NCJTC- Fox Valley | 1-23-20 Intro to Implementation Science for Enhancing Victim Services

Welcome, everyone, to the National Criminal Justice Training Center webinar. In partnership with the Center for Court Innovation, our topic today is Introduction to Implementation Science and Applications for Enhancing Victim Centered Services. Presenting today's webinar is Dr. Anjali Nandi and Rebecca Thomforde Hauser. My name is Greg Brown, and I will be your moderator for today's webinar.

Before we begin the presentation, there are some items I need to go over. This project was supported by Grant Number 2017-TA-AX-K068, awarded by the Office of Violence Against Women, US Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this program are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Justice, Office of Violence Against Women.

And with that, we have our first poll question. Can you please launch that, Daniel? We'd love to know more about who is on this call and to get a better sense of which types of agencies are represented. The question is, which of the following best describes your role? Your choices are victim services or victim advocate, probation or community corrections, law enforcement, child advocacy center employee, social worker, or mental health professional, or other if your role has not been specified.

So the poll is now closed, and you can see our results. It looks like the vast majority of people attending this webinar are victim services or victim advocates, with a good showing from probation and parole, law enforcement, and social workers, advocacy workers, and mental health workers-- so very diverse audience and should be some exciting questions in the end.

Welcome to everyone joining us today. This webinar is the first in a three-part series of webinars to enhance victim-centered probation responses. We're excited to be kicking this off by talking about implementation science. Over the next 90 minutes, it is our goal to help you first, understand the differences between technical and adaptive skills. Second, accurately identify implementation types, steps, and tasks. Third, explain drivers of implementation using real-life examples that you can apply to your own organization. And finally, describe national strategies for practical application.

With that, it's my pleasure to introduce you to our presenters for today's webinar. Dr. Anjali Nandi is an instructor with the National Criminal Justice Training Center of Fox Valley Technical College. She is also the chief probation officer for the 20 judicial districts of the State of Colorado. Additionally, Dr. Nandi is a published author, having coauthored five books.

Rebecca Thomforde Hauser is the Associate Director of domestic violence programs for the Center of Court Innovation, a partner with NCJTC on this grant project. She assists jurisdictions nationally and in the state of New

York to plan and implement domestic violence courts. She has also coauthored several articles relating to the topic of domestic violence. And with that, I'll now turn the remainder of our time over to the presenters, starting with Dr. Anjali Nandi, who will be our first speaker today. Anjali, the time is now yours.

Thank you so much, Greg. And welcome, everyone. I'm very thrilled to start by talking a little bit about implementation plans. And then Rebecca will ground this a little bit and deepen your understanding.

So in order for us to talk about implementation science, we need to understand why this is so important and what it is that we are trying to implement and what the differences are when we use implementation plans and when we don't. So in order to understand that, we start by getting clear about what technical skills are versus what adaptive skills are.

So technical skills are skills that are the same in the classroom as they are when we're executing them when we're out and about in our real world. So a simple example of that is math-- 2 plus 2 is 4 in the classroom. And then when I'm in the grocery store, 2 plus 2 continues to be 4. These are technical skills. And if I use a more work-related example, a technical skill could be how to fill out a particular form, for example, or how to use a particular software or enter case notes.

An adaptive skill is something that's different. An adaptive skill is where the context really matters. This means that in the classroom, the skill is taught a certain way. But when we're out about in our real world, we have to go through a lot of decision making to be thinking about, how does this apply in our real world? So there's a higher level of decision making that's required.

Communication skills are such a great example of adaptive skills. I can teach you communication skills in the classroom. But then when you're faced with working with somebody who's escalating in front of you, it's really important to be able to adapt my skills to the context that's in front of me. So adaptive skills take a lot of focus and attention to really learn and to implement because it's not as simple as, let's all complete this particular form a certain way.

So that leads us, then, to talking about adaptive skills requiring a paradigm shift, which means adaptive skills take a while to implement. I have several examples of a paradigm shift on your slide. But if we have to talk about it from implementing a victim-centered model, we're thinking about change not as an event, but as a process. Maybe the paradigm shift is away from punishment and a move towards long-term behavior change.

We're shifting away from individually oriented service to more community, where we're looking at the bigger picture. We're shifting away, perhaps, from a judgment or shame orientation to one that's more curious or focusing on vulnerability, and vulnerability particularly in learning. We're also, perhaps, moving away from this

assumption that people have choice in all of their behaviors and really understanding the impact of trauma.

And then most importantly, when we're thinking about implementation science, the paradigm shift is away from, learning happens quickly, to, learning actually happens in a really deep way. We have to focus on deepening learning as opposed to just getting excited about something and then implementing it and thinking, OK, now that everyone's trained, let's move on. So there's a very different way of understanding how people learn.

So when we're thinking about the different types of implementation, I'll give you some examples of each of these three types. So a paper implementation is where-- let's say I am the leader of my organization. And I go out to a conference. And I go to a conference somewhere else. And I get really excited about a particular program that they're using with their population. And it's so incredibly successful.

And so I'm thrilled and excited. And I come back to my organization. And I say, we must implement this. This is amazing. It has great outcomes. And so everybody around me says, oh, sounds great. Great idea. Let's implement it.

