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Traditional Model of ‘Science to Service’
The Reality?
Mark Greenberg (2009):

“In the real world, translation of science-based practices stumble, largely unguided, toward uneven, incomplete and socially disappointing outcomes”
Problems of crime prevention internationally

1. The **understanding** of what crime prevention is and what it involves is very imprecise - **over use of criminal justice and punishment responses**.

2. Available **theory** is inadequately applied or poorly developed.

3. Crime prevention efforts experience significant **implementation** problems.

4. **Evaluations** are done badly or not done at all.

5. Poorly developed and constantly changing **governance arrangements** in crime prevention leadership.
A summary of the Australian experience...
Specific problems in Australia: (“Second hand Europeans ...”)

- *A poverty of imagination* – a history of politically driven stop-start initiatives – no consistent national leadership

- *Good intentions* instead of practice influenced by scientific evidence

- *Overuse of community development and social crime prevention* - where evidence is weakest

- *Over-emphasis on ‘program packages’* – limited attention to enduring social institutions & civil society

- *The pilot program disease*: inadequate funding & a low skills workforce

- *Over-control by government* - absence of cooperative relationship between government agencies, private sector and community groups
Effective Implementation

- Good Governance
- Evidence
- Strong direction
- Capacity for evidence to action
Abstract

A population-level approach to deliver parenting and family support is a necessary but neglected approach needed to reduce the high prevalence of emotional/behavioral problems in children, decrease inadequate and potentially abusive parenting practices, and to provide improved parenting support to all parents within a specified population. We examined the initial feasibility of a large-scale professional training regimen to prepare existing service providers to implement an evidence-based preventive intervention in the realm of parenting and family support. Data from the U.S. Triple P System Population Trial are used to illustrate how a parenting and family support intervention can be successfully disseminated to a large, multidisciplinary workforce. We discuss lessons learned from this dissemination effort as well as implications for population-based approaches to child and family well-being.
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Society for Prevention Research

Type 1 Translation

- The application of basic discoveries to the development and preliminary testing of preventive interventions
- Based on *efficacy trials*: the extent to which an intervention does more harm than good when delivered under optimal conditions
- Usually carried out through randomized controlled trials, or ‘high quality’ matched quasi-experimental designs
Society for Prevention Research

Type 2 Translation

- Investigates factors, models and processes associated with the adoption, implementation and sustainability of effective prevention strategies in communities, service settings, and populations

IMPLEMENTATION =

- *Effectiveness trials* test whether efficacious interventions produce benefits under ‘real world’ conditions or in ‘natural’ settings +

- *Dissemination* moves beyond effectiveness trials to large scale use nationally or internationally.
Society for Prevention Research

T – Translation stage-setting during pre-adoption phases
I – Institutional adoption of evidence-based interventions
E – Effective implementation
S – Sustainability
Implementation Science

Implementation is *a recursive process* with six stages:

- Exploration
- Installation
- Sustainability
- Innovation
- Initial implementation
- Full implementation
We interpret this model in terms of organizational capacity and quality of governance.
Community Capacity

- MAY be critical for *sustaining interventions*

- Little clarity about meaning, so
  
  “the translation from broad concept to social action is fraught with difficulty” (Chaskin, 2001, p. 293).

- Frequent target of government funding despite *complete lack of evidence* that community interventions can reduce crime or even build ‘capacity’!

- The concept of *collective efficacy* helps provide a scientific foundation for understanding community capacity
Governance: Many definitions

One by Rod Rhodes (1996): “Governing without government”

Self-organizing inter-organizational networks ...
for authoritatively allocating resources and
exercising control and co-ordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Networks of organizations</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>A degree of autonomy from central government control?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our definition:

The *processes and systems* by which societies or organizations:

- make their important *decisions*,
- determine *who has a voice*,
- determine *who will be engaged* in the process,
- and decide *how account is to be rendered*

(Edgar, Marshall & Bassett 2006).
Rowers always listen to their cox

Be part of a team; choose to cox
Email: WCBC.coxes@gmail.com
Intervening early in the pathway before problems emerge or become entrenched.
Investing to deliver: reviewing the implementation of the UK Crime Reduction Programme

Peter Homel, Sandra Nutley, Barry Webb and Nick Tilley

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors, not necessarily those of the Home Office (nor do they reflect Government policy).

Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate
December 2004
UK’s Crime Reduction Programme (CRP) - an example of implementation problems

- The CRP began in April 1999 as a £400 million three year cross government commitment to:
  - Achieving a sustained reduction in crime
  - Improving and mainstreaming knowledge of best practice
  - Maximising the implementation of cost-effective crime reduction activity

- The CRP was centrally designed and managed but delivery was primarily local

- Reflected a commitment to the use of evidence based policy programs (EBPP)
The Crime Reduction Programme was...

A comprehensive array of 20 separate but linked initiatives of varying scale organised around five broad themes:

1. Working with families, children and schools to prevent young people becoming offenders;

2. Tackling crime in communities, particularly high volume crime (e.g., domestic burglary);

3. Developing products and systems that are resistant to crime;

4. More effective sentencing practices;

5. Working with offenders to ensure that they do not re-offend.
What happened and what can we learn?

- Major program implementation delays
- Significant funding underspends
- Diminished program effectiveness and capacity for sustained crime reduction activity
What was the experience of people involved?

“There were far too few people working centrally on the project’s development and implementation and no consistent project management approach”

“We were flying blind: although the decentralised model was adopted we had no guidelines to help us through the development phase…”

“In recent years we (i.e. Government) have proceeded to raise the programme delivery standard and then put amateurs in charge of delivery (i.e. local partnerships)”

“The design of programmes like the CRP is based on wrong assumptions about how business is transacted at a local level and leads to excessively high estimations of the general sophistication of local project managers”
Some specific problems that were identified

- Difficulties recruiting suitably qualified and skilled staff
- High staff turnover
- Generally inadequate technical and strategic advice and guidance from the centre and regions
- Inadequate levels of project management competency and skill, particularly financial
CRP’s implementation problems

- Lack of adequate guidance and support from the central agency.
- Lack of a local skill base.
- Absence of strategic leadership from the centre.
- Ineffective program monitoring.
- A failure to learn from and to apply past lessons.
- Difficulties with local application of evidence bases.
- No contingency planning or capacity to cope with external factors impacting on program implementation.
The formal lessons from the CRP

1. Invest to deliver

2. Organise centrally to support efficient local implementation

3. Research the evidence base to learn for programme delivery

4. Build, implement, and maintain an effective knowledge management system

5. Create flexible fund management models
Peter’s version of the CRP’s problems...
The Stockholm Prevents Alcohol & Drug Problems (STAD) Project

- Survey (mid-1990s) of owners of licensed premises: owners saw no problems with overserving
- Formation of action group: develop strategies to prevent intoxication and service to minors
  - Two-day training course in RBS for servers, security staff and owners;
  - New forms of enforcement: notification letters, mutual controls (police & licensing officials)
- Signing of written agreement by high-ranking officials --> formal steering committee
Interrupted time series analyses of police-recorded violence (inside & outside) between 10 pm and 6 am

- Reduction of 29% in intervention area, slight increase in control area

- Gradual reduction as interventions became more intense

- No displacement or influence of extraneous factors

- Increase in rates of refusal of service to drunks (5% --> 70%)

- Effects sustained over a period of 5 or more years
STAD sustainability

- Strong inter-agency collaborative climate
- with strong leadership from head of licensing
- Lobbying by action group members
- Police gradually came on board strongly
- Institutionalization through agency financial support, signed agreement

- **10 year time frame**

- Partnership of agencies: “community” only involved through venue employees, leisure industry etc

- Currently being extended to all local government areas in Sweden
Some common features of good crime prevention

