**Attachment B16 – MDRBD Program Semi-Structured Interview Guide**

**Pilot Test Results**

**Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) Evaluation of the Maternal and Child Health Bureau (MCHB) Pediatric Mental Health Care Access (PMHCA) and Screening and Treatment for Maternal Depression and Related Behavioral Disorders (MDRBD) Programs Project**

Note: The instruments included in this OMB package have been revised and incorporate

the pilot test results. The question numbers correspond with the instruments pilot tested.

| **Feedback** | **Changes Made to Instrument**  |
| --- | --- |
| **General Comment:** All questions are clear and make sense. Order of questions is logical and probes provide solid opportunity for capturing important details. | N/A—no changes required. |
| **General Comment:** Was surprised not to see questions about service gaps or barriers encountered in care coordination. Was surprised not to see linkage time (some can take weeks or months) not addressed in the linkage section. | Question 24 has been added to address the gaps/barriers. In addition, linkage time was added as an example to the new probe in Question 25. |
| **General Comment:** Overall the content was easy to read, was aligned with the survey. There is a typo on page 4 2nd paragraph word structured is missing "ur". | The typo has been corrected. |
| **Format:** Format allows for ample qualitative data collection. | N/A—no changes required. |
| **Format:** Format appears fine. | N/A—no changes required. |
| **Format:** Format is good, flows, for the most part is easy to read/understand and covers a lot of information in the span of the one hour allotted. | N/A—no changes required. |
| **Question 1 (and probes):** Question regarding the clarity of Probe 2. | Added clarifying text to the probe. |
| **Question 1 (and probes):** Per my feedback on the survey I wonder if there is interest in learning if folks have dual titles/roles? | Given the semi-structured nature of the interview, respondents can address dual titles/roles as appropriate. |
| **Question 10 (and probe):** Wondering if wording could be "what challenges have you or are you experiencing in ...... and for the probe ...what changes have, or are you, making to improve.... | The question has been revised to read “What challenges have you experienced in recruiting and enrolling health care providers/practices?” |
| **Question 11:** I still find myself confused between health provider and practice in terms of when you mention one vs another. Questions 7-10 mention both and 11-14 switches back to provider but it could be my lack of understanding. | Individual health care providers as well as practices can be enrolled, which is addressed in Questions 7 – 10. However, health care providers (vs. practices) are trained as specified in Questions 11 – 14.  |
| Question 11: **Re: question 11-14** - would it be useful to ask them to clarify for their project what health care provider involves - dr.'s, nurses, etc.? | These questions have been left as is, due to availability of this information from other sources. |
| **Question 15:** In the intro to this one should a definition of clinical behavioral health consultation be defined for this project (as it is for care coordination)? And, for question 15 specifically I am not sure what this question is asking - wonder if wording such as - Describe the processes for provision of clinical behavioral health...... is relevant or would help to clarify question intent? | This change has been made (adding “for provision of”). |
| **Question 19:** As with #15 would wording such as this clarify question intent ...Describe the processes for delivery of care coordination support.... | The wording has been changed as suggested. |
| **Question 20 (and probe):** Find the use of the word topics odd- perhaps "types" might be more appropriate. Also, you might want a probe that asks what if any care coordination services are needed but not sufficiently available/accessible. | The wording changes have been made as suggested and Question 24 has been added to address availability/accessibility of care coordinate services has been added. |
| **Question 24 (and probes):** I feel like the linkages section should precede the care coordination section. Wouldn't you establish linkages and THEN coordinate the associated care? | No change made due to HRSA’s definition of care coordination used for this program. |
| **Question 26:** Feedback provided on clarity of question and type of response it may elicit.  | Clarifying language has been added to this question as suggested. |
| **Question 26:** Wonder if interviewer should ask the question and then list each of the social determinants to elicit from interviewee how their project addresses each? Also, I don’t recall a question about social determinants being on the survey - should it be? | Clarifying language has been added to this question as suggested. Regarding social determinants of health, this was not included in the survey, but the community linkages addressing these social determinants are included. |
| **Question 29 (and probe):** Is there interest in also learning of lessons learned or challenges for this area (as there was for the area above comm linkages) and how these were addressed/overcome? | Question 31 has been added regarding lessons learned/challenges and how addressed has been added as suggested. . |
| **Question 33 (and probe):** Not sure I understand this question in line with the survey that asks what funding is anticipated - if they answer yes to having a formal plan for funding (on the survey) then they can likely respond to this - if they marked no then the question is more about pursuing the funding stream to leverage for sustainability. | This question has been left as is as given the semi-structured nature of the interview, if they do not have a formal funding plan, they can discuss their plans sustainability otherwise. |
| **Question 33 (and probe):** Wondering if the plan is to invite them to discuss as the question is stated or invite them to share? | The question has been changed to allow for discussion. |