Concepts Behind the PPI Framework

The Program Planning for Impact (PPI) framework and related guidance was produced by a working group consisting of various program leaders throughout CSU Extension (see the Working Group section for a list of contributors). This group combed through a wide variety of literature and concepts related to Extension programming, strategic planning, networked improvement communities, engaged scholarship, community health governance, and value creation.

The PPI framework adopted many of the program planning elements common to other Extension program development models such as participant-driven needs assessment, program design, and evaluation (Diaz, Gusto, & Diehl, 2018). The program development and program performance “staircase” concept from Rockwell and Bennett’s Targeting Outcomes of Programs model was applied to the clockwise (planning) and counterclockwise (evaluation) applications of the PPI framework (Rockwell & Bennett, 2004). Tools from generally accepted strategic planning efforts, such as SWOT/SOAR analysis, core competency identification, and development of performance indicators were taken extensively from CSUE staff participation in George Washington University’s Strategic Management & Performance Systems certificate program.

Of particular influence on the PPI framework is ongoing work around Networked Improvement Communities, sponsored in part by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. NICs are characterized by five domains that attend to: “developing a theory of practice improvement; building a measurement and analytics infrastructure; learning and using improvement research methods; leading, organizing, and operating the network; and fostering the emergence of culture, norms, and identity (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2017). The PPI framework elements of “diverse network” and formative evaluation focused on testing a theory of change pull from work on NICs.

Similarly, both CSU’s Continuum of Engaged Scholarship and Lasker and Weiss’s 2003 article on Community Health Governance (CHG) informed the PPI framework’s use of a Diverse network to co-create CSUE programming. The CHG model proposes that individual empowerment, bridging social ties, and creating synergy (breakthroughs in thinking and action produced from successful collaboration) are critical to collaborative problem-solving and thus community health (Lasker & Weiss, 2003).

Finally, the Value Creation framework presented by Wenger and Trayner has influenced multiple pieces of the PPI framework. That framework posits five types of value offered by social learning networks (articulated as Diverse networks in the PPI framework) which helped us frame guidance on Defining a scope of work and Choosing key indicators (Wenger, Trayner, & de Laat, 2011).