And then I make a policy change. We're now using this program. Let's get everybody trained. Oh, everybody is trained. Excellent. Everybody has a certificate. Wonderful. This has been implemented. That's a paper implementation.

When we take it a step further, where we want to see, have processes changed? Have things actually shifted where people are doing something different as a result of this particular implementation, that's when we move to a process implementation, meaning we are taking a look at, have actual processes of people-- the way they work-- changed as a result of implementing whatever this program is?

And then the next level of implementation, which is where we ideally want to get, is, as a result of this program being implemented, have not only our processes changed, but have our performance metrics been impacted? So are we getting the outcomes that I was so excited about when I went to the conference? Are we getting those outcomes here in my jurisdiction? Are we performing at that level?

So that is three levels of implementation. And I'm very curious about what you are most comfortable with or what you have seen most often in your organization. So here is your next poll.

What type of implementation most happens in your organization most often? Is it the paper implementation? We get excited, we implement it on paper, and we're good to go. Is it a process implementation, where we change actual processes and measure that? Or is it a performance-level implementation, where we also measure, has this implementation actually impacted outcome?

I'll just give you the results really quickly. And the results were that 72% of you are most familiar and see this most often-- see a paper implementation most often. And then about 16% of you with a process and 12%, which is actually higher than I'm used to seeing when people are responding to these-- 12% of you are familiar with performance implementation.

So for those of you who are most familiar and the paper implementations happen most often, please don't feel like you're the outlier. It's absolutely extremely common and part of the reason why we're talking about implementation science.

So let's talk a little bit more, then, about implementation steps. What does this mean? What does it mean to pay attention to implementation science? What it means is that we start with exploration first. So in the example that I just used where I go off to a conference, I get excited, and then I come back and say, we need to do this, what I've missed is asking the question, what is it that my jurisdiction needs?

What is it that my population will most benefit from? If I bring in this external program, what kinds of needs will I meet? What kinds of needs will I miss? So it's just really paying attention to exploring what the needs are of our particular organization. And how does this match up with the program that I'm thinking about implementing-- so really exploring first before adopting.

Once adoption happens-- so let's say I say, OK, we're going with this program or whatever it is that we're trying to do, a different way of doing things-- program installation is about training and about shifting several different layers while training is happening. So most often when we think of an implementation, we think of training people.

And what we miss is that when we implement a program, there need to be change-- it might need to be changes in existing processes in order to support the implementation. So a simple example is, let's say, in my department I want to introduce a CBT - cognitive behavioral curriculum for clients with domestic violence-related charges. And I want to-- this program, the CBT program, this cog program, is-- I want to do it in a group format.

So now program installation requires not only that I train facilitators. But it also requires that I have space reserved for this particular group. So when we're talking about program installation, it's not limited to training. It expands to, what kind of systems need to be in place in order to support this implementation? And then what kind of continuing and ongoing support, training support is needed? What kind of training and support is needed for everyone to really maintain that level of facilitation skills?

So we move, then, from initial implementation, where now everybody's trained up, to what we call a "full implementation." And a full implementation is where 50% or more of all the staff are trained to fidelity. By that I mean that there are fidelity checks in place to examine whether all the folks who have been trained are actually

providing this cognitive behavioral curriculum in a way that the program was designed to do.

So full implementation is a minimum of 50% of staff or more performing whatever this program is to fidelity. Full implementation also means that we start to gather data to see if we're having a positive impact, whether behaviors are changing within the facilitators, whether they're doing what the curriculum is asking them. But then are they also delivering it to the clients in a way that's changing client behaviors to where it's implementing outcomes or examination of outcomes as well?

And then the next step is innovation. So this is an interesting place because oftentimes, when we start to implement a program, we run into some trouble. We run into difficulties. And unfortunately, what we often tend to do is before we really get the full implementation, we start to tweak the program.

The CBT curriculum that I was supposed to implement, for example, requires a closed group. And instead, that's causing a lot of trouble because I have a lot of people dropping out. So I converted to an open group. So I'm changing and innovating too soon without actually making sure that there is fidelity in the program.

And then the last piece is sustainability. How do I consistently pay attention to keeping this program sustainable?

So implementations take time. They take a minimum of two years all the way up to four years to get to full implementation. And unfortunately, a lot of times, we lose patience. We start with a particular program.

Within six to eight months, we see some problems. And then we start to feel like the program is really not what we needed. There were too many issues, too many problems. And we stop even though we haven't actually gotten to full implementation.

So we really can't say that the program is not working until we've gotten to full implementation because if we look at the program too soon, we're actually not measuring implementation effect. Or we're not measuring outcome effects. We're measuring implementation effect. So it's really important that we give implementation the full time-- two to four years-- in order to get to full implementation to measure outcome.

So this to me-- this next slide is really what the heart of implementation science is. So I'm going to give you a second to take a look at this slide. And then I'll talk you through it.

So the slide actually starts with the triangle and then moves towards the top. So the three pieces that are on the sides of the triangle are called "drivers of implementation." On the one side you see organizational drivers. These are ways of supporting the implementation. I've provided some examples on the side. But let me see if I can give you some really practical examples.

