OMB Control No:
Expiration Date:
Length of time for instrument: 2.00 hours

ATTACHMENT 7: MIHOPE STATE ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW_BASELINE

5/29/2012 Edited 9/12/2012

OMB Control No:	_
Expiration Date:	

STATE ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW - BASELINE

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has contracted with MDRC to evaluate the federal Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Program.

The Mother and Infant Home Visiting Program Evaluation (MIHOPE) is designed to build knowledge for policymakers and practitioners about the effectiveness of MIECHV.

MIHOPE gathers information from many different perspectives—state administrators, home visiting program staff, community service providers, and families.

Your answers will be kept confidential. Only the research team will have access to this information. Your answers will not be shared with anyone at your program or any other agencies. In our research reports, the information you provide will not be attributed by name to you or your individual program.

One objective of MIHOPE is to learn how implementing agencies and other organizations work together to design and implement home visiting program services. We are requesting that you participate in this interview because you are a state administrator of one of the states participating in MIHOPE. Your answers will help us understand your state's home visiting programs and implementation systems.

The following request will be sent to the state MIECHV Administrator approximately one month before the interview: Before we meet to discuss your state's MIECHV program, please provide us with the written contracts you are using with the sites participating in the MIECHV evaluation (MIHOPE). These materials will help us to use your time most efficiently by focusing our discussion on aspects of the program that are not available in writing. We are also enclosing a list of agencies or organizations that may or may not be involved in your state's MIECHV program. Prior to our interview, please indicate on the form if an organization was involved in shaping or changing a particular aspect of the MIECHV program. This will help facilitate our conversation.

Timing of Interview

The interview will occur either in-person or via phone around the time the site's first families are enrolled in the study.

Purpose of Interview

The purpose of this interview is to understand more about your experiences at the state level implementing the MIECHV program. Your experience and opinions are very important to us, and we want to thank you for taking the time to speak with us.

Your comments will remain confidential, and we will not quote your name in any publications or presentations about this project. Do you have any questions for me before we begin?

OMB Control No:	_
Expiration Date:	

A. PAST HISTORY OF THIS STATE AGENCY IN ADMINISTERING HOME VISITING PROGRAMS

Some MIECHV lead agencies were involved in home visiting programs before this program began, and some were not. In this section, we will ask about your agency's involvement in home visiting before launching your MIECHV program.

1.	Did your agency fund home visiting programs prior to MIECHV?
	□ Yes
	□ No [SKIP TO 3]
2.	Which home visiting program(s) did your agency fund?
	□ HFA
	□ PAT
	□ EHS
	☐ Other program models
	\square Did not require a specific model in order for site to receive funding
3.	Did your state have a state-operated home visiting program prior to the enactment of MIECHV?
	□ Yes
	□ No
4.	Did your agency play a role in developing infrastructure such as MIS systems, intake processes
	or other implementation strategies before MIECHV?
	□ MIS
	☐ Intake processes
	☐ Other implementation strategies (specify)
5.	Did any other state agencies also fund home visiting programs?
	☐ Yes
	☐ No [SKIP TO NEXT SECTION]
6.	Which state agenc(ies)?
7.	Which home visiting program(s)?
	□ NFP
	□ HFA
	FD3

		 □ Other program models □ Models varied / Did not require a specific model in order for site to receive funding □ Not sure
	8.	If multiple state agencies funded home visiting, did the agencies work collaboratively on these programs prior to MIECHV? Yes
		□ No
В.	D	EVELOPMENT OF STATE NEEDS ASSESSMENTS
	1.	As I understand from your FY10 state plan, [XX, YY, and ZZ] were key stakeholders in the developing the needs assessment and developing the state plan. Is that correct? \[\subseteq \text{Yes} \] \[\subseteq \text{No} \]
	2.	Who else was actively involved (such as other state agencies, model developers, community representatives, etc.)? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]
		National program model or developer Federal government State agency operating MIECHV program Agency operating the local program State's Title V agency Title II of the Child Abuse Prevention State child welfare agency Single state agency for substance abuse services State's Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Director of the State's Head Start State Collaboration Office State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care authorized by 642B(b) (1)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act State's Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B Section 619 lead agency/ies State's Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I or State pre-kindergarten program State's Medicaid/Children's Health Insurance program (or the person responsible for Medicaid Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT) Program) State's Domestic Violence Coalition State's Public Health agency State agency charged with crime reduction State's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) agency
		☐ State's Injury Prevention and Control (Public Health Injury Surveillance and Prevention) program☐ Other:

