

OMB Control Number: _____
Expiration Date: _____
Length of time for instrument: 1.50 hours

**ATTACHMENT 2: MIHOPE FIRST ROUND VISITS WITH STATE
ADMINISTRATORS**

1/25/2012

Draft AGENDA for Meeting with State Administrators

Thank you for taking time to meet with the MIHOPE study team. As a reminder, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has contracted with MDRC to evaluate the federal Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting program (MIECHV). We expect this meeting to take one and a half hours. We will be using the meet to answer your questions about the study and to learn more about your state and local program sites in order to help us choose states and sites for the evaluation. As you may remember, the MIECHV legislation requires this national evaluation and your state provided assurances about your willingness to participate in the evaluation, if selected. All information provided in these discussions will be kept private to the extent permitted by law.

Participants: (names of all those attending)

I. Introductions

II. Study overview and discussion

- Project description
- Research questions and Study design
- Benefits of participation
- Roles and responsibilities
- MIHOPE timeline
- Steps for site selection

III. Discussion of key state information


- State administrative records
- Sites that are likely to be suitable for the evaluation
- Next steps

Adjourn

Slide 1



Slide 2



Slide 3

What is MIHOPE?

Mother and Infant Home Visiting Program Evaluation

- ▶ Large-scale evaluation of the effectiveness of home visiting models supported by MIECHV
- ▶ Includes 85 program sites in 12 states nationwide
- ▶ Focuses on models serving at-risk expectant families and infants to 6 months

12/16/11 3

Slide 4

Who is Conducting MIHOPE?

Sponsored by: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning Research and Evaluation (OPRE) and Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA)

Authorization: Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program (MIECHV), Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010

Project Team:

- ▶ MDRC
- ▶ James Bell Associates
- ▶ Johns Hopkins University
- ▶ Mathematica Policy Research

12/16/11 4

Slide 5

What Questions Will MIHOPE Answer?

MIHOPE is designed to answer three main questions:

- How do local programs operate and who are the families who participate?
- Do MIECHV services make a difference in the lives of the families that are served?
- What are the costs of running a home-visiting program?

12/16/11 5

Slide 6

What Home Visiting Models are in MIHOPE?

- ▶ Evidence-based models supported with MIECHV funding
- ▶ Models serving expectant families or those with infants
- ▶ Models selected for implementation by at least 10 states
- ▶ Models:
 - Early Head Start–Home Visiting
 - Healthy Families America
 - Nurse Family Partnership
 - Parents as Teachers

12/16/11 6

Slide 7

Three components of the evaluation design

- ▶ Analysis of state needs assessments
- ▶ Effectiveness study
 - Reports variation in impacts for sites and populations with different characteristics
 - Incorporates study of health disparities and outcomes
 - Includes implementation study
- ▶ Economic evaluation

12/16/11 7

Slide 8

What are the Benefits to Participation in the Evaluation?

- ▶ National recognition for your state and MIECHV program
- ▶ Builds strong evidence base to inform home visiting policy decision making
- ▶ Provides information on what differences home visiting programs make
- ▶ Funds to support staff participation in research activities
- ▶ Provides program and state feedback about program participation

12/16/11 8

Slide 9

What is Random Assignment?

- ▶ A lottery-like process to place individuals into a program group and a comparison group
- ▶ Increases the likelihood that groups have similar characteristics on average before treatment, so the differences over time in the outcomes for the groups is more likely the effect of the program services offered to the program group
- ▶ Allows you to measure the impacts (effects) on outcomes for each group, not for individuals in the groups

12/16/11 9

Slide 10

Why Use Random Assignment?

- ▶ Fair and equitable way to determine who receives program services
- ▶ More reliable way to measure program effects than statistical controls alone
- ▶ Widely used in social service settings
- ▶ Endorsed by:
 - The Department of Health and Human Services
 - The Office of Management and Budget
 - The Department of Labor
 - The Department of Education
 - Other federal and private agencies

12/16/11 10

Slide 11

How Random Assignment Measures Impacts: Example from National Guard Youth Challenge Program

Educational Attainment			
Outcome (%)	Challenge	Comparison	Difference
Has High School diploma or GED	71.8	55.5	16.2***
HS Diploma	30.3	26.6	3.7
GED	56.9	34.5	22.4***
Earned any college credit	34.9	18.8	16.1***
Employment in the Past 12 Months			
Employed	88.4	84.5	3.9*
Earnings (\$)	13,515	11,248	2,266***
Number of months employed	8.1	7.2	0.9***

12/16/11

11

Slide 12

What are We Looking for in Local Programs?