So if I continue with this cognitive behavioral group that I'm trying to run, examples might be a room to run the group, a data system where I can enter information regarding attendance and participation, et cetera. Ideally, that data system is hooked up or somehow already overlaps an existing system so that there's no additional data entry burden.

The administration, perhaps, supports it-- so facilitative administration meaning that as I'm implementing whatever this program is, I have support from administration, from my leadership, as well as support to make referrals to the system so-- to my program so the entire system is involved. So assistance intervention-- meaning that I have something that fits within the context of a system where people know how to make referrals and are all supporting the success of this particular program. So those are examples of organizational drivers.

On the bottom you'll see leadership. And you all probably know and recognize that leadership is extremely important. However, when focusing on adaptive skills, leadership looks a little bit different.

Leadership moves away from, are you doing what you're supposed to be doing, to, how can I help you grow your skills to get there? How can I help you shift this paradigm? How do I provide you with the support that you need in order to understand that it is a growing process, as opposed to, are you doing it, yes or no, which is a very technical style of leadership.

So yes, we need leadership support. But we also need a certain kind of leadership support that understands that adaptive skills don't just get implemented in two days. It takes quite a while. And it's a shift. It's skill building. It's a paradigm shift. There's a lot of growth that happens for the folks who are implementing whatever the program is.

And so the last piece, which is competency drivers-- those are the training pieces. Are we selecting the correct individuals to implement this program? Are we training them sufficiently? And then, most importantly, are we coaching their skills? Are we supporting them on an ongoing basis?

An easy example to use here is golfing. If I want to learn how to golf, I can't go by myself with a YouTube video and pick up a few skills. I would need a coach. I would need somebody to watch me and then to give me feedback about whether I'm improving or not. Otherwise I'm just golfing in the dark, so to speak. So it's that coaching piece that's really important.

Now, all these three drivers are integrated and compensatory. What that means is that they depend on each other and can compensate for each other. But at some point, if you have a weak link somewhere, it'll start to show.

So let's say you have fantastic leadership and great competency among your facilitators, but you don't have administrative support. You'll take your implementation to second level, and then you'll get stuck. So even though competency and leadership can compensate for lack of organizational drivers, you can only take it so far. And

then once your implementation drivers are supporting each other, you can look at performance assessment, which you see above the triangle, and then all the way to improved outcomes.

So really, this particular slide is at the crux of implementation science. And at the corner at the bottom corner, I've given you where I pull this-- where implementation science really came from and the authors who talk a lot about implementation science and have written a tremendous amount about it. So that you can see in the corner.

When you're thinking about your organization, which type of implementation driver is strongest in your organization? Is it the organizational side, the competency side, or the leadership? If you had to pick one, which driver is strongest in your organization? Is it you have a lot of organizational capacity? You have systems in place that really support implementations.

Or is it that your staff tend to be really well-trained, and your staff is left to their own devices and can carry out whatever these implementations are? It's just they don't really have the leadership support or the administrative support. Or is it really strong leadership?

More than half as you say that your organizational drivers are the strongest in your organization, followed by competency at about 27%, and then leadership at around 17%, which is really interesting, which means that you all have systems in place for really good implementation. And then sometimes what falls by the wayside is, perhaps, training and coaching or really helpful leadership support.

In the next slide, what the next slide helps us understand is the importance of getting everybody involved. So we call getting everybody involved "implementation teams." Implementation teams include the primary or relevant stakeholders from across all the levels of the organization-- so really anyone who has a stake in the successful implementation, whether it's inside or outside the organization.

Having implementation teams, as you can tell from this slide, dramatically improve the likelihood of a successful implementation. So when you have implementation teams, you can have an effective intervention. And you get there within three years, where 80% of your folks are trained up. And they're implementing with fidelity as opposed to with no implementation team, where it kind of drags on. And 17 years later, you're still at only 14%. So one of the ways of talking about that is that implementing without an implementation team is kind of letting it happen versus helping it happen.

So who should be in an implementation team? It really depends on what kind of things you're implementing. But most importantly, these are our stakeholders.

So when I talk about stakeholders, let's say I'm talking about this cognitive behavioral curriculum. My stakeholders

would be the folks who would be delivering the curriculum. Perhaps it would be leadership and administration. Perhaps it would be clients as well. Perhaps it would be community members and victims so that everybody has a say in how this gets done, the importance of it, what gets measured. What are outcomes that we're looking for?

An implementation team really can be pretty creative. And ideally, an implementation includes lots of boots-on-the-ground people, as well as people with positional power who can make things happen and make the changes happen that you need. The implementation teams really help drive an implementation and help an implementation be extremely successful.

Unfortunately, all implementations suffer challenges. Here are some common challenges. I'm sure you may have experienced others as well. Some common challenges that implementations are not staff driven. So there's no buy-in or input from staff, meaning that the leader-- I come in. I get excited about something. and I really don't take into account staff needs or their interests.

Or an implementation starts to stall out. We get really excited in the beginning. But sometimes because of a lack of a feedback loop, people start to wonder about the implementation. And it sort of stalls out. Or because of lack of support of administration-- we talked about buy-in already.