	OMB Control No: Expiration Date:
3.	Additional comments: Please describe the general decision process and how the different stakeholders were part of this process.
C. US	SE OF THE NEEDS ASSESSMENT TO CHOOSE TARGET COMMUNITIES
	re'll get into some more specifics about how you developed your needs assessments and how informed decisions about your program.
1.	I understand that [XX, YY, and ZZ] are communities that are targeted in your state plan for FY10, FY11, and/or FY12. Is this correct? Yes, partly Yes, fully [SKIP TO 3] No
2.	What are the formula targeted communities?
3.	I understand that [XX, YY, and ZZ] are competitive communities that are targeted in your state plan for FY10, FY11, and/or FY12. Is this correct? Yes, partly Yes, fully [SKIP TO 5] No
4.	What are the competitive targeted communities?
5.	How did your state go about identifying these communities to be part of MIECHV?
6.	Were the needs assessments used in this process? ☐ Yes ☐ No [SKIP TO 8]
7.	How were the needs assessments used in this process?

8.	What other needs assessments did your state build on and how useful did you find those for this particular purpose?				
9.	Did you	rank communities to help identify priority communities? ☐ Yes ☐ No [SKIP TO 11]			
10.	. How d	lid you rank communities to identify priority communities?			
11.	-	our initial needs assessment, has your set of targeted communities changed, whether in a plans or competitive plans? Yes No [SKIP TO 13]			
12.	. How d	lid they change?			
13.	. Do yo	u anticipate this set of communities changing in future state MIECHV plans? Ves No [SKIP TO NEXT SECTION]			
14.	. How d	lo you anticipate this set of communities changing in future state MIECHV plans?			
Now I h	have a siı	THE NEEDS ASSESSMENT TO CHOOSE TARGET SUBGROUPS milar set of questions about how your state went about choosing subgroups of families our MIECHV program.			
1.		and that [XX, YY, and ZZ] are populations that are particularly targeted by your MIECHV n. Is this correct? Yes, partly Yes, fully [SKIP TO 3] No			
2.	What are	e the targeted populations?			

3.	How did	your state go about identifying populations to be targeted in your MIECHV program?
4.		e needs assessments used in this process? ☐ Yes ☐ No [SKIP TO 6]
5.	How wer	re the needs assessments used in this process?
6.		ner needs assessments did your state build on and how useful did you find those for this ar purpose?
7.	-	rank populations to help identify priority groups? ☐ Yes ☐ No [SKIP TO 9]
8.	How did	you rank populations to help identify priority groups?
9.		et of targeted populations change between the 2010 and 2011 plans (and competitive applicable)? Yes No [SKIP TO 11]
10		d the set of targeted populations change between the 2010 and 2011 plans (and itive plan if applicable)?
11		set of targeted populations changed since you submitted your 2011 plans (and itive plan if applicable), for example due to the FY12 update? □ Yes □ No [SKIP TO 13]

12	. How has the set of targeted populations changed since you submitted your 2011 plans (and competitive plan if applicable)?
13	Do you anticipate this set of target groups changing in future state MIECHV plans? ☐ Yes ☐ No [SKIP TO SECTION E]
14	. How do you anticipate this set of target groups changing in future state MIECHV plans?
	IOICE OF EVIDENCE-BASED PROGRAM MODEL I understand that your program is funding program sites that are using the [XX, YY, and ZZ]
	national model(s). Is this correct? ☐ Yes, partly ☐ Yes, fully [SKIP TO 3] ☐ No
2.	What models are you using?
3.	How did your state go about deciding which national program model(s) to use?
4.	Were the needs assessments used in making this decision? ☐ Yes ☐ No [SKIP TO 6]
5.	In what ways did the needs assessments inform your decision?
6.	Who else was actively involved in model selection? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

E.

