of exhaustive documentation: Re-centering system-oriented organizations around user need. *Technical Communication*, *54*(1), 46–57.

Sanders, M. R., & Kirby, J. N. (2015). Surviving or thriving: Quality assurance mechanisms to promote innovation in

the development of evidence-based parenting interventions. *Prevention Science*, *16*, 421–431. doi:10.1007/s11121-014-0475-1

Sauro, J. (2011). *A practical guide to the System Usability Scale: Background, benchmarks & best practices*. Denver, CO: Measuring Usability LLC.

Schoenwald, S. K., Kelleher, K., Weisz, J. R., & Research Network on Youth Mental Health. (2008). Building bridges to evidence-based practice: The MacArthur Foundation Child System and Treatment Enhancement Projects (Child STEPs). *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, *35*, 66–72. doi:10.1007/s10488-007-0160-9

Scott, K., & Lewis, C. (2014). Using measurement-based care to enhance any treatment. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, *22*(1), 49–59. doi:10.1016/j.cbpra.2014.01.010

Smart, K. L., Madrigal, J. L., & Seawright, K. K. (1996). The effect of documentation on customer perception of product quality. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, *39*, 157–162. doi:10.1109/47.536264

Solberg, C., Larsson, B., & Jozefiak, T. (2015). Consumer satisfaction with the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service and its association with treatment outcome: A 3–4-year follow-up study. *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry*, *69*, 224–232.

Southam-Gerow, M. A., Rodríguez, A., Chorpita, B. F., & Daleiden, E. L. (2012). Dissemination and implementation of evidence based treatments for youth: Challenges and recommendations. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *43*, 527. doi:10.1037/a0029101

Spielmans, G. I., Gatlin, E. T., & McFall, J. P. (2010). The efficacy of evidence-based psychotherapies versus usual care for youths: Controlling confounds in a meta-reanalysis. *Psychotherapy Research*, *20*, 234–246. doi:10.1080/10503300903311293

Steinfeld, B., Scott, J., Vilander, G., Marx, L., Quirk, M., Lindberg, J., & Koerner, K. (2014). The role of lean process improvement in implementation of evidence-based practices in behavioral health care. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research*, *42*, 504–518. doi:10.1007/s11414-013-9386-3

Stirman, S. W., Kimberly, J., Cook, N., Calloway, A., Castro, F., & Charns, M. (2012). The sustainability of new programs and innovations: A review of the empirical literature and recommendations for future research. *Implementation Science*, 7(12), 17. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-7-17

Stirman, S. W., Miller, C. J., Toder, K., & Calloway, A. (2013). Development of a framework and coding system for modifications and adaptations of evidence-based interventions. *Implementation Science*, *8*, 1186. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-8-65

Tognazzini, B. (2014). *First principles of interaction design*. Retrieved from http://asktog.com/atc/principles-of-interaction-design/

Tufte, E. R. (2001). *The visual display of quantitative information*. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.

Tullis, T. S., & Stetson, J. N. (2004). *A comparison of questionnaires for assessing website usability*. Paper presented at the Usability Professional Association Conference, Minneapolis, MN.

Van Merriënboer, J. J., Kirschner, P. A., & Kester, L. (2003). Taking the load off a learner's mind: Instructional design for complex learning. *Educational Psychologist*, *38*(1), 5–13. doi:10.1207/S15326985EP3801_2

Ware, C. (2013). *Information visualization: Perception for design*. San Francisco, CA: Elsevier.

Weingardt, K. R. (2004). The role of instructional design and technology in the dissemination of empirically supported, manual-based therapies. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, *11*, 313–331. doi:10.1093/clipsy.bph087

Weisz, J. R., & Chorpita, B. F. (2011). Mod squad for youth psychotherapy: Restructuring evidence-based treatment for clinical practice. In P. Kendall (Ed.), *Child and adolescent therapy: Cognitive-behavioral procedures* (4th ed., pp. 379–397). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Weisz, J. R., Chorpita, B. F., Palinkas, L. A., Schoenwald, S. K., Miranda, J., Bearman, S. K., ... Research Network on Youth Mental Health. (2012). Testing standard and modular designs for psychotherapy treating depression, anxiety, and conduct problems in youth: A randomized effectiveness trial. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *69*, 274–282. doi:10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2011.147

Weisz, J. R., Jensen, A. L., & McLeod, B. D. (2005). Development and dissemination of child and adolescent psychotherapies: Milestones, methods, and a new deployment-focused model. In E. Hibbs, & P. S. Jensen (Eds.), *Psychosocial treatments for child and adolescent disorders: Empirically based strategies for clinical practice* (2nd ed., pp. 9–39). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Weisz, J. R., Jensen-Doss, A., & Hawley, K. M. (2006). Evidence-based youth psychotherapies versus usual clinical care: A meta-analysis of direct comparisons. *American Psychologist*, *61*, 671. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.61.7.671

Weisz, J. R., Kuppens, S., Eckshtain, D., Ugueto, A. M., Hawley, K. M., & Jensen-Doss, A. (2013). Performance of

evidence-based youth psychotherapies compared with usual clinical care: A multilevel meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry*, *70*, 750–761. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2013.1176

Whaley, A. L., & Davis, K. E. (2007). Cultural competence and evidence-based practice in mental health services: A complementary perspective. *American Psychologist*, *62*, 563–574. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.6.563

Wilson, J., & Rosenberg, D. (1988). Rapid prototyping for user interface design. In M. Helander (Ed.), *Handbook of human-computer interaction* (pp. 859–875). Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Wright, A. J., Weinman, J., & Marteau, T. M. (2003). The impact of learning of a genetic predisposition to nicotine dependence: An analogue study. *Tobacco Control*, *12*, 227–230. doi:10.1136/tc.12.2.227

Wu, S., Duan, N., Wisdom, J. P., Kravitz, R. L., Owen, R. R., Sullivan, J. G., … Hoagwood, K. E. (2015). Integrating science and engineering to implement evidence-based practices in health care settings. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, *42*, 588–592. doi:10.1007/s10488-014-0593-x

Yamey, G. (2011). Scaling up global health interventions: A proposed framework for success. *PLoS Medicine*, *8*(6), e1001049. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001049

Zaff, B. S. (1995). Designin"g with affordances in mind. In J. M. Flach, P. A. Hancock, J. Caird, & K. J. Vicente (Eds.), *Global perspectives on the ecology of human-machine systems* (pp. 121–156). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Zomerdijk, L. G., & Voss, C. A. (2010). Service design for experience-centric services. *Journal of Service Research*, *13* (1), 67–82. doi:10.1177/1094670509351960

Received August 12, 2015; revised October, 28 2015; accepted January 4, 2016.