



Supporting Evidence-Based Home Visiting to Prevent Child Maltreatment

Replicating Home Visiting Programs With Fidelity: Baseline Data and Preliminary Findings

Deborah Daro and Bonnie Hart
Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago
January 25, 2012



Acknowledgements

- **The sponsoring agencies: Children’s Bureau (CB), Administration for Children and Families and the Maternal Child Health Bureau, Health Resources and Services Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services**
- **Our federal project officer: Melissa Lim Brodowski**
- **Grantee and implementation agency staff for contributing data**
- **Our colleagues on the work underlying this presentation: Kim Boller, Cassandra Meagher, Cay Bradley, Kirsten Barrett, and others at Mathematica**



Today's Main Points

- **Descriptive data on program participants, providers and home visits underscore key similarities and differences across HV models.**
- **Initial implementation data found implementing agencies adhering to many model performance standards although some variation does exist.**
- **Areas presenting the greatest challenges include sustaining full enrollment and achieving service dosage levels.**



Cross-Site Fidelity Research Questions

- **Were the evidence-based home visitation programs selected by the grantees implemented and delivered with fidelity?**
- **To what extent did the grantees modify these national models to “fit” their target populations and local service delivery context?**
- **What contextual factors were associated with fidelity of implementation?**



Interest in Two Aspects of Fidelity

Structural (Implementation fidelity)	Dynamic (Intervention fidelity)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hiring qualified staff/providing sufficient training and supervision• Engaging the target population• Achieving recommended dosage and duration• Maintaining caseload levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nature of the provider-participant relationship• Manner of service delivery



Sources for Fidelity Indicators

- **Explicit performance standards outlined by each national HV model**
 - Caseloads
 - Service dosage
- **Implicit performance standards drawn from a model's theoretical approach or values regarding service delivery**
 - Engagement of participants in decision making
 - Responsiveness to participant needs
- **Current notions of efficiency or “best practice”**
 - Obtaining appropriate referrals
 - Maintaining high enrollment and retention levels



Data Collection Tools

- **Participant Profile completed at intake and termination**
- **Provider Profile completed at onset of data collection and updated as required**
- **Monthly reporting forms from IAs on caseloads and supervisory activity**
- **Individual report on each planned home visit**
- **Working Alliance Inventory (WAI) completed by providers and participants twice during the service period**



Analytic Approach

- **Examine the descriptive characteristics of participants, providers and home visits across program models and IAs**
- **Assess individual staff members and participants' service experiences in terms of relevant fidelity indicators for each IA**
- **Examine participant, provider and program factors that may account for variation in fidelity levels**
- **Provide data to IAs to facilitate continuous program improvement**



Our Current IA Sample

Type of Data Provided	HFA	NFP	PAT	SafeCare	Triple P
Monthly Reporting Data	11	15	8	2	1
Participant Level Data	3	16	2	5	1
Provider Level Data	9	12	8	5	1
Home Visit Data	3	16	2	5	1
WAI Data	3	0	2	5	1
# of IAs Providing ANY Data	11	19	8	5	1
# of IAs Providing FULL Data	3	0	2	3	1

Source: EBHV Cross-Site Fidelity Database, October 1, 2009 through December 31, 2010.



Our Current Population Sample

HV Model	Participants	Providers	Home Visits
HFA	110	61	1,022
NFP	1,427	69	19,447
PAT	75	54	784
SafeCare	146	31	1,633
Triple P	64	12	660
TOTAL	1,822	227	23,546

Source: EBHV Cross-Site Fidelity Database, October 1, 2009 through December 31, 2010.