		☐ Federal government
		☐ State agency operating MIECHV program
		☐ Agency operating the local program
		☐ State's Title V agency
		☐ Title II of the Child Abuse Prevention
		☐ State child welfare agency
		☐ Single state agency for substance abuse services
		☐ State's Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF)
		☐ Director of the State's Head Start State Collaboration Office
		\square State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care authorized by 642B(b) (1)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act
		☐ State's Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B Section 619 lead agency/ies
		☐ State's Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I or State pre-kindergarten
		program ☐ State's Medicaid/Children's Health Insurance program (or the person responsible for
		Medicaid Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT) Program)
		☐ State's Domestic Violence Coalition
		☐ State's Mental Health agency
		☐ State's Public Health agency
		☐ State agency charged with crime reduction
		☐ State's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) agency
		☐ State's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) agency
		\square State's Injury Prevention and Control (Public Health Injury Surveillance and
		Prevention) program
		☐ Other :
		Additional comments:
7.	•	ou made any changes in your selection of models since your FY11 state plan (or itive plan, if applicable) was submitted, for example due to the FY12 update? Ves No [SKIP TO 9]
		LINO [SKIP TO 9]
8.	If so, pl	ease describe those changes.
9.	Do you	anticipate this set of models changing in future state MIECHV plans?
		□ Yes
		□ No [SKIP TO NEXT SECTION]
10.	How o	lo you anticipate this set of models changing in future state MIECHV plans?

OMB Control No:	
Expiration Date:	

F	CLIDDENIT	INVOLVEMENT	. UE STAKEHUI DED	S IN PLANNING PROCES
Г.	LURREINI	HINVLA VEIVIEINI	CE SIAREDULIER	3 IIV PI AIVIVIIVU PRULES

• •		
	1.	You mentioned that [XX, YY, and ZZ] were involved in the initial decision process in MIECHV. To what extent, and through what mechanisms, are these stakeholders part of the continuing planning process for MIECHV? [INTERVIEWER: CHECK ANY THAT APPLY AND DESCRIBE IF NEEDED].
		☐ State MIECHV task force
		☐ Regularly scheduled meetings between particular stakeholders. Which ones? (specify):
		☐ MOUs between state agencies
		For what purposes? (specify):
		☐ Other formal mechanisms (specify):
	CC	THER HOME VISITING PROGRAMS OPERATING IN POTENTIAL EVALUATION OMMUNITIES
		/IEWER DESCRIBES]. Your needs assessment provided information about the other home visiting ms operating in the state.
	1.	Is it your understanding that these models/programs are still operating?
		☐ Yes [SKIP TO 3] ☐ No
	2.	Why are they not being implemented anymore?
	3.	Are you aware of any other home visiting models being implemented that were not mentioned in your state plan?
н.		THER CHANGES IN STATE'S MIECHV PROGRAM SINCE STATE 2011 PLAN AS SUBMITTED
	1.	Have you made any other fundamental changes to your MIECHV formula program since your FY11 state plan was submitted, beyond those that we already discussed, for example due to the FY12 update? These might be changes in communities, target populations, national models, or other aspects of your program. <i>Please answer even if MIHOPE sites were not involved</i> .
		☐ Yes ☐ No [SKIP TO QUESTION 3]