- ▶ Operating location that can recruit approx. 60 families in 12–15 months and provide services to 30
- ▶ Has more than 2 years experience offering home visiting services
- ▶ Is offering at least 1 of the 4 models selected for evaluation
- ▶ Would be willing to implement research procedures

12/16/11 12

Slide 13

What Will State /Programs Do?

States:

- ▶ Facilitate agency's recruitment of program sites
- ▶ Help negotiate access to state administrative records for purposes of the study

Programs:

- ▶ Recruit and enroll 60 couples (30 in the program group and 30 in the comparison group)
- ▶ Staff and administration participate in interviews and surveys
- ▶ Provide program records such as staffing, training, and cost information
- ▶ Complete and submit program participation logs
- ▶ Facilitate home visits videotaped by research staff (9 families, 2 visits each)

12/16/11 13

Slide 14

What Will the Research Team Do?


- ▶ Explain research design and provide training on research procedures
- ▶ Enroll program participants in the study and collect consent forms
- ▶ Collect data through surveys, interviews, observations, and program and administrative records
- ▶ Provide funding to programs to offset costs of research participation
- ▶ Analyze data, provide results, and disseminate information

12/16/11

14

Slide 15

Summary of Enrollment



¹We anticipate that in 15 percent of cases, field staff will be present when eligibility is determined. In the other 85 percent of cases, field staff tasks take place during a separate visit.

12/16/11

15

Slide 16

What are the Stages of State/ Program Site Selection?

- ▶ Meet with study team to learn more about the evaluation and provide information
- ▶ Discuss research design and reach agreement on roles and responsibilities
- ▶ Prepare for research enrollment and data collection
- ▶ Implement evaluation procedures
- ▶ Study team monitors research procedures and provides feedback

12/16/11 16

Slide 17

What is the MIHOPE Timeline?

Phase 1

- ▶ Site recruitment and selection: 2012
- ▶ Enroll families in the evaluation: mid 2012 through 2014
- ▶ Report to Congress on characteristics of enrolled families: 2015

Phase 2 (date is tentative)

- ▶ Report on program impacts: 2017

12/16/11 17

Slide 18

Need More Information?

If you would like additional information about

logo

please contact us at:

Sharon.rowser@mdrc.org

Lauren.supplee@acf.hhs.gov

12/16/11

18

DISCUSSION TOPICS ABOUT KEY SITE INFORMATION

Thank you for taking time to meet with the MIHOPE study team. As a reminder, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has contracted with MDRC to evaluate the federal Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting program (MIECHV). We expect this meeting to take one and a half hours. We will be using the meet to answer your questions about the study and to learn more about your state and local program sites in order to help us choose states and sites for the evaluation. As you may remember, the MIECHV legislation requires this national evaluation and your state provided assurances about your willingness to participate in the evaluation, if selected. All information provided in these discussions will be kept private to the extent permitted by law.

Discussion Topics about Key Site Information

Administrative Structure

- Organizational structure of administering agency; governing boards; other programs operating in same agency; how long organization and home visiting programs have been in operation; expected stability of non-MIECHV funding
- Service Delivery Structure; # home visitors; supervision; training; staff qualifications of HVs; length of time HVs delivered model; staff turnover rate
- Intensity of program services; duration; frequency of contact; rate of program attrition.
- Ways MIECHV funds are being used; hiring new home visitors; expanding caseload of existing home visitors
- Local context; alternative community services, specifically presence of other home-visiting programs or center-based programs.
- Other evaluation activities going on at organization or within home visiting program
- Timing of program model recertification
- For EBHV sites: As grants end, are you continuing with MIECHV funds?

Recruitment and Enrollment Schedule

- Target population; race/ethnicity; military; other special populations, such as teens, foster kids, immigrant families etc.
- Marketing and outreach; methods used to recruit; length of recruitment period; type of referral sources; most common referral sources; any families that are exempted from intake process (i.e. immediately get into program)

OMB Control Number: _____

Expiration Date: _____

- Screening and intake process; any centralized activities; summary of number of families and timing from applicant through intake; exceptions made to the intake process; evidence of demand (waitlists, lotteries)
- Enrollment; total number enrolled; ways families are notified; referrals elsewhere if not enrolled

Data Systems

- Type of management information systems used at local program site (i.e. How are the systems used? What goes in them and when?)

Other research feasibility questions

- Concerns about the buy-in of local program referral sources?
- Concerns about service contrast?
- Concerns about sufficient pool?
- Concerns about random assignment?