

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 60 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to: NIH, Project Clearance Branch, 6705 Rockledge Drive, MSC 7974, Bethesda, MD 20892-7974, ATTN: PRA (0925-XXXX). Do not return the completed form to this address.

**NHLBI GHI COE Outcome Evaluation
DRAFT Training Director/Coordinator Key Informant Interview Protocol**

Thank you for agreeing to do this interview. My name is _____ and I am part of an evaluation team that has been contracted to assess the NHLBI and UnitedHealth Global Health Initiative, which I'll refer to as the COE Program. The team includes evaluation staff at Westat and NHLBI. Although Westat served as the Academic Coordinating Center (ACC) for the COE Program, the evaluation team does not have any involvement with the ACC.

I'd like to speak with you today regarding your involvement in the [center name] and the COE Program to better understand your role and contributions, areas for improvement, and lessons learned. We'll discuss the center's training program and your perspective of the COE Program.

Our goal is to understand how the COE Program was implemented, progressed, and the extent that it has been continued after funding for the Program ended. I [interviewer] was not involved in developing or implementing the program, so I encourage you to tell me about your experiences as frankly as you wish. Many times learning what works is just as important as learning about what does not work. Findings may be used to inform NIH and NHLBI about operational issues relevant to planning both global and domestic biomedical research and training programs.

Your decision to participate will not impact your involvement with NHLBI or future funding with NHLBI. While themes will be extracted from the interviews for analysis, the interviews will be held in confidence. Statements may be used for illustrative purposes, but would not be attributed to individuals. The interview will be audio-recorded to supplement our notes, but your name will not be associated with any of your comments, and the recordings will be destroyed once analysis is complete. The interview should take about 60 minutes of your time.

Do you have any questions? Do I have your consent to participate in this interview? Do I have consent to audio-record this interview?

A. Current Status of the Training Program

First, I would like to start by asking you some questions about the current status of the training program.

1. Please describe your current role at the center? How are you currently involved with the center? How does this compare to your role when the center was funded by NHLBI?
Probe: Types of training and mentoring guidance provided, teaching, involvement on training subcommittee
2. Please briefly describe the current status of the training program.
Probe: How has it changed since the time when it was funded by NHLBI? Training activities sustained, enhanced, suspended?
3. What supporting and/or impeding factors do you attribute to the current state of the training program?
Probe: Funding, support/resources from other COEs, local institutional partners, DCP staff, NHLBI, ACC, UHG, training subcommittee?
4. Upon completing the training program, approximately how many trainees have continued their careers at the institution?
5. What are the reasons why trainees stay? Leave?
Probe: For trainees that stay, what activities are they working on? Did the center use any strategies/efforts to retain trainees? If so, describe the efforts used to retain the trainees?
6. How did you engage or collaborate with the following stakeholders in terms of sharing training and mentoring expertise? Which collaborations were the most effective? Which are ongoing?
 - a. Research partners at local, national and international levels
Probe: What factors have supported any ongoing collaborations?
 - b. Higher level officials (e.g., officials in your institution such as deans, directors and those external to the COE such as MOH officials and other)
Probe: What factors have supported any ongoing collaborations?
 - c. The community (advocacy groups, local champions - what are the types?)
Probe: What factors have supported any ongoing collaborations?
 - d. Community health workers *Probe:* Will this be an outcome of government buy-in?
Probe: What factors have supported any ongoing collaborations?
 - e. Other trained investigators/graduates (Fogarty scholars, other scholars from outside institutes)
Probe: What factors have supported any ongoing collaborations?
7. What elements of the training program do you think were the most effective?
Probe: How were these elements effective? What contributed to their effectiveness? Were these developed during or after the center was funded by NHLBI?
8. What elements of the training program do you think were the least effective?
Probe: How were these elements ineffective? Were there efforts to address these elements?

9. What factors are most critical for [sustaining/enhancing, based on response from A2] the training program (support from the institution, funding, retaining trainees)?
10. Were these lessons learned shared with others involved in the COE Program? If so, how were they used by others in the program?

B. Consortium Level

Now, I would like to learn more about your thoughts on how to improve the COE program.

1. What elements of the COE Program structure worked well, particularly for training and mentoring? What areas needed improvement?
Probe: bidirectional communication/collaboration between partners (leveraging resources, sharing scientific expertise, best practices, publications, community buy-in)
2. If given the chance to advise on the design of a future COE program, particularly in terms of training and mentoring, what would you recommend?
3. What are your thoughts on the feasibility of replicating this training and mentoring program for CVPD research? For other types of research areas?

C. Wrap-Up

1. Those are all the questions that I have. Do you have any questions or comments for me?

Thank you for your time. The information you have provided will be very valuable to NHLBI. Together with other information being collected, it will help NHLBI to better plan global and domestic biomedical research and training program. Should you have questions or input regarding the evaluation, feel free to contact Jennifer Huang, the Project Director of the evaluation, at JenniferHuang@Westat.com.