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Background
FCAB needs for IPV survivors

- Economic abuse: exert control over financial resources, aim for making financially dependent
- Common: 93% of IPV shelter residents in one study
- Evidence for both ability-strengthening and opportunity-increasing programs
- Yet gaps in service: ~19/ >120 MCADSV members
- Little to no research examining reasons behind limited implementation
FCAB for DSV

- Not one EST, rather: menu of interventions
- Voluntary, survivor-centered model of service provision:
  - central to practice in many DSV agencies
  - partnership between survivors and advocates
  - Diverse survivors develop own goals for service and voluntarily engage
  - Feminist empowerment frame: undo “abusive partner’s use of power and control” (Wood, Clark, Heffron, & Voth Schrag, 2020, p. 4).
- We propose: implementation efforts should change the way DSV agencies offer a range or menu of FCAB interventions to create opportunities for engagement. This can allow survivor choices to dictate service engagement.
How to change?

• Implementation science

• “Attempts to change the behaviour of health professionals may be impeded by a variety of different barriers, obstacles, or factors (which we collectively refer to as determinants of practice). Change may be more likely if implementation strategies are specifically chosen to address these determinants” - Cochrane review: Baker et al. 2015

• One established process: VA’s Quality Enhancement Research Initiative (QUERI) —Curran et al., 2008
Our study:

- Apply a tiered implementation approach (QUERI) to the novel setting of a domestic and sexual violence agency
- Single-site, non-experimental design case study
- Piloting this approach in a domestic and sexual violence agency.
Setting – Agency partnership

- Identified limited FCAB programming
- Researcher-practitioner partnership
  - March 2018 - Present

- Safe shelter 84 ♂; 37
- Outreach (455)
- 24-hour crisis hot line services
- Case management
- Counseling
- Court advocacy
- Referrals
- Community education
Process and findings
Four phase process

Phase 1: Formative evaluation
Phase 2: Development panel
Phase 3: Develop tailored action plan
Phase 4: Implement and test action plan
Phase 1: Formative evaluation

Aim
Identify determinants of practice (barriers/facilitators) for FCAB programming

Participants
10 agency staff, 3 stakeholders, 10 clients

Measures
IDI guide (per Krause et al., 2014); adapted checklist of determinants (Flottorp et al., 2013)
Phase 1: Process/methods

Staff/Stakeholders
- Brainstorming
- Use of checklists of determinants of practice

Clients
- Financial needs & worries
- Feedback on financial literacy topics
## Phase 1: Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention factors</th>
<th>The successful implementation of an FCAB intervention depends heavily on timing, sequencing, and delivery.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client factors</td>
<td>Must address both clients’ real and perceived needs. Must be responsive to varying levels of client knowledge and readiness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff factors</td>
<td>Limited financial literacy and self-efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency factors</td>
<td>Culture and climate are conducive to learning, yet organizational factors may limit FCAB programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External factors</td>
<td>External support for FCAB programming is available in limited quantities and underutilized.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 2: Development panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aims</th>
<th>Prioritize determinants of practice and recommend implementation strategies for action plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>2 Agency staff; 1 implementation expert; 2 content experts; research team (N=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments</td>
<td>Formative evaluation data table. Implementation strategies matrix (Powell et al., 2015)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 2 findings

• Identified five determinants of practice:
  1. staff financial skills
  2. staff financial self-efficacy
  3. (dis)incentives for FCAB programming
  4. connections to other agencies doing similar programming
  5. connections with influential external stakeholders

• Prioritized broad areas of strategy for change
  • changes in the staff financial knowledge and self-efficacy
  • processes that limit economic advocacy
Phase 3: Tailored action plan

Aim: Match implementation strategies to barriers in a targeted action plan

Participants: Research team/expert panel

Instruments: Process influenced by Intervention Mapping guidelines (Bartholomew et al., 2016)
Phase 3 Results: Action plan

Three strategies:
1. Conduct ongoing training
2. Identify agency staff “champions” to promote implementation from within
3. Change the record system (intake forms and case notes)

Phase 4: Implement action plan

Questions
Is target action plan feasible? Does it appear to be potentially effective for: a) Improving organizational capacity? b) Improving service to clients?

Participants
15 agency staff (incl. 2 agency “champions”)

Instruments
Pretest/Posttest survey; IDI guide for champions; client database; monthly outcome data
Phase 4: Process and methods

1. Conduct ongoing training
   1. April 2019 Pretest
   2. May 2019 Webinar
   3. June 2019 Training #1
   4. January 2020 Training #2
   5. February 2020 Posttest

2. Identify staff “champions”
   May 2019 identified
   MCADSV Economic Advocacy training Nov 2019

3. Change the record system
   - Intake form
   - Monthly outcome data
   - March 2019 – March 2020
Phase 4: Process

Indicators added to monthly outcome survey:

- Job training resources
- Getting a job
- Govt. benefits
- Recognize signs financial abuse
- Access/understand credit report
- Access credit-debt counseling
- Budgeting, saving, financial goals
- Financial safety planning
## Phase 4: Measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff training</th>
<th>Champions</th>
<th>Change record system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- REAP Feelings About Money (ROW)</td>
<td>- In-depth interviews</td>
<td>- Monthly outcome data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FWB (CFPB)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Client service hours data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Self-efficacy (YMYG-CFPB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Phase 4: Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff training</th>
<th>Champions</th>
<th>Change record system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Pretest – Posttest: Minimal changes in scores</td>
<td>- “...financial makes it so incredibly hard, because those effects last far longer than the physical ...they get really excited when you can get stuff off their credit score...”</td>
<td>- Did you get help you needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td>- NEW: Financial Literacy, 12 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 10 Clients, avg. 2.2 hrs/ea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 4: Findings

“Did you get the help you needed?”

- 55% Needed FCAB help
- 64% Got all the FCAB help needed

- 78% Access benefits
- 77% Credit report
- 48% Signs of FA
- 53% Financial safety planning
Study limitations

• Single site case study
• Observational, descriptive
• Staff turnover
Implications and next steps
Implications

• Determinants of practice are likely relevant for IPV survivors in other settings (VonDe Linde & Correia, 2005)

• May also be relevant for other service agencies: particularly small, community-based agencies, flat organizational structures

• Relevant for other populations in different settings, e.g. social work educators (Hageman, Sherraden, Birkenmaier, & Loke, 2019)
Where do we go?

• We invite additional research on scaling up FCAB programming under the voluntary, survivor led model unique to DSV agencies.

• Questions for participants:
  • If a useful process, where else might we apply it? (implications for practice)
  • What other questions should we be asking? (implications for research)
Thank you!
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