And then sometimes lack of results-- and this is an interesting one because they have the results. They're just not sharing it with folks. Or they're collecting information that their stakeholders are not interested in and are not collecting data that stakeholders are most curious about. So those are some of the challenges that an implementation team can help facilitate through.

So let's simplify this and summarize the whole thing. So ideally, we start with an implementation team that has some authority but that also is sensitive to what's going on in the field. They have connection to the field. We engage stakeholders, making whatever we're talking about very relevant to them with a clear path. And we help outline what outcomes we are looking for.

We then gather baseline data. We then train people. We coach. We adjust. We train. And we gather more data. And we analyze this data. And then we share the outcomes. And that process is cyclical. You rinse and repeat. So you continue to train, coach, and adjust. You gather data, analyze it, and share outcomes.

Just to be clear, though, the outcomes here are not necessarily outcomes related to the program per se. Sometimes these are called "implementation outcomes" because we're just implementing a new program. And we sometimes are looking at outcomes that are less about the program and more just about behavior change.

So here's an example of an implementation that happened in schools. The principal of the school wanted to reduce the number of people who were being expelled and was really clear with everybody around reduction in

the number of kids expelled and, at the same time, implemented this new program. We're starting to gather data. And we see, wow, expulsions are really dropping.

But are they dropping because of the program? Or are they dropping because teachers and everyone else in the school just want to reduce expulsions? So it's really important to tell the difference between-- that's actually an implementation effect, not a program effect just yet. We have to wait a little while to get the full implementation to see if it's an actual program effect.

When we're paying attention to implementation science, it's important to pay attention to implementation fidelity and program fidelity. Are we implementing it in the way that we committed to implementing it, meaning all the systems, the leadership, all of that is on board as opposed to just the facilitators, for example, implementing whatever the program is?

Making sure that we're separating how we're implementing from what we're implementing-- so sometimes the what is excellent. But the how we're going about it is problematic. And it might lead to a failed implementation. I talked already about implementation outcomes versus program outcomes.

And the last piece to pay attention to is implementation problems versus program effectiveness problems. So it's really important to distinguish between the two. Sometimes it's not the program that's ineffective. It's that we have implementation problems that we might need to solve before we throw the baby out with the bathwater, before we say something like, this program is really unsuccessful. So I'm going to turn it over now to Rebecca.

Actually, to Greg quick first, and then to Rebecca. Thanks, Anjali, for your insight and expertise. It's now our pleasure to turn the rest of the webinar over to Rebecca. As a reminder, there will be a question-and-answer period at the end of the webinar. So feel free to enter questions as you may have for Anjali or Rebecca into the Q&A box. And Rebecca, this time is now yours.

Great. So thank you so much. I'm excited to be on this webinar with Anjali. I hope you saw a little bit or maybe even a lot of yourselves and your grant process and your grant proposal and the challenges that you may be wrestling with in what you heard so far, whether you-- what kind of driver you have and what kind of process you have I think can really help you understand and break down maybe some of the challenges you're having and also help you really appreciate the strength that you have in your community in successfully implementing your grant.

So this is just a summary slide of what Anjali just said with some maybe more familiar language that you are already thinking of or wrote into your grant proposals. And so I wanted to take some time and just highlight what we've seen on the national level with really successful project implementation.

It's interesting. I was just last week at the new grantee orientation for the Legal Assistance for Victims grant funding stream and the Justice for Families grant funding stream. And we talked a lot about the importance of collaboration, strategic planning, starting small in all of those things, and really helping grantees to increase their capacity to increase that community buy-in that will ultimately help ensure more sustainability for your project.

So let's talk about collaboration. One of my favorite judges often refers to it as "co-loboration." When she was first starting on domestic violence court, everybody got stressed about coming into the room and talking about, how can we do things differently in our communities? So we're not talking about "co-loboration." We're talking about collaboration.

And so what do we mean from that? I think one of the keys to successful implementation is collaboration. We've heard Anjali talk about this. And it's a key component of many OVW grant funding streams. I think it's one of the most beautiful things about the Office on Violence Against Women's grants-- is that they really encourage that collaboration.

In our experience working with courts and their community stakeholders, collaboration has been crucial both to the successful implementation and the ongoing sustainability of their project. But it can present some challenges. I think ways to address those challenges are to think about who can be on your team. Who should be there?

Anjali talked about the importance of leadership. And I was really appreciative of the way that she had talked about that. So you are grantees. Many of you are grantees who are on this call. And that shows leadership in even writing and successfully receiving this grant. The grant funding streams are very competitive. So identifying a leader in your community that can really bolster and support the implementation is important.

So thinking about who could be on there, regardless of what your focus is, whether it's starting up a domestic violence court, whether it's implementing abusive partner intervention programming or working more collaboratively with civil legal service providers or supervised visitation centers, it's great to start with a large, collaborative team. You can always break yourselves off into subcommittees. But having a big, strong beast gets that buy-in from the beginning.

