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Evidence-Based Home Visiting (EBHV) Grants

- In 2008 ACF’s Children’s Bureau funded 17 grantees in 15 states to:
  - Select home visiting program models that were evidence-based (as defined for purposes of the grant)
  - Leverage the grant funds to build infrastructure to implement, scale up, and sustain their selected programs with fidelity to their evidence-based models
  - Participate in local and cross-site evaluations

- The grantees engaged partner organizations to build infrastructure and implement and sustain home visiting programs over a 5-year period
## Grantees’ Home Visiting Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Visiting Program Model</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Number of Grantees Selecting Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nurse-Family Partnership</td>
<td>First-time pregnant women &lt; 28 weeks gestation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Families America</td>
<td>Pregnant women or new parents within two weeks of infant’s birth</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents as Teachers</td>
<td>Birth or prenatal to age 5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SafeCare</td>
<td>Birth to age 5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple P</td>
<td>Birth to age 12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Koball et al. (2009). Grantee plan updates.
Cross-Site Evaluation Design
Mathematica and Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago funded to conduct a six-year cross-site evaluation

Goal: identify successful infrastructure building strategies for adopting, implementing and sustaining high-quality home visiting programs

The evaluation was designed using a participatory approach, building on local evaluation plans, with minimal data requirements and utilization-focused reporting
Systems Evaluation Concepts

- Grantee-specific systems: collective groups of interrelated, interdependent individuals and organizations that directly or indirectly influence child abuse prevention
- Through systems change activities, grantees develop infrastructure capacity to improve implementation, spread, and sustainability of EBHV programs
- Systems change: changes in the scope (boundaries), relationships, and perspectives of those involved, directly or indirectly, in grantees’ EBHV systems
System Infrastructure Research Questions

- What were the characteristics of the grantees, their partner networks and environments?
- How did grantees levels and types of infrastructure building activities differ?
- What factors were associated with differences in infrastructure building activity?
- What goals were achieved through these activities?
- Did the home visiting programs improve child and family outcomes?
EBHV Evaluation Conceptual Framework


PLN = peer learning network.
# System Attributes and Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logic Model Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systems level at which grantees are working</td>
<td>Core operations, organizational, community, state, and national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure development activities</td>
<td>Activities that grantees are carrying out to build infrastructure capacities at various system levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key players</td>
<td>Types of individuals or organizations involved in grantee activities at different system levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure capacities needed to carry Out Planned Activities</td>
<td>Planning, operations, workforce development, funding, collaboration, communication, political support, and quality assurance and program evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVIDENCE-BASED HOME VISITING GRANT LOGIC MODEL

**Inputs**

**National:**
- ACF, ARA grants
- FRIENDS
- Model Developers
- MPR-CH Team

**State:**
- Governor
- Legislature
- State agencies
- Provider coalitions

**Community:**
- County agencies
- Steering committee
- Private funders
- Target population
- Service providers

**Implementing Agencies:**
- Organizational support – leadership, planning, funding, evaluation
- Direct operations – Managers, supervisors, home visitors

**Activities**

- Grant management
- Cross-site evaluation
- Model certification and adaptation

- Needs assessments and plans
- Legislation and regulation
- TA and consultation system
- Program reporting and evaluation system
- Dissemination of evidence-based models

- Partner collaboration
- Building of community network of services
- Development of referral system

- Develop program for target population
- Obtain program funding
- Create evaluation plan
- Manage daily operation
- Hire, train staff

- Program certification
- National funding secured

- Increased knowledge of EBHV programs
- New state funding streams
- Increased coordination among EBHV models across state

- New service providers in service network
- Coordinated referral system in place
- Community support for EBHV

- Program funding maintained
- Evaluation implemented
- Training capacity developed
- Home visitors operate program with fidelity to model

**Short-term Results: Outputs, Outcomes**

- Program adaptations certified
- National funding sustained

- Expansion of EBHV programs to new areas, populations
- State funding sustained

- Comprehensive EBHV services available
- Target population gets needed services

- Expansion to new sites, target groups
- Funding sustained
- Evaluation used to improve services
- Fidelity sustained
- Families benefit from services

**Long-term Outcomes**

**EBHV Goals**

- Implement EBHV programs with Fidelity
- Scale-up, expansion of EBHV program with fidelity
- Sustain EBHV programs with fidelity

**Context**
Early Evaluation Findings
Findings: Grantee Characteristics

- **Diverse grantees**
  - Geography: 15 states
  - Organizations: 6 state agencies, 7 non-profits, 2 research centers, 1 county agency, and 1 hospital
  - Scope: 7 direct services, 6 contracted with others, 4 managed statewide initiatives
  - Stage of development: 4 new statewide programs, 6 ongoing statewide programs, 6 new local programs, and 1 ongoing local program

- **Diverse partner networks**
  - Size: 10 to 25 partners; 18 on average
  - Collaboration: Average of 3.17 on 1 to 4 scale
  - Complicated/complex dynamics

Source: “Assessing the Need for Evidence-Based Home Visiting: Experiences of Grantees,” Mathematica Policy Research
Findings: Infrastructure Activity

- Grantees implemented concurrently 8 types of infrastructure activity clustered in three groups
  - Foundation: planning and collaboration
  - Implementation: operations and workforce development
  - Sustaining: fiscal capacity, community and political support, communications, and evaluation
Findings: Infrastructure Building Strategies

- Grantees’ strategies depended on scope of their project, stage of their EBHV program’s development, and environmental context.
- New statewide programs engaged in more operations, workforce development, fiscal, and communications development strategies than other types of grantees.
- Ongoing statewide programs engaged in more evaluation and community and political support development strategies than other types of grantees.

Source: “Assessing the Need for Evidence-Based Home Visiting: Experiences of Grantees,” Mathematica Policy Research
Findings: Diverse Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Grantees (n=17)</th>
<th>Partners (n=226)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local or state agency</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-profit organization</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care organization/Hospital</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based service provider</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer or support organization for home visiting model</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (such as school districts, advocacy groups)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 EBHV Partner Survey, Mathematica Policy Research
## Findings: Diverse Partner Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Total (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement/Operate HV</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build HV Continuum of Care</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Partnerships and Collaboration</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent Child Abuse/Neglect</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee Specific or Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure or Sustain Funding</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Parent Outcomes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build Infrastructure</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Quality or Evaluate HV</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build Community and Political Support</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Child Outcomes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate to Partners and/or Public</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train, Coach, or Supervise HV Workforce</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan and Develop EBHV</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 EBHV Partner Survey, Mathematica Policy Research
Social Network Analysis Methods

- Social network analysis (SNA) is a way to look at relationships – linkages between people, groups, organizations, and communities.

- Method - Sociograms

- Statistics
  - Centralization – the extent to which the working activity is targeted at a single organization as the “hub” of activities.
  - Transitivity – the extent to which there are clusters of organizations that are interconnected to each other.
Findings: Complex Partner Networks

Source: EBHV Partner Survey 2010
HLM Methods

- **Regression-based analyses**
  - Assume relationships differ within and between levels (the 17 sites)

- **Measures at each level**
  - Attributes of grantees and partners
  - Infrastructure activities
  - Fidelity, scale-up, and sustainability

- Interpreted as higher levels affecting lower levels
Findings: Collaborative Partnerships Key

- Grantees and their partners most active in foundation building activities and least involved in implementation activities
- Some systems more active than others in building foundation and sustaining infrastructure
- An important predictor of the level of system infrastructure activity was goal alignment – where partners shared goals, there was more foundation and sustaining activity
- Within systems, partners were more active in building infrastructure when they perceived that the quality of collaboration among their EBHV partners was high
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