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National Home Visiting Alliance Mission

The collective mission of the Alliance is to improve the health and wellbeing of pregnant women, young children and their parents by elevating and advancing the field of evidence-based home visiting through collaborative leadership. Our activities include legislative and local advocacy, identifying cross-model issues that affect outcomes of interest for each model, collaborations on research, and innovations to improve service. While each home visiting model is unique in intervention goals and outcomes, aspects of federal, state, and local mechanisms of HV implementation pertain to all.
Early Head Start
Early Head Start MIHOPE Consortium

Purpose of MIHOPE Consortium
To bring together all Early Head Start programs participating in the study and facilitate collaborative relationships of support.

Goal of MIHOPE Consortium
To understand how the study can potentially inform and influence service delivery for the EHS Home Based Option and the field.
Mother and Infant Home Visiting Program Evaluation (MIHOPE) & MIHOPE-Strong Start
Sponsors and Study Team

Sponsored by:
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
- Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation (OPRE)
- Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), Maternal and Child Health Bureau
- The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation

Project Directors:
- Virginia Knox and Charles Michalopoulos

Project Team:
- MDRC
- James Bell Associates
- Johns Hopkins University
- Mathematica Policy Research
MIHOPE

Evaluation of the effectiveness of home visiting models supported by MIECHV

NFP, HFA, PAT, EHS

4 components:
1. State needs assessment analysis
2. Random assignment impact study
3. Multi-level implementation study
4. Economic evaluation

MIHOPE-Strong Start

Evaluation of the effectiveness of home visiting models with prior evidence of improving birth outcomes

NFP and HFA

2 components:
1. Random assignment impact study
2. Multi-level implementation study
Sample

MIHOPE
- Expectant women and families with child ≤6 months old
  - EHS
  - PAT

MIHOPE-Strong Start
- Women at least 8 weeks from their expected date of delivery
  - HFA
  - NFP
States with Participating Programs

- MIHOPE programs
- MIHOPE-Strong Start programs
- MIHOPE & MIHOPE-Strong Start programs
Process for this evaluation process:

- First, this project is not research. Included cross-model focused interviews.
- Use of consistent focused questions about research and about research specific to participation in MIHOPE and MSS.
- A request was sent to supervisors in each model.
- Each supervisor was interviewed by model staff person using the focused questions.
- Collaboratively, we analyzed the results to identify themes.
- Secondly, we sent questions to all of our networks about research in the field.

** EHS was not able to participate in the focused questions and short survey due to federal regulations.
## Total Number of Participants Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Agencies in MIHOPE</th>
<th>MIHOPE Agencies Participated in Interview</th>
<th>Agencies in MIHOPE-SS Participated in Interview</th>
<th>Agencies in MIHOPE and MIHOPE-SS Participated in Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HFA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFP</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Common Themes

Randomization

Data Collection

Retention
What is Random Assignment?

- Fair way to determine who receives program services
  - A lottery-like process to place individuals into a program group and a comparison group
  - Allows you to measure the impacts (effects) on outcomes for each group

Groups will have similar average characteristics before one receives program services

- The differences in outcomes over time between groups are due to program services
Why Random Assignment?

Without a comparison, Program 3 might appear to be the most effective.
Study Enrollment Process

1. Meet with client to obtain informed consent for study
2. Enter client data into Web Intake System; Confirm eligibility for MIHOPE-Strong Start
3. Determine program eligibility and interest

- If ineligible for study, proceed with usual program intake
- Yes, consents to study. Completes brief survey via telephone

4. Random Assignment (RA)

- Selected for home visiting services: Inform family of RA status; Initiate home visiting services
- Not selected for home visiting services: Inform family of RA status; Refer to alternative services
Panelist Questions

How did randomization impact families, staff, and sites?

1. What did we learn from the agencies?
2. What was helpful in the randomization process?
MIHOPE
Participants:
- 60 minute baseline phone survey
- 60 minute follow-up survey (15 months)
- Video observation of home visit*

Program staff
- Baseline & 12-month survey
- Service delivery, training, and supervision logs
- Video observation of home visit*
- Qualitative interviews*

MIHOPE-Strong Start
Participants:
- 20 minute phone survey

Program staff
- 6-month survey

* Subset of participants and/or program staff
Panelist Questions

What did we learn overall about the data collection process?

What was challenging?
Panelist Questions

What did we learn overall about client retention?

What was challenging?
Implications and points to ponder for researchers, agencies, local and state, and home visitors

1. Preparing for a study/evaluation
2. Randomization
3. Minimizing Potential Impacts on Retention
4. Improving Data Collection
5. Ongoing training and communication support for data collectors
Questions
Thank you