So thinking about who can you-- who are the judges and court administrators that might be helpful to them to understand what your project is and getting their buy-in? Who are the criminal and civil attorneys in your community, the local community-based victim advocates, as well as your system-based advocates, other social service programs, abusive partner intervention programs, treatment programs, all those types of things? Probation, your supervised visitation centers, and your child welfare-- oftentimes bringing them to the table, inviting them to learn more about your project, whether they're directly involved or not, can help with that ongoing

successful team.

So one of the things that we've found works really well is to meet regularly. Discuss what's happening with your project and any development of protocols. Anjali talked about the process or the driver of that paper process. We encourage people to memorialize things. You have those deliverables in your grant that can help support you.

But really convening regularly to discuss your project and then having those ongoing meetings once you're up and running-- that helps identify small gaps or challenges before they become something that's really big and something almost overwhelming for you. Again, we found people doing this in different ways.

In one community, they held their planning meetings in the different agencies so that each person, each-- everybody could see, oh, look. This is where the victim advocacy agency is. This is where civil legal attorneys work. This is how prosecutors-- this is where the prosecutor's office are. These are the people who are-- this is how they prep cases, those types of things.

It seems almost too simple. But in this particular grant site, it was really helpful to break down some of the barriers and increase that coordination and communication. And then having those ongoing meetings-- those can be great opportunities for ongoing training and support and just keeping the fire burning once you're up and running.

Another important step, as Anjali was talking about, is this needs assessment and baseline data. It's hard to figure out where you want to go if you don't know where you are right now. And so doing some of those initial baseline assessments and needs assessments can really help you understand and create that strong foundation for ongoing success. So let's talk a little bit about some of those strategies.

When we're thinking about-- when the Center for Court Innovation is working with jurisdictions or around the country as part of either our work at the comprehensive training and technical assistance providers for the Justice for Families grant funding stream or with grantees as part of this great collaboration with Fox Valley, we talk about a needs assessment as a process for systematically gathering qualitative and quantitative information about a community and justice system strengths, their resources, and their challenges. And I think part of that is figuring out what questions you want to ask. And that's going to help you figure out and make some concrete steps for successful ongoing implementation and sustainability.

So why would you want to have and do a needs assessment? I think well-planned, community-focused justice initiatives really should include some kind of formal needs assessment. And it's crucial. It helps clarify what the problem may be that needs to be addressed and help each agency understand exactly what their role is in that process.

It helps you also reach out to other community members that may not initially want to be part of your project. But

you can say, you know what? We're doing this needs assessment. We really want to hear from you. And that will help bring people into-- and get that buy-in.

So helping to clarify what the problems might be, conduct outreach to community members-- that really is meaningful to them. And they think, oh, you know what? This was actually a good meeting for me to have gone to because they asked me questions about what some strengths were in our organization, what some challenges were we were facing. And it seems like they're going to be able to respond to that.

And it's going to help you collect some baseline data. So we've had people do this in a variety of different ways. You can do it on one-on-one interviews where someone in your planning team either brings individuals in or individual profession groups in to talk about what's working well in your community around addressing domestic violence.

Where are there challenges? Where do you think our community strengths are? Where are there opportunities for us to collaborate and address some of those challenges? You can do it through focus groups with more people or, as I said, by discipline. You can do it through surveys or community forums.

And then really thinking about how you want to-- that will help you examine your current system response. And that might be looking at the paperwork. What kind of forms do law enforcement fill out? What's the actual process and the considerations that your prosecutor's office uses to determine their recommendations around bail or their recommendations around sentencing and plea agreements?

What does our abusive partner intervention program or our batter intervention program actually do? Can I observe that program and better understand what the messaging is to defendants or respondents in our community? What's the difference between community-based and system-based advocates?

And then thinking about the caseload, doing a caseload analysis so that you really understand, OK, this is how many DV cases make it to our criminal court. This is how many domestic violence cases are in our family court, either through civil orders of protection or child custody and parenting arrangements, child protective cases that involve domestic violence.

And then you can see, wow, this is how many victims reach out to our community-based advocates. This is how many DV calls our law enforcement went on. And that helps you really see how people are moving through our system, what agencies they're accessing when they're in crisis regarding a domestic violence situation, and then helps you really think about how you can utilize those services and resources most efficiently.

Again, one way to do that-- one way we worked with jurisdictions around the country is to do a spot analysis. I

don't know how many of you have done that already. I want to call it a SCOT analysis. Instead of weaknesses, we're really thinking about our challenges.

But it's a strategic way where you really list, either in a multidisciplinary way or with your planning team, what are the strengths in our community in addressing domestic violence? Where are weaknesses and challenges? Where do we have opportunities?

And where are the threats? And the threats are larger issues, like legislative changes. Or our building is too small, and we'd have to build a whole new building, those kinds of things that are either outside of the scope of you being able to address through your grant or through your planning process.

But this really does help you focus in on the opportunities and, again, help create a sense of belonging for those community partners with whom you want to engage and can help you prioritize how to use your grant or how to use other resources in your communities to address the challenges in serving the needs of domestic violence litigants.

So system mapping-- system mapping is one of my favorite things. If you've ever gone to a training that the Center for Court Innovation has done, more often than not we'll ask you to system map. And the reason that we do that is it really helps you understand, kind of as Anjali was talking about, what are your different processes? And what are the different drivers in your response to domestic violence?