- Evidence-based (or at least “evidence informed”)
- Collaborative multi-agency based action
  - “whole of government/community” (Australia)
  - “networked government” (USA)
  - “joined-up government” (UK)
- Built on the use of multiple interventions to address linked problems
Some common features of good crime prevention

- *Problem oriented* not process oriented
- *Outcome focused*
  - i.e. measures performance and effectiveness
- *Centrally developed* and driven but *locally delivered*
- Built on *partnership* and shared outcomes
- Focused on principles of *inclusiveness and participation*
# Five Principles of Good Governance for Crime Prevention Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance principle</th>
<th>Conditions for success (examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Legitimacy &amp; Voice</em></td>
<td>Everyone who needs to be, is at the table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is consensus orientation around the table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Direction/Strategic Vision</em></td>
<td>All parties share a joint and CLEAR vision of their goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roles &amp; responsibilities are clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Performance</em></td>
<td>Performance is monitored &amp; reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What constitutes success is clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance is monitored &amp; reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- *Legitimacy & Voice*: Those in power are perceived to act legitimately and all players are afforded a voice in decisions.
- *Direction/Strategic Vision*: Exercise of power leads to a sense of direction & a guide to action.
- *Performance*: Institutions & processes are responsive to needs of participants, citizens & stakeholders.
## Five Principles of Good Governance for Crime Prevention Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance principle</th>
<th>Conditions for success (examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
<td>The accountabilities of all parties are clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The accountabilities of all parties to their respective organizations is recognized &amp; respected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The effectiveness of the partnership is reported publicly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is accountability between those in positions of power &amp; those whose interests they serve, &amp; they are transparent &amp; open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fairness</strong></td>
<td>All parties believe they receive sufficient value from the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The clients of the parties, and the public, benefit from the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is conformity with the rule of law and the principle of equity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A school-family-community agency partnership

begun in 2001

in a community of 25,000 people with more than 2000 students in 7 schools

involving 500-1000 families at any one time

with other children and parents as controls
1999 Federal Government Report

International literature on prevention

STRENGTHEN DEVELOPMENTAL SYSTEMS

Brisbane Pathways Project 2001-2011

Research database & program delivery infrastructure

PATHWAYS MODEL FOR COLLABORATIVE PRACTICE
The Pathways to Prevention Model: A Developmental Systems Approach

- Actions in one setting (e.g., schools) interact with, complement, and reinforce actions in other settings (e.g., home).

- More generally, all parts of a child’s developmental system must be in harmonious, mutually reinforcing relationship to promote positive child outcomes:

- The focus of all interventions is to build such mutually reinforcing system relations
DST framework leads naturally to:

- building trust
- fostering respectful relationships
- engaging families, and
- striving for collaborative practice between services and enduring developmental institutions such as schools.
Community-centered models of intervention

- The improvement of existing practice in local contexts rather than the introduction of something new.
- The practitioner takes center stage rather than being the recipient of an innovation developed through external research.

Hallmarks are:

- Empowerment,
- Capacity building,
- Engagement
Pathways is a synthesis of community centered and research-to-practice models

- Pathways – except partly in its first phase – does NOT seek to introduce programs designed in universities for children or families - *no ‘bolt-ons’.*

- It DOES seek to introduce and **normalize** programs and strategies that *build connections between and harmonize activities within key developmental settings,* especially home and school.

- It involves the construction of a database and evaluation of the effects on children and families of the complex forms of family support and other programs *routinely delivered through community service organizations and schools*
Figure 1. Conceptual representation of mediation pathway