OMB Control No:	_
Expiration Date:	_

2.	Can you describe those changes? Why were these changes made?
3.	Who advocated for these changes? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]
	☐ Stakeholder group
	☐ National program model or developer
	☐ Federal government
	\square State agency operating MIECHV program
	\square Agency operating the local program
	☐ State's Title V agency
	☐ Title II of the Child Abuse Prevention
	☐ State child welfare agency
	☐ Single state agency for substance abuse services
	☐ State's Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF)
	☐ Director of the State's Head Start State Collaboration Office
	☐ State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care authorized by 642B(b) (1)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act
	\square State's Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B Section 619 lead agency/ies
	☐ State's Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I or State pre-kindergarten
	program
	☐ State's Medicaid/Children's Health Insurance program (or the person responsible for
	Medicaid Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT) Program)
	☐ State's Domestic Violence Coalition
	☐ State's Mental Health agency
	☐ State's Public Health agency
	☐ State agency charged with crime reduction☐ State's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) agency
	☐ State's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) agency
	☐ State's Injury Prevention and Control (Public Health Injury Surveillance and
	Prevention) program
	☐ Other:
	Additional comments:
	Additional comments.
4.	Have you made any other fundamental changes to your MIECHV competitive program since
	your FY11 state plan was submitted, beyond those that we already discussed?
	your First state plan was submitted, beyond those that we already discussed.
	☐ Yes
	☐ No [SKIP TO SECTION I]
5.	Can you describe those changes? Why were these changes made?

OMB Control No:	_
Expiration Date:	_

6.	Who ad	vocated for these changes? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]
		Stakeholder group National program model or developer Federal government State agency operating MIECHV program Agency operating the local program State's Title V agency Title II of the Child Abuse Prevention State child welfare agency Single state agency for substance abuse services State's Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Director of the State's Head Start State Collaboration Office State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care authorized by 642B(b) (1)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act State's Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B Section 619 lead agency/ies State's Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I or State pre-kindergarten program State's Medicaid/Children's Health Insurance program (or the person responsible for Medicaid Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT) Program) State's Domestic Violence Coalition State's Public Health agency State agency charged with crime reduction State's Public Health agency State agency charged with crime reduction State's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) agency State's Injury Prevention and Control (Public Health Injury Surveillance and Prevention) program Other: Additional comments: Additional comments:
EN	IHANCE	CISIONS TO CHANGE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA, ADAPTATIONS, OR EMENTS, AND STAFF TRAINING AND SUPERVISION RELATIVE TO ALL MODELS
1.	the eligi	state made any decisions about eligibility criteria for MIECHV that narrow or broaden bility criteria relative to the eligibility criteria usually used by the national models being your MIECHV program?
		☐ Yes ☐ No [SKIP TO 4]
2.	Can you	describe those changes?

I.

OMB Control No:
Expiration Date:

3.	Who advocated for these changes relative to the national model? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]
	Stakeholder group National program model or developer Federal government State agency operating MIECHV program Agency operating the local program State's Title V agency Title II of the Child Abuse Prevention State child welfare agency or substance abuse services State's Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Director of the State's Head Start State Collaboration Office State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care authorized by 642B(b) (1)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act State's Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B Section 619 lead agency/ies State's Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I or State pre-kindergarten program State's Medicaid/Children's Health Insurance program (or the person responsible for Medicaid Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT) Program) State's Mental Health agency State's Public Health agency State's Public Health agency State's Public Health agency State's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) agency State's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) agency State's Injury Prevention and Control (Public Health Injury Surveillance and Prevention) program Other: Additional comments:
4.	Has the state made any decisions about the intended duration of home visiting services for families for MIECHV that narrow or broaden the service duration recommended by the national models being used in your MIECHV program?
	☐ Yes ☐ No [SKIP TO 7]
5.	Can you describe those changes?
6.	Who advocated for these changes relative to the national model? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY] ☐ Stakeholder group

	National program model or developer Federal government State agency operating MIECHV program Agency operating the local program State's Title V agency Title II of the Child Abuse Prevention State child welfare agency Single state agency for substance abuse services State's Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Director of the State's Head Start State Collaboration Office State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care authorized by 642B(b) (1)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act State's Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B Section 619 lead agency/ies State's Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I or State pre-kindergarten program State's Medicaid/Children's Health Insurance program (or the person responsible for Medicaid Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT) Program) State's Domestic Violence Coalition State's Mental Health agency State's Public Health agency State's Public Health agency State's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) agency State's Injury Prevention and Control (Public Health Injury Surveillance and Prevention) program Other : Additional comments:
7.	Has the state asked the local MIECHV programs to implement any adaptations to the national models? $\hfill \mbox{$\square$ Yes}$
	□ No [SKIP TO 10]
8.	Can you describe those changes?
9.	Who advocated for these changes relative to the national model? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY Stakeholder group National program model or developer Federal government State agency operating MIECHV program Agency operating the local program State's Title V agency