So when you do a system map, there are many ways to do them. One is to think about the victim in a family court case. Say a victim is wanting to get a civil order of protection. You would chart out the steps in the process. What is the initial step? How would someone find out that there is such a thing as an order of protection? What are the steps? And who might a victim advocate reach out to?

And then once they get to court to file that petition, what are the processes in that court process? Is it the initial hearing, and then there's some preliminary hearing, and then there's a final determination? And is there any compliance monitoring?

The same thing on the criminal side-- how are victims entering into our criminal justice system? Who are they accessing? Who are the service providers in each step of the way?

And then thinking about it from a defendant perspective, who are the stakeholders that the defendant is interacting with? What services are available to that defendant post-disposition? And what kind of compliance monitoring is happening?

That combined with some kind of SWOT analysis or, in my dream world, a SCOT analysis really allows you to

further drill down on exactly what is happening in your community and helps inform the next steps. It's kind of like a road map. Where are we now? Where do we want to go? And then in between there is, how do we get there? And system mapping can really be a great way to do that.

So you want to think about, what are the major steps and decision points in our system? Who are the decision makers at each point? How long does it take for a case to move from point to point? And how many cases are in the system at each point?

And some folks have done this around risk and risk assessment in addition to those types of things. And in each of the points in the system, you can identify where risk information is captured, how that information is being shared, if at all, from point to point. And what is that risk information being used to inform?

And I think that's a great way for you to ensure that you're having a robust, holistic response to increase that victim's safety and that offender accountability in your community. And both of those things are usually a primary goal or primary goals of any OVW grant.

So when we're thinking about strategies around training, Anjali talked about the importance of training. And I think folks are wanting to jump quickly from, OK, we've got our grant. We've got to get cracking. Let's just go for it, or, oh, we said we were going to do training. Great. Let's just do training and jump in.

And I think taking the time to think about-- what kind of training do we need before we start what we're doing to successfully implement our project or our grant project? What kind of training do we need to support us once we're up and going? And then who can help us? Who needs to be trained in each of those steps? And who can help train us?

What's lovely about those of you who have an OVW grant is that there's usually some kind of set-aside that you have to put into that grant because they want you to be able to go to OVW-approved trainings. And there are training and technical assistance providers that can provide on-site training to you at little or no cost to your grant. And so thinking about these things is how training can support that role that ongoing planning and then the implementation as well.

The Center for Court Innovation created a training needs assessment that helps communities and grantees think about, what are our training needs, and then helps you identify which OVW-- how to use OVW training and technical assistance providers to help you. Some of you-- with this great collaboration with Fox Valley, we've had grantees. Fox Valley was able to go to Rockford, Illinois, for instance, and do a site visit and do some ongoing-- some on-site training there.

Bemidji has partnered-- is an ICJR grantee. And they're a mentor court through the Office on Violence Against

Women. And they participated in an initial discussion group that we had online to understand more about holistic responses and victim-centered responses. And they've been able to use national TA providers to come to them to provide all different types of training to support their projects.

The TA2TA website is another wonderful resource. It houses all the information about upcoming trainings and webinars and that kind of thing. And through this grant, Fox Valley and the Center and other partners are able to come on site to you, as we said, to support you and do targeted trainings and is also doing regional trainings, which you might hear about at the end of this webinar from Greg-- so really thinking about training as a good resource for you.

That leads us to implementation. And I think one of the important things that we've learned about implementation is starting small. You can phase in your changes. It can be overwhelming once you've done some kind of needs assessment and collected your baseline data. You have all your partners there. You've been trained. And now you think, oh my gosh. How can we ever make these changes?

Starting small can help you. When we're working with courts around the country, we often encourage them to start small. Phase in. You don't have to take every single case right now. We have integrated domestic violence courts. And oftentimes we have them just start very small. Take misdemeanors with an overlapping civil order of protection. And then you can branch out to taking other types of overlapping cases.

Or maybe you want to create a court that has both misdemeanors and felonies to start with those misdemeanors and branch out into the felonies or vice versa. Whatever that change is that you want to make, starting small and capturing your data-- capturing that data and tracking your success. That's all what Anjali was talking about as the process part of things-- making sure that you write that down.

And it's OK to make changes over time. It's important, as Anjali said, to have fidelity to your model and the implementation. But you may see things evolve over time, and that's OK. That's what life and growth is about.

So you can talk to your TA providers if you are thinking about making some other changes. You can always talk to your OVW grant managers and say, you know what? We tried this. We think we've identified another way to do it. Are there other communities who are also struggling with this? Can we be connected with them? What have you seen in other jurisdictions?

Your TA providers and your OVW grant managers are great supports for you as you're implementing your project. And what we've found with many of the Justice for Families grantees, for instance, is doing site visits, using your TA providers to identify other jurisdictions that are doing great work.

And there may be ways that you can go and visit them and see what they're doing. Or you can have peer-to-peer mentorship. That's a great way to make sure that you're implementing things in your community in the best way possible. So I think we are through what we wanted to talk about. And we wanted to leave it open for time for Q&A. So I'm going to shoot it back over to Greg.