- **Family Adversity (Risk status)**
  - School-Based Programs for Children
    - Preschool Intervention Program
      - Social skills
      - Communication skills
      - Supporting transition (STEP)
  - Targeted Programs for Primary School Children
    - Personal development
    - Circles of Care
    - Individual support & counselling
  - Opportunities for Parent Engagement in Children’s Learning & School
    - Linking to Learn program activities
  - Family Support Program
    - Wide range of family support services
  - Children’s Skills for Learning
    - Social competence
    - Interpersonal & social problem-solving skills
    - Language skills
    - School readiness
  - Parent Involvement in Children’s Education
    - Strong home-school relationships
  - Parent Efficacy
    - Connectedness to supportive networks & capacity to enlist support when needed
    - Parent skills (behaviour management; supporting child development & learning)
  - Child Behaviour
  - Children’s Attachment to School and Motivation to Learn
  - Family Aspirations and Expectations / Valuing Education
  - Positive and Responsive Parenting
  - Nurturing and Stimulating Family Environment
  - Enhanced Family Resilience and Capacity to Manage Adversity
  - Improved Family Relationships and Interactions

- **Wellbeing**
- **Educational Achievement**
- **Offending**
Figure 2. Pathways Child Longitudinal Database

**Intervention Context**
- Participation in Pathways
  - Family Support Program Activities
    - Carer contacts
    - Child contacts
    - X Activity Type
    - Individual Support
    - Advocacy
    - Playgroup
    - Parent Support Group
    - Parent Education
    - Personal Development
    - Recreational Activities

**Family Context**
- Level of Family Stress and Adversity
- Protective Factors and Social Assets
- Parental Efficacy

**Individual Context**
- Social Skills
- Preschool Language and Communication Skills
- School Readiness, Readiness to Learn; Attitude to Learning & Motivation
- Social and Emotional Wellbeing
- Connectedness to School
- Gender
- Ethnicity

**School Context**
- Child Behaviour
- Suspensions and Exclusions
- School Attendance Rate and Absenteeism
- Academic Achievement

**Young Adolescent Outcomes**
- Antisocial Behaviour
- Indicators of Positive Development
  - Connection
  - Confidence
  - Competence
  - Character
  - Contribution
  - Caring

**Participation in Pathways Pre- and Primary School Based Program Activities**
- Child contacts
- Carer contacts

Use this information to construct matched groups and explore patterns of participation over time. For example:
- Overall Duration of participation
- Level of participation (dosage: intensive vs. light)
- Consistency of contact across time (e.g., one-off vs. sporadic vs. sustained)
- Type of Pathways Participation (Number and type of services used; Contact with Child Only vs. Carer Only vs. Child + Carer vs. None)

**Longitudinal Data Collection (Time Series / Repeated Measures)**
From 2002/3 (Preschool Year) to 2009/2010 (Year 7/8)

**Transition to High School**
2009-2010 +
Clowning Around: Content areas

55 questions tapping 4 domains
- Educational Wellbeing
- Emotional Wellbeing
- Social Wellbeing
- Protective Factors

3 tasks
- Visual Attention
- Impulse control
- Working memory (learn and transfer rules)
‘Clowning Around’: Capturing data at school on children’s wellbeing
CLOWNING AROUND

Hi! My name's Pip. What's your name?
Creating Capacity for Collaboration

- The Holy Grail - easy to talk about – hard to do:
  
  *In the history of service integration “one is struck by its nobility of intent, its tenacity of purpose, and its ineffectiveness in implementation”* (Bruder, 2005, p. 31)

- *Co-location* is not enough

- Establish clear outcomes focus

- Lessen structural barriers and mindsets

- Need to develop deliberate strategies to link systems

- The power of DATA
One of the family rooms in the schools
Linking Education and Families (LEAF)
Circles of Care:
*bringing system elements into harmony*

Child-centred approach – but the real client is:
*a dysfunctional developmental system*

---

**Circle Meeting**

- **Goal Setting**
- **Action Planning**
- **Review Progress**
- **Implement Program**
Figure 4. Pathways Project Governance (2001)

Project Executive
- Chair: Lincoln Hopper (Mission)
- Members: Ross Homel (Griffith), Marie Leech (Mission) and reps of Qld Government

Project Reference Group
- Chair: Lincoln Hopper (Mission Australia)
- Project Sponsor (1999-2000): David Northcott (Mission Australia, representing the Barnes Foundation)
- Queensland Government agencies
- Ross Homel & Kate Freiberg (Griffith University)
- Cherie Lamb, Manager, Family Independence Program
- Community representatives

