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Quality Improvement Process

- Organizations struggle with EBP implementation
- QIPs consider **structure, practices** and **context** that facilitate or constrain implementation
- Prior studies often...
  - lack clear conceptual frameworks
  - focused design on predictors, not on holistic frameworks to capture interactions,
  - were cross-sectional designs with single-source data collection (Alexander & Hearld, 2010)
Challenges to Implementing EBPs

Moving EBPs from clinical settings to real world work environments ("bench to trench") is challenging.

Is the concept transportable and what changes, if any, need to be made in this CJS setting?

- Are there enough **resources** to implement?
- Is the **organizational climate** ready for the EBP?
- Do **managers/supervisors** support the EBP?
- Can street-level workers **understand**, accept and incorporate the EBP into routine practice?
- Will the EBP **serve** needs of **clients** in this organization?
Contingency Management

- Evidence-based treatment
- 3 meta-analyses confirm that CM has a modest effect; as great as other psychosocial interventions (Prendergast, et al. 2006)
- Shape behaviors through rewards
- Focus on a social contract for behavior
- Technique to replace immediate “drug using”; structured rewards

Adaptation
- Fit to Environment
- Include Sanctions
JSTEPS Study Goals

- **Teach and support** adoption of positive reinforcement in criminal justice settings
- Examine **adoption** and **implementation** processes
- Examine **adherence, feasibility, transportability**, and **drift** to CM principles ...and if not working, why/how/where
- Examine **outcomes** for CM clients
Mixed Methods Design

- Structure: QUAN→QUAL
- Function: Complimentary
- Process: Connect & Embed

(Palinkas et al. 2011)—Taxonomy of Mixed Methods Designs in Mental Health Studies
Research Methods: QUAN + QUAL

- Surveys (attitude measures) to understand different system actor perspectives

- Two learning sessions (process improvement model) with feedback loops:
  #1: Design your own CM system with feedback report
  #2: Examine your target behaviors with feedback report

- On-going Technical Assistance (TA) on-site, via telephone & email (with Software Manual)

- Analysis of offender data to learn about impact on outcomes, substance abuse, rearrest, etc.
Innovative Qualitative Methods

- Longitudinal interviews and non-participant observation to learn about systems and organizational actors’ experiences
  - Baseline
  - At learning sessions
  - Follow-up

- Monthly conference calls
- TA qualitative “process” data collection
- Subject-generated data (via presentations)
Constant Comparative Process

- Allows researchers to formulate theory by evaluating data as it relates to other data of varying perspectives on key issues and content (Glaser, 1965; Lincoln & Guba, 1985)

- On-going coding and analysis using Atlas.ti (qualitative software)
1. Sites agree to join JSTEPS study
2. Initial Site Visits Occurred

ACE! training Seminar

Practitioner teams self-design CM protocols

Initial feedback reports, on-site coaching & TA

Feedback reports follow-up phone calls & emails

Practitioner teams considered feedback, some revised (site visits)
Site Overview

- **Site One**: Drug Court & Reentry Court
- **Site Two**: Reentry Court
- **Site Three**: Drug Court & Gang Court
- **Site Four**: Regular caseload (5, then 3x per officer)
- **Site Five**: Halfway House & Drug Court

- Each site selected and designed own CM schedule
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CM Principles</th>
<th>Site One</th>
<th>Site Two</th>
<th>Site Three</th>
<th>Site Four</th>
<th>Site Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive incentives w/ point system</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear guidelines about earning pts.</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasizes abstinence</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>No Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early incentives</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>No Priority</td>
<td>No Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point escalation</td>
<td>No Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating pt. system into existing system</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonuses</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>No Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No more than 3 behaviors at a time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JSTEPS Continuous Feedback Loop

ACE! training seminar #2 w/ interactive exercises

Practitioner teams complete CM homework

Follow-up phone calls & e-mails

Practitioner teams consider feedback; some revised

Feedback reports & monthly TA via phone

Next cycle starts here…
Collaborative Learning Exercise (at 18 mo.)

Materials:
- “Principles of Contingency Management”
- Exercise Worksheet:
  1. Define Principles of Case Management
  2. Specify Role of Case Manager/PO
  3. List duties of PO
  4. Alignment/misalignment between duties and CM principles
  5. Identify process issue
Sites’ Vary Dramatically

- In point-design and reward structure
- In definition of CM
- In challenges they faced
- Probationer feedback/understanding
Recognizing Contextualized Feedback

Competing Goals

Effectiveness vs. Efficiency
Equity vs. Performance

Intra-Org Challenges

Redefining the EBP

Perception and Fit

e.g. Bad press; legitimacy, etc.
DATA SOURCES via Integrated **QUAN + QUAL** design

**Outcome (WHAT)**
- Organizational team surveys
- Client data via JSTEPS software and internal org. systems
- Participant feedback (interviews, focus groups, calls, emails)

**Process (HOW & WHY)**
- Site visits
- Learning Collaborative
- Monthly phone calls
- Emails
- On-going presentation participation
Status of CM & JSTEPS

No site dropped out
Most "learned to love" rewards

Found hidden treasures in learning about their systems

Alignment to CM is promising; each site differed in approach