	 □ Title II of the Child Abuse Prevention □ State child welfare agency □ Single state agency for substance abuse services □ State's Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) □ Director of the State's Head Start State Collaboration Office □ State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care authorized by 642B(b)
	(1)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act ☐ State's Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B Section 619 lead agency/ies
	☐ State's Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I or State pre-kindergarten program
	 □ State's Medicaid/Children's Health Insurance program (or the person responsible for Medicaid Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT) Program) □ State's Domestic Violence Coalition
	☐ State's Mental Health agency
	□ State's Public Health agency□ State agency charged with crime reduction
	☐ State's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) agency
	 □ State's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) agency □ State's Injury Prevention and Control (Public Health Injury Surveillance and Prevention) program □ Other:
	Additional comments:
10. Has the models?	state asked the local MIECHV programs to adopt any enhancements to the national?
	□ Yes
	□ No [SKIP TO 13]
11. Can you	describe those changes?
	vocated for these changes relative to the national model?
	☐ Stakeholder group
	□ National program model or developer□ Federal government
	☐ State agency operating MIECHV program
	☐ Agency operating the local program
	☐ State's Title V agency
	☐ Title II of the Child Abuse Prevention ☐ State child welfare agency
	☐ Single state agency for substance abuse services
	☐ State's Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) ☐ Director of the State's Head Start State Collaboration Office

	☐ State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care authorized by 642B(b) (1)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act ☐ State's Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B Section 619
	lead agency/ies State's Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I or State pre-kindergarten
	program State's Medicaid/Children's Health Insurance program (or the person responsible for Medicaid Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT) Program) State's Domestic Violence Coalition State's Mental Health agency
	☐ State's Public Health agency
	☐ State agency charged with crime reduction ☐ State's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) agency
	☐ State's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) agency ☐ State's Injury Prevention and Control (Public Health Injury Surveillance and Prevention) program
	Other:Additional comments:
13. Does your a MIECHV sites?	gency provide any training or TA, including state-wide meetings or conferences, to
	☐ Yes ☐ No [SKIP TO 15]
14. What traini	ng and TA activities do you provide? Are they required?
15. Does any ot MIECHV sites?	ther agency provide any training or TA, including state-wide meetings or conferences, to
	☐ Yes ☐ No [SKIP TO 17]
16. Which agen	cy(ies), and what training and TA activities do they provide?
	☐ Stakeholder group ☐ National program model or developer ☐ Fodoral program and
	 ☐ Federal government ☐ State agency operating MIECHV program ☐ Agency operating the local program
	☐ State's Title V agency ☐ Title II of the Child Abuse Prevention ☐ State child welfare agency
	☐ State child wehare agency ☐ Single state agency for substance abuse services ☐ State's Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF)
	□ Director of the State's Head Start State Collaboration Office

	State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care authorized by 642B(b)
•	L)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act
	State's Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B Section 619 and agency/ies
	State's Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I or State pre-kindergarten
рі	rogram
M	State's Medicaid/Children's Health Insurance program (or the person responsible for dedicaid Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT) Program) State's Domestic Violence Coalition State's Mental Health agency
	State's Mental Health agency
	State agency charged with crime reduction
	State's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) agency
	State's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) agency
	State's Injury Prevention and Control (Public Health Injury Surveillance and
	revention) program] Other :
	dditional comments:
requir	ne state asked the local MIECHV programs to make any changes to the supervision red for home visitors relative to that required by the national models? Yes
	No [SKIP TO SECTION J]
18. Can y	ou describe those changes?
_	
19. Who a	advocated for these changes relative to the national model? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]
	Stakeholder group
	National program model or developer
	Federal government State agency operating MIECHV program
	Agency operating the local program
	State's Title V agency
	Title II of the Child Abuse Prevention
	State child welfare agency
	Single state agency for substance abuse services
	State's Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF)
	Director of the State's Head Start State Collaboration Office State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care authorized by 643P/b)
	State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care authorized by 642B(b) (L)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act
-	[](A)(I) Of the riead start Act] State's Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B Section 619
	ead agency/ies