Thanks, Rebecca. Thank you to both Anjali and Rebecca for excellent presentations today and sharing their insights with us. We've now reached the question-and-answer portion of the webinar. We know that most of the people on the call are either brand-new grantees under OVW or have had a program for a year or two or is continuation planning to build on that.

One of the things that comes up when we do training or we're trying to help people with technical assistance is, these are great ideas. How do we assess where we're at? Is there a checklist out there to look at implementation science and see how we're doing to see where we might have some areas for growth?

Or if we identify an area that's a challenge, how do you go about addressing that? So I put that out to both Rebecca and Anjali to talk a little bit about whether there are resources out there to actually look at a program that you can do a checklist and/or any kinds of support around implementation science that they can tap into.

Sure. Thank you, Greg. Rebecca, I'll start, and then I'll turn it over to you. So there are lots of resources. And it's such a great question. One quick clarification and just to separate two things, implementation science-- when you're thinking about it in terms of checklists, it's different from looking at program and program fidelity.

So when Greg asks the question, is there a checklist or something that can help us figure out, are we on the right track regarding implementation science, the question is really a big systems-level question. And oftentimes what's extremely helpful is to get the implementation team involved to take a look at the drivers of implementation and to see, how well are we doing across all three drivers?

In terms of the resources, an excellent resource is what called NIRN. And on their website-- so it's the National Implementation Research Network, NIRN. And on their website, they have a long list of resources and references. They also have some checklists available and many different articles that are extremely helpful for folks to understand where they're at in terms of implementation science. Rebecca, what would you like to add to that?

Yeah. So over the years, the Center has developed some tools that have been helpful for OVW grantees and other jurisdictions seeking to enhance their response to domestic violence. As I said, one of the things we developed was a training needs assessment. And that can be sent out to your community stakeholders to identify what the training needs might be.

We have a DV court self-assessment tool, which is for folks who-- it can be used-- it's mostly used by folks who

already have a domestic violence court. And they can kind of gauge where they are on some general performance measures and best practices.

We also have a domestic violence court toolkit, which is for folks who are starting up a domestic violence court toolkit. And it has worksheets that go through all of the planning and implementation steps that we talked about, including all of the different types of strategic planning.

And we recently created one for abusive partner intervention programming. It's a community self-assessment. And it allows jurisdictions to think about how their jurisdiction or their community is working towards some guiding principles around abusive partner intervention programming. So I think those might be some good first steps.

I think using your grant deliverables can be helpful. And then working with your-- not being shy about reaching out to your training and technical assistance providers, whether that's your ITJR grantee, if it's with the Battered Women's Justice Project, or you're a rural grantee and it's through Praxis, or some of the targeted training and technical assistance experts, such as Fox Valley.

Those are good folks to reach out to to think about, all right, here's what we said we were going to do in our grant. You had to put in some kind of timeline in there. So then we can help you think about how to work through some of these things and where to apply some of this implementation science throughout the lifetime of your grant.

Thanks, Rebecca. That's really a nice segue into a question that we got, which is, we applied for an OVW grant last year and were turned down. We were told we were not specific enough. How do we balance this with leaving detail undefined to allow for planning and collaboration? And I'll put that out to both of you again.

Yeah, I mean, I'm not going to guess as to exactly. I don't know the exact details of that. But I think sometimes we've found with jurisdictions who-- they've reached out to us in advance, like years before they even applied for an OVW grant.

And when they were able to do some of this strategic planning, thinking about some of the things that Anjali was talking about in terms of implementing things, it does help focus you then when you go to apply for a grant because you-- again, you can say, we've done this needs assessment. And here's where we are. And here's how we think grant funding can help us.

I'm not going to say that's a definite-- that you're definitely going to get an OVW grant if you do those things. But regardless of whether you get the funding or not, I think bringing a team together and thinking about where we are, where we want to be, and how do we want to get there is helpful in achieving your community's goals of increased and enhanced safety for victims. And so I guess that's the long-winded way I would answer it. I don't

know, Anjali, if you have any other ideas-- or Greg.

No. I think that those were great, Rebecca. And I also think that as people become familiar with implementation science and do the SWOT or SCOT analysis on, what's the problem or issue that they're trying to address, that will help them hone in and also allow them some flexibility about which direction to go.

It may not be that they've done a complete needs analysis upfront. But they can identify some kind of high-level targets. But one of the strategies would be to do a needs assessment with the community and with an implementation team around a particular program change or practice change or culture change or shift like that.

One of the other things that comes up as we interact with grantees-- big topics tend to be things like integrating victim services with corrections. And as most of you saw at the beginning of this, the focus of our technical assistance is around improving a victim-centered approach and community-based corrections from pretrial services all the way through jail, probation, prison, parole, and back out.

And how do we do that? How do we bring victims' needs, victims' interests, how they want to be involved in the process, if at all, to the forefront and really pay attention to that not only in the beginning, but long term? So I'm wondering if either Rebecca or Anjali can talk about blending of systems and how maybe implementation science might help with that.