Participant Characteristics

Variable	HFA	NFP	PAT	SafeCare
Socio-Demographic Risk Factors				
•Welfare/TANF/food stamps	91%	34%	72%	79%
•Unemployed & not in school	58%	35%	36%	51%
•No HS diploma or GED	28%	47%	55%	48%
•First child when teen	49%	50%	62%	57%
•Single parent	76%	92%	87%	69%
Socio-Demographic Risk Score				
•Low (0-2)	21%	40%	24%	35%
•Medium (2 - < 3)	41%	26%	40%	26%
•High (3 – 5)	38%	34%	36%	39%
Mean Risk Score (SD)	3.02 (1.12)	2.69 (1.26)	3.15 (1.08)	3.06 (1.25)
N for Risk Score =	109	1,288	75	133

Source: EBHV Cross-Site Fidelity Database, October 1, 2009 through December 31, 2010.



Fidelity Indicator Clusters

- Referrals
- Staff qualifications/training
- **Home visitor caseloads**
- Supervisory caseloads and supervision
- **Participant duration in program**
- **Service dosage**
- Participant-provider relationship
- Home visit content



Home Visitor Caseloads

Indicator	Mean	Standard Deviation	Low Score	High Score
Mean monthly HV caseload (n = 35 IAs)	13.4	6.8	2.1	24.8
% home visitors at or below recommended caseload (n = 35 IAs)	90.9	18.4	33.3	100.0
% home visitors below recommended caseload (n = 35 IAs)	78.3	31.4	16.7	100.0

Source: EBHV Cross-Site Fidelity Database, October 1, 2009 through December 31, 2010.



Duration

Indicator	Mean	Standard Deviation	Low Score	High Score
% of participants enrolled for at least 3 months or still enrolled (n = 27 IAs)	90.0	9.9	60.0	100.0
% of participants enrolled for at least 6 months or still enrolled (n = 27 IAs)	81.9	16.9	33.3	100.0
% of those leaving the program who did not successfully complete the program (n = 25 IAs)	91.3	19.1	35.0	100.0
Mean duration for those who left program during observation period (weeks) (n = 25 IAs)	19.3	8.0	3.0	34.8

Source: EBHV Cross-Site Fidelity Database, October 1, 2009 through December 31, 2010.



Dosage

Indicator	Mean	Standard Deviation	Low Score	High Score
# of visits provided/weeks of enrollment				
For those still enrolled (n = 27 IAs)	0.6	0.2	0.2	0.9
For successful completers (n = 5 IAs)	0.7	0.1	0.5	0.8
For unsuccessful/early leavers (n = 25 IAs)	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.7
Mean length of time between completed visits (days)				
For those still enrolled (n = 27 IAs)	14.5	7.3	8.3	46.8
For successful completers (n = 5 IAs)	11.2	2.9	9.0	16.2
For unsuccessful/early leavers (n = 25 IAs)	13.2	4.3	4.3	27.5



Dosage (con't)

Indicator	Mean	Standard Deviation	Low Score	High Score
% of participants who received appropriate service dosage during initial 6 months of enrollment (n = 27 IAs)	44.2	24.6	0.0	100.0
% of participants who received at least 90% of appropriate service dosage during initial 6 months of enrollment (n = 27 IAs)	50.0	24.7	0.0	100.0
% of participants who received at least 80% of appropriate service dosage during initial 6 months of enrollment (n = 27 IAs)	58.1	24.7	0.0	100.0

Source: EBHV Cross-Site Fidelity Database, October 1, 2009 through December 31,2010.



Emerging Questions

- **Given all the changes and adjustments being made in the implementation standards being set by the models, where do you draw the line on “fidelity”?**
- **If programs change the structural or dynamic aspects of service delivery, are they still evidence-based?**
- **Should Implementing Agencies be given a single “fidelity” score or rated in terms of the number of “domains” they implement with fidelity?**



Next Steps

- **Continue data analysis, focusing on examining variation in IA performance across indicators**
- **Draft report under review by grantees and Federal funders**
- **Final report, with focus on caseloads, duration and dosage, available in early 2012**
- **Continue ongoing data collection from implementing agencies, with an additional report being develop in late 2012**