	□ State's Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I or State pre-kindergarten program □ State's Medicaid/Children's Health Insurance program (or the person responsible for Medicaid Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT) Program) □ State's Domestic Violence Coalition □ State's Mental Health agency □ State's Public Health agency □ State agency charged with crime reduction □ State's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) agency □ State's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) agency □ State's Injury Prevention and Control (Public Health Injury Surveillance and Prevention) program □ Other: Additional comments:
J. AC	COUNTABILITY MECHANISMS
-	VIEWER WILL HAVE A LIST OF FEDERAL BENCHMARK DOMAINS TO REFER TO IF NEEDED]. As part CHV, states are required to monitor and periodically report on the federal benchmark areas.
1.	Please describe your state's system for collecting and analyzing benchmark data.
2.	At the state level, how do you use or plan to use the information you collect about federal benchmarks? [INTERVIEWER: CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]
	 □ Primarily for federal reporting purposes □ To identify needs for technical assistance to programs
	☐ To identify training needs for staff
	 □ Benchmarks are incorporated into our state's contracts with local MIECHV programs □ For state CQI purposes □ Other (specify):
3.	How is the funding awarded to local MIECHV programs in your state?
4.	If by contract, is performance reporting incorporated into the contracts?
5.	What does the state consider programs to be accountable for?

J.

6.	What are the consequences if the programs do not meet their performance requirements?
7.	What additional monitoring mechanisms are used?
8.	Do you have a state level MIS system for your MIECHV program? ☐ Yes, some program sites use it (List which ones:) ☐ Yes, all program sites use it ☐ No [SKIP TO 12]
9.	What kind of information does it collect? Family eligibility information Dates / types of services delivered Screening results for children Screening results for parents Outcomes for children Outcomes for parents Provision of information activities Education activities Support activities Referrals Benchmark area-related indicators Other(s)
10.	What levels of staff and management receive reports from this MIS system?
11.	How frequently are these reports generated and how are they used?
	Does your state have a Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) plan? ☐ Yes ☐ No [SKIP TO 16]
13.	What COI activities do you have in place now?

14. Who is responsible for implementing the CQI plan?	
15. Is your current MIS system sufficient for the CQI proce	esses you would like to use?
☐ Yes ☐ No	
16. Who was actively involved in the development of and reporting, and accountability systems? [CHECK ALL TH	
☐ Stakeholder group	
☐ National program model or developer	
☐ Federal government	
☐ State agency operating MIECHV program	
☐ Agency operating the local program	
☐ State's Title V agency	
☐ Title II of the Child Abuse Prevention	
☐ State child welfare agency☐ Single state agency for substance abuse set	nuicos
☐ State's Child Care and Development Fund (
☐ Director of the State's Head Start State Col	
☐ State Advisory Council on Early Childhood B	
(1)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act	radeation and care admonized by 0 125(b)
☐ State's Individuals with Disabilities Education	on Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B Section 619
☐ State's Elementary and Secondary Education	on Act Title I or State pre-kindergarten
program	
☐ State's Medicaid/Children's Health Insuran	
Medicaid Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis,	and Treatment (EPSDT) Program)
☐ State's Domestic Violence Coalition	
☐ State's Mental Health agency☐ State's Public Health agency	
☐ State s rubilc realth agency ☐ State agency charged with crime reduction	
☐ State agency charged with chine reduction ☐ State's Temporary Assistance for Needy Fa	
☐ State's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance I	
☐ State's Injury Prevention and Control (Publ	
Prevention) program	
□ Other :	
Additional comments:	

OMB Control No:	
Expiration Date:	

K. STATE PERSPECTIVES ON PROGRAM GOALS AND OUTCOMES

<u>Instructions:</u> In this section, we would like to learn how state administrators perceive their state's intended outcomes, as well as any training or TA provided to achieve those outcomes. Home visiting programs vary in the outcomes they try to achieve with families. In general, a program outcome is a benefit to a child, parent, or family. For example, some states might see the improvement of prenatal health as an important outcome.