Yeah. That's really important because you are talking about blending systems. And therefore it really highlights the importance of having a nice, robust implementation team, an implementation team that has members on it from all of these different systems. Because when you're looking at cross-system implementation, are you looking at doing something that maybe is a little bit different because you're including different perspectives?

The implementation team-- the more diverse it is, the better it can really inform the implementation process. So very, very helpful thing to be thinking about-- how can I make sure that my implementation team is broad enough and is close enough to the ground? So that field sensitivity piece that I talked about earlier regarding implementation teams is also really important. Rebecca, what are your thoughts?

Yeah, no. I think that's really important as well. And I think sometimes-- we were just talking about this at the new grantee orientation last week. Oftentimes if you're in-- regardless of what community you're in, whether you're in rural Vermont, where I live right now, or you're in New York City, oftentimes you have the same people involved in every single project that involves domestic violence.

And so I think a way to rekindle the flame and the excitement around a particular new project is to think about this implementation science. It's a nice way to think about things. It's very bold-oriented.

And it is a way to say, you know what? We really want this to be successful. We want to engage you for this specific purpose. And we plan to get things done. And here's our process for doing that. We have this strategic plan. Or we have this grant. And here's exactly how you fit in. And here is how it fits into this larger coordinated community response.

And particularly around this issue of victim-centered responses to community corrections, I know that Fox Valley was able to do some on-site technical assistance to two jurisdictions. And I think that was really helpful for them to think about who needed to be at the table. Whether we're a Family Justice Center grantee or we're a grantee that's focusing on creating a domestic violence court or enhancing our law enforcement response, thinking about being victim-centered and understanding probation's role in having a victim-centered coordinated response is really beneficial.

Thanks, Rebecca and Anjali. We have a comment, actually, making sure that we provide correct name and any contact information available. Both Anjali and Rebecca's contact information are on here, as well as NCJTC and CCI's contact information. And feel free to contact any of us if you have questions about the implementation of your project. What kinds of things can we help you with or get you to the right resource?

That's what we're here for. And your program manager at OVW-- they have a 20,000-foot view of the different kinds of programs that are out there, some best practices, programs that are doing well in an area that's related to yours, as well as what our role is in helping you all successfully implement the changes that you're trying to make in your systems.

For Anjali and Rebecca, one of the big topics that comes up is a trauma-informed approach, both for victim services and corrections. I'm wondering if either or both of you can talk about, what would that look like? If we wanted to look at our system and say, are we trauma-informed, what does that look like?

And how might we go about-- if we think that we're doing that, how do we look to see if we're doing a good job with that? And then how do we support people with those higher-level skills, Anjali, that you mentioned with adaptive skills in the real world, both in corrections and in victim services?

Yeah. Trauma-informed care is definitely one of those adaptive skills. It falls in that adaptive skills category. And when we talk about being trauma-informed, we're not talking about having the skills to resolve or address trauma. It's having a different lens, an additional lens that we can look at behavior through and therefore understand a bit more about the behavior. So rather than just assuming that the person is defensive are lying or manipulating, we have a slightly negative view of how trauma might be impacting that particular individual.

So in terms of being trauma-informed, there are some checklists online that people can use to assess whether

they're truly trauma-informed. And these checklists are really helpful because it broadens our view about what being trauma-informed means.

I think sometimes we get a little bit stuck thinking that, OK, I'm trauma-informed because I know that a huge percentage, close to 90%, of folks in the criminal justice world-- clients in the criminal justice world have been impacted by some sort of trauma. And so given that I know that, I'm trauma-informed.

But it's really about changing my behavior to accommodate for trauma-impacted behaviors that then show up in the office or show up in an interaction. So using a checklist like that is really very helpful because it can broaden our understanding of what it means to be trauma-informed-- might be helpful for people to be able to look at.

Yeah, and this is Rebecca. I think trauma-informed responses are so important, especially in domestic violence cases. It can kind of become a buzz word, where it is meaningless. But again, I think that's where saying, doing a system map can help you think about-- or looking at people's documents and thinking about, OK, how are we acting in a trauma-informed way?

How are we looking at this person as a whole, complicated person, whether it's the defendant in front of us-- how can we hold them accountable and address some of the trauma that's both a risk factor towards their current partner and a responsivity factor in terms of what kind of treatment might be most beneficial to them? How is trauma impacting this victim's ability to understand and receive services to communicate his or her needs to the court?

And so I think that's where training can be helpful. That's where taking the time to understand why you're asking certain questions and to what end and using information wisely to create these holistic responses-- it can be helpful.

And there's a lot of really good resources through OVW around speakers who are experts on trauma and trauma-informed responses. And when we're thinking about trauma-informed responses from probation, obviously Fox Valley, as the national TA provider on probation response, is a good way to start as well.

Thanks so much. Great questions and great dialogue. Any final comments from either Anjali or Rebecca?

No. I don't have anything to add. Thank you.

No. And I think if you're interested in any resources, you can reach out to us directly. Information is free on our website. All of the tools that we discussed or that I discussed are free and available on our website, which is dvcourts.org.

Thanks, both of you. That concludes our question-and-answer period for today's webinar. Thank you all for attending, and have a wonderful day. Thank you.

Thank you.