Meera Kumanan ([00:00](#)):

We saw how Triple P is being rolled out, adopted and scaled up within this region. And the Albemarle team especially emphasized its renewed focus on equity, but what does this look like on a broader scale? This field has always been committed to reducing health disparities, but in the past year, I think we've had more concrete conversations and had a renewed commitment towards promoting equity in everything that we do. Will, could you talk a little bit more about the conversations surrounding equity that have taken place in the field of implementation science in the past year or so?

Will Aldridge ([00:35](#)):

What is the role of equity, not just in this project work or at the institutional level but I think at the, the larger field level, what is the role of equity and inclusion in prevention science and implementation science? Because I see that both of those fields, while in prevention science, I think the questions of racial equity and inclusion have always been there. They've always been discussed and recognized. Again, that's different than structuring things in a different way, right? As a scientific enterprise and implementation science, I think both are happening at the same time, it's a younger field. It hasn't been around, you know, more than 20 years or so, and that may be overstating it a bit, but both fields are really trying to look at large scale change and large scale outcomes, public health impact. And when we're talking and thinking about public health impact, there's really a recognition that we can not just focus just population level outcomes, population level outcomes.

Will Aldridge ([01:46](#)):

If we're, if we're changing them, that's great, but it can also hide inequities and disparity. We really have to unpack, not just overall are things getting better, but at the same time are inequities and, and particularly disparities and outcomes reducing both implementation science, I would say particularly implementation science, but also prevention science really do work at the systems level. Both of them are looking at policy, they're looking at system structures and teaming structures and leadership structures and community and how community works. And so since we're already in there trying to work with those elements, if you will, to try and generate stronger outcomeswe can, and we must take the responsibility to look at the inequities that might be present in those policies, in those system elements. And by doing that, we can really get much better and more consistent at, again, not just achieving population level impacts and benefits, but simultaneously reducing disparities in outcomes and reducing system inequities as well.

Meera Kumanan ([03:04](#)):

What does that mean for the future of implementation practice? What are we changing and how are we tracking those changes so that we can be better and help reduce these disparities rather than contributing to them?

Will Aldridge ([03:17](#)):

We can commit to this. We can articulate that commitment, we can say that commitment out loud and publicly, but what do we need to do to change the structures and the practices, whether that's at the institute level, whether that's at our project team level and then how are we gonna know that's happening for us and, and our project work? We are looking at how this shows up in things like our practice model, how this shows up and the resources that we are bringing to our partners, to our funders. We are looking at this and the type of data we collect and how we're using data. Are we collecting information on race and ethnicity? Are we identifying where there might be disparities? And

then looking structurally back mapping at, you know, what might be contributing to these disparities. We're looking at the diversity in our teaming structures, but we're also looking not just in who's involved, but how are they involved?

Will Aldridge (04:22):

How are we sharing power as well, and the makeup of our project teams, our work group teams, and that type of data, that type of evidence should be starting to come in in the next year or two if we're doing that. Well, my hope is that we're already starting to see the benefits of, you know, the ability to have these conversations. I, I see that in our work at FPG. I see that in our work, in our project teams and our work group teams. Having those conversations in a very different way, building trust with each other and, and really setting a common envision that everybody is involved in contributing to not just the leaders, not just the funders. But folks I believe are, are hopefully starting to see their fingerprint on the blueprints for the future particularly at our project team level and our work group level.

Meera Kumanan (05:21):

Throughout this episode, we've seen how moving forward in implementation practice, whether that be informing partnerships in adopting and scaling up programs, or even driving equity within the field of implementation, science requires community engagement, authentic community buy-in, and foundational relationships that we heard from all of our guests today. To learn more about community-engaged implementation science or implementation practice at work, visit impact.fpg.unc.edu. This episode was produced and edited by Meera Kumanan. Original music by Robin Jenkins, Artwork by Julie Chin. Special thanks for concept and creation to Sandra Diehl, Meera Kumanan, Will Aldridge, Devin Minch, and Capri McDonald. Technical advice from Katherine Neer and funding from the Duke Endowment in the North Carolina Division of Social Services.