Below is a list of possible outcomes. We know your state may care about all of these benefits for your families. However, we would like to get a sense of which outcomes your state has identified as more important than others. We would like you to check the box that best represents what you think your state MIECHV program believes about the outcome. To help you decide on an outcome's rank, think about whether it is discussed routinely in training and in communication to local agencies and programs.

programs	i.									
	_		-		MIECHV progr et, exercise, re				uch of a	priority
□ 0 Not a Priority at All	1	2	3	4	5 Moderate Priority	6	7	8	9	□ 10 Highes Priority
	_		-		MIECHV progr e-term birth an				uch of a	priority
□ 0 Not a Priority at All	1	2	3	4	□ 5 Moderate Priority	6	□ 7	8	9	☐ 10 Highes Priority
3. Conside	_		-	our state	MIECHV progr	am aims	to achiev	e, how m	uch of a	priority
□ 0 Not a Priority at All	1	2	3	4	□ 5 Moderate Priority	6	□ 7	8	9	☐ 10 Highes Priority

							OMB Control No Expiration Date:			
					MIECHV progressive of pregnancy					
□ 0 Not a Priority at All	1	2	3	4	□ 5 Moderate Priority	6	7	8	9	☐ 10 Highes Priority
5. Conside					MIECHV progr g?	am aims	to achiev	e, how m	uch of a	priority
□ 0 Not a Priority at All	1	□ 2	3	□ 4	□ 5 Moderate Priority	6	□ 7	8	9	□ 10 Highes Priority
6. Conside					MIECHV progr use?	am aims	to achiev	ve, how m	uch of a	priority
□ 0 Not a Priority at All	1	2	3	4	5 Moderate Priority	6	□ 7	8	9	10 Highes Priority
	-		-		MIECHV progr substance use			e, how m	uch of a	priority
□ 0 Not a Priority at All	1	2	3	4	□ 5 Moderate Priority	6	□ 7	8	9	10 Highes Priority
8. Conside	ering all o	of the out	comes yo	our state	MIECHV progr	am aims	to achiev	ve, how m	uch of a	priority

is preventing and reducing domestic violence?

								B Control No: iration Date:		
Not a Priority at All					Moderate Priority					Highest Priority
	-		-		MIECHV progr such as reachi					-
0 Not a Priority at All	1	2	3	4	5 Moderate Priority	6	□ 7	8	9	□ 10 Highest Priority
is promot	ing child	preventi	ve care su	ch as ha	e MIECHV prog ving all recomr of their home t	mended	well-child	visits, be		
O Not a Priority at All	1	2	3	4	5 Moderate Priority	6	7	8	9	☐ 10 Highest Priority
	ing posit	ive paren	iting beha	viors, su	e MIECHV prog ch as nurturing					
O Not a Priority at All	1	2	3	4	5 Moderate Priority	6	7	8	9	☐ 10 Highest Priority
12. Considis prevent	_		•		e MIECHV prog eglect?	gram aim	ıs to achie	eve, how r	much of	a priority
0 Not a Priority at All	1	2	3	4	5 Moderate Priority	6	7	8	9	□ 10 Highest Priority

	_		-		e MIECHV prog elopment and					a priority
□ 0 Not a Priority at All	1	2	3	4	5 Moderate Priority	6	7	8	9	□ 10 Highest Priority
VISIT	ING				SE AND CH				V HON	1E
1.	1. When you think about implementing your state's MIECHV program, what is the one thing that excites you the most about this program?									
2.	What is	the one thi	ng that w	orries yo	u the most?					
3.		of the follow od system?	ving state	ments be	est describes tl	ne role of	f home vi	siting in y	our state	e's early
		program ☐ Within to state's s ☐ Home v	ns. he next fe ystem of isiting doo n my state	ew years, early chil es not ha	l expect home dhood prograve a clear role record, it is ha	e visiting ms. in our st	to have a	well-spe	cified rol	e in our m and
4.		-	-		ve should kno ave influenced			-	our MIE	CHV