Expert Advisory Group
- Experts from other Universities and government and other organisations and agencies, as available

Development and Evaluation Group
- Director: Ross Homel
- Academics from Griffith University
- Experts from Government
- Cherie Lamb, Manager, Family Independence Program, Mission Australia

School Programs Implementation & Project Data Management & Evaluation Group
- Coordinator: Kate Freiberg
- Located at Griffith University
- Responsible for management of school interventions
- Project database development, data collection & local liaison

Local Stake Holders
- Local schools
- Local ethnic communities & other groups
- Local service providers (Government and non-Government)

Family Independence Program Implementation
- Manager: Cherie Lamb
- Team located at Mission Australia Pathways offices, Inala
- Responsible for management and development of family programs and community development activities
Reflecting on what we’ve learned: especially about schools

- Developmental systems model highlights the way contextual influences on child development and learning extend beyond school and why schools must work in partnership to achieve their goals.

- Collaboration and community partnership is critical to academic success and fundamental to goals of education system: not just an extra thing schools do (reflected in National Partnerships).

- Genuine collaboration (not just add-on) is not easy - schools need ‘top-down’ support to achieve this (e.g. training, resources and infrastructure to support governance structures for working with other agencies).

- Schools’ work as part of an integrated system with families and social support agencies should be appropriately valued.
Partnership involves “power sharing”

Partners are not always equal
So the key is...
Some practical issues for partnership working

1. Agreement on goals
2. Agreeing on budget and staff management processes
3. New arrangements for shared responsibilities (outcomes) and tasks (service delivery)
4. Revised client-service provider arrangements focusing on outcomes not activities
5. Innovative community engagement and joint management arrangements
6. Data management issues
7. Developing meaningful joint performance measures and systems

Source: IPAA 2002
Collaboration Pyramid

A clear Goal leads to better understanding of Roles and Procedures and enables better working Relationships

The central goal of interventions is to transform developmental systems to achieve better outcomes for children and their families, now and across the life course.

All actors in developmentally relevant settings (e.g., parents, teachers, service providers) understand that optimum child outcomes are achieved by working as a system, not as 'silos'.

Policies and resources in developmentally relevant organisations enable, reinforce and normalise holistic system practices.

Integrated practice is achieved through collaborative and respectful working partnerships between organisations, institutions and networks relevant to child and family wellbeing.

If Procedures and Roles are clear then clarify the Goal.

If relationships are strained look to the levels above to see if the cause is confusion about Procedures and Roles.
Some general lessons

• Focus on shared goals and indicators
• Emphasize performance improvement
• Embed system in ongoing management processes
• Keep it familiar and practical
• Build from performance measurement to targeted evaluation
THE PATHWAYS APPROACH

THE DEVELOPMENTAL SYSTEMS MODEL
- Key Principles of the Pathways Model
- Explanatory Videos
- iTunes U

WHAT'S NEEDED TO DEVELOP COLLABORATION
- Creating Community Coalitions
- Who / How?
- Community Coordinators
- Collaborative Planning and Governance

OPERATIONALISING FAMILY EMPOWERMENT
- Trust
- Partnership and active participation (doing with not to or for)

LEAF
Linking Families And Education

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND TOOLKIT
Pathways processes for ACCOUNTABILITY, EVALUATION, DATA COLLECTION, MEASUREMENT
- Clowning Around
- PEEM
- Participation Records
- Index of Coalition

TRAINING MODULES FOR EACH OF THE MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS
How to Administer the Measure; Automated System for Generating Reports; Interpretation and Getting the most from the Data; Using Outcomes for: decision making; needs analyses, monitoring progress, gauging program effectiveness, and program planning

LINK TO BIBLIOGRAPHIES OF EVIDENCE BASED PROGRAMS
Precipitous Bluffs Ahead
